The costs and benefits of multicellular group formation in algae

Journal:	<i>Evolution</i>
Manuscript ID	19-0055
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Predation, major evolutionary transitions, cooperation, multicellularity, <i>Chlorella</i>

1 **The costs and benefits of multicellular group formation in algae**

2 **Abstract**

3 The first step in the evolution of complex multicellular organisms involves single
4 cells forming a cooperative group. Consequently, to understand multicellularity, we
5 need to understand the costs and benefits associated with multicellular group
6 formation. We found that in the facultatively multicellular algae *Chlorella*
7 *sorokiniana*: (1) the presence of the flagellate *Ochromonas danica* or the crustacean
8 *Daphnia magna* leads to the formation of multicellular groups; (2) the formation of
9 multicellular groups reduces predation by *O. danica*, but not by the larger predator *D.*
10 *magna*; (3) under conditions of relatively low light intensity, where competition for
11 light is greater, multicellular groups grow slower than single cells; (4) in the absence
12 of live predators, the proportion of cells in multicellular groups decreases at a rate that
13 does not vary with light intensity. These results can explain why, in cases such as this
14 algae species, multicellular group formation is facultative, in response to the presence
15 of predators.

16 **Keywords:** predation, major evolutionary transitions, cooperation, multicellularity,
17 *Chlorella*

18 **Introduction**

19 A blue whale is a cooperative group of about 100 quadrillion cells (Zhang et al.
20 2005). In order for such a large and complex multicellular organism to have evolved,
21 the single-celled ancestor of this species must have joined together to form a
22 cooperative multicellular group (Maynard Smith and Szathmary 1995; Grosberg and
23 Strathmann 2007; Michod 2007; Bourke 2011; Claessen et al. 2014; West et al.
24 2015). This poses an evolutionary problem, because grouping together is likely to

have costs, such as increased competition for resources, which would have to be outweighed by any benefits of group formation. The costs and benefits of multicellular group formation cannot be examined in complex multicellular organisms, like the blue whale, because they cannot complete their life cycle as single cells (they are obligately multicellular). In addition, such species also exhibit division of labor between different cells, a subsequent elaboration, which only arose after the formation of multicellular groups. Consequently, if we want to understand the factors that favored the initial evolution of multicellular groups, we need to examine species that can exist both as single cells and multicellular groups (facultatively multicellular), and before division of labor has evolved. Possible benefits to forming multicellular groups include that multicellular groups are better able to defend against predators, disperse, or forage for food and resources (Strassmann et al. 2000; Grosberg and Strathmann 2007; Bourke 2011; Koschwanez et al. 2013; Claessen et al. 2014; Smith et al. 2014; Biernaskie and West 2015).

Facultatively multicellular algae offer excellent opportunities for measuring the benefits and costs of multicellular group formation. Many species of green algae live as single cells, until certain ecological conditions, such as the presence of predators, cause them to form multicellular groups (Van Donk et al. 2011; Fisher et al. 2016; Kapsetaki et al. 2016). Previous work examining the costs and benefits of group formation in algae has produced mixed results. Some studies have found that group formation provides a defence against predators, but others have not (Hessen and Van Donk 1993; Lampert et al. 1994; Lüring and Van Donk 1996; Lüring 1999). One possible reason for this variation could be that forming groups provides a defence against relatively small predators, but not against relatively large predators that can consume groups.

50 A possible explanation for why group formation is only facultative is that it
 51 could incur costs, and so would only be favoured when the benefits outweigh the
 52 costs. Most studies have failed to find a cost of group formation, in terms of increased
 53 competition for resources (Riegman et al. 1992; Peperzak 1993; Boraas et al. 1998;
 54 Lurling and Van Donk 2000; Jakobsen and Tang 2002; Lurling and Beekman 2006).
 55 However, costs and benefits will depend upon environmental conditions, and the
 56 conditions that influence group formation could have confounding influences. For
 57 example, a failure to find a cost of group formation, in terms of decreased growth
 58 rates, may reflect experiments being carried out in benign environments, where
 59 resources were not limiting (Lurling and Van Donk 2000; Jakobsen and Tang 2002;
 60 Lurling and Beekman 2006).

61 We examined the costs and benefits of multicellular group formation in the
 62 algae *Chlorella sorokiniana*. This species forms multicellular groups facultatively, in
 63 response to the presence of a number of predators, including the flagellate
 64 *Ochromonas* spp., the ciliate *Tetrahymena thermophila*, and the crustacean *Daphnia*
 65 *magna* (Kapsetaki et al. 2016). We have previously shown that group formation can
 66 also be induced by the addition of products from a culture of one of these predators,
 67 *D. magna*, in the absence of actual predators (Kapsetaki et al. 2016). We exploited
 68 this as an experimental tool, to manipulate whether cells are in groups, independently
 69 of other factors.

70 We had three specific aims. First, we tested whether multicellular group
 71 formation led to reduced predation by the flagellate predator *Ochromonas danica* or
 72 by the crustacean predator *D. magna*. We used *O. danica* and *D. magna* because: (i)
 73 both species predate *C. sorokiniana*, and (ii) *O. danica* is approximately 100 times
 74 smaller than *D. magna*, allowing us to examine a small predator that is a similar size

as the algae, and a large predator that can be much larger than groups of algae (Lürling et al. 1997; Boraas et al. 1998; Kapsetaki et al. 2016). Second, we tested whether, in the absence of predators, multicellular group formation led to reduced growth. We examined for this potential cost of group formation under conditions of both high and low light availability, because the growth cost of forming groups could depend upon environmental conditions (Lürling and Van Donk 2000; Jakobsen and Tang 2002; Lurling and Beekman 2006).

Third, we tested whether multicellular groups broke up, and returned to single cells, in the absence of predators, and whether this varied between high and low light availability. If group formation is costly, then we would expect group breakup to be favoured when the benefit (predator avoidance) was not there, and especially under conditions where resources are limiting, and hence the costs of group formation are higher (Dehning and Tilzer 1989; Boraas et al. 1998; Verschoor et al. 2009). In addition to our specific experimental aims, we also examined the generality of our results, with a meta-analysis on data compiled from the literature.

Methods

Strains

We maintained the algae *Chlorella sorokiniana* (non-axenic from the Culture Collection of Algae and Protozoa; strain number 211/8K) in Bolds Basal media at 20°C at a light:dark cycle of 16:8 hours fluorescent illumination (LMS incubator - Model 280). To eliminate bacteria from the cultures, we added 500 $\mu\text{g mL}^{-1}$ of the antibiotic rifampicin to 1-mL samples of *C. sorokiniana*, and diluted the samples 1:300 after 24 hours in Bolds Basal media (Kapsetaki et al. 2016; Kapsetaki et al. 2017). No bacteria were visible under an inverted microscope after rifampicin

99 treatment. In addition, before each experiment, we took culture samples, and observed
100 them under an inverted microscope at x20 and x40 magnification, to test for possible
101 bacterial contamination. In the richer media, for instance Proteose Peptone Yeast
102 extract (PPY), contamination was more frequent. In cases where there was
103 contamination, we did not carry out the experiment. Instead, we started a new culture
104 from the stock culture, treated this new culture with rifampicin, and started the
105 experiment afresh. We maintained the cultures in 1-L Erlenmeyer flasks shaking at
106 220 rpm, at 20°C and a light:dark cycle of 16:8 hours fluorescent illumination, before
107 using the cultures in experiments.

