Accepted by Hydrobiologia: 14/7/014

Temperature effects on body size of freshwater crustacean zooplankton from Greenland to the tropics

Karl E. Havens¹, Ricardo Motta Pinto-Coelho², Meryem Beklioğlu^{3,4}, Kirsten S. Christoffersen⁵, Erik Jeppesen^{6,7}, Torben L. Lauridsen^{6,7}, Asit Mazumder⁸, Ginette Méthot⁹, Bernadette Pinel Alloul⁹, U. Nihan Tavşanoğlu³, Şeyda Erdoğan³ and Jacobus Vijverberg¹⁰

¹ University of Florida and Florida Sea Grant, Gainesville, FL 32608 USA

² Departamento de Biologia General, Universidade Federal de Minas Geras, 31270-901 Belo Horizonte, Brazil

³ Middle East Technical University, Department of Biological Sciences, Ankara, Turkey

⁴ Kemal Kurdaş Ecological Research and Training Stations, Lake Eymir, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey

⁵ Institute of Biology, Universitetsparken 4, Copenhagen, Denmark

⁶ Department of Plant Biology, University of Aarhus, Nordlandsvej 68, Risskov, Denmark

⁷ Sino-Danish Centre for Education and Research, Beijing, China

⁸ Department of Biology, University of Victoria, P.O. Box 3020, Stn. CSC, Victoria, British Columbia V8W 3N5, Canada

⁹ Groupe de Recherche Interuniversitaire en Limnologie, Département de Sciences biologiques, Université de Montréal, C.P. 6128, Succ. Centre-ville, Montréal, QC, Canada

¹⁰ Netherlands Institute of Ecology, Droevendaalsesteeg 10, 6708 PB Wageningen, The Netherlands

Corresponding author and contact information:

E-mail: khavens@ufl.edu

Telephone: (352) 392-5870

Fax: (352) 392-5113

Abstract The body size of zooplankton has substantive effects on the function of aquatic food webs because size affects the ability of zooplankton to: exploit food resources, effectively clear the water of algae, and serve as a food source for fish. A variety of factors may affect size, and earlier studies indicate that water temperature may be a particularly important variable. Here we tested the hypothesis that the body size of cladocerans, calanoids and cyclopoids declines with increasing water temperature, a response documented in an earlier study that considered only cladoceran zooplankton. We tested the hypothesis by comparing body size data that were available from prior studies of lakes ranging from 6 to 74° latitude and encompassing a temperature range of 2 to 30°C. Cladoceran body size declined with temperature, however, the trend was just marginally significant ($p = 0.01$). The decline in size was significant ($p = 0.05$) for cyclopoids. In both cases, there was considerably more variation around the regression than previously observed suggesting that other variables such as fish predation played an important role in affecting size. Calanoid body size was unrelated to temperature. In contrast with cladocerans and cyclopoids, perhaps calanoid body size is not metabolically constrained by temperature or is differently affected by changes in fish predation occurring with increasing temperature. The unexpected result for calanoids requires further investigation.

Keywords zooplankton size; latitudinal patterns; global comparison

61 **Introduction**

62 Body size of zooplankton is a highly important attribute because of the influence it has on
63 bioenergetics in aquatic food webs. Body size affects the manner in which the zooplankton
64 interacts with its resources. Large-bodied zooplankton have higher grazing rates, they
65 graze a wider size range of food items, and therefore have greater top-down effects on
66 resources than small-bodied zooplankton (Carpenter & Kitchell, 1988). Likewise body size
67 affects the availability and antipredator responses of zooplankton to both invertebrate and
68 vertebrate predators (Zaret, 1980; Gelinas et al., 2007), and the relationship between
69 phytoplankton biomass and phosphorus in lakes (Mazumder, 1994a; b and see the review
70 by Meerhoff et al., 2012).

71 In warm water lakes the size of zooplankton generally is smaller than of those in cold
72 water lakes. The reasons for this trend have been debated, yet so far, answers are
73 inconclusive. When considered alone and independent of other factors, higher temperature is
74 expected to result in smaller animals because higher temperature shortens generation time
75 (Gillooly, 2000) resulting in smaller adult body size (Geiling & Campbell, 1972; Angilletta &
76 Dunham, 2003). This phenomenon is not restricted to zooplankton. Atkinson (1994)
77 conducted a review and found that >80% of ectothermic species studied in laboratory
78 experiments displayed faster growth and smaller adult size at higher temperatures, and in
79 general, animals in colder climates are larger as adults than conspecifics at colder
80 temperatures (Ashton, 2001).

81 Larger zooplankton also may be more susceptible to thermal stress at high
82 temperatures (Moore et al., 1996). However, changes in temperature also can have indirect
83 effects on the food web, and these could be of greater importance than direct effects in

determining zooplankton body size. Hart & Bychek (2011) reviewed the factors affecting body size and concluded that 'direct thermal effects on body size are commonly confounded by other environmental factors that are related directly or indirectly to temperature' and that 'predation undoubtedly has an over-riding influence on body size selection.'

