

1    **Initial decomposition of floating leaf blades of waterlilies: causes, damage types and impacts**

2

3    Peter F. Klok and Gerard van der Velde

4

5    P. F. Klok · G. van der Velde (✉)

6    Department of Animal Ecology and Physiology, Institute for Water and Wetland Research,

7    Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

8    e-mail: [g.vandervelde@science.ru.nl](mailto:g.vandervelde@science.ru.nl)

9

10   P. F. Klok

11   Department of Particle Physics, Institute for Mathematics, Astrophysics and Particle Physics,

12   Radboud University, Nijmegen, The Netherlands

13

14   G. van der Velde

15   Naturalis Biodiversity Center, Leiden, The Netherlands

16

## 17 Abstract

18 The initial decomposition of large floating-leaved macrophytes, such as waterlilies, can be studied by  
19 following changes in leaf damage and area loss of leaf blades tagged in their natural environment. This  
20 approach was taken in the present study to examine the initial decomposition patterns of floating leaf  
21 blades of *Nuphar lutea* (L.) Sm., *Nymphaea alba* L. and *Nymphaea candida* J. Presl at three freshwater  
22 sites differing in nutrient status, alkalinity and pH. Floating leaf blades of the three plant species were  
23 tagged and numbered within established replicate plots and the leaf length, percentages and types of  
24 damage and decay of all tagged leaves were recorded weekly during the growing season. Autolysis,  
25 microbial decay, [mog1]infection by phytopathogenic fungi (*Colletotrichum nymphaeae*) and oomycetes  
26 (*Pythium* sp.), consumption by pond snails, and mechanical factors ~~to-were-be~~ the most important causes  
27 of leaf damage. -Several types of succession comprising different causes of damage were distinguished  
28 during the season. For example, young floating leaves are affected by more or less specialized  
29 invertebrate species consuming leaf tissue, followed by non-specialized invertebrate species feeding on  
30 the damaged floating leaves. In the two investigated ~~hardwater alkaline~~ [mog2]lakes the seasonal patterns  
31 of initial decomposition differed between *Nymphaea* and *Nuphar*.

## 36 Introduction

37 The decomposition of leaf blades of floating-leaved macrophytes commences when the leaves are  
38 still connected to the parent plant. The usual approach to study this process is to place detached or  
39 harvested plant material in litter bags (Brock et al., 1982; Wieder & Lang, 1982; Taketani et al.,  
40 2018). Much less attention has been paid to the initial decomposition of aquatic macrophytes  
41 before detachment or harvesting. Decomposition in these natural conditions involves a complex  
42 set of interacting processes (Fig. 1)<sup>[mog3]</sup>, which can be classified into internal (physiological) and  
43 external (abiotic or biotic) processes (Van der Velde *et al.*, 1982). Often, various stages and  
44 causes of decomposition occur on one plant or even on a single leaf.

45 During initial decomposition macrophyte tissue can be used by herbivores and by  
46 phytopathogenic and saprotrophic microorganisms. Before death, the plant tissue senesces ~~during~~  
47 ~~which~~ and further decomposition and disintegration is initiated by weak pathogens and facultative  
48 herbivores, leading to the production of debris and faecal pellets. The chemical composition of  
49 plant tissue also changes during senescence due to the hydrolysis of macromolecules, which can  
50 weaken tissue structure, like DNA and proteins and the resorption of nutrients like N and P as  
51 well as carbon compounds such as starch, and. ~~This leads to weakening of tissue structure~~  
52 ~~[mog4] and dependent on the conditions to the~~ loss of secondary compounds.  
53 ~~Subsequently~~ Furthermore, leaves are colonized by microorganisms, which make the tissue more  
54 attractive for detritivorous macroinvertebrates (Rogers & Breen, 1983).

55 The phases of initial decomposition can be studied well in floating leaf blades (laminae)  
56 of large-leaved plants such as waterlilies (Nymphaeaceae). ~~Their turnover is low ( $P/B_{\max}$  1.35-~~  
57 ~~2.25  $\text{yr}^{-1}$ ) and which the leaves~~ exist for a relatively long time, on average 38-48 days, and whose  
58 turnover is low ( $P/B_{\max}$  1.35-2.25  $\text{yr}^{-1}$ ) (Klok & Van der Velde, 2017). ~~Waterlilies occur~~  
59 worldwide (Conard, 1905; Wiersema, 1987; Padgett, 2007) and in many types of water bodies  
60 differing in ~~the physico-chemical conditions of water, sediment or both~~ (Van der Velde, Custers  
61 & De Lyon, 1986). Waterlilies typically ~~They~~ occupy a fixed position in the plant zonation in the  
62 littoral zone of lakes between emergent and submerged macrophytes. The nymphaeid growth  
63 form combines floating leaves with rooting in the sediment (Luther, 1983; Den Hartog & Van der  
64 Velde, 1988). In addition, waterlilies produce thin underwater leaves and aerial leaves when  
65 crowding occurs at the water surface or water levels are lowered, ~~respectively~~<sub>[mog5]</sub> (Glück, 1924;  
66 Van der Velde, 1980).

67 Floating leaf blades of waterlilies develop under water and subsequently unroll at the  
68 water surface where they are attacked by various organisms, although ~~young~~ leaves can already  
69 be attacked under water before they unroll (Lammens & Van der Velde, 1978; Van der Velde *et*  
70 *al.*, 1982; Van der Velde & Van der Heijden, 1985; Martínez & Franceschini, 2018). ~~Herbivores~~  
71 reduce plant growth in the long term (Marquis, 1992; Stenberg & Stenberg, 2012).  
72 <sub>[mog6]</sub> Responses of waterlilies to attacks include replacing old leaves by new ones, shifting from  
73 floating leaves to underwater leaves (Kouki, 1993), producing hydrophobic epicuticular wax

74 layers (Riederer & Müller, 2006; Aragón, Reina-Pinto & Serrano, 2017) (Fig. 2), spines (Zhang  
75 & Yao, 2018), sclereids containing calcium oxalate crystals (Brock & Van der Velde, 1983;  
76 Franceschi & Nakata, 2005), tough tissue (Kok *et al.*, 1992; Mueller & Dearing, 1994), and plant  
77 secondary metabolites such as alkaloids (Hutchinson, 1975) and phenolics (Kok *et al.*, 1992;  
78 Vergeer & Van der Velde, 1997; Smolders *et al.*, 2000; Martínez & Franceschini, 2018). This  
79 means that only specific species are able to attack the fresh plant tissue. These species are more  
80 or less specialized and often restricted to particular plant ~~species, genera or families~~taxa. Other  
81 species colonize the leaves at later stages after ~~autolysis, microbial decay and other factors have~~  
82 ~~weakened~~ the defense system has been weakened (Kok *et al.*, 1992). Damage of leaves can  
83 induce the leaching of soluble carbohydrates such as oligosaccharides and starch, proteinaceous  
84 and phenolic compounds, some of which can be rapidly metabolized by microorganisms (Brock,  
85 Boon & Paffen, 1985). Partially decayed floating leaves sink to the bottom, where they provide a  
86 resource fuelling detritus-based benthic food webs and continue being decomposed (Brock, 1985;  
87 Van der Velde & Van der Heijden, 1985; Kok & Van der Velde, 1991; Kok *et al.*, 1992; Kok,  
88 1993).