108 As putative predators, we used *Ochromonas danica* (axenic from the National
109 Center for Marine Algae and Microbiota; strain number CCMP 3279) cultured in 2.5
110 mL PPY media diluted in 7.5 mL dH₂O, and *Daphnia magna* (Sciento, UK), which
111 we fed 5 mL *Scenedesmus obliquus* (10⁶ cells mL⁻¹) every 4-5 days. A number of
112 previous studies have shown that *Ochromonas* and *Daphnia* species can predate algae
113 (Ryther 1954; Daley et al. 1973; Boraas et al. 1992; Lurling and Verschoor 2003). We
114 maintained the *O. danica* culture in a 50-mL Falcon tube and the *D. magna* in 500-
115 mL jars and at 20°C and a light:dark cycle of 16:8 hours fluorescent illumination.
116 Before using *O. danica* in experiments, we reverse-filtered the culture with Bolds
117 Basal media to remove *O. danica* from the nutrient rich PPY media and thus minimise
118 the possibility of PPY-induced group formation in *C. sorokiniana* (Fisher et al. 2016;
119 Kapsetaki et al. 2016). The filter we used in all experiments had a pore diameter of
120 0.22 µm. The resulting final concentration of *O. danica* that we used in experiments
121 was 1.5 x 10⁶ cells mL⁻¹.

122 To induce group formation in the algae *C. sorokiniana*, we used filtered liquid

from the predator *D. magna* (Kapsetaki et al. 2017). *D. magna* is a much larger predator, whose extracts have a much larger influence on group formation, and hence allow us greater experimental power (Kapsetaki et al. 2016; Kapsetaki et al. 2017).

Experiment 1: Is there a fitness benefit of being in a group?

Ochromonas predator

Our previous work with *C. sorokiniana* used a different *Ochromonas* species, *Ochromonas* spp. Consequently, our first aim was to test whether the algae *C. sorokiniana* form groups in response to live *O. danica* and/or supernatant from *O. danica*. We added 1 mL of *C. sorokiniana* (10^6 cells mL⁻¹) with 0.75 mL filtered Bolds media to either: (1) 0.75 mL of *O. danica*; (2) 0.75 mL filtered liquid from the culture of *O. danica*; (3) 0.75 mL filtered Bolds media as a negative control of group formation; or (4) 0.75 mL filtered liquid from the culture of *D. magna* (final concentration of 3 individuals per mL) as a positive control of group formation in 50-mL Falcon tubes (15 replicates per treatment). We randomized the tubes on tube racks incubated at 20°C and a light:dark cycle of 16:8 hours fluorescent illumination. We kept the tube caps loose to allow oxygenation. We collected samples at 0 and 24 hours by tilting each tube 5 times to adequately mix the cultures, and transferring 50 μ L from each culture into a 96-well plate. We minimized sampling bias by obtaining an image from a random area of each well with a VisiCam digital camera under an inverted microscope (VWR, Model XDS-3) at x20 magnification. In these 2-dimensional images, we quantified the proportion of cells in groups (number of algal cells in groups/total number of algal cells). We performed image analysis using Image J software (Cell Counter plugin). We define a group as ≥ 3 cells in contact with each other, but found the same qualitative results when analysing mean group size. In

several cases the exact number of cells in 3-dimensional groups, especially in large groups, was difficult to determine from the 2-dimensional images, as many cells were 'hidden in the background'. For consistency, we counted what we saw in the 2-dimensional images. We counted paired cells as single cells in all the experiments. We counted cell numbers based on the images obtained from the microscope rather than OD measurements, because we noticed that the light from the spectrophotometer interferes with multicellular groups and so does not provide an accurate measure of total cells when there are groups in a culture.

Second, we tested whether *O. danica* is a predator of *C. sorokiniana* and whether groups of *C. sorokiniana* have a higher fitness relative to single cells when exposed to *O. danica*. We added 4.04 mL of *C. sorokiniana* (10^6 cells mL⁻¹) to either: (1) 0.96 mL of filtered liquid from the culture of *D. magna* (final concentration of 3 individuals per mL) (n=10 'multicellular' cultures); or (2) 0.96 mL of filtered Bolds media in a 50-mL Falcon tube (n=10 'unicellular' cultures). We maintained the 20 tubes at 20°C at 16:8 hours light:dark cycle fluorescent illumination for 96 hours. We mixed replicates of the same treatments resulting in two cultures, and diluted both cultures to 40 algal cells per field of view at x20 magnification. We then created four experimental treatments in a 2x2 factorial design, with multicellular or unicellular cultures, and with or without the addition of *O. danica* predators. We did this by combining into 50-ml Falcon tubes 0.75 mL of filtered Bolds media with: (1) 1 mL of the multicellular culture, and 0.75 mL of *O. danica*; (2) 1 mL of the multicellular culture, and 0.75 mL filtered liquid from the culture of *O. danica*; (3) 1 mL of the unicellular culture, and 0.75 mL *O. danica*; or (4) 1 mL of the unicellular culture, and 0.75 mL filtered liquid from the culture of *O. danica*. We replicated each treatment 30 times. We randomized the tubes on tube racks, keeping the tube caps loose to allow

oxygenation, and incubated at 20°C and a light:dark cycle of 16:8 hours. After adding the predator treatments, we collected samples at 0 and 3 hours, sampling as described above, to measure the total number of algal cells and the proportion of cells in groups.

A potential complication with this experiment is that the addition of *O. danica* predators induces multicellular group formation in the algae, which could reduce the difference between our treatments in the proportion of algae in multicellular groups. To avoid this, we quantified predation just 3 hours after adding predators - live *O. danica* induces group formation in *C. sorokiniana* after 24 hours, but not after 3 hours (Kapsetaki et al. 2016). We also used a relatively low density of algae in this experiment as mentioned above (40 algal cells per field of view at x20 magnification) because prior experiments showed that a related small predator *Ochromonas* spp. cannot eat a very large number of cells especially in such a short amount of time (3 hours; Kapsetaki et al. 2016).

Daphnia predator

We performed three experiments to test whether group formation is beneficial in terms of avoiding predation by *D. magna*. We examined whether cultures of unicellular algae experience a larger decrease in density than multicellular cultures after exposure to: (1) mixed sizes of *D. magna*; (2) small-, medium-, or large-sized *D. magna*; and (3) whether cells that were in multicellular groups were less likely to be predated by *D. magna* in cultures that contained both multicellular groups and unicells. This combination of experiments allowed us to test if multicellular group formation helped reduce predation, if this benefit only occurred with certain size *D. magna*, or if *D. magna* preferentially fed on unicells/smaller groups.