One prior study examined the relationship of body size in freshwater cladoceran zooplankton with latitude and temperature (Gillooly & Dodson, 2000) using data from 1,100 lakes between 7 and 78° latitude in North, Central and South America. The authors found that temperature alone explained over 90% of variation in cladoceran body size. In that study the authors did not use direct measurements of size. They took species lists from the literature and estimated size based on assumptions including invariant size within species and even distribution of density among species in lakes. This makes our study unique, in being the first to address the relationship between size and temperature with actual measurements of density and biomass of cladocerans, and the first to broaden the assessment to include cyclopoids and calanoids.

We obtained crustacean zooplankton data from published studies conducted in Brazil, Canada (British Columbia and Ontario), Ethiopia, Greenland, Turkey and the USA (Alaska and Florida). All datasets had direct measurements of density, and biomasses were calculated from body lengths using published and well-accepted allometric methods. We calculated the mean body size (μg dry weight) of cladocerans, calanoids and cyclopoids in each region by dividing total biomass by total density in each of these major taxonomic groups. We tested the hypothesis that body size of cladocerans, cyclopoids and calanoids declines with temperature across the broad latitudinal gradient of our study lakes.

Methods

Study Lakes

We used pre-existing data from lakes representing a wide range of nutrient concentrations, six countries and several climactic regions (Fig. 1, Table 1). Late summer samples were used (August-September in Canada, United States and Turkey, and September in Greenland), because only that period of time was sampled in synoptic surveys in Greenland and Turkey and so that data would be comparable in regard to the time of full development of crustaceans and highest fish predation (Jeppesen et al., 1997). In Ethiopia and Brazil, data were taken from the dry season (November to January in Ethiopia, July-August in Brazil), which also are times of high fish predation (Vijverberg et al., 2014). During the rainy season (July-September) in N.E. Africa and in South America, short water residence times flush zooplankton from lakes and reservoirs, making it an unsuitable time for studying zooplankton.

Sampling Methods

Detailed sampling methods are provided in published papers dealing with other aspects of the plankton: for Greenland (Jeppesen et al., 2001); Ontario, Florida and Brazil (Pinto-Coelho et al., 2005); British Columbia (Kainz et al., 2004); and Africa (Vijverberg et al., 2014). Therefore, only brief descriptions of methods are provided here.

Sampling methods in all lakes except Turkey collected animals from the entire water column. In Greenland, mid-lake depth-integrated water samples (20-25L) were taken with a Patalas sampler. Of the pooled sample, a 15-20 L subsample was filtered on a 20 μ m filter. In Turkey, a 40 L mid-lake integrated water sample through the entire mixed layer was

taken with a KC Denmark Water Sampler (3.5 L), and 20 L was filtered through a 20 μm filter. In Ontario, zooplankton was sampled from the entire water column at the deepest site in the lakes by vertical tows with a 53 μm mesh conical plankton net. In British Columbia and Alaska, vertical tows of a 64 μm mesh conical net were taken from 1 m above the sediments to the surface at the deepest location in the lakes. In Florida, Ethiopia and Brazil, single vertical tows of the entire water column were done with conical nets with 153, 150 and 90 μm mesh, respectively. In Ethiopia, water column samples were collected from three open-water sites, whereas in Brazil, water column samples were taken from 11 sites in Furnas Reservoir and 2 sites in Ibirité Reservoir (Pinto-Coelho et al. 2005).

Samples from Alaska, Canada, Florida, Ethiopia and Brazil were preserved in 10% formalin. In Greenland and Turkey, samples were preserved in 4% Lugol's. Crustacean zooplankton was enumerated at 40, 50 or 100x magnification, and 25-50 individuals (where possible) of each species were measured with an ocular micrometer to the nearest 25 μm . Standard allometric equations were used to convert body lengths to biomass (Dumont et al., 1975; McCauley, 1984).

In a large compilation of data from many different regions, it is optimal if sampling methods are identical. In practice this rarely is possible, but the methods used here were comparable and were adequate to collect a representative sample of crustacean zooplankton, as for the most part, only nauplii and rotifers passed through the nets, even in Florida, where the largest mesh size was used (Havens et al., 1996). Here we examined body size only for adults and copepod copepodids, so loss of those smaller animals was not an issue. While chemical preservation can affect the dry weight of zooplankton (Giguere et al., 2011), we are aware of no literature that examines effects of different chemical

preservatives on body lengths, which were used in this study to estimate weight with standard equations.

The average body size ($\mu\text{g dry weight animal}^{-1}$) was determined separately for cladocerans, calanoids and cyclopoids, by dividing the total biomass of the group ($\mu\text{g dry weight L}^{-1}$) by the total numeric density (animals L^{-1}). We did not weight the calculations by relative densities of species in each lake, because the individual species measurement and body size data were not available to the authors. Although body lengths might be more relevant to predators than body size in μg , the authors did not have access to the thousands of raw count sheets where body length measurements were recorded.

Water temperatures were measured *in situ* and reflect either near-surface temperatures in shallow mixed lakes or the average epilimnetic temperatures in deeper stratified lakes.

Data Analysis

We examined graphically the relationship between the body size of cladocerans, calanoids and cyclopoids and water temperature, and fitted linear regressions to the non-transformed data, using means from each lake region. We did not use data from individual lakes, because the number of data points varied widely among the regions, such that certain lake-rich locations such as Greenland would have largely driven the results. We also did not transform the data because in general, the number of lakes per region was low, and the body size data from the regions were not highly skewed.