89         The present study summarizes causes and patterns of initial decomposition of floating  
90 leaves of three species of waterlilies in three water bodies differing in pH, alkalinity, nutrient  
91 levels and surrounding land use. Data from previous studies were compiled to answer three

92 questions: 1) What are the causes and patterns of initial decomposition of floating leaves? 2)  
93 What is the impact of each cause? 3) How does initial decomposition progress during the season?

94

## 95 **Materials and Methods**

### 96 **Sites**

97 Field research took place in dense, nearly mono-specific stands of waterlilies in three different  
98 water bodies located in The Netherlands: Haarsteegse Wiel (HW), Oude Waal (OW) and Voorste  
99 Goorven (VG) (Table 1). Three plots were laid out in stands of *Nuphar lutea* (L.) Sm. (HW and  
100 OW in 1977; VG in 1988), two plots in stands of *Nymphaea alba* L. (OW in 1977; VG in 1988)  
101 and one plot in a stand of *Nymphaea candida* Presl (HW in 1977). The plots were accessed with a  
102 small zodiac, which was navigated by gently paddling. Otherwise no boating or navigation  
103 occurred in the water bodies, which prevented damage of the plants by propellers.

104 Haarsteegse Wiel, located in the Province of Noord-Brabant, originates from two  
105 connected ponds created by dike bursts along the River Meuse. ~~It is an~~The now isolated ~~eutrophic~~  
106 water body is eutrophic with and has a relatively low alkalinity. The water level fluctuates,  
107 depending on precipitation, groundwater seepage and evaporation. Stratification of the water  
108 column occurs during summer. The lake bottom consists of sand and an organic layer with  
109 increasing thickness towards the littoral zone. The waterlily beds are situated in the wind-  
110 sheltered part of the lake.

111 Oude Waal in the Province of Gelderland is a highly eutrophic oxbow lake in the  
112 forelands of the River Waal. Depth during the growing season is shallow, except for three  
113 connected breakthrough ponds. The water level is dependent on precipitation, ~~groundwater~~  
114 seepage, overflow of the River Waal in winter ~~and/or~~ spring, which strongly influences water  
115 chemistry and quality, and evaporation. The bottom consisting of clay and sand is covered by an  
116 organic layer of varying thickness in the nymphaeid beds.

117 Finally, Voorste Goorven in the Province of Noord-Brabant is a shallow, oligotrophic,  
118 isolated, culturally acidified moorland pond with very low alkalinity. It is surrounded by forests  
119 stocking on poorly buffered sandy soils. The hydrology is mainly dependent on precipitation,  
120 groundwater seepage and evaporation.

121

## 122 Leaf area

123 ~~The p~~Potential and actual leaf areas were ~~distinguished-determined~~ to quantify leaf area loss. The  
124 potential area refers to the area of the intact leaf. The actual area was defined as the potential  
125 area minus the area that was missing. The potential leaf area was calculated by using a quadratic  
126 regression to relate it to leaf length (Van der Velde & Peelen-Bexkens, 1983; Klok & Van der  
127 Velde, 2017) (Table 2). Specifically, undamaged, fully green floating leaves randomly sampled  
128 outside the plots were taken to the laboratory where both length and area were measured to  
129 establish relationships of the form:

$$A(L) = c_i L^2 \quad (1),$$

where:

$A(L)$  = potential leaf area at length  $L$  (cm<sup>2</sup>)

$L$  = leaf length from the leaf tip to a basal lobe tip (cm)

$c_i$  = regression coefficient of species  $i$

$i$  = species (*Nuphar lutea*, *Nymphaea alba*, *Nymphaea candida*)

### Study design and data collection

Six representative plots of 1 m<sup>2</sup> were laid out in the center of mono-specific stands, each containing one rhizome apex per plot. A non-destructive method was used to tag all floating leaves individually within the plots (Klok & Van der Velde, 2017). Newly unrolled leaves were tagged with uniquely numbered Rotex tape fixed around the petiole just under the leaf blade. This enabled us to collect data during the full life-span of the leaves. Each plot was bordered by a square perforated PVC tube frame, held approximately 15 cm below the water surface by cork floaters and anchored to the bottom by four bricks. This set-up does not affect the unrolling of floating leaves in the plots. All leaves having their petioles within the frame were counted and measured. A leaf was considered present as long as, after partial degradation and disintegration, tissue of the lamina was connected to the petiole in the case of OW and HW. In VG a leaf was



148 | considered 'gone' when it was completely brown, dead and submerged, or when it had  
149 | disappeared.

150 | All leaves within the plots were inspected and measured at weekly intervals during the  
151 | growing season, typically from April until November. Site visits involved tagging newly  
152 | unrolled leaves, counting the number of leaves, measuring leaf length from the leaf tip to one of  
153 | the basal lobe tips and visually estimating different types of initial decomposition expressed as  
154 | percentage of the potential leaf area of each leaf. Leaves showing several types of damage were  
155 | harvested outside the plots to be photographed in the laboratory.

156

## 157 | **Results**

158 | Leaves developed during 53 to 73 % of the vegetation period of 135 to 199 days (Klok & Van der  
159 | Velde, 2017). -Loss of leaf tissue tended to increase during the vegetation period (Fig. 3; Table  
160 | 3). In the ~~more alkaline~~hardwater lakes (OW and HW), leaf area loss by damage of *Nuphar lutea*  
161 | and *Nymphaea alba* was less than 20% of the total potential leaf area until mid-September, but  
162 | increased to more than 50% thereafter. Leaf area loss by damage of *Nymphaea candida* (HW)  
163 | was less than 10% of the potential area in the beginning and increased to almost 20% in  
164 | September-October. In the acidic moorland pond (VG) leaf area loss was minimal as these leaves  
165 | did not disintegrate.