First, we examined whether unicellular cultures decrease in density more than multicellular cultures after adding mixed sizes of *D. magna*. We added 4 mL of *C.*

197 *sorokiniana* (10^6 cells mL⁻¹) to either: (1) 1 mL of filtered liquid from the *D. magna*
 198 culture (final concentration of 3 individuals per mL) (n=30 ‘multicellular’ cultures);
 199 or (2) 1 mL of filtered Bolds media in a 50-mL Falcon tube (n=30 ‘unicellular’
 200 cultures). We kept tubes at 20°C at 16:8 hours light:dark cycle fluorescent
 201 illumination for 96 hours. We mixed replicates of the same treatments resulting in two
 202 cultures, and diluted both cultures to 10^6 cells mL⁻¹. We then created four
 203 experimental treatments, with multicellular or unicellular cultures, and with or
 204 without the addition of *D. magna* predators of mixed sizes. Specifically, we combined
 205 into 50-ml Falcon tubes: (1) 4.5 mL of the multicellular culture, and 0.5 mL of
 206 filtered liquid from the culture of *D. magna*; (2) 4.5 mL of the multicellular culture,
 207 and 0.5 mL with 15 individuals *D. magna* of various sizes; (3) 4.5 mL of the
 208 unicellular culture, and 0.5 mL of filtered liquid from the culture of *D. magna*; or (4)
 209 4.5 mL of the unicellular culture, and 0.5 mL with 15 individuals *D. magna* of various
 210 sizes. We replicated each treatment 18 times. We randomized tubes on tube racks,
 211 keeping the tube caps loose allowing gas exchange, and incubated at 20°C and a
 212 light:dark cycle of 16:8 hours. After adding the predator treatments, we collected
 213 samples at 0 and 12 hours, sampling as described above, to measure the total number
 214 of algal cells and the proportion of cells in groups.

215 Second, we tested whether groups of *C. sorokiniana* have a benefit in terms of
 216 avoiding predation by small, medium, or large *D. magna*. We carried out this
 217 experiment because any benefit of avoiding predation could vary with predator size,
 218 and so could have been masked by using *D. magna* of variable sizes. We followed the
 219 same protocol as above, but instead of the treatments where we added *D. magna* of
 220 various sizes, we had three separate treatments where we added small (<2 mm),
 221 medium (2-3 mm), or large (>3 mm) *D. magna*.

Third, we tested whether multicellular groups of algae were less likely to be predated by *D. magna* in cultures that contained both multicellular groups and unicells. We carried out this experiment in case the benefit of avoiding predation was only realized when there was a range of group sizes available, for example if *D. magna* preferentially feed on unicells. We differentiated between cells that were from multicellular or unicellular cultures by marking them with different fluorescent dyes. We prepared unicellular and multicellular cultures by either adding filtered Bolds media or filtered *D. magna* supernatant to the algae *C. sorokiniana*, then separated each culture in two separate treatments, dyed each treatment with either a green or violet fluorescent dye, mixed together the differently-dyed multicellular and unicellular cultures at a 1:1 ratio, before adding the *D. magna*.

We added 2.5 mL of *C. sorokiniana* (10^6 cells mL⁻¹) in 50-mL falcon tubes to either 2.5 mL of filtered Bolds media, or 2.5 mL filtered liquid from the *D. magna* culture (final concentration of 3 individuals per mL) (6 replicates per treatment). We kept the falcon tube caps loose to allow for gas exchange and randomized tubes on a rack in the incubator at 20°C with a light/dark cycle of 16:8 hours using fluorescent illumination.

After 48 hours, we mixed together the tubes from the same treatments and followed the protocol for fluorescently dyeing cells as described in Kapsetaki et al. 2017. We centrifuged the cultures at 100 x g for 10 minutes and resuspended the pellet in CD-CHO Medium (Gibco, Carlsbad, CA). We then split each culture in equal volumes and added the fluorescent dye CellTracker™ Green BODIPY (final concentration 20 μ M) to one culture, and CellTracker™ Violet BMQC (final concentration 20 μ M) to the other culture. We diluted stock dyes in 10 mM DMSO. We covered the four cultures with aluminium foil, left them shaking at 170 rpm

overnight at room temperature, then centrifuged both cultures at 100 x g for 10 minutes, and resuspended in Bolds media to remove the dyes.

We diluted the cultures to 10^6 cells mL⁻¹, and mixed together the multicellular green-dyed culture with the unicellular violet-dyed culture, and the multicellular violet-dyed culture with the unicellular green-dyed culture at a 1:1 volume ratio.

We then combined into 50-ml Falcon tubes: (1) 1 mL of the multicellular green:unicellular violet culture and 3 medium-sized *D. magna*; (2) 1 mL of the multicellular violet:unicellular green culture and 3 medium-sized *D. magna*. We used 18 replicates for each treatment. We randomized tubes on tube racks, keeping the tube caps loose to allow oxygenation, and incubated at 20°C under fluorescent illumination. After adding the predators, we collected 20 µL samples at 0 and 3 hours, constructed fluid tunnel slides (Kapsetaki et al. 2017), and imaged samples under a Zeiss Axio Zoom V16 fluorescence stereoscope (Carl Zeiss, Oberkochen, Germany) at x100 magnification. We took 3 images per replicate and measured the number of green and violet cells. We averaged these 3 experimental replicates to a single data point, leading to 18 independent data points per treatment.

Experiment 2: Is there a fitness cost of being in a group?

We examined whether cells growing in groups have lower growth rates than cells growing as unicells, and whether this was influenced by light availability. We manipulated light availability by wrapping some tubes uniformly with aluminum foil up to the 30-mL indication (Fig. 4A), which reduced light and subsequent algal growth (see results). We transferred 4.04 mL of *C. sorokiniana* (10^6 cells mL⁻¹) to either: (1) 0.96 mL of filtered Bolds media in Falcon tubes; (2) 0.96 mL of filtered Bolds media in Falcon tubes wrapped with aluminum foil (see Fig. 4A); (3) 0.96 mL of filtered liquid from the culture of *D. magna* (final concentration of 3 individuals

per mL) in Falcon tubes; or (4) 0.96 ml of filtered liquid from the culture of *D. magna* in Falcon tubes wrapped with aluminum foil. We used 5 independent replicates for each treatment. We randomized tubes on tube racks and incubated them at 20°C at a light:dark cycle of 16:8 hours fluorescent illumination, keeping the tube caps loose to allow for oxygenation. After adding the predator treatments, we collected samples at 0 and 96 hours, using the abovementioned sampling protocol, and measured the total number of algal cells and the proportion of cells in groups.

Next, following our observation of lower algal growth in multicellular cultures than unicellular cultures grown in darkness, we examined whether this decline was due to competition of cells for light, supporting the hypothesis that multicellular group formation is costly, or simply due to multicellular groups sinking to the bottom of tubes, thus cells inhibiting other cells from exposure to light essential for their growth. We performed the same experiment as above, but instead of the dark treatments we used ‘dark with hole’ treatments where we removed aluminium foil from the bottom of the tubes creating a hole through which light could pass (Fig. 5A). We used 15 independent replicates per treatment.

Experiment 3: Do groups revert to unicellularity faster in the dark?

In this experiment, we tested whether the rate at which groups of *C. sorokiniana* break up, from multicellular groups to single cells (unicells), is influenced by the light level. We placed 4.04 mL of *C. sorokiniana* to either 0.96 mL of filtered Bolds media (n=18), or 0.96 mL filtered liquid from the *D. magna* culture (final concentration of 3 individuals per mL) (n=18) in 50-mL Falcon tubes. We kept the tube caps loose to allow for oxygenation and randomized all 36 tubes on tube racks in the incubator at 20°C with a light:dark cycle of 16:8 hours using fluorescent illumination. On day 4,

we covered 50% of the tubes which had been treated with *D. magna* supernatant and 50% of the tubes which had been treated with filtered Bolds media, in aluminium foil (Fig. 4A). We left the remaining tubes without aluminium foil. After adding the *D. magna* supernatant we obtained samples on day 0 (0 hours), 1 (24 hours), 4, 7, 10, 13, 16, 19, and 22, using the sampling protocol described above, and quantified the proportion of cells in groups. In the beginning of the experiment, the proportion of cells in groups did not differ between the four treatments (anova-glm, $F_{3,32} = 0.07$, $P = 0.97$).