In the 59 lake dataset from Greenland, 29 of the lakes were free of fish because they freeze solid to the bottom in winter or due to the fact that the lakes today are or in the past

have not been connected to the sea, preventing fish colonization. In order to elucidate the importance of fish predation on mean body size of crustacean zooplankton, we compared body sizes of cladocerans, cyclopoids and calanoids between the two groups of Greenland lakes: fishless vs. lakes with fish.

We also examined an alternative explanation for body size differences among lake regions; i.e, differences in trophic state. We used linear regression to explore whether there were significant relationships between lake trophic state and the body size of cladocerans and copepods. We used total phosphorus (TP) as a surrogate for trophic state, because it was measured in all of the lakes except for those in Ethiopia. All statistical analyses were done with SYSTAT 13.

Results

Across all of the lakes there were 85 species of cladocerans, 18 calanoids and 27 cyclopoids (Appendix 1). Only five species of cladocerans occurred in more than four lake regions (*Bosmina longirostris*, *Chydorus sphaericus*, *Diaphanosoma brachyurum*, *Holopedium gibberum* and *Polyphemus pediculus*). No species of calanoids or cyclopoids occurred in more than two regions.

The mean body size of cladocerans declined with increasing temperature (Fig. 2A). The largest mean size was in Greenland at an average water temperature of 12°C, and smaller animals occurred in Florida at 30°C. There was considerable scatter of data around the mean values, and the linear regression explained just 33% ($p = 0.10$) of the variability in the data, i.e. it was only marginally significant. There were smaller cladocerans in Alaska at 16°C than in Florida at 30°C (one-way ANOVA, $p < 0.05$). Mean body size of cyclopoids

also declined with increasing water temperature, there was somewhat less scatter around the means, and a larger amount of overall variation in body size (38%, $p = 0.05$) was explained by temperature than was the case for cladocerans. Largest animals were in the cold lakes in Greenland and smallest animals were in the warm-water lakes in Florida (Fig. 2B). There was no significant relationship between the mean body size of calanoids and water temperature (Fig. 2C). It was equally likely to find large and small animals in lakes at high and low water temperatures.

Although earlier studies have identified effects of trophic state on zooplankton body size, in particular smaller cladocerans and larger copepods in lakes with higher TP (Jeppesen et al., 2000), in this study body size was not affected by that attribute. There were no significant relationship between body size of any crustacean zooplankton group and TP for the regionally aggregated data (cladocerans: $r^2 = 0.08$, $p > 0.4$; cyclopoids, $r^2 = 0.01$, $p > 0.9$; calanoids, $r^2 = 0.07$, $p > 0.6$).

A closer examination of the Greenland data was done by comparing lakes with fish and without fish. The lakes did not differ importantly in trophic state (TP $10 \pm 6 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ with fish, $18 \pm 8 \mu\text{g L}^{-1}$ without fish) or water temperature ($12.2 \pm 4^\circ\text{C}$ with fish vs. $11.7 \pm 3^\circ\text{C}$ without fish), only in the presence or absence of planktivores. Cladoceran body size was 5-fold higher ($p < 0.001$) in the fishless lakes ($10.9 \pm 3.1 \mu\text{g}$) than in the lakes with fish ($2.2 \pm 1.3 \mu\text{g}$). Body size of cyclopoids was marginally higher ($p < 0.05$) in the fishless lakes ($6.1 \pm 1.4 \mu\text{g}$) than in the lakes with fish ($4.4 \pm 1.5 \mu\text{g}$), and body size of calanoids did not significantly differ between lake types ($1.4 \pm 0.2 \mu\text{g}$ in lakes with fish, vs. $1.6 \pm 0.2 \mu\text{g}$ in fishless lakes).

Discussion

This is the first study to quantify with actual measurements of density and biomass of zooplankton (from 123 lakes including 85 species) whether or not cladocerans become smaller as one moves southward from the Arctic to the tropics. We observed a declining trend in size; however it was just marginally significant at $p = 0.10$. While the trend was weak, in general it was in agreement with that found in an earlier study (Gillooly & Dodson, 2000). The greater variability of our results is possibly explained by differences in methodology. While we measured species' densities and biomass, Gillooly and Dodson (2000) worked only with species lists, and they assumed that: (1) in any lake, the density of every species is equal; and (2) across all lakes, the size of any given species does not vary. Because we took a more direct approach that did not require such assumptions, our results provide a more realistic picture of what occurs in lakes, where other factors interact with temperature to influence body size.

