

A peer-reviewed version of this preprint was published in PeerJ on 19 July 2018.

[View the peer-reviewed version](https://peerj.com/articles/5143) (peerj.com/articles/5143), which is the preferred citable publication unless you specifically need to cite this preprint.

Aray-Andrade MM, Uyaguari-Diaz MI, Bermúdez JR. 2018. Short-term deleterious effects of standard isolation and cultivation methods on new tropical freshwater microalgae strains. PeerJ 6:e5143
<https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.5143>

1 **Keywords:** cryopreservation, lipids, growth rate, microalgae, antibiotics

2

3 **Summary**

4 Algae with potential biotechnological applications in different industries are commonly isolate
5 from the environment in order to obtain pure (axenic) stocks that can be safely stored for long
6 periods of time. To obtain axenic cultures, antibiotics are frequently used, and cryopreservation
7 is applied to keep standing stocks. However, many of these now standard methods were
8 developed using strains coming from pristine-to-low intervened environments and cold-to-
9 temperate regions. Thus, it is still not well understand the potential effect of said methods on the
10 life cycle and biochemical profile of algae isolates from hiper-eutrophic and constant high-
11 temperature tropical regions, which could potentially render them unsuitable for their intended
12 biotechnological application. In this study, we conducted a genetic characterization (18S rRNA)
13 and evaluated the effect of purification (use of the antibiotic chloramphenicol, CPA) and
14 cryopreservation (dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO)-sucrose mix and Glycerol) on the growth rate and
15 lipid content of four new tropical freshwater algal isolates: *Chorella* sp. M2, *Chlorella* sp. M6,
16 *Scenedesmus* sp. R3, and *Coelastrella* sp. A2, from the Ecuadorian coast. The genetic
17 characterization showed a clear discrimination between strains. All strains cultured with CPA
18 had a lower growth rate. After cryopreservation *Coelastrella* sp. A2 did not grow with both
19 methods; *Chorella* sp. M2, *Chlorella* sp. M6 and *Scenedesmus* sp. R3 presented no significant
20 difference in growth rate between the cryopreservants. A significantly higher lipid content was
21 observed in biomass cryopreserved with glycerol in relation to DMSO-sucrose, with *Chorella* sp.
22 M2 and *Chlorella* sp. M6 having twice as much in the first treatment. The results highlight the
23 relevance of choosing an appropriate method for storage as the materials used can affect the

1 biological performance of different tropical species, although is still to determine if the effects
2 observed here are long lasting in subsequent cultures of these algae.

3 **Introduction**

4 The cultivation of wild microalgae under defined/controlled conditions has received considerable
5 interest due to their potential as a source of various compounds with biotechnological and
6 commercial significance in nutraceutical, cosmetic and pharmaceutical industries (Gellenbeck,
7 2011; Encarnação *et al.*, 2015; Rodrigues *et al.*, 2015; Dogaris *et al.*, 2015; Maurya *et al.*, 2016).
8 Some microalgae are essential raw materials in biofuel production because of their ability to
9 accumulate a high lipid content. Microalgae such as *Chlorococcum* sp. is a fast growing specie
10 and its lipid content can contribute up to $30.55 \pm 2.65\%$ in dried biomass (Mahapatra &
11 Ramachandra, 2013); some *Chlorella* species are known to produce lipid ranged from 10–39%
12 in dried biomass (Chiu *et al.*, 2015), showing a huge potential as lipid sources in biotechnology.
13 Nowadays the production of microalgal biomass has been upscaled to large outdoors cultivation
14 systems for the production of biodiesel. However, high temperatures can severely affect the
15 productivity of said systems (Béchet *et al.*, 2013). For this reason, it has become important the
16 isolation and characterization of high temperature-tolerant microalgal species in order to
17 mitigate said effects, as has been demonstrated with the temperature-tolerant strain *Chlorella*
18 *sorokiniana* (Béchet *et al.*, 2013).