166

## 167 Causes and impacts of initial decomposition

168 The causes of damage classified in the present study are autolysis<sup>[mog7]</sup>, frost, hailstones,  
169 dehydration, mechanical damage, bird scratches, feeding waterfowl (*Fulica atra* L. and *Gallinula*  
170 *chloropus* L., Rallidae), pond snails (*Lymnaea* sp., Lymnaeidae, Gastropoda), water-lily reed  
171 beetle (*Donacia crassipes* F., Chrysomelidae, Coleoptera), adults and larvae of the water-lily leaf  
172 beetle (*Galerucella nymphaeae* L., Chrysomelidae, Coleoptera), a weevil (*Bagous rotundicollis*  
173 Bohemann, Curculionidae, Coleoptera), larvae of the aquatic moth brown china mark (*Elophila*  
174 *nymphaeata* (L.), Crambidae, Lepidoptera), larvae of a dung fly (*Hydromyza livens* (Fabricius),  
175 Scathophagidae, Diptera), chironomid larvae (Chironomidae, Diptera), including  
176 *Endochironomus* spp. and *Tribelos intextus* (Walker), a phytopathogenic fungus (*Colletotrichum*  
177 *nymphaeae* (Pass.) Aa) and an oomycete (*Pythium* sp.), and finally microbial decay<sup>[mog8]</sup> (Fig. 4,  
178 Table 4). In some cases, specific causes could not be identified.

179 **Autolysis.** Autolysis is a stage of senescence, visible by the change in leaf colour from green to  
180 yellow.<sup>[mog9]</sup> The influence extent of autolysis-yellow areas<sup>[mog10]</sup> reached its maximum towards  
181 the end of the growing season. In October the percentage of affected leaves was 100%; however,  
182 the yellow surface area affected by autolysis was generally around 10% and leaf loss<sup>[mog11]</sup> ranged  
183 between 10 and 20% of the total leaf loss. The extent of leaf area turned yellow affected by  
184 autolysis decreased over time, since microbial decay brown leaf areas became increasingly  
185 dominant on leaf areas affected by autolysis (Fig. 5; Table 4).

186 **Frost.** Frost in early spring can damage the tips of young leaves sticking out of the water. As a  
187 result, such leaves can lose up to one third of their area (Fig. 6). However, the effect on the total  
188 leaf surface area was less than 5%.

189 **Hailstones.** Occasional hailstone showers damage the floating leaves by penetrating the leaf and  
190 leaving typical Y-shaped scars (Fig. 7). Leaf area damaged by hail was minimal.

191 **Dehydration.** High winds often lift floating leaves above the water surface and may flip them  
192 over. Subsequently, those leaves are exposed to air, particularly the leaf margins, leading to leaf  
193 desiccation (Fig. 8). The effect of desiccation stress on leaf surface area was generally less than  
194 5%.

195 **Mechanical damage.** This type of damage is caused by wind and wave action resulting in cracks  
196 in the leaf tissue or lost leaves when the petiole breaks (Fig. 8). Lost leaves were ascribed to  
197 unknown causes. For *Nuphar lutea* at HW, *Nymphaea alba* at OW and *Nymphaea candida* at  
198 HW, the percentage of leaves affected over the whole vegetation period ranged from 60-80%.  
199 *Nuphar lutea* at OW showed peaks of 90% in spring, 70% in autumn and 10% in summer. In  
200 contrast, *Nuphar lutea* at VG and *Nymphaea alba* at VG showed no mechanical damage.

201 **Bird scratches.** Scratches are often caused by the claws of birds, mostly coots (*Fulica atra*) but  
202 also the common moorhen (*Gallinula chloropus*), as they walk or run over the leaves (Fig. 9). In  
203 general, the scratches are straight and affect only the epidermis of the leaf, but angle-shaped cuts  
204 due to claws penetrating the leaf tissue also occur. The affected leaf surface area was low,

generally below 5%, although a high percentage of leaves was affected, sometimes up to 100% for all plots at HW and OW. In contrast, the plots at VG showed no scratches.

**Consumption by coots.** Consumption of leaf tissue by coots can be recognized by missing parts in the form of triangular areas at the edge of leaves. Sometimes major parts of leaves are consumed. Generally, prints of the beak are visible around the consumed areas (Fig. 10). Nevertheless, the overall effect on total leaf surface area was minimal. The plots at VG showed no damage by coot consumption.

**Consumption by pond snails.** A major cause of damage on fresh leaf tissue is caused mainly by *Lymnaea stagnalis* L., to a lesser extent also by other lymnaeids. Pond snails consume folded leaves still under water. Rows of holes can then be seen in the unrolled ~~floating~~-leaf blades, large near the edge and smaller towards the center of the leaf (Fig. 11). Lymnaeid and other freshwater pulmonate snails show a preference for decaying leaf material, such as areas infected by fungi. Damage by snails was generally an important cause of damage during the whole period for both *Nuphar lutea* and *Nymphaea alba*, contributing up to 20% to the total leaf area loss in HW.

**Consumption by water-lily reed beetles.** Both *Nuphar* and *Nymphaea* spp. are host plants of the water-lily reed beetle *Donacia crassipes*. The adult beetles live on the upper side of floating leaves where they feed on leaf tissue (upper epidermis, parenchyma and lower epidermis). The leaf areas removed as a result of tissue consumption by these beetles are round to oval. Eggs are

224 deposited in two or three rows on the leaf underside. To this end, the beetle gnaws a round or oval  
225 hole in the leaf, then sticks its abdomen through the hole to reach the leaf underside and oviposit  
226 (Fig. 12). The percentage of leaf area damaged by reed beetles was minimal.

227 **Consumption by water-lily leaf beetles.** The water-lily leaf beetle (*Galerucella nymphaeae*)  
228 completes its full life cycle on the upper surface of floating leaves. Both adult beetles and larvae  
229 feed on the upper epidermis and palisade and sponge parenchyma. The larvae, which can be  
230 considered half miners, create irregular trenches on the surface, leaving the lower epidermis of  
231 the leaf intact and depositing their faeces in the trenches. The resulting pattern of leaf tissue  
232 damage is easily recognized. The adult beetles consume smaller areas (Fig. 13). Damage was  
233 only found in *Nymphaea alba* at VG, where leaves started to be affected in mid-June, rising to  
234 30-40% between August and October and reaching a sharp peak of 60% in mid-October. The  
235 percentage of lost leaf area ~~percentage~~ was minimal.

236 **Consumption by weevils.** The adults of *Bagous rotundicollis* scrape off areas of leaf tissue (ca. 1  
237 cm diameter) from the underside of floating leaves near the margin. Only the lower epidermis and  
238 sponge parenchyma are consumed, whereas the palisade parenchyma and upper epidermis remain  
239 intact (Fig. 14). Damage by weevils was found only in *Nymphaea alba* at VG, with up to 30% of  
240 these leaves being affected. Leaf area ~~loss~~st was minimal.

241 **Consumption and damage by the brown china mark.** The caterpillar of the aquatic moth  
242 *Elophila nymphaeata* damages floating leaves in two ways, by leaf tissue consumption and by

243 cutting out oval leaf patches that they can attach to the underside of a floating leaf to make a  
244 shelter. They can also spin two patches together to construct a floating shelter (Fig. 15). The  
245 effect of these activities on leaf surface area was low, at most 5%. *Nymphaea candida* at HW,  
246 *Nuphar lutea* at VG and *Nymphaea alba* at VG were not damaged by the moth.