To illustrate what affect the assumption of invariant species' size can have on the variability of results, we examined the degree of variation in mean body size of dominant cladoceran species between individual lakes, considering two selected regions – one in the subtropics (Florida) and one in the north temperate zone (British Columbia). In Florida, four species accounted for 94% of the total density of cladocerans: *Bosminopsis dietersi*, *Eubosmina tubicen*, *Daphnia lumholtzi* and *Diaphanosoma brachyurum*. Had we assumed invariant body sizes, it would have markedly affected our results, because actual body sizes varied by more than two-fold among the lakes. The actual mean sizes (in μg dry weight, averaged by lake) ranged from 0.7 to 1.2 for *B. dietersi*, from 0.4 to 0.8 for *E. tubicen*, from 3.5 to 8.4 for *D. lumholtzi*, and from 0.6 to 1.4 for *D. brachyurum*. In British Columbia, where

the mean body size of the cladoceran assemblage was highly variable, four species accounted for 99% of total biomass: *Bosmina longirostris*, *Diaphanosoma brachyurum*, *Holopedium gibberum* and *Daphnia* sp. Again, had we assumed an invariant species' body sizes, it would have considerably affected our results, greatly reducing variation. The actual mean sizes (in μg dry weight, averaged by lake) ranged from 0.8 to 3.7 μg for *B. longirostris*, from 0.8 to 18.9 μg for *D. brachyurum*, from 0.1 to 9.5 μg for *H. gibberum*, and from 0.9 to 11.5 μg for *Daphnia* sp.

There also is evidence, from our study and others, that a viewpoint (e.g., Crisman, 1992) that sub-tropical and tropical lakes contain only small cladocerans is incorrect. Iglesias et al. (2011) found that in warm water lakes in Uruguay (34° latitude), some lakes had small cladocerans while in other lakes they were large and included large *Daphnia*. The difference was due to an absence of visual predation (by zooplanktivorous fish) in the *Daphnia* dominated lakes, not to a difference in water temperature. Further, when fish-free enclosures were placed into the lakes with high fish predation and small cladocerans, large *Daphnia* appeared within two weeks, and they only were eliminated when fish were added to the enclosures.

A somewhat stronger relationship occurred between body size and temperature in cyclopoids than in cladocerans. This is consistent with a greater relative control of cyclopoids by temperature than by fish predation or resource composition. Because of their escape swimming behaviors, cyclopoids are less sensitive to fish predation than cladocerans, especially when considering large species such as *Daphnia* (Fernando, 1994; Jeppesen et al., 2001) and because cyclopoids are omnivorous (Adrian & Frost, 1993), they may be less sensitive to changes in phytoplankton composition. Resistance of cyclopoids to

increased fish predation is evidenced by results of controlled experimental (eg., Drenner & McComas, 1984) and whole-lake studies (Brooks & Dodson, 1965).

An unexpected result was the finding that body size of calanoid copepods did not vary with water temperature. The literature on calanoid response to temperature also is rife with inconsistent results. Some studies document an inverse relationship between adult body size and temperature (Lonsdale & Levinton, 1985; Atkinson, 1994); others indicate more complex effects that depend on species and resource availability (Lin et al., 2013); and some indicate that no relationship exists. For example, Twombly & Tisch (2000) found that in controlled experiments, temperature had no significant effect on mature adult body size of *Boeckella triarticulata* or *Diaptomus leptopus*, and Escribano & McLaren (1992) found no significant effect of temperature on *Calanus glacialis* size. These findings are in contrast to results from the ocean, where there is a well-established relationship between the size of copepods and temperature. In general, marine cold-water calanoids are large and have large lipid deposits, and warm-water calanoids are small and have small lipid deposits (e.g., Hooff & Peterson, 2006; Lee et al., 2006). In lakes, more is known about fish predation on calanoids (and cyclopoids) than about temperature effects. Catching these animals may be challenging because copepods are fast swimmers and therefore have a better chance to escape predation than cladocerans (Drenner & McComas, 1984). Yet this does not explain the difference in relationship between calanoids and cyclopoids with temperature and more research is needed to discern the underlying cause.

More evidence regarding the importance of fish predation on the zooplankton came from the analysis of Greenland data from lakes with vs. without fish. Cladocerans, the group most affected by fish predation, were much larger in lakes without fish. Cyclopoids, less

affected by fish predation, were only slightly smaller in the presence of fish, and calanoids were unaffected. While we do not have data from the other regions to make such a comparison (Greenland was the only region where we encountered fishless lakes) the results are (a) consistent with the hypothesis that fish predation plays a greater role in regulating body size of cladocerans than copepods, and (b) reinforce the importance, for cladocerans in particular, of measuring body size on a lake-by-lake basis, rather than assuming invariant species' body sizes across all lakes.

It is possible that other factors, such as invertebrate predation, also could influence the observed variation in body size in this study, as generally discussed by Hart & Bychek (2011); however, we have no such data to analyze.

Another factor not considered in this study, which could influence body size estimates, is diel vertical migration. In lakes with planktivorous fish, it is well established that larger zooplankton migrate to deeper water to avoid predation by sight-feeding fish. We do not expect this factor to largely influence our results, because except for Turkey, all samples encompassed the entire water column. It is possible that in Turkish lakes, especially those with a thermocline and fish predation, the body sizes could be underestimated. Lacking information on whether or not migration occurred, we cannot test this hypothesis.

From our results, it is not clear whether the changes in body size with temperature were driven primarily by a change in species composition or by individual species becoming smaller. Daufresne et al. (2009) found that reduced size in warm waters can be attributed to small species replacing larger ones, smaller individuals within a species being favored over larger ones, or a combination of both. In our analysis, very few species

occurred over the entire geographic range (Appendix I), so with just a few exceptions, the changes in body size likely were driven by a change in the taxonomic composition of the communities. However, the authors do not have access to the detailed data from all of the geographic regions to quantify the relative importance of these two factors that could affect average size.