Statistical Analysis

We performed most of our statistical analyses with generalized linear models, in the statistical package R (version 3.2.3; ‘glm’ package; Crawley 2012; R Core Team 2015). When analysing the proportion of cells in groups, we assumed binomial errors, with the family “quasibinomial” to correct for data overdispersion. We carried out our analyses by step-wise deletion to the minimal adequate model. The only experimental analysis which we did not carry out with a generalized linear model, was when examining the effect of *Daphnia* size (large, small, medium) on algal density where we carried out a regression analysis using a linear model and when examining how groups break up in experiment 3. In the latter, because our data were repeated measures over time we fitted a generalized mixed-effects model with Penalized Quasi-Likelihood (‘glmmPQL’ package) using quasibinomial errors. We treated the interaction between the two treatments (“light with *Daphnia* supernatant”, “dark with *Daphnia* supernatant”) and time as a fixed effect and the repeated measurements across time as random effects. We set Day 4 as the starting time point in our analysis for comparing how groups break up over time in light versus darkness, since that is

when the tubes were separated into light and dark conditions, and set time as a 2nd degree orthogonal polynomial to allow for curvature in the fit.

Results

Experiment 1: Is there a fitness benefit of being in a group?

Consistent with our previous results, we found that the algae *C. sorokiniana* form multicellular groups in response to the addition of live *O. danica* or supernatant from a culture of *D. magna* ($F_{1,58} = 123.14$, $P < 0.0001$; Fig. 1; Kapsetaki *et al.* 2016), but not in response to supernatant from a culture of *O. danica* ($F_{1,57} = 1.50$, $P = 0.22$; Fig. 1A). We exploited this by using *D. magna* supernatant as a way to experimentally manipulate the extent to which cultures of *C. sorokiniana* were in multicellular groups.

Figure 1. Group formation in the algae *C. sorokiniana*. (A) The addition of both live *O. danica* predators and *D. magna* supernatant, but not the addition of *O. danica* supernatant, led to an increase in the proportion of cells in multicellular groups. These

335 results are in comparison to our control treatment, where we added filtered media.
 336 Error bars show 95% confidence intervals (15 independent replicates per treatment).
 337 (B) Single cells of the algae *C. sorokiniana* (red arrow) are smaller than their *O.*
 338 *danica* predator (black arrow). Multicellular groups of *C. sorokiniana* (white arrow)
 339 can be similar in size or larger than their *O. danica* predator. (C) Group formation in
 340 the algae *C. sorokiniana* is visible to the naked eye. The two tubes show *C.*
 341 *sorokiniana* incubated for 96 hours in the presence (left) and absence of *D. magna*
 342 supernatant (right). Groups of *C. sorokiniana* are visible on the left where
 343 multicellular group formation had been induced.

344 ***Ochromonas predator***

345 We found that: (i) the presence of *Ochromonas* relative to just *Ochromonas*
 346 supernatant significantly reduced the number of algae in unicellular cultures
 347 indicating that *Ochromonas* is a predator of *C. sorokiniana* (Fig. 2B); (ii) the
 348 formation of multicellular groups in the algae *C. sorokiniana* reduced predation by *O.*
 349 *danica* (Fig. 2). Three hours after adding *O. danica* predators, the number of algal
 350 cells was significantly lower in the experimental replicates containing unicellular
 351 algae relative to those where we had induced multicellular group formation prior to
 352 adding the predators (interaction term: $F_{1,116} = 8.19$, $P = 0.004$). We observed cells of
 353 *C. sorokiniana* inside *O. danica*, consistent with *O. danica* predating *C. sorokiniana*
 354 (Fig. S4). Furthermore, the algal density in our treatment where we induced
 355 multicellular groups prior to adding predators was not significantly different from our
 356 two controls, where we added *O. danica* supernatant rather than live *O. danica* to
 357 either unicellular or multicellular groups ($F_{2,116} = 0.10$, $P = 0.89$; Fig. 2B).

Figure 2. The benefit of multicellular group formation in the algae *C. sorokiniana* upon predation by *O. danica*. (A) The proportion of algal cells in multicellular groups was manipulated by adding *D. magna* supernatant. The addition of *D. magna* supernatant, prior to adding *O. danica* predators, led to a significantly higher proportion of cells in multicellular groups, as also shown in Figure 1. In contrast, the proportion of cells in multicellular groups did not change significantly in response to three hours exposure to *O. danica* predators. (B) Multicellular group formation prevented predation by *O. danica*. Three hours after adding *O. danica* predators the total number of algal cells was reduced in the cultures containing unicellular algae, but not in the cultures containing multicellular algae. These differences are compared to the control treatments where we did not add *O. danica*

383 predators. In both plots, error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals (30 independent
384 replicates per treatment).

385 ***Daphnia predator***

386 In contrast, in all three of our experiments with *D. magna*, formation of multicellular
387 groups by the algae *C. sorokiniana* did not reduce predation (Fig. 3). First, the
388 number of algal cells in unicellular and multicellular cultures did not decrease at
389 different rates after adding mixed sizes of *D. magna* (interaction term: $F_{1,68} = 0.41$, P
390 $= 0.52$; Fig. 3A). Second, when we added different sizes of *D. magna*, the predation
391 rate did not differ between unicellular and multicellular cultures (interaction term:
392 $F_{3,136} = 1.92$, $P = 0.12$; Fig. 3B). The reduction in number of algae (predation) was
393 greater with larger *D. magna* (Fig. 3B; linear model, adjusted $r^2 = 0.38$, $F_{1,106} = 68.71$,
394 $P < 0.0001$). Third, in cultures containing a mixture of multicellular and unicellular
395 algal cells, the proportion of cells originating from the multicellular culture did not
396 change significantly after adding medium-sized *D. magna*, suggesting that
397 multicellular groups were not differently predated than unicellular groups ($F_{1,70} =$
398 0.25 , $P = 0.61$; Fig. 3C). These medium-sized *D. magna* decreased total algal density
399 after 3 hours ($F_{1,69} = 15.39$, $P = 0.0002$), indicating predation.

Figure 3. Multicellular group formation does not reduce predation by *D. magna*.

(A) The rate at which *D. magna* predators predated algae did not vary significantly dependent upon whether the algae were in multicellular groups. (B) Across different sized *D. magna* predators, the rate at which they predated algae did not vary significantly dependent upon whether the algae were in multicellular groups., Larger *D. magna* caused a larger decrease in algal density. (C) In mixed algal cultures, there was no significant difference in the rate at which *D. magna* predated multicellular groups versus unicells. Error bars in all plots A-C represent 95% confidence intervals (18 independent replicates per treatment). (D) A multicellular group (white arrow) of *C. sorokiniana* can be seen inside the *D. magna*, indicating ingestion. A single cell of *C. sorokiniana* (red arrow) outside the *D. magna* is shown for size comparison.