247 **Mining by a dung fly.** Larvae of the dung fly *Hydromyza livens* only occurred in *Nuphar* leaves,  
248 where they mine and consume leaf tissue. Eggs are laid at the underside of the leaves. For that  
249 purpose the fly goes underwater, following the dichotomous veins on the underside of the leaves  
250 till it reaches the midrib to lay an egg. The newly hatched larvae immediately start to mine the  
251 leaf tissue. The mine track has a characteristic shape as the larvae first move from the midrib  
252 towards the margins of the leaf, then turn to continue mining in parallel to the leaf margin, then  
253 turn again towards the midrib and mine further into the petiole where they pupate. This creates a  
254 breaking point where the leaf blade can detach and float away (Fig. 16). Overall, the effect of  
255 dung flies mining the leaves was less than 8%.

256 **Mining by chironomids.** Larvae of some Chironomidae mine their way through the leaf tissue: ~~b~~By  
257 ~~mining they consume~~ particular tissue layers ~~but while~~ leaving the upper and lower epidermis  
258 unaffected for protection.

259 Typical damage on *Nuphar* leaves is caused by larvae of *Tribelos intextus*. These larvae mine  
260 leaves still folded underwater, resulting in rows of small holes that become visible when the  
261 floating leaves unroll at the water surface (Fig. 17). ~~Other miners~~Also observed at the study sites  
262 ~~we~~are larvae of *Cricotopus trifasciatus* (Meigen) (Fig. 18), ~~which is a half miner~~<sup>[mog12]</sup> which

263 ~~means they make~~s an open mine by removing the upper epidermis ~~and while~~ leaving the lower  
 264 epidermis intact. The species was observed in OW to cause some damage at the leaf margins of  
 265 *Nuphar lutea* in the neighbourhood of *Nymphoides peltata* (Gmel.) O. Kuntze, its main food plant  
 266 ~~in OW~~. Overall, however, the impact of these chironomid species on floating leaves was minimal.  
 267 **Mining by *Endochironomus* spp.** Larvae of these midges mine in floating leaves. The mines ~~of~~  
 268 could clearly be distinguished from those of other Chironomidae described above, since they  
 269 appear on the upper side of the floating leaves as straight dark stripes (Fig. 19). The total effect  
 270 on the decomposition of floating leaves was minimal.  
 271 **Infection by phytopathogens.** The leaves of *Nuphar lutea* were infected by the oomycete  
 272 *Pythium* “type F” (Fig. 20) and the leaves of *Nymphaea alba* and *Nymphaea candida* by the  
 273 fungus *Colletotrichum nymphaeae*, the causative agent of leaf spot disease (Fig. 21). The  
 274 percentage of damaged surface area was about 15% for *Pythium* and up to 55% for  
 275 *Colletotrichum*.  
 276 **Microbial decay.** The resistance of a leaf against microbial infection disappears quickly due to  
 277 autolysis, facilitating microbial decay (Fig. 5), which is indicated by a change in leaf colour  
 278 ~~change~~ from yellow to brown. [mog13] The affected surface area rose to 15-25%, with an  
 279 exceptional ~~level extent~~ of ~~damage reaching~~ 60% reached in *Nymphaea candida* at HW at the  
 280 very end of the growing season.  
 281 **Unknown causes.** Missing leaves or parts thereof can result from various types of damage, ~~e.g.~~  
 282 including animal consumption ~~or and~~ mechanical damage. Missing leaf material ~~of where~~ the

283 cause of loss could not be determined was registered under unknown causes. ~~such as~~ These causes  
284 include leaves disconnected from their petioles and scattered by wind and wave action. ~~and could~~  
285 ~~not be traced back to their parent plant. Damage~~ occasionally ~~rose~~ accounting for up to 60% of  
286 lost area [mog14] for *Nuphar lutea* at HW, *Nymphaea alba* at OW and *Nymphaea candida* at HW. ÷  
287 ~~H~~however, ~~this type of damage was~~ such losses were rare ~~hardly found~~ for *Nuphar lutea* at OW  
288 and VG and *Nymphaea alba* at VG.

289

## 290 Discussion

291 Senescence and autolysis. [mog15] Newly unrolled leaf blades of waterlilies are fully green and  
292 hydrophobic due to a thick epicuticular wax layer. This waxy layer gradually erodes during  
293 senescence and as cellulolytic and other bacteria and fungi colonize the leaf tissue (Howard-  
294 Williams, Davies & Cross, 1978; Robb *et al.*, 1979; Rogers & Breen, 1981; Barnabas, 1992).  
295 Senescence by autolysis [mog16] starts shortly after the first leaves are fully grown and continues  
296 throughout the growth period. During senescence, an orderly physiological process controlled by  
297 the plant itself, the leaves turn from green to yellow, and ~~subsequently~~ ultimately to brown.  
298 Concomitant microbial decay softens the leaves. The list of causes identified in the present study  
299 (Table 4) clearly indicates that senescence by autolysis followed by microbial decay [mog17] had the  
300 greatest impact on the initial decomposition of floating leaves.



301 | **Infection by phytopathogens and microbial decay**<sup>[mog18]</sup>. In *Nuphar* both **microbial decay** and  
302 | infection by the phytopathogenic oomycete *Pythium* sp. “type F” were important from the start of  
303 | the season. In *Nymphaea*, infection by the phytopathogenic fungus *Colletotrichum nymphaeae*  
304 | also started early and increased in importance towards the end of the season. In general, microbial  
305 | decay and phytopathogenic infection gradually increased in importance, whereas most other  
306 | causes of damage diminished over time.

307 | **Weather conditions.** Minor causes of leaf impairment occurring once during spring were frost  
308 | damage of the first newly unrolled leaves and hailstones. Hailstones hardly caused leaf area loss.  
309 | High solar radiation and air temperature dehydrated leaves that had been flipped over, with the  
310 | impact being high in HW and OW but not in the wind-sheltered VG. Prolonged cloudy and wet  
311 | weather imposes stress on waterlilies by weakening the defense of leaves due to reduced solar  
312 | radiation, and thus promoting heavy infection and damage by phytopathogens (~~v~~-Van<sup>[mog19]</sup>der  
313 | Aa, 1978). One mechanism is that poor light conditions reduce the content of phenolics with  
314 | fungistatic properties in the leaf tissue (Vergeer & Van<sup>[mog20]</sup>der Velde, 1997), which turns  
315 | mature leaves vulnerable to infection.