It is well-established that temperature affects growth rates and adult size in a wide range of organisms, both from field and laboratory experiments (Atkinson, 1994; Ashton, 2001). Yet it also has been established that temperature can have both direct and indirect effects, the latter being mediated by changes in food web structure, including changes in predation pressure. Here we demonstrated that in lakes over a broad latitudinal gradient, cladocerans displayed a marginally significant decrease in body size with water temperature, as documented in an earlier synoptic study. However, in the present study the variation in body size at any given temperature was higher than previously reported, and that it may be attributed to differences in fish predation. Cyclopoids responded to temperature in a similar manner as cladocerans; however, the degree to which temperature explained the variation in size was greater and in line with expectations considering the greater ability of cyclopoids to co-exist with fish predators. Calanoid size did not vary with temperature. It suggests that in contrast with cladocerans and cyclopoids, calanoid body size is not metabolically constrained by higher temperatures. This unexpected result requires further investigation.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to the many field and laboratory support staff who collected and analyzed zooplankton in the study regions. Without their support this paper would not have been possible. The data collection in Florida was supported financially by the South Florida Water Management District. The groups from Aarhus University and METU were supported by the MARS project (Managing Aquatic ecosystems and water Resources under multiple Stress) funded under the 7th EU Framework Programme, Theme 6 (Environment including Climate Change), Contract No.: 603378 (<http://www.mars-project.eu>). The data collection in Turkey was supported by TÜBİTAK-ÇAYDAG (Projects 105Y332 and 110Y12). The Greenland studies were supported by the Research Council for Nature and Universe, Greenland Climate Research Centre and the Danish Agency of the Environment. The data collection in Ethiopia was supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) project R83-206 and by the Schure-Beijerinck-Popping Fund of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW) project SBP/JK/2004-14. The Canadian studies were supported by the National Science and Engineering Research Council and the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources. Data collection in Brazil was supported by CNPq (Proc. 521.513/93-6) and FAPEMIG (CBS 1897/96) grants. The work in Florida was done under CRIS Project FLA-FRE-005152 and was supported by the National Sea Grant College Program of the United States Department of Commerce, National Oceanic and Administration, under NOAA Grant NA06OAR-4170014. The authors thank Roger Bachmann for pre-reviewing this paper and providing many valuable comments.

References

- Adrian, R. & T. Frost, 1993. Omnivory in cyclopoid copepods: comparisons of algae and invertebrates as food for three, differently sized species. *Journal of Plankton Research* 15: 643-658.
- Angilletta, M.J. & A.E. Dunham, 2003. The temperature-size rule in ectotherms: simple evolutionary explanations may not be general. *The American Naturalist* 162: 332-342.
- Ariyaratne, M.G., P.B. Amarasinghe, N.C. Lopez, M. Kakkaew & J. Vijverberg, 2008. Selective feeding of small zooplanktivorous pelagic fish species in South-east Asian reservoirs (Sri Lanka, Thailand) and Lake Taal (Philippines). In Schiemer F., D. Simon D., U.S. Amarasinghe & J. Moreau (eds) *Aquatic Ecosystems and Development: Comparative Asian Perspectives*. Biology of Inland Waters series, Backhuys Publishers, Leiden: 235-248.
- Ashton, K.G., 2001. Are ecological and evolutionary rules being dismissed prematurely? *Diversity and Distributions* 7: 289-295.
- Atkinson, D., 1994. Temperature and organism size – a biological law for ectotherms? *Advances in Ecological Research* 25: 1-58.
- Brooks, J.L. & S.I. Dodson, 1965. Predation, body size, and composition of plankton. *Science* 150: 28-35.
- Carpenter, S.R. & J.F. Kitchell, 1988. Consumer control of lake productivity. *Bioscience* 38: 764-769.
- Crisman, T.L. 1992. Natural lakes of the southeastern United States: origin, structure and function. In Hackney, C.T., S.M. Adams & W.A. Martin (eds) *Biodiversity of the South-Eastern United States: Aquatic Communities*. John Wiley, NY: 475-538.
- Daufresne, M., K. Lengfellner and U. Sommer, 2009. Global warming benefits the small in aquatic ecosystems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106: 12788-12793.

383 Dejen, E., J. Vijverberg, M. de Graaf & F.A. Sibbing, 2006. Predicting and testing resource partitioning
 384 in a tropical fish assemblage of zooplanktivorous barbs: an ecomorphological approach.
 385 Journal of Fish Biology 69: 1356-1378.

386 Drenner, R.W. & S.R. McComas, 1984. The role of zooplankter escape ability and fish size selectivity
 387 in the selective feeding and impact of planktivorous fish. In: F.B. Taub (ed), Lakes and
 388 Reservoirs, Ecosystems of the World. Elsevier, Amsterdam: 587-593.

389 Dumont, H.J., I. Van de Velde & S. Dumont, 1975. The dry weight estimate on a selection of
 390 Cladocera, Copepoda and Rotifera from the plankton, periphyton and benthos of continental
 391 waters. Oecologia 19: 75-97.