412 Experiment 2: Is there a fitness cost of being in a group?

413 We examined the cost of multicellular group formation by comparing the growth rate
414 of populations with different proportions of cells in multicellular groups under
415 conditions of high resource availability (light) and low resource availability (dark). As
416 in our benefit experiment, we manipulated the proportion of cells in multicellular
417 groups by adding in *D. magna* supernatant (Fig. 4B; $F_{1,18} = 269.28$, $P < 0.0001$).

418 We found that whether populations were maintained under light or dark
419 conditions did not influence the proportion of cells growing in multicellular groups
420 (Fig. 4B; $F_{1,17} = 0.54$, $P = 0.46$; interaction term: $F_{1,16} = 1.93$, $P = 0.18$). Growing
421 cells under relatively dark conditions led to reduced growth rate when algae were in
422 multicellular groups, but not when they were growing as unicells (Fig 4C; $F_{1,16} =$
423 12.56 , $P = 0.002$). This suggests that the costs of multicellular group formation are
424 greater when light is more limiting.

425 An alternate hypothesis for our above result is that in the dark treatment,
426 multicellular groups have higher sinking rates than single cells, sink to the bottom of
427 the tube, and due to the density of algae in the precipitate receive less light and thus
428 grow less than single cells in the dark. To distinguish between these two hypotheses,
429 we repeated our experiment, but instead allowed light to pass through the bottom of
430 tubes covered in aluminium foil ('dark with hole' treatments; Fig. 5A), thus enabling
431 growth of any precipitate which may have formed in the multicellular culture. We
432 found that multicellular cultures also grew less than unicellular cultures in the 'dark
433 with hole' treatments, suggesting that multicellular cultures experienced greater
434 competition (Fig. 5C; $F_{1,56} = 6.19$, $P = 0.01$). Algae formed larger precipitates in
435 single-celled cultures than in multicellular cultures (Fig. S1), further supporting the

436 hypothesis that the observed decrease in algal density (Fig. 4C) is due to multicellular
 437 groups competing for light, not due to sinking.

438

439 **Figure 4. The cost of group formation in the algae *C. sorokiniana*.** (A) We used
 440 aluminium foil to reduce the light availability. The left tube is the ‘light’ treatment
 441 and the right tube is the ‘dark’ treatment. (B) The addition of *D. magna* supernatant
 442 led to a higher proportion of cells being in multicellular groups. Light levels did not
 443 influence the proportion of cells in multicellular groups. (C) Algae with more cells in
 444 multicellular groups grew to lower cell densities under dark, but not light, conditions.
 445 This suggests there is a cost of multicellular group formation, but only when light is
 446 limiting. In plots B and C, error bars show 95% confidence intervals (5 independent
 447 replicates per treatment).

Figure 5. The cost of group formation is not due to sinking. (A) The first two cultures from the left are the ‘light’ treatments, and the remaining two are the ‘dark with hole’ treatments. In the latter, light was allowed to pass from the bottom of tubes by creating a small hole in the aluminium foil. (B) The proportion of cells in groups was not influenced by light levels. (C) Multicellular cultures grew less than unicellular cultures in the ‘dark with hole’ treatment, but not in the ‘light’ treatment, indicating that this decreased growth is not caused by sinking, i.e. cells restricting other cells access to light. Both plots show error bars of 95% confidence intervals (15 independent replicates per treatment).

Experiment 3: Do groups break up faster in the dark?

Examining the treatments where we used extract of predator culture to induce multicellular group formation, the proportion of cells in groups significantly decreased over time (Fig. 6; glmmPQL, $P < 0.0001$). This decrease in the proportion of cells in groups could potentially be explained by either existing multicellular groups breaking up, or by the new cells being produced remaining predominantly unicellular (causing the absolute number of cells not in groups to increase over time).

Although, the rate of growth was lower in the dark treatments (Fig. S3). In addition, examining the average size of multicellular groups, between day 4 and day 22 in the treatments with *Daphnia* supernatant, we found a significant decrease from 9 ± 1 ($\pm$ 95% CI) to 4 ± 1 in the light treatment (glmmPQL, $P = 0.001$), but no significant change in the dark treatment (day 4: 8 ± 1 , day 22: 10 ± 3 ; glmmPQL, $P = 0.37$).

The rate at which the proportion of cells in groups decreased did not vary significantly depending upon whether cells were maintained in the dark or light (Fig. 6; from Day 4 onwards, glmmPQL, $P = 0.08$; day 4, proportion of cells in groups in the light and dark treatments with *Daphnia* supernatant $\pm$ 95% CI, respectively: 0.39 ± 0.07 , 0.33 ± 0.08 ; on day 22 the same comparison: 0.14 ± 0.05 , 0.25 ± 0.09).

Figure 6. Multicellular groups of the algae *C. sorokiniana* did not break up faster in the dark than in the light. At time point 0, we exposed 50% of the 36 replicate tubes of algae to *D. magna* supernatant (solid line) leading to an increase the proportion of cells in multicellular groups. On day 4, we wrapped 50% of the tubes in aluminium foil, to produce a ‘dark’ treatment. The proportion of cells in multicellular groups did not significantly vary depending upon whether they were kept in light or dark conditions. Error bars show 95% confidence intervals.

Figure 7. Benefits and costs of group formation in algae meta-analysis. (A). We found data from four algal species, including this study, where we could examine whether the benefit of being in a multicellular group varies with predator size (see supplementary information). Each data point represents a different experimental study with a specific value for the benefit of group formation and average predator size for a particular predator-prey combination (total n = 22 studies). Values on the y-axis represent the log-transformed mean number of multicellular algae/mean number of unicellular algae after adding the predator. Different shapes show the four different algal species, with a regression line shown for each. In all four species, group formation led to a greater reduction in predation against smaller predators. (B). We found data from four algal species, including this study, where we could examine whether the cost of group formation varied with resource availability. Each data point represents a different experimental study with a specific value for the cost of group formation and resource availability for a particular predator-prey combination (total n

= 22 studies). Values on the y-axis represent the log-transformed mean number of unicellular algae/mean number of multicellular algae, thus higher y values essentially mean a higher cost of multicellular group formation. Different shapes show the four different algal species, with a regression line shown for each. In three of the four species, group formation was more costly in poorer quality environments.

Discussion

We found that in the algae *C. sorokiniana* the formation of multicellular groups can provide both a benefit and a cost. In particular, group formation: (1) reduces predation by *O. danica* (Fig. 2B, Movie S1); (2) doesn't reduce predation by the larger predator *D. magna* (Fig. 3); and (3) leads to reduced algal growth under conditions of relatively low light intensity (Fig. 4C, 5). Over time, in the absence of predators, the proportion of cells in multicellular groups decreases, this decrease did not differ between algae grown in the dark or light (Fig. 6).

Benefits of multicellular group formation

Previous studies examining the benefits of multicellular group formation in algae have produced mixed results (Hessen and Van Donk 1993; Lürling 1999; Herron et al. 2018). In *Scenedesmus acutus*, *S. obliquus* and *Scenedesmus subspicatus*, group formation has been suggested to reduce predation by the predators *Brachionus calyciflorus* (Lürling 1999), *D. magna* (Hessen and Van Donk 1993), and *Daphnia cucullata* (Lürling and Van Donk 1996; Lürling et al. 1997), but not in *S. obliquus* upon exposure to the predators *D. magna* (Lürling et al. 1997) or *Daphnia pulex* (Lürling and Van Donk 1996). Multicellular groups might escape predation for a number of reasons, including being too large for predators to ingest, being better able to survive the predator's gut, or by sinking to a predatory free zone (Ryther 1954;

Porter 1976; Dehning and Tilzer 1989; Sterner 1989; Kretzschmar et al. 1993; Kampe et al. 2007). It has also been suggested that several protists, including *Gyrodinium dominans*, *Ochromonas vallescia*, and *Euplotes* sp., are able to ingest single algal cells but cannot ingest groups of algae (Weisse and Scheffel-Möser 1990; Boraas et al. 1992; Boraas et al. 1998; Tang et al. 2001; Jakobsen and Tang 2002; Long et al. 2007).