316 | **Damage by animals.** Causes of damage by insects were similar for *Nymphaea* and *Nuphar* with  
317 | the exception of *Hydromyza livens* and *Tribelos intextus*, which appear to be specific for *Nuphar*  
318 | (Brock & Van der Velde, 1983; Van der Velde & Hiddink, 1987). Some species such as *Bagous*  
319 | *rotundicollis* (Van der Velde, Kok & Van Vorstenbosch, 1989) and *Donacia crassipes*

(Gaevsкая, 1969) exclusively feed on Nymphaeaceae. Other species such as *Galerucella* *nymphaeae* and *Elophila nymphaeae* feed on both floating-leaved ~~macrophytes but also~~ ~~consume and~~ emergent macrophytes (Gaevsкая 1969; Lammens & Van der Velde, 1978; Pappers et al., 2001). *Cricotopus trifasciatus* primarily causes damage on leaves of *Nymphoides peltata* (Lammens & Van der Velde, 1978) but was also observed to damage nearby *Nuphar lutea* leaves (Van der Velde & Hiddink, 1987).

In VG, damage was mainly caused by phytophagous insects consuming floating leaf tissue, particularly herbivorous beetles, fly larvae and mining chironomid larvae. Leaf disintegration was hardly observed in the acidic VG, which was also the site most sheltered against wind and wave action by a surrounding forest. ~~This Protection from wind and wave action~~ allowed the water-lily leaf beetle *Galerucella nymphaeae* to cause extensive damage ~~as in because~~ wind blows adult ~~[mog21] exposed lakes the~~ beetles ~~are blown~~ from the leaves and wave action ~~the causes~~ larvae to float away ~~by wave action~~. Although ~~t~~ This species sp ~~ar~~ves the lower epidermis of their tracks, ~~but~~ ~~this makes the leaf tissue of the lower~~ epidermis becomes vulnerable to ~~subsequent~~ microbial attack ~~by which and~~ this ~~layer~~ disappears at a later stage (Wesenberg-Lund, 1943; Roweck, 1988). As observed in the present study, the minor leaf area loss by the beetle and its larvae is succeeded by damage caused by fungi or /oomycetes and bacteria, which cause major leaf loss ~~[mog22]~~ (Wallace & O'Hop, 1985). The damaged areas characterized by regular margins made by adult *Galerucella nymphaeae* are distinct from those made by adult *Donacia crassipes* where the

339 margins of damaged areas are rather irregular (Roweck, 1988). *Galerucella nymphaeae* was  
 340 absent in the two water bodies ~~which are~~ frequently exposed to strong wind.  
 341 Consumption by snails was ~~only found in~~restricted to the ~~more alkaline two hardwater~~ lakes,  
 342 since they require calcium to build their shells. Snails at those sites prefer consuming ~~decaying,~~  
 343 microbially colonized, decaying parts of the leaves (Kok, 1993).  
 344 *Nymphaea candida* (HW) showed an increase in scratches by bird claws towards the end of June,  
 345 which may have been due to young coots. High densities of waterfowl at HW and OW are  
 346 facilitated by the surrounding meadows where birds graze during winter.  
 347 **pH and alkalinity.** Decomposition of leaves was slowed down at the acidic site (VG). Such  
 348 water bodies are characterized by a very low alkalinity and high Al concentrations of the water, as  
 349 well as low pH (Leuven, Van der Velde & Kersten, 1992). ~~Kok, Meesters & Kempers (1990) A~~  
 350 laboratory study~~ied in chemostats with synthetic media showed that pH, Al and HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>~~  
 351 concentrations clearly influence the decomposition and chemical composition of leaf blades of  
 352 floating-leaf plants, with~~blade detritus in chemostats in the laboratory using synthetic media to~~  
 353 ~~investigate the influence of pH, Al and HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> concentrations on decomposition and chemical~~  
 354 ~~composition. Low pH and elevated Al concentrations inhibit~~ing~~ed decay while and~~ high  
 355 bicarbonate concentrations (alkalinity) stimulat~~ing~~ed decomposition (Kok, Meesters & Kempers,  
 356 1990). Al is ~~known to be~~ toxic to microorganisms and low pH slows down leaf disintegration by  
 357 ~~The inhibiting~~on of cell-wall degradation by microbial pectin-~~degrading~~ exoenzymes and

358 xylanase ~~at low pH slows down leaf disintegration~~ (Kok & Van der Velde, 1991). Concentrations  
359 of phenolics and ~~nutrients remain high~~ <sup>[mog23]</sup> in the ~~decompos~~<sup>grading</sup> leaf tissue (Kok et al., 1992)  
360 and ~~softening of the leaf tissue, is reduced.~~ <sup>[mog24]</sup> ~~resulting,~~ in a low-quality food resource for  
361 detritivores, ~~shredders and grazers~~ which ~~animals~~ are also inhibited by high Al concentrations and  
362 low pH (Kok & Van der Velde, 1994). ~~Also Finally, the fungal~~ degradation of major groups of  
363 structural carbohydrates ~~by fungi~~ is inhibited by low pH (Kok, Haverkamp & ~~Van~~ <sup>[mog25]</sup> der Aa,  
364 1992).

365         Harvested green leaf blades of *Nymphaea alba* placed in litter bags in the field and in the  
366 laboratory showed lower leaf area loss under acidic conditions in a moorland pond (VG) than in a  
367 eutrophic, more alkaline oxbow lake (OW), and results ~~at under~~ laboratory conditions mimicking  
368 differences in water chemistry were similar (Brock, Boon & Paffen, ~~(1985)~~). Depending on water  
369 chemistry, mass loss was pronounced and organic matter chemical composition changed rapidly  
370 during the first 10-30 days, followed by an accumulation of structural plant polymers such as  
371 cellulose, hemicellulose and lignin. The disappearance of those fractions was dependent on the  
372 water quality of the water body (Brock, Boon & Paffen, 1985).

373 In conclusion, the present study shows that the decomposition pattern of *Nuphar lutea* was  
374 similar in the two ~~more alkaline~~<sup>hard</sup>-water lakes, and differed from those of *Nymphaea alba* and  
375 *N. candida*. In the acidic VG, the effect of leaf damage on leaf area loss was minimal for both  
376 *Nuphar lutea* and *Nymphaea alba*.

377

## 378 Acknowledgements

379 We thank M. Ankersmid, R. Kwak, R. de Mooij, H. Peeters, F. Verhoeven, V. Vintges and C.J.  
380 Kok for collecting field data, R.P.W.M. Jacobs and H.A. van der Aa for identifying ~~ing~~  
381 oomycetes and fungi, respectively, W. Lemmens for help with data ~~processing~~ analysis, W.J.  
382 Metzger for English language corrections, and the editor Mark Gessner, ~~the~~ reviewer Manuela  
383 Abelho and one anonymous reviewer for constructive comments that very much improved the  
384 manuscript ~~very much~~.

385

## 386 References

387

388 Aragón W, Reina-Pinto JJ, Serrano M. 2017. The intimate talk between plants and  
389 microorganisms at the leaf surface. Journal of Experimental Botany 68(19): 5339-5350.

390

391 Barnabas AD. 1992. Bacteria on and within leaf blade epidermal cells of the seagrass  
392 *Thalassodendron ciliatum* (Forsk.) Den Hartog. Aquatic Botany 43: 257-266.