392 Escribano, R. & I.A. McLaren, 1992. Influence of food and temperature on lengths and weights of
 393 two marine copepods. Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 19: 77-88.

394 Fernando, C.H., 1994. Zooplankton, fish and fisheries in tropical freshwaters. Hydrobiologia 272:
 395 105-123.

396 Geiling, W.T. & R.S. Campbell, 1972. The effect of temperature on the development rate of the major
 397 life stages of *Diaptomus pallidus* Herrick. Limnology and Oceanography 17: 304-307.

398 Gélinas, M., B. Pinel-Alloul & M. Ślusarczyk, 2007. Formation of morphological defences in response
 399 to YOY perch and invertebrate predation in two *Daphnia* species coexisting in a
 400 mesotrophic lake. Hydrobiologia 594: 175-185.

401 Giguere, L.A., J.F. St. Pierre, B. Bernier, A. Vezina & J.G. Rondeau, 2011. Can we estimate the true
 402 weight of zooplankton samples after chemical preservation? Canadian Journal of Fisheries
 403 and Aquatic Sciences 46: 522-527.

404 Gillooly, J.F., 2000. Effect of body size and temperature on generation time in zooplankton. Journal
 405 of Plankton Research 22: 241-251.

406 Gillooly, J.F. & S.I. Dodson, 2000. Latitudinal patterns in the size distribution and seasonal dynamics
 407 of new world, freshwater cladocerans. Limnology and Oceanography 45: 22-30.

408 Hart, R.C. & E.A. Bychek, 2011. Body size in freshwater planktonic crustaceans: an overview of
 409 extrinsic determinants and modifying influences of biotic interactions. *Hydrobiologia* 668:
 410 61-108.

411 Havens, K.E., T.L. East, J. Marcus, P. Essex, B. Bolan, S. Raymond & J.R. Beaver, 1996. Dynamics of the
 412 exotic *Daphnia lumholtzii* and native macro-zooplankton in a subtropical chain-of-lakes in
 413 Florida, USA. *Freshwater Biology* 45: 21-32.

414 Hooff, R.C. & W.T. Peterson, 2006, Copepod biodiversity as an indicator of changes in ocean and
 415 climate conditions of the northern California current ecosystem. *Limnology and*
 416 *Oceanography* 51: 2607–2620.

417 Iglesias, C., N. Mazzeo, M. Meerhoff, G. Lacerot, J.M. Clemente, F. Scasso, C. Kruk, G. Goyenola, J.
 418 García-Alonso, S.L. Amsinck, J.C. Paggi, S.J. de Paggi & E. Jeppesen, 2011. High predation is of
 419 key importance for dominance of small-bodied zooplankton in warm shallow lakes:
 420 evidence from lakes, fish exclosures and surface sediments. *Hydrobiologia* 667: 133-147.

421 Jeppesen, E., K. Christoffersen, F. Landkilehus, T. Lauridsen, S.L. Amsinck, F. Riget & M. Søndergaard,
 422 2001. Fish and crustaceans in northeast Greenland lakes with special emphasis on
 423 interactions between Arctic charr (*Salvelinus alpinus*), *Lepidurus arcticus* and benthic
 424 chydorids. *Hydrobiologia* 442: 329-337.

425 Jeppesen, E., J.P. Jensen, M. Søndergaard, T. Lauridsen & F. Landkildhus, 2000. Trophic structure,
 426 species richness and biodiversity in Danish lakes: changes along a phosphorus gradient.
 427 *Freshwater Biology* 45: 201-213.

428 Jeppesen, E., T.L. Lauridsen, S.F. Mitchell & C.W. Burns, 1997. Do planktivorous fish structure the
 429 zooplankton communities in New Zealand lakes? *New Zealand Journal of Marine and*
 430 *Freshwater Research* 31: 163-173.

431 Kainz, M., M.T. Arts & A. Mazumder, 2004. Essential fatty acids in the planktonic food web and their
 432 ecological role for higher trophic levels. *Limnology and Oceanography* 49: 1784-1793.

433 Lee, R.F., W. Hagen & G. Kattner, 2006. Lipid storage in marine zooplankton. *Marine Ecology*
 434 *Progress Series* 307: 273–306.

435 Lin, Y.K., A.R. Sastri, G.C. Gong & C.H. Hsieh, 2013. Copepod community growth rates in relation to
 436 body size, temperature, and food availability in the East China Sea: a test of metabolic
 437 theory of ecology. *Biogeosciences* 10: 1877-1892.

438 Lonsdale, D.J. & J.S. Levinton, 1985. Latitudinal differentiation in copepod growth: an adaptation to
 439 temperature. *Ecology* **66**: 1397-1407.

440 Mazumder, A., 1994a. Phosphorus-chlorophyll relationships under contrasting herbivory and
 441 thermal stratification: predictions and patterns. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic*
 442 *Sciences* 51: 390-400.

443 Mazumder, A., 1994b. Phosphorus-chlorophyll relationships under contrasting zooplankton
 444 community structure: potential mechanisms. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic*
 445 *Sciences* 51: 401-407.