We found that multicellular group formation reduces predation of the algae *C. sorokiniana* by a small predator (*O. danica*), but not by a large predator (*D. magna*) (Fig. 2B, 3A, 3D). We confirmed that our negative result with *D. magna* was not due to a reduction of predation by only certain size *D. magna* (Fig. 3B) or by an effect on relative predation rates when different size groups were available (Fig. 3C). Examining the literature we found data from a total of four algal species, including our own study, where the influence of predator size on the benefit of group formation could be examined (Fig. 7A; Supplementary information Fig. S2, Table S1; Lüring 1999; Hessen & Van Donk 1993). In all four cases, the benefit of being in groups was greater against smaller predators (Fig. 7A). Notably, we found a relatively small influence of predator size in *S. subspicatus*, which is the only species out of the four known to produce spines, which may serve as an additional predator defence mechanism apart from group formation (Hessen and Van Donk 1993; Pančić and Kiørboe 2018).

Costs of multicellular group formation

Previous studies testing for a cost of multicellular group formation have tended to obtain positive results (Lüring and Van Donk 2000; O'donnell et al. 2012; Wang et al. 2014; Wang et al. 2015; Zhu et al. 2015; Zhu et al. 2016). Potential costs of group formation include resource competition, a cost of producing extracellular adhesive

molecules, and higher sinking rates (Reynolds 1984; Lancelot and Mathot 1985; Kirk 1994; Trainor 1998; Ploug et al. 1999; Lüring 1999; Tollrian and Dodson 1999). However, lower growth rates of multicellular groups have not been detected in the algae *S. acutus* (Lüring and Van Donk 2000), *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii* (Lüring and Beekman 2006), and *Phaeocystis globosa* (Jakobsen and Tang 2002) in high nutrients. Furthermore, multicellular groups of *Phaeocystis* sp. outcompete single cells in environments high in nitrate and irradiance, rather than grow slower, although formal measurements have not been taken in these studies (Riegman et al. 1992; Peperzak 1993). Multicellular groups have higher sinking rates in *Scenedesmus*, but not in *P. globosa* (Conway and Trainor 1972; Lüring and Van Donk 2000; Jakobsen and Tang 2002).

A possible explanation for the negative results is that the costs only manifest under certain conditions such as when resources are more limiting (Lampert et al. 1994; Boraas et al. 1998; Tollrian and Harvell 1999; Tollrian and Dodson 1999; Lüring and Van Donk 2000; Jakobsen and Tang 2002). We found that multicellular groups grow at lower rates than single cells, but only when the algae are kept under lower light availability, and hence when competition for light in the tube is greater (Fig. 4C, 5). Examining the literature we found data from four algal species, including our own study, where the influence of resource availability on the cost of group formation could be examined (Fig. 7B; Supplementary information Fig. S2, Table S1; Lüring & Van Donk 2000; O'donnell et al. 2012; Zhu et al. 2016; Wang et al. 2014; Wang et al. 2015). In three out of four species, the cost of being in a group was greater in poorer quality environments (Fig. 7B).

In the absence of predators, we might expect groups to be broken up when competition for resources, and hence the cost of being in a group, is greater. However,

we did not find that groups broke up more quickly in the dark (Fig. 6). Although we found that the proportion of cells in groups went down in the absence of predators, further work is required to determine if this is due to groups breaking up and/or new cells being predominantly unicellular. Previous studies have suggested that *Scenedesmus acuminatus*, *S. obliquus*, and *C. vulgaris* break up groups quicker in the dark (Dehning and Tilzer 1989; Boraas et al. 1998; Verschoor et al. 2009). This contradiction could reflect different selective regimes, different costs and benefits, mechanistic constraints, and/or differences in the way groups form. For instance, some algae display constant stickiness independent of nutrient availability (Kjørboe et al. 1990; Kjørboe et al. 1994).

Multicellular group formation and major transitions

Our results add to a growing body of research showing how multicellular group formation can provide benefits (Grosberg and Strathmann 2007; Michod 2007; Claessen et al. 2014; Lyons and Kolter 2015). In several bacterial species and freshwater algae, such as *C. reinhardtii*, multicellular groups are successful in avoiding predation (Hahn et al. 1999; Matz et al. 2004; Corno and Jürgens 2006; Lurling and Beekman 2006; Queck et al. 2006; Jezberová and Komárková 2007; Yang et al. 2009; Becks et al. 2010; Herron et al. 2018). The mucilaginous matrix of groups can serve as storage for energy and trace elements (Lancelot et al. 1994). Groups of mycobacteria and choanoflagellates are better at foraging (Dworkin and Bonner 1972; Berleman and Kirby 2009; Nichols et al. 2009; Roper et al. 2013), and fruiting bodies of slime moulds and *Myxococcus* bacteria are better at dispersal (Velicer and Yuen-tsu 2003; Smith et al. 2014). Groups may be more efficient in using extracellular factors, such as the invertase produced by the yeast *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*, to break down sugars, or the proteases used by bacteria to

break down proteins (Koschwanez et al. 2011; Darch et al. 2012; Koschwanez et al. 2013; Biernaskie and West 2015).

Our results also suggest a potential explanation for why group formation may sometimes be facultative. If group formation has a cost, such as increased competition for resources (Fig. 4C), and the benefits only arise at certain times, such as when predators are present (Fig. 2B), then selection could favour group formation to be conditional, in response to cues that signal the benefits. A key future step is to determine why, once groups have formed, cells evolve to perform different tasks (Gavrilets 2010; Ackermann 2015; West and Cooper 2016; Cooper & West 2018). Once this division of labor becomes so extreme, that the different cell types are dependent upon each other, then a major transition can be made to obligate multicellularity, and a new higher level organism (Maynard Smith and Szathmary 1995; Bourke 2011; West et al. 2015).

References

- Ackermann M. 2015. A functional perspective on phenotypic heterogeneity in microorganisms. *Nat. Rev. Microbiol.* 13:497–508.
- Becks L, Ellner SP, Jones LE, Hairston Jr NG. 2010. Reduction of adaptive genetic diversity radically alters eco-evolutionary community dynamics. *Ecol. Lett.* 13:989–997.
- Berleman JE, Kirby JR. 2009. Deciphering the hunting strategy of a bacterial wolfpack. *FEMS Microbiol. Rev.* 33:942–957.
- Biernaskie JM, West SA. 2015. Cooperation, clumping and the evolution of multicellularity. *Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci.* 282: 20151075.
- Boraas ME, Seale DB, Boxhorn JE. 1998. Phagotrophy by flagellate selects for colonial prey: A possible origin of multicellularity. *Evol. Ecol.* 12:153–164.