393

394 Brock TCM, Huijbregts CAM, Van de Steeg-Huberts, Vlassak MA. 1982. In situ studies on the  
 395 breakdown of *Nymphoides peltata* (Gmel.) O. Kuntze (Menyanthaceae); some methodological  
 396 aspects of the litter bag technique. Hydrobiological Bulletin 16(1): 35-49.  
 397

398 Brock TCM, Van der Velde G. 1983. An autecological study on *Hydromyza livens* (Fabricius)  
 399 (Diptera, Scatomyzidae), a fly associated with nymphaeid vegetation dominated by *Nuphar*.  
 400 Tijdschrift voor Entomologie 126(3): 59-90.  
 401

402 Brock TCM. 1985. Ecological studies on nymphaeid water plants. Thesis. Catholic University  
 403 Nijmegen, 205 pp.  
 404

405 Brock TCM, Boon JJ, Paffen BGP. 1985. The effects of the season and water chemistry on the  
 406 decomposition of *Nymphaea alba* L. – weight loss and pyrolysis mass spectrometry of the particulate  
 407 organic matter. Aquatic Botany 22 (3-4): 197-229.  
 408

409 Conard HS. 1905. *The Waterlilies. A monograph of the genus Nymphaea*. The Carnegie Institute  
 410 of Washington, 279 pp.  
 411

412 Den Hartog C, Van der Velde G. 1988. Structural aspects of aquatic plant communities. In:  
 413 Symoens JJ, ed. *Vegetation of inland waters*. Handbook of vegetation science 15: 113-153.  
 414 Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.  
 415  
 416 Franceschi VR, Nakata PA. 2005. Calcium oxalate in plants: Formation and function. Annual  
 417 Review in Plant Biology 56: 41-47.  
 418  
 419 Gaevskaya NS. 1969. The role of higher aquatic plants in the nutrition of the animals of fresh-  
 420 water basins. Volume I, II and III. Published by National Lending Library for Science and  
 421 Technology, Boston Spa, Yorkshire, England, 629 pp.  
 422  
 423 Glück H. 1924. *Biologische und morphologische Untersuchungen über Wasser- und*  
 424 *Sumpfgewächse. Vierter Teil: Untergetauchte und Schwimmblattflora*. Verlag von Gustav  
 425 Fischer, Jena, 746 pp.  
 426  
 427 Howard-Williams C, Davies BR, Cross RHM. 1978. The influence of periphyton on the surface  
 428 structure of a *Potamogeton pectinatus* L. leaf (an hypothesis). Aquatic Botany 5: 87-91.  
 429

430 Hutchinson GE. 1975. A treatise on limnology Vol. III-Limnological Botany. New York: John  
431 Wiley & Sons, 660 pp.  
432  
433 Klok PF, Van der Velde G. 2017. Plant traits and environment: floating leaf blade production and  
434 turnover of waterlilies. PeerJ 5:e3212; DOI 10.7717/peerj.3212.  
435  
436 Kok CJ, Meesters HWG, Kempers AJ. 1990. Decomposition rate, chemical composition and  
437 nutrient recycling of *Nymphaea alba* L. floating leaf blade detritus as influenced by pH, alkalinity  
438 and aluminium in laboratory experiments. Aquatic Botany 37: 215-227.  
439  
440 Kok CJ, Van der Velde G, Landsbergen KM. 1990. Production, nutrient dynamics and initial  
441 decomposition of floating leaves of *Nymphaea alba* L., and *Nuphar lutea* (L.) Sm.  
442 (Nymphaeaceae) in alkaline and acid waters. Biogeochemistry 11: 235-250.  
443  
444 Kok CJ, Van der Velde G. 1991. The influence of selected water quality parameters on the decay  
445 and exoenzymatic activity of detritus of floating leaf blades of *Nymphaea alba* L. in laboratory  
446 experiments. Oecologia 88: 311-316.  
447



448 Kok CJ, Haverkamp W, Van der Aa HA. 1992. Influence of pH on the growth and leaf  
 449 maceration ability of fungi involved in the decomposition of floating leaves of *Nymphaea alba* in  
 450 an acid water. Journal of General Microbiology 138: 103-108.

451

452 Kok CJ, Hof CHJ, Lenssen JPM, Van der Velde G. 1992. The influence of pH on concentrations  
 453 of protein and phenolics and resource quality of decomposing floating leaf material of *Nymphaea*  
 454 *alba* L. (Nymphaeaceae) for the detritivore *Asellus aquaticus* (L.). Oecologia 91: 229-234.

455

456 Kok CJ. 1993. Decomposition of floating leaves of *Nymphaea alba* L. under alkaline and acid  
 457 conditions. Doctoral Thesis, Catholic University Nijmegen, 121 pp.

458

459 Kok CJ, Van der Velde G. 1994. Decomposition and macroinvertebrate colonization of aquatic  
 460 and terrestrial leaf material in an alkaline and an acid still water. Freshwater Biology 31: 65-75.

461

462 Kouki J 1993. Herbivory modifies the production of different leaf types in the yellow water-lily,  
 463 *Nuphar lutea* (Nymphaeaceae). Functional Ecology 7: 21-26.

464

465 Lammens EHRR, Van der Velde G. 1978. Observations on the decomposition of *Nymphoides*  
 466 *peltata* (Gmel.) O. Kuntze (Menyanthaceae) with special regard to the leaves. Aquatic Botany 4:  
 467 331-346.  
 468  
 469 Leuven RSEW, Van der Velde G, Kersten HLM. 1992. Interrelations between pH and other  
 470 physico-chemical factors. Archiv für Hydrobiologie 126: 27-51.  
 471  
 472 Luther H. 1983. On life forms, and above-ground and underground biomass of aquatic  
 473 macrophytes. Acta Botanica Fennica 123: 1-23.  
 474  
 475 Marquis RJ. 1992. Selective impact of herbivores. Chapter 13: In: Fritz RS, Simms EL, eds. *Plant*  
 476 *resistance to herbivores and pathogens. Ecology, evolution, and genetics*. The University of  
 477 Chicago Press, Chicago and London, 301-325.  
 478  
 479 Martínez FS, Franceschini C. 2018. Invertebrate herbivory on floating-leaf macrophytes at the  
 480 northeast of Argentina: should the damage be taken into account in estimations of plant biomass?