446 McCauley, E., 1984. The estimation of the abundance and biomass of zooplankton in samples. p.
 447 228-265. In Downing, J.A. & F.H. Rigler (eds), *A Manual for the Assessment of Secondary*
 448 *Productivity in Fresh Waters*. Blackwell Scientific, Oxford: 228-265.

449 Meerhoff, M., F. Teixeira-de Mello, C. Kruk, C. Alonso, I. Gonzalez Bergonzoni, P.J. Pacheco, G.
 450 Lacerot, A. Matias, M. Beklioglu, S.B. Balmana, G. Goyenola, C. Iglesias, N. Mazzeo, S. Kosten &
 451 E. Jeppesen, 2012. Environmental warming in shallow lakes : a review of potential changes
 452 in community structure as evidenced from space-for-time substitution approaches.
 453 *Advances in Ecological Research* 46: 259-349.

454 Moore, M.V., C.F. Folt & R.S. Stemberger, 1996. Consequences of elevated temperatures for
 455 zooplankton assemblages in temperate lakes. *Archiv für Hydrobiologie* 135: 289-319.

456 Pinto-Coelho, R., B. Pinel-Alloul, G. Methot & K.E. Havens, 2005. Crustacean zooplankton in lakes
457 and reservoirs of temperate and tropical regions: variation with trophic status. Canadian
458 Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 62: 348-361.

459 Twombly, S. & N. Tisch, 2000. Body size regulation in copepod crustaceans. Oecologia 122: 318-326.

460 Vijverberg, J., E. Dejen, A. Getahun & L.A.J. Nagelkerke, 2014. Zooplankton, fish communities and the
461 role of planktivory in nine Ethiopian lakes. Hydrobiologia 722: 45-60.

462 Zaret, T.M., 1980. Predation and Freshwater Communities. Yale University Press, New Haven, CT.

Table 1. Lake regions, latitudes, numbers of lakes and water temperatures at the time of sampling.

Region	Latitude	# Lakes	Temp (°C)
Greenland	66 - 74°N	57	2 – 16
Alaska	55 - 60°N	5	15 – 17
Ontario	49°N	5	17 – 19
British Columbia	49°N	4	19
Turkey	38 - 42°N	32	9 – 17
Florida	28°N	6	30
Brazil	19 - 21°S	4 (13)*	23 - 27
Ethiopia	6 - 13°N	9	19 - 26

*Parenthetical value includes multiple sampling sites in two large dendritic reservoirs

List of Figures

Fig. 1. Map showing the general locations of lakes included in this paper, in: Alaska, Brazil, British Columbia, Ethiopia, Florida, Ontario and Turkey.

Fig. 2. Relationships between the mean size ($\mu\text{g dry weight animal}^{-1}$) of cladocerans (A), cyclopoids (B) and calanoids (C) and water temperature for the eight lake regions. Data are regional means $\pm$ 95% confidence intervals. Linear regressions are shown where there is significance at $p \leq 0.10$.

Fig. 1.

Fig. 2.

Appendix 1. Crustacean zooplankton species in the selected lakes and reservoirs of each geographic region.

A + indicates that the species is present in one or more of the lakes in that geographic region. G = Greenland, A = Alaska, ON = Ontario, BC = British Columbia, T = Turkey, F = Florida, B = Brazil, and E = Ethiopia.

Species	G	A	ON	BC	T	F	B	E
Cladocera								
<i>Acroperus angustatus</i>					+			
<i>Acroperus harpae</i>	+				+	+		
<i>Alona affinis</i>	+				+			
<i>Alona exigua</i>					+			
<i>Alona guttata</i>			+		+	+		
<i>Alona quadrangularis</i>					+			
<i>Alona rectangula</i>	+				+			
<i>Alona</i> sp.			+					
<i>Alonella nana</i>	+							
<i>Alonella excisa</i>	+							
<i>Alonella</i> sp.	+							
<i>Alonopsis</i>	+							
<i>Bosmina hagmanii</i>						+		+
<i>Bosmina</i> (<i>Sinobosmina freyii</i>)			+					
<i>Bosmina longirostris</i>	+	+		+	+	+	+	+
<i>Bosmina</i> (<i>Eubosmina longispina</i>)		+	+					
<i>Bosminopsis deitersi</i>						+	+	
<i>Branchinecta paludosa</i>	+							
<i>Camptocercus rectirostris</i>					+			
<i>Ceriodaphnia cornuta</i>							+	+
<i>Ceriodaphnia dubia</i>					+			
<i>Ceriodaphnia c. rigaudi</i>						+	+	
<i>Ceriodaphnia lacustris</i>			+					
<i>Ceriodaphnia laticaudata</i>					+			
<i>Ceriodaphnia megops</i>								
<i>Ceriodaphnia quadrangulata</i>	+				+			
<i>Ceriodaphnia</i> sp.				+			+	
<i>Chydorus sphaericus</i>	+	+	+		+	+		
<i>Chydorus piger</i>			+		+			
<i>Chydorus</i> sp.			+	+				
<i>Daphnia ambigua</i>						+		
<i>Daphnia barbata</i>								+
<i>Daphnia catawba</i>			+					
<i>Daphnia dubia</i>			+					
<i>Daphnia galeata</i>		+			+			
<i>Daphnia hyalina</i>								+
<i>Daphnia gessneri</i>						+		
<i>Daphnia laevis</i>			+				+	
<i>Daphnia longiremis</i>			+					
<i>Daphnia longispina</i>		+			+			
<i>Daphnia lumnoltzi</i>						+		
<i>Daphnia magna</i>					+			+
<i>Daphnia mendotae</i>			+					
<i>Daphnia parvula</i>			+					
<i>Daphnia pulex</i>	+		+		+			
<i>Daphnia retrocurva</i>			+					
<i>Daphnia</i> sp.	+		+	+				
<i>Diaphanosoma birgei</i>			+			+	+	

Appendix 1 (Cont'd).