- 621 Boraas ME, Seale DB, Holen D. 1992. Predatory behavior of *Ochromonas* analyzed
 622 with video microscopy. Arch. für Hydrobiol. 123:459–468.
- 623 Bourke AFG. 2011. Principles of social evolution. Oxford University Press Oxford.
- 624 Claessen D, Rozen DE, Kuipers OP, Søgaard-Andersen L, van Wezel GP. 2014.
 625 Bacterial solutions to multicellularity: a tale of biofilms, filaments and fruiting bodies.
 626 Nat. Rev. Microbiol. 12:115–124.
- 627 Conway K, Trainor FR. 1972. *Scenedesmus* morphology and flotation. J. Phycol.
 628 8:138–143.
- 629 Cooper GA, West SA. 2018. Division of labour and the evolution of extreme
 630 specialisation. Nat. Ecol. Evol. 1.
- 631 Corno G, Jürgens K. 2006. Direct and indirect effects of protist predation on
 632 population size structure of a bacterial strain with high phenotypic plasticity. Appl.
 633 Environ. Microbiol. 72:78–86.
- 634 Crawley MJ. 2012. The R book. John Wiley & Sons.
- 635 Daley RJ, Morris GP, Brown SR. 1973. Phagotrophic ingestion of a blue-green alga
 636 by *Ochromonas*. J. Protozool. 20: 58–61.
- 637 Darch SE, West SA, Winzer K, Diggle SP. 2012. Density-dependent fitness benefits
 638 in quorum-sensing bacterial populations. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 109:8259–8263.
- 639 Dehning I, Tilzer MM. 1989. Survival of *Scenedesmus acuminatus* (Chlorophyceae)
 640 in darkness. J. Phycol. 25:509–515.
- 641 Van Donk E, Ianora A, Vos M. 2011. Induced defences in marine and freshwater
 642 phytoplankton: a review. Hydrobiologia 668:3–19.
- 643 Dworkin M, Bonner JT. 1972. The myxobacteria: new directions in studies of
 644 procaryotic development. CRC Crit. Rev. Microbiol. 1:435–452.
- 645 Fisher RM, Bell T, West SA. 2016. Multicellular group formation in response to

- 646 predators in the alga *Chlorella vulgaris*. J. Evol. Biol. 29:551–559.
- 647 Gavrillets S. 2010. Rapid transition towards the division of labor via evolution of
648 developmental plasticity. PLoS Comput Biol 6:e1000805–e1000805.
- 649 Grosberg RK, Strathmann RR. 2007. The Evolution of Multicellularity: A Minor
650 Major Transition? Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst. 38:621–654.
- 651 Hahn MW, Moore ERB, Höfle MG. 1999. Bacterial filament formation, a defense
652 mechanism against flagellate grazing, is growth rate controlled in bacteria of different
653 phyla. Appl. Environ. Microbiol. 65:25–35.
- 654 Herron MD, Borin JM, Boswell JC, Walker J, Knox CA, Boyd M, Rosenzweig F,
655 Ratcliff WC. 2018. De novo origin of multicellularity in response to predation.
656 bioRxiv:247361.
- 657 Hessen DO, Van Donk E. 1993. Morphological changes in *Scenedesmus* induced by
658 substances released from *Daphnia*. Arch. für Hydrobiol. 127:129–140.
- 659 Jakobsen H, Tang K. 2002. Effects of protozoan grazing on colony formation in
660 *Phaeocystis globosa* (Prymnesiophyceae) and the potential costs and benefits. Aquat.
661 Microb. Ecol. 27:261–273.
- 662 Jezberová J, Komárková J. 2007. Morphological transformation in a freshwater
663 *Cyanobium* sp. induced by grazers. Environ. Microbiol. 9:1858–1862.
- 664 Kampe H, König-Rinke M, Petzoldt T, Benndorf J. 2007. Direct effects of *Daphnia*-
665 grazing, not infochemicals, mediate a shift towards large inedible colonies of the
666 gelatinous green alga *Sphaerocystis Schroeteri*. Limnol. Manag. Int. Waters 37:137–
667 145.
- 668 Kapsetaki SE, Fisher RM, West SA. 2016. Predation and the formation of
669 multicellular groups in algae. Evol. Ecol. Res. 17:651–669.
- 670 Kapsetaki SE, Tep A, West SA. 2017. How do algae form multicellular groups? Evol.

- 671 Ecol. Res. 18:663–675.
- 672 Kiørboe T, Andersen KP, Dam HG. 1990. Coagulation efficiency and aggregate
673 formation in marine phytoplankton. Mar. Biol. 107:235–245.
- 674 Kiørboe T, Lundsgaard C, Olesen M, Hansen JLS. 1994. Aggregation and
675 sedimentation processes during a spring phytoplankton bloom: A field experiment to
676 test coagulation theory. J. Mar. Res. 52:297–323.
- 677 Kirk JTO. 1994. Light and photosynthesis in aquatic ecosystems. Cambridge
678 university press.
- 679 Koschwanez JH, Foster KR, Murray AW. 2011. Sucrose utilization in budding yeast
680 as a model for the origin of undifferentiated multicellularity. PLoS Biol. 9:e1001122.
- 681 Koschwanez JH, Foster KR, Murray AW. 2013. Improved use of a public good
682 selects for the evolution of undifferentiated multicellularity. Elife 2:e00367.
- 683 Kretzschmar M, Nisbet RM, McCauley E. 1993. A predator-prey model for
684 zooplankton grazing on competing algal populations. Theor. Popul. Biol. 44:32–66.
- 685 Lampert W, Rothhaupt KO, Elert E Von. 1994. Chemical induction of colony
686 formation in a green alga (*Scenedesmus acutus*) by grazers (*Daphnia*). Limnol.
687 Oceanogr. 39:1543–1550.
- 688 Lancelot C, Mathot S. 1985. Biochemical fractionation of primary production by
689 phytoplankton in Belgian coastal waters during short-and long-term incubations with
690 ¹⁴C-bicarbonate. Mar. Biol. 86:227–232.
- 691 Lancelot C, Rousseau V, Green JC, Leadbeater BSC. 1994. Ecology of *Phaeocystis*-
692 dominated ecosystems: the key role of colony forms. The Haptophyte Algae:229–245.
- 693 Long JD, Smalley GW, Barsby T, Anderson JT, Hay ME. 2007. Chemical cues
694 induce consumer-specific defenses in a bloom-forming marine phytoplankton. Proc.
695 Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 104:10512–10517.