481 Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciências 90(1): 12 pp. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0001->  
 482 3765201820170415.  
 483  
 484 Mueller UG, Dearing MD. 1994. Predation and avoidance of tough leaves by aquatic larvae of the  
 485 moth *Paraponyx rugosalis* (Lepidoptera, Pyralidae). Ecological Entomology 19(2): 155-158.  
 486  
 487 Padgett DJ. 2007. A monograph of *Nuphar* (Nymphaeaceae). Rhodora 109 (937): 1–95.  
 488  
 489 Pappers SM, Van Dommelen H, Van der Velde G, Ouborg NJ. 2001. Differences in morphology  
 490 and reproduction traits of *Galerucella nymphaeae* from four host plant species. Entomologia  
 491 Experimentalis et Applicata 99: 183-191.  
 492  
 493 Riederer M, Müller C (eds). 2006. *Biology of the plant cuticle*. Annual Plant Reviews, Vol. 23.  
 494 Blackwell, Oxford, 438 pp.  
 495  
 496 Robb F, Davies BR, Cross R, Kenyon C, Howard-Williams C. 1979. Cellulolytic bacteria as  
 497 primary colonizers of *Potamogeton pectinatus* L. (Sago pond weed) from a brackish south-  
 498 temperate coastal lake. Microbial Ecology 5: 167-177.  
 499

500 Rogers KH, Breen CM. 1981. Effects of periphyton on *Potamogeton pectinatus* L. leaves.  
 501 Microbial Ecology 7: 351-361.  
 502  
 503 Rogers KH, Breen CM. 1983. An investigation of macrophyte epiphyte and grazer interactions.  
 504 In: Wetzel, R.G. (ed.). Periphyton of freshwater ecosystems. Developments in Hydrobiology 17:  
 505 217-226.  
 506  
 507 Roweck H. 1988. Ökologische Untersuchungen an Teichrosen. Archiv für Hydrobiologie  
 508 Monographische Beiträge Supplementband 81 (2/3): 103-358. Stuttgart: E. Schweizerbart'sche  
 509 Verlagbuchhandlung (Nägele u. Obermiller).  
 510  
 511 Smolders AJP, Vergeer LHT, Van der Velde G, Roelofs JGM. 2000. Phenolic contents of  
 512 submerged, emergent and floating leaves of (semi-) aquatic macrophyte species. Why do they  
 513 differ? Oikos 91: 307-310.  
 514  
 515 Stenberg JA, Stenberg JE. 2012. Herbivory limits the yellow water lily in an overgrown lake and  
 516 in flowing water. Hydrobiologia 691: 81-88.

517

518 Taketani R, Moitinho MA, Mauchline TH, Melo IS. 2018. Co-occurrence patterns of litter  
519 decomposing communities in mangroves indicate a robust community resistant to disturbances.  
520 PeerJ 6: article number e5710.

521

522 Van der Aa HA. 1978. A leaf spot disease of *Nymphaea alba* in the Netherlands. Netherlands  
523 Journal of Plant Pathology 84: 109-115.

524

525 | Van der Velde -G. 1980. Studies in nymphaeid-dominated systems with special emphasis on  
526 | those dominated by *Nymphoides peltata* (Gmel.) O. Kuntze (Menyanthaceae). Doctoral Thesis,  
527 | Catholic University Nijmegen, 163 pp.

528

529 Van der Velde G, Van der Heijden LA, Van Grunsven PAJ, Bexkens PMM. 1982. Initial  
530 decomposition of *Nymphoides peltata* (Gmel.) O. Kuntze (Menyanthaceae), as studied by the  
531 leaf-marking method. Hydrobiological Bulletin 16 (1):51-60.

532

533 Van der Velde G, Peelen-Bexkens PMM. 1983. Production and biomass of floating leaves of  
534 three species of Nymphaeaceae in two Dutch waters. Proceedings of the International Symposium  
535 on Aquatic Macrophytes, Nijmegen, The Netherlands, 18-23 September, 1983, 230-235.

536

537 Van der Velde G, Van der Heijden LA. 1985. Initial decomposition of floating leaves of  
538 *Nymphoides peltata* (Gmel.) O. Kuntze (Menyanthaceae) in relation to their age, with special  
539 attention to the role of herbivores. Verhandlungen der Internationalen Vereinigung für  
540 theoretische und angewandte Limnologie 22: 2937-2941.

541

542 Van der Velde G, Custers CPC & de Lyon MJH. 1986. The distribution of four nymphaeid species in  
543 the Netherlands in relation to selected abiotic factors. Proceedings of the European Weed Research  
544 Society/Association of Applied Biologists, 7th Symposium on Aquatic Weeds, ~~1986~~ (Loughborough,  
545 UK, 1986), 363-368.

546

547 Van der Velde G, Hiddink R. 1987. Chironomidae mining in *Nuphar lutea* (L.) Sm.  
548 (Nymphaeaceae). Entomologica Scandinavica Supplement ~~No.~~ 29: 255-264.

549

550 Van der Velde G., Kok CJ, Van Vorstenbosch HJWT. 1989. *Bagous rotundicollis*, new for The  
 551 Netherlands, feeding on waterlily leaves (Coleoptera: Curculionidae). Entomologische Berichten,  
 552 Amsterdam 49: 57-60.  
 553  
 554 Vergeer LHT, Van der Velde G. 1997. The phenolic content of daylight-exposed and shaded  
 555 floating leaves of water lilies (Nymphaeaceae) in relation to infection by fungi. Oecologia 112:  
 556 481-484.  
 557  
 558 Wallace JB, O'Hop, J. 1985. Life on a fast pad – Waterlily leaf beetle impact on water lilies.  
 559 Ecology 66 (5): 1534-1544  
 560  
 561 Wesenberg-Lund C. 1943. *Biologie der Süßwasserinsekten*. ~~Springer-Gyldendalske Boghandel.~~  
 562 ~~Nordisk Forlag, Kopenhagen und~~ Verlag ~~J. Springer~~, Berlin. ~~Wien~~, 682 pp.  
 563  
 564 Wieder RK, Lang GE. 1982. A critique of the analytical methods used in examining  
 565 decomposition data obtained from litter bags. Ecology 63 (6): 1636-1642.  
 566

- 567 Wiersema JH. 1987. A monograph of *Nymphaea* subgenus *Hydrocallis* (Nymphaeaceae).  
568 Systematic Botanical Monographs 16: 1-112.
- 569
- 570 Zhang G, Yao R. 2018. The spinescent aquatic plants in the Yangtze Delta, East China. Israel  
571 Journal of Plant Science 65 (1-2): 9-16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/07929978.2017.1279440>.