Species	G	A	ON	BC	T	F	B	E
<i>Diaphanosoma brachyurum</i>			+	+	+	+		
<i>Diaphanosoma brevireme</i>						+		
<i>Diaphanosoma excisum</i>								+
<i>Diaphanosoma fluviatile</i>							+	
<i>Diaphanosoma lacustris</i>								+
<i>Diaphanosoma mongolianum</i>					+			
<i>Diaphanosoma sarsi</i>								+
<i>Diaphanosoma spinulosum</i>							+	
<i>Diaphanosoma sp.</i>			+		+		+	
<i>Echinisca rosea</i>						+		
<i>Eubosmina tubicen</i>						+		
<i>Eurycercus glacialis</i>	+							
<i>Graptolebris testudinaria</i>	+							
<i>Holopedium gibberum</i>	+	+	+	+		+		
<i>Ilyocryptus spinifer</i>						+		
<i>Latona setifera</i>	+							
<i>Leptodora kindtii</i>			+	+		+		
<i>Leydigia leydigi</i>					+			
<i>Macrothrix rosea</i>					+			
<i>Macrothrix sp.</i>	+				+			
<i>Macrothrix hirsuticornis</i>								
<i>Moina branchiate</i>					+			
<i>Moina micrura</i>					+		+	+
<i>Moina minuta</i>							+	
<i>Moina macrocopora</i>					+			
<i>Moina sp.</i>					+			
<i>Ophryoxus gracilis</i>				+				
<i>Pleuroxus aduncus</i>					+			
<i>Pleuroxus striatus</i>						+		
<i>Pleuroxus truncatus</i>					+			
<i>Pleuroxus uncinatus</i>					+			
<i>Pleuroxis sp.</i>					+			
<i>Polyphemus pediculus</i>	+	+		+	+			
<i>Scapholebris mucronata</i>	+							
<i>Sida crystallina</i>						+		
<i>Simocephalus vetulus</i>	+				+			
<i>Simocephalus sp.</i>				+	+			

Calanoida

<i>Argyrodiaptomus furcatus</i>							+	
<i>Epischura lacustris</i>		+	+					
<i>Arctodiaptomus doralis</i>						+		
<i>Diaptomus floridanus</i>						+		
<i>Diaptomus sp.</i>		+						
<i>Leptodiaptomus ashlandi</i>			+					
<i>Leptodiaptomus minutus</i>	+		+					
<i>Leptodiaptomus sicilis</i>			+					

Appendix 1 (Cont'd).

Species	G	A	ON	BC	T	F	B	E
<i>Notodiaptomus iheringi</i>							+	
<i>Notodiaptomus cf. nordestinus</i>							+	
<i>Notodiaptomus cearensis</i>							+	
<i>Notodiaptomus henseni</i>							+	
<i>Notodiaptomus corderoi</i>							+	
<i>Skistodiaptomus oregonensis</i>			+					
<i>Thermodiaptomus galebi lacustris</i>								+
<i>Thermodiaptomus processifer friedae</i>								+
<i>Tropodiaptomus kraepelini</i>								+
Calanoid copepods (not identified)				+	+			
Cyclopoida								
<i>Acanthocyclops carolinus</i>								
<i>Acanthocyclops vernalis</i>			+			+		
<i>Cyclops abyssorum alpinus</i>								
<i>Cyclops</i> sp.	+	+						
<i>Diacyclops bicuspidatus thomasi</i>			+					
<i>Diacyclops navus</i>			+					
<i>Ergasilus</i> sp.		+						
<i>Eucyclops serrulatus</i>			+					
<i>Eucyclops speratus</i>			+					
<i>Megacyclops viridis viridis</i>								+
<i>Mesocyclops aequatorialis similis</i>								+
<i>Mesocyclops brasiliensis</i>							+	
<i>Mesocyclops edax</i>			+			+		
<i>Mesocyclops leuckarti</i>			+					
<i>Mesocyclops longisetus</i>							+	
<i>Mesocyclops meridianus</i>							+	
<i>Mesocyclops ogannus</i>							+	
<i>Mesocyclops</i> sp.			+				+	
<i>Metacyclops mendocinus</i>							+	
<i>Orthocyclops modestus</i>			+					
<i>Thermocyclops decipiens</i>							+	
<i>Thermocyclops minutus</i>							+	
<i>Thermocyclops</i> sp.								+
<i>Tropocyclops prasinus</i>			+			+		
<i>Tropocyclops prasinus mexicanus</i>								
<i>Tropocyclops</i> sp.								
Cyclopoid copepods (not identified)				+	+			