19 An additional advantage of algal biomass production is the potential use of wastewater as culture
20 media for the production of middle and high-value by-products. The use of wastewater is
21 beneficial as it reduces the use of freshwater, decrease the cost of nutrient addition, and helps in
22 the removal of nitrogen and phosphorus which otherwise would end in the environment (Chiu *et*
23 *al.*, 2015), and have been show that several microalgae have high bioremediation potential as

1 *Chlorella* and *Scenedesmus* (Silkina *et al.*, 2017). However, wastewater has an elevated amounts
2 of nitrogen, phosphorus and microbes, which could affect algal productivity (Mara, 2004;
3 Mahapatra & Ramachandra, 2013) Therefore, an efficient strategy to mitigate potential negative
4 effects of the use of wastewater as culture media is the isolation of wild algal strains that
5 proliferate in it (Mahapatra & Ramachandra, 2013). However, to assess the biotechnological
6 potential and applications of microalgal species, the first step is to isolate them from the
7 environment and to obtain pure (axenic) stocks that can be safely stored for long periods of time,
8 and then can be used as stock for future cultures. Given that an elevated bacterial contamination
9 can be expected during the isolation of fresh strains from wastewater (Mara, 2004), antibiotics
10 such as florfenicol, streptomycin, furazolidone and specially chloramphenicol (CAP) are often
11 used to eliminate bacteria in the culture media (Campa-Córdova *et al.*, 2006; Lai *et al.*, 2009),
12 this last is highly effective because it inhibits a variety of aerobic and anaerobic microorganism.
13 Nevertheless, an intensive use of antibiotics in households, agriculture and aquaculture have had
14 adverse ecological effects, including the development of resistant bacterial populations (Lai *et*
15 *al.*, 2009), which may require a higher concentration of antibiotics to achieve its elimination
16 from isolated strains. However, it has been reported that antibiotics can negatively affect the
17 growth of certain algal species such as *Chlorella pyrenoidosa*, *Isochrysis galbana* and
18 *Tetraselmis chui* (Lai *et al.*, 2009) cultured with CAP.

19

20 Cryopreservation of microalgae stocks for long term storage is important as it eliminates the
21 requirement of keeping continuous batches of growing strains (Bui *et al.*, 2013). Although the
22 mechanisms underlying cryopreservation are understood in general, the impact of these are not
23 always elaborated (Bui *et al.*, 2013) and it is not well understood their impact in potentially

1 difficult-to-freeze algae, specially that from tropical environments, as this species have never
2 experienced cold or desiccation, much less freezing in their life cycles (Fuller, Lane & Benson,
3 2004).

4 In general terms, the issues of cryopreservation is the forming ice crystals within the cellular
5 cytoplasm during the freezing process, which disrupts the cell membrane (Bui *et al.*, 2013). To
6 reduce such effect, several cryopreservants can be added to the culture media to protect
7 eukaryotic cells from damage caused by freezing. For example Dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) and
8 methanol are cell wall-permeable cryoprotectants that rapidly enter the cell; glycerol is also
9 permeable, but enters more slowly; while sucrose does not cross the cell membrane and thus its
10 protection is extracellular (Hubálek, 2003; Bui *et al.*, 2013). Furthermore, the cryopreservation
11 of algae can change their original biochemical profile through the alteration of their genetic
12 structure and/or metabolic pathways (Müller *et al.*, 2007), making them unsuitable for their
13 intended biotechnological application when they were originally isolated.

14 A crucial step for the potential use of tropical algae as a biotechnological resource is to
15 determine the effects of cultivation process on their biochemical profiles and productivity rates.
16 The aim of the present study was to evaluate the effect of traditional isolation and cultivation
17 process used to obtain axenic culture (treatment with chloramphenicol) and their
18 cryopreservation (DMSO-sucrose and glycerol) on the growth rate and lipid content of four
19 fresh algae isolates from wastewater in the tropical Ecuadorian coast region.

20

21

22

1 **Materials and Methods**

2 **Isolation, identification and preparation of stocks**

3 Microalgae strains were isolated from green standing water bodies (20 ml) in different standing
4 ponds around the urban areas of Guayaquil, Ecuador. From each water sample collected, serial
5 1:10 dilutions were made in 1.5 ml eppendorf tubes using Guillard's *f/2* medium (Guillard &
6 Ryther, 1962) as culture media.

7 The strains, identified by morphological differentiation were: *Chorella* sp. M2, *Chlorella* sp. M6,
8 *Scenedesmus* sp. R3. and *Coelastrella* sp. A2, following the method of Wehr & Sheath (2003).

9 The isolated and identified strains were cultivated in batch cultures with Guillard's *f/2* medium,
10 under controlled laboratory conditions (culture cabins at 30°C and a 12/12 hours photoperiod), to
11 increase the biomass of each strain prior to the beginning of the experiments.

12 **DNA extraction, polymerase chain reaction, cloning, and sequencing**

13 Before extraction and to facilitate disruption of algal cells, eight freeze-thaw cycles were
14 conducted followed by overnight digestion using 20 µl of 20 mg/ml of proteinase K (Qiagen
15 Sciences, Germantown, MD). DNA was extracted using the UltraClean Soil DNA Kit (MoBio,
16 Carlsbad, CA) as per the manufacturer's instructions. DNA concentration and purity was
17 assessed with Qubit dsDNA high sensitivity in a Qubit 3.0 fluorometer (Life Technologies,
18 Carlsbad, CA) and NanoDrop spectrophotometer (NanoDrop technologies, Inc., Wilmington,
19 DE), respectively. Specific primers targeting V1–V3 regions of the 18S rRNA gene were
20 selected from previous studies (Amann, Krumholz & Stahl, 1990; Zhu *et al.*, 2005) (Amann,
21 Krumholz & Stahl, 1990; Zhu *et al.*, 2005). Each 50 µl of PCR reaction consisted of 1.5-mM
22 MgCl₂, 0.2-mM nucleotides, 400 mM of each primer, 1.25 U of Hot Start Polymerase (Promega

1 Corporation, Fitchburg, WI), and 1 µl of template DNA. The thermal cycling conditions
2 consisted of 94 °C × 5 min, 35 cycles of 30 s at 94 °C, 60 s at 55 °C, and 90 s at 72 °C, and a
3 final cycle of 10 min at 72 °C. PCR amplicons were examined in a 1.5% agarose/0.5X TBE gel
4 stained with 1X GelRed (Biotium, Inc., Hayward, CA), and purified with a QIAQuick PCR
5 Purification Kit (Qiagen Sciences, Maryland, MD) according to the manufacturer's instructions.
6 Amplicons then were ligated into pCR2.1-TOPO cloning vectors (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA), and
7 transformed into One Shot E. coli DH5 α-T1R competent cells following the manufacturer's
8 protocol. At least 4 transformants per sample were screened for inserts by following
9 manufacturer's recommendations. Positive transformants were then grown overnight at 37 °C in
10 lysogeny broth with 50 µg ml⁻¹ of kanamycin. Plasmids were extracted using PureLink Quick
11 Plasmid Miniprep Kit (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, CA). Further quantitation assessment used a
12 dsDNA high sensitivity kit in a Qubit 3.0 fluorometer (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, CA).
13 Plasmids were end-sequenced in an ABI 3130xl Genetic Analyzer (Life Technologies, Carlsbad,
14 CA) with M13 forward primer (-20) (5'-GTAAAACGACGGCCAG-3') and M13 reverse primer
15 (5'- CAGGAAACAGCTATGACC-3') using BigDye Terminator version 3.1 cycle sequencing
16 kit (Applied Biosystems, Warrington, UK). The resultant set of DNA sequences were blasted
17 against the SILVA 18S rRNA database (Pruesse *et al.*, 2007).

18 **Phylogenetic tree construction**

19 To further define the sequences in this study, an unweighted pair group method with arithmetic
20 mean (UPGMA) tree was constructed using BLASTN matches and other characterized 18S
21 rRNA gene algal sequences using Geneious 9.1.8 software (Kearse *et al.*, 2012). The robustness
22 of the tree was tested using bootstrap analysis (1,000 times)

23

1 **Axenic Culture**

2 To obtain axenic culture, chloramphenicol was added to Guillard's f/2 medium to a final
3 concentration of 50 mg L⁻¹, as recommended by Lai *et al.* (2009). This concentration was used
4 on account of the strains evaluated are wild microalgae, isolated around the market places in
5 Guayaquil in stagnant water ponds, exposed to direct solar radiation, and expected to have an
6 elevated nutrient content and bacterial load). The microalgae strains were cultivated in triplicates
7 during 6 days at 30°C and photoperiod 12:12. For each strain, a negative control without added
8 antibiotic was cultivated under the same conditions as the treated group. The growth rate of each
9 culture was determined by microscopy counts using a Neubauer chamber (IOC, UNESCO, 2010)
10 and expressed as cell ml⁻¹.

11 **Cryopreservation Test**

12 The test of DMSO-sucrose mix and glycerol treatments on each strain isolated was performed in
13 triplicates. Cultures of *Chorella* sp. M2, *Chlorella* sp. M6 and *Scenedesmus* sp. R3, which had a
14 concentrations in the range of 2 - 9 × 10⁷ ml⁻¹ cells were selected to evaluate the effect of
15 cryopreservants, as recommended by Bui (2013). From each culture 1 ml was transferred to two
16 1.8 ml cryovials; in one vial was added DMSO and sucrose solution (Fisher Chemical, CSA
17 grade) to a final concentration of 10% (v / v) and 200 mM (v / V) respectively (Bui *et al.*, 2013);
18 while in the other vial was added glycerol to a final concentration of 10% (v / v) (Hubálek,
19 2003). The cryopreservants were added slowly to the cryovials containing the cultures (Bui *et*
20 *al.*, 2013).

21 The cryovials were inserted into a polyethylene container with a screw cap filled with 125 ml
22 isopropanol (Bui *et al.*, 2013). Isopropanol enable a freezing rate of approximately -1 °C min⁻¹
23 (Shiraishi, 2016). This container was kept in a freezer at -80 °C for 120 hours, which is the

1 approximate time for replenishment of stocks during semi-continuous cultures with harvest every
2 five days. After this time, the container was removed from the freezer and the cryovials were
3 floated in a beaker filled with water (~ 500 ml at 25 °C) (Bui *et al.*, 2013), 4 cryovials at a time.
4 The thawed cell cultures were gently poured into sterile Falcon tubes containing 49 ml of
5 Guillard's *f/2* medium at room temperature and left unmixed for 1 h and subsequently carefully
6 inverted 5 times (Bui *et al.*, 2013). Falcon tubes were kept in the dark for 24 hours at 30 °C.
7 After this time, the microalgae were cultivated at 30°C and photoperiod 12:12 for 6 days. At the
8 end of the culture period the algal batches were filtered using Whatman GF/F and GF/D glass
9 fiber filters (~ 0.7 µm and 2.7 µm pore size respectively) according to the size of the microalgae.
10 The growth rate was determined and expressed as mentioned above.

11 **Total Lipid**

12 Total lipid content was determined following the protocol described by Christie (1994), by
13 extraction of the filtered microalgae biomass from the cryopreservation test using a mix of
14 chloroform, dichloromethane and methanol (1:1:1). The ethereal extract was determined by
15 weight difference.

16 **Statistical analysis**

17 Statistical analysis was performed by two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) using Statistica
18 v7.0.61.0 Software. Normality of distribution was check with a Shapiro test. A p value of <0.05
19 was consider as statistically significant, and Post-hoc analysis was done with a Tukey test to
20 determine significance. The total lipid was analyzed by nonparametric Kruskal.Wallis and
21 Median test as the data showed non-normal distribution.

22

1 **Result and discussion**

2 The genetic identification conducted by 18S rRNA partial sequences and the SILVA database
3 matched the morphological identification with the most probable genera to be *Chlorella* sp. (M2),
4 *Chlorella* sp. (M6), *Scenedesmus* sp. (R3), and *Coelastrrella* sp. (A2). Moreover, to determine an
5 association between our sequences and other characterized algal sequences from the GenBank
6 database, an UPGMA consensus tree was constructed (Fig. 1). Consensus sequence percentage
7 showed a 90% of similarity between M2 and M6 in nucleotide alignment. Sequences from M2
8 and M6 had a 67.9% of similarity to members of the genera *Chlorella*. Overall, M2 and M6
9 clustered within members of the Chlorellaceae family, and included genera such as *Chlorella* and
10 *Parachlorella*. These results would point out the relationship among members of this family as
11 previously reported (Krienitz *et al.*, 2004; Bock, Pröschold & Krienitz, 2011) On the other hand,
12 R3 and A2 clustered with members of the Scenedesmaceae family, including *Coelastrrella*,
13 *Scenedesmus* and *Desmodesmus* (Fig. 1). There was a 64.1% of similarity in terms of nucleotides
14 between R3 and A2. Both genera were not completely resolved using phylogenetic analysis (Fig.
15 1). The small discrepancies to define genera in the clades may be due to partial sequences
16 obtained in this study. Nevertheless, bootstrap values were higher than 50% for these branches.
17 We also support our findings with the morphological identification conducted for all algal
18 isolates from this study, including R3 and A2. In other phylogenetic studies, members of
19 *Coelastrrella* and *Scenedesmus* fall within a combining node, which may indicate a common
20 lineage between both genera (Baytut *et al.*, 2013; Jiang *et al.*, 2014).

21

22

23





Figure 1.- Unweighted pair group method with arithmetic mean (UPGMA) consensus tree of the 18S rRNA sequences isolated in this study and other representative algal sequences retrieved from the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) database. Numbers in the branches represent bootstrap values from 1,000 replications. Numbers in parentheses are the GenBank accession identification numbers.

2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13

1 **Growth rate using Chloramphenicol**

2 All microalgae strains cultured with chloramphenicol showed a lower growth rate than the
3 negative controls (two-way ANOVA, $F = 26.68, p < 0.001, df = 2$; post-hoc in Table 1) (Fig. 2).
4 This demonstrate that CAP can inhibit microalgae growth, especially *Scenedesmus* sp. R3,
5 which showed a 65% decrease in its growth rate in comparison to its control culture (Fig. 2).
6 Similar results have been reported by Lai *et al.* (2009), where concentrations 20 - 40 mg L⁻¹ of
7 chloramphenicol inhibited growth of *Chlorella pyrenoidosa*, which is near the range used in the
8 present study (50 mg L⁻¹). However, CAP in lower concentrations (0.5 a 12.0 mg L⁻¹) have been
9 shown to have no significant effect in the growth of *C. pyrenoidosa* and *Isochrysis galbana*
10 (Campa-Córdova *et al.*, 2006; Lai *et al.*, 2009). This effect has been attributed to the CAP acting
11 as an inhibitor of photosynthetic oxygen evolution and as well as an inhibitor of protein synthesis
12 in chloroplasts, affecting the chlorophyll synthesis in photosynthetic organisms. Seoane *et al.*
13 (2014) reported one decreased in size and in chlorophyll a content, but detected an increase in
14 chlorophyll a fluorescence in microalga *Tetraselmis suecica*, this could be due to an inhibitory
15 effect localized on the oxidant side of mitochondria. This effect is short-term, several studies
16 showed that microalgae ad resistance to chloramphenicol when Additional to the toxic effect of
17 chloramphenicol on photosynthesis, the high antibiotic concentration used in the present study
18 could eliminate the bacteria associated to the freshly isolated strains, which could contribute of
19 the observed negative effect when the chloramphenicol concentration increases. It is known that
20 microalgae live in synergism with certain bacteria, interacting between each other, through
21