**Table 1**

Characteristic	Haarsteegse Wiel (HW)	Oude Waal (OW)	Voorste Goorven (VG)
Type of water body	Breakthrough lake	Oxbow lake with three breakthrough ponds	Moorland pond
Location	51°43'05" N, 5°11'07" E	51°51'13" N, 5°53'35" E	51°33'53" N, 5°12'26" E
Area (ha)	18	25	5
Maximum depth	17 m	1.5 m and 6-7 m	2 m
Water level fluctuations	Low	High in winter and spring	Low
Stratification	In summer, thermocline at 4-6 m	No	No
Hydrology	Precipitation, evaporation, groundwater seepage	Precipitation, evaporation, groundwater seepage, river overflow	Precipitation, evaporation, groundwater seepage
Surrounding vegetation	Trees, shrubs, reeds	Grassland	Forest
Wind and wave action	Low	Moderate	Moderate
Bottom	Sand, organic (sapropel)	Sand, clay, organic (sapropel)	Sand, organic (sapropel)
Trophic state	Eutrophic	Highly eutrophic	Oligotrophic
Alkalinity (mmol L <sup>-1</sup> )*	1.5	4.3-6.7	<0.01-0.07
pH*	7.1-8.5	6.7-8.3	4.7-5.5
Sampling year	1977	1977	1988
Macrophyte species (water depth of plot)	<i>Nuphar lutea</i> , (1.5 m) <i>Nymphaea candida</i> (2.5 m)	<i>Nuphar lutea</i> (1.5 m) <i>Nymphaea alba</i> (1.5 m)	<i>Nuphar lutea</i> (2 m) <i>Nymphaea alba</i> (2 m)

Table 2: Relationship between length (L) and area (A) of undamaged leaf blades of three species of waterlilies.

Species	N	Regression equation	r <sup>2</sup>	p
<i>Nuphar lutea</i>	37	$A=0.623L^2$	0.99	<0.001
<i>Nymphaea alba</i>	84	$A=0.788L^2$	0.98	<0.001
<i>Nymphaea candida</i>	10	$A=0.695L^2$	0.99	<0.001

Table 3

Site	Species	Year	Vegetation period		Growth period		Total number of leaves (m <sup>2</sup> )	Total potential leaf area (cm <sup>2</sup> )
			Time span	Days	Time span	Days		
HW	<i>Nuphar lutea</i>	1977	May 10 – Nov 24	199	May 10 – Sep 13	127	77	49674
OW	<i>Nuphar lutea</i>	1977	May 11 – Nov 1	175	May 11 – Sep 7	120	59	39898
VG	<i>Nuphar lutea</i>	1988	Apr 28 – Oct 27	183	Apr 28 – Sep 8	134	22	8440
HW	<i>Nymphaea candida</i>	1977	Jun 7 – Oct 19	135	Jun 7 – Aug 16	71	43	11185
OW	<i>Nymphaea alba</i>	1977	May 11 – Nov 6	180	May 11 – Sep 7	120	108	53035
VG	<i>Nymphaea alba</i>	1988	Apr 28 – Oct 27	183	Apr 28 – Sep 8	134	80	23053

Formatted Table

Deleted: .

Table 4

Cause of damage	Percentage of leaves affected						Percentage of potential area affected												Area lost (cm <sup>2</sup> )					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(1)		(2)		(3)		(4)		(5)		(6)		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
							av.	max.	av.	max.	av.	max.	av.	max.	av.	max.	av.	max.						
Autolysis	79	92	91	84	78	64	6.3	40.0	6.2	19.0	4.8	23.5	10.9	39.0	5.4	35.0	2.9	15.7	4278	2508	1863	2181	4727	2748
Frost	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	<0.1	0.83	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	-	-	-	-
Hail stones	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dehydration	23	37	-	9	28	6	0.45	5.00	0.97	6.86	-	-	0.05	0.63	0.64	7.78	0.17	8.00	384	603	-	9	854	48
Mechanical damage	78	47	-	74	80	-	1.05	8.75	1.15	10.00	-	-	0.79	3.29	1.51	10.91	-	-	546	577	-	95	1118	-
Bird scratches	83	59	-	84	77	-	0.67	1.00	0.49	1.00	-	-	0.64	1.00	0.61	1.00	-	-	382	223	-	83	386	-
Consumption by coots	36	14	-	12	50	-	0.78	10.00	0.56	17.50	-	-	0.08	0.92	0.58	3.00	-	-	385	204	-	14	442	-
Consumption by pond snails	56	12	-	12	13	-	2.47	10.00	0.41	5.43	-	-	0.34	5.00	0.25	8.00	-	-	1113	203	-	26	120	-
Consumption by reed beetles	65	63	73	70	54	-	0.62	2.00	0.60	1.75	0.78	2.00	0.57	1.17	0.41	1.56	-	-	375	285	64	74	324	-
Consumption by waterlily beetles	-	-	-	-	-	24	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.28	2.73	-	-	-	-	-	85
Consumption by weevils	-	-	-	-	-	29	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.20	1.00	-	-	-	-	-	63
Consumption and damage by the brown china mark	10	3	-	-	6	-	0.36	5.00	0.11	3.57	-	-	-	-	0.12	3.89	-	-	144	43	-	-	66	-
Mining by a dung fly	65	69	73	-	-	-	1.31	6.45	1.10	4.00	1.34	3.50	-	-	-	-	-	-	786	516	119	-	-	-
Mining by chironomids	14	2	-	2	6	-	0.18	5.00	<0.1	1.00	-	-	<0.1	0.38	<0.1	1.00	-	-	99	7	-	3	33	-
Mining by <i>Endochironomus</i> spp.	5	-	50	12	25	23	<0.1	1.20	-	-	1.08	5.00	0.09	1.00	0.3	1.80	0.52	5.40	34	-	99	13	181	110
Infection by <i>Pythium</i> "type F"	86	92	77	77	77	77	4.21	11.75	6.07	12.86	1.02	4.86	7	7	7	7	7	7	2879	3153	277	7	7	7
Infection by <i>Colletotrichum nymphaeae</i>	-	-	-	79	53	94	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.68	17.86	6.10	21.67	2.08	8.80	-	-	-	3274	11464	767
Microbial decay	56	86	59	56	72	60	4.87	26.25	9.67	26.11	4.55	80.29	0.39	5.25	2.84	26.78	1.25	64.31	8803	11844	766	182	5634	6314
Unknown causes	65	5	-	19	34	-	7.19	33.33	0.05	1.00	-	-	1.04	26.67	1.59	40.00	-	-	3888	20	-	115	1235	-

Deleted: D...mage cause ...

Comment [mog1]: See comments in main body of ...

Comment [mog2]: Please round to only one digit ...

Deleted: 2

Deleted: 0

Deleted: 19

Deleted: 0

Deleted: 4

Deleted: 0

Deleted: 2

Deleted: 0

Deleted: 39

Deleted: 0

Deleted: 4

Deleted: 1

Deleted: 0

Deleted: 02

Deleted: 0

Deleted: 05

Deleted: C

Deleted: 04

Deleted: 29

Deleted: phytopathogens

Deleted: ¶ ...

Deleted: ¶ ...

Deleted: ¶ ...

Deleted: ¶ ...

Deleted: ¶ ...

Formatted ...

Deleted: ¶ ...

Deleted: ¶ ...

Deleted: ¶ ...

Deleted: ¶ ...

Deleted: ¶ ...

Formatted ...

Deleted: ¶ ...

Deleted: ¶ ...

Deleted: ¶ ...

Deleted: ¶ ...

Formatted ...

Deleted: ¶ ...

Deleted: ¶ ...

Formatted ...

...