- 696 Lüring M. 1999. The smell of water. Grazer-induced Colony Formation in
 697 *Scenedesmus*. Agric. Univ. Wageningen.
- 698 Lüring M, Beekman W. 2006. Palmelloids formation in *Chlamydomonas reinhardtii*:
 699 defence against rotifer predators? In: Annales de Limnologie-International Journal of
 700 Limnology. Vol. 42. EDP Sciences. p. 65–72.
- 701 Lüring M, Van Donk E. 2000. Grazer-induced colony formation in *Scenedesmus*: are
 702 there costs to being colonial? Oikos 88:111–118.
- 703 Lüring M, Van Donk E. 1996. Zooplankton-induced unicell-colony transformation in
 704 *Scenedesmus acutus* and its effect on growth of herbivore *Daphnia*. Oecologia
 705 108:432–437.
- 706 Lüring M, Van Donk E. 2000. Grazer-induced colony formation in *Scenedesmus*: are
 707 there costs to being colonial? Oikos:111–118.
- 708 Lüring M, Verschoor AE. 2003. FO-spectra of chlorophyll fluorescence for the
 709 determination of zooplankton grazing. *Hydrobiologia* 491: 145-157.
- 710 Lüring M, De Lange HJ, Van Donk E. 1997. Changes in food quality of the green
 711 alga *Scenedesmus* induced by *Daphnia* infochemicals : biochemical composition and
 712 morphology. Freshw. Biol. 3:619–628.
- 713 Lyons NA, Kolter R. 2015. On the evolution of bacterial multicellularity. Curr. Opin.
 714 Microbiol. 24:21–28.
- 715 Matz C, Deines P, Boenigk J, Arndt H, Eberl L, Kjelleberg S, Ju K, Icrobiol
 716 APPLNM. 2004. Impact of Violacein-Producing Bacteria on Survival and Feeding
 717 of Bacterivorous Nanoflagellates. 70:1593–1599.
- 718 Maynard Smith J, Szathmary E. 1995. The major transitions in evolution. Oxford;
 719 New York: W.H. Freeman Spektrum.
- 720 Michod RE. 2007. Evolution of individuality during the transition from unicellular to

- 721 multicellular life. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 104:8613–8618.
- 722 Nichols SA, Dayel MJ, King N. 2009. Genomic, phylogenetic, and cell biological
723 insights into metazoan origins. *Anim. Evol. Genomes, Foss. trees*:24–32.
- 724 O'donnell DR, Fey SB, Cottingham KL. 2012. Nutrient availability influences
725 kairomone-induced defenses in *Scenedesmus acutus* (Chlorophyceae). *J. Plankton*
726 *Res.* 35:191–200.
- 727 Pančić M, Kiørboe T. 2018. Phytoplankton defence mechanisms: traits and
728 trade-offs. *Biol. Rev.* 93:1269–1303.
- 729 Peperzak L. 1993. Daily irradiance governs growth rate and colony formation of
730 *Phaeocystis* (Prymnesiophyceae). *J. Plankton Res.* 15:809–821.
- 731 Ploug H, Stolte W, Jørgensen BB. 1999. Diffusive boundary layers of the colony-
732 forming plankton alga, *Phaeocystis* sp. - implications for nutrient uptake and cellular
733 growth. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* 44:1959–1967.
- 734 Porter KG. 1976. Enhancement of algal growth and productivity by grazing
735 zooplankton. *Science* (80-.). 9:1332–1334.
- 736 Queck S, Weitere M, Moreno AM, Rice SA, Kjelleberg S. 2006. The role of quorum
737 sensing mediated developmental traits in the resistance of *Serratia marcescens*
738 biofilms against protozoan grazing. *Environ. Microbiol.* 8:1017–1025.
- 739 R Core Team. 2015. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
740 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- 741 Reynolds CS. 1984. The ecology of freshwater phytoplankton. Cambridge University
742 Press.
- 743 Riegman R, Noordeloos AAM, Cadée GC. 1992. Phaeocystis blooms and
744 eutrophication of the continental coastal zones of the North Sea. *Mar. Biol.* 112:479–
745 484.

- 746 Roper M, Dayel MJ, Pepper RE, Koehl MAR. 2013. Cooperatively generated stresslet
 747 flows supply fresh fluid to multicellular choanoflagellate colonies. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*
 748 110:1–5.
- 749 Ryther JH. 1954. Inhibitory effects of phytoplankton upon the feeding of *Daphnia*
 750 *magna* with reference to growth, reproduction, and survival. *Ecology* 35:522–533.
- 751 Smith J, Queller DC, Strassmann JE. 2014. Fruiting bodies of the social amoeba
 752 *Dictyostelium discoideum* increase spore transport by *Drosophila*. *BMC Evol. Biol.*
 753 14:105.
- 754 Sterner RW. 1989. The role of grazers in phytoplankton succession. In: *Plankton*
 755 *ecology*. Springer. p. 107–170.
- 756 Strassmann JE, Zhu Y, Queller DC. 2000. Altruism and social cheating in the social
 757 amoeba *Dictyostelium discoideum*. :965–967.
- 758 Tang KW, Jakobsen HH, Visser AW. 2001. *Phaeocystis globosa* (Prymnesiophyceae)
 759 and the planktonic food web: feeding, growth, and trophic interactions among grazers.
 760 *Limnol. Oceanogr.* 46:1860–1870.
- 761 Tollrian R, Dodson SI. 1999. Inducible defences in cladocera: constraints, costs, and
 762 multipredator environments. *Ecol. Evol. inducible defenses* (ed TRHCD):177–202.
- 763 Tollrian R, Harvell CD. 1999. The ecology and evolution of inducible defenses.
 764 Princeton University Press.
- 765 Trainor FR. 1998. Biological aspects of *Scenedesmus* (Chlorophyceae)-phenotypic
 766 plasticity. J. Cramer.
- 767 Velicer GJ, Yuen-tsu NY. 2003. Evolution of novel cooperative swarming in the
 768 bacterium *Myxococcus xanthus*. *Nature* 425:75–78.
- 769 Verschoor AM, Bekmezci OK, van Donk E, Vijverberg J. 2009. The ghost of
 770 herbivory past: Slow defence relaxation in the chlorophyte *Scenedesmus obliquus*. *J.*

- 771 Limnol. 68:327–335.
- 772 Wang X, Wang Y, Ou L. 2014. The roles of light–dark cycles in the growth of
 773 *Phaeocystis globosa* from the South China Sea: The cost of colony enlargement. J.
 774 sea Res. 85:518–523.
- 775 Wang X, Wang Y, Ou L, He X, Chen D. 2015. Allocation costs associated with
 776 induced defense in *Phaeocystis globosa* (Prymnesiophyceae): the effects of nutrient
 777 availability. Sci. Rep. 5:10850.
- 778 Weisse T, Scheffell-Möser U. 1990. Growth and grazing loss rates in single-celled
 779 *Phaeocystis* sp.(Prymnesiophyceae). Mar. Biol. 106:153–158.
- 780 West SA, Cooper GA. 2016. Division of labour in microorganisms: an evolutionary
 781 perspective. Nat. Rev. Microbiol. 14:716.
- 782 West SA, Fisher RM, Gardner A, Kiers ET. 2015. Major evolutionary transitions in
 783 individuality. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 112:10112–10119.
- 784 Yang Z, Kong F, Yang Z, Zhang M, Yu Y, Qian S. 2009. Benefits and costs of the
 785 grazer-induced colony formation in *Microcystis aeruginosa*. Ann. Limnol. - Int. J.
 786 Limnol. 45:203–208.
- 787 Zhang J, Del Aguila R, Schneider C, Schneider BL. 2005. The importance of being
 788 big. In: Journal of Investigative Dermatology Symposium Proceedings. Vol. 10.
 789 Elsevier. p. 131–141.
- 790 Zhu X, Wang J, Chen Q, Chen G, Huang Y, Yang Z. 2016. Costs and trade-offs of
 791 grazer-induced defenses in *Scenedesmus* under deficient resource. Sci. Rep. 6:22594.
- 792 Zhu X, Yang J, Xu N, Chen G, Yang Z. 2015. Combined effects of nitrogen levels
 793 and *Daphnia* culture filtrate on colony size of *Scenedesmus obliquus*. Algal Res.
 794 9:94–98.
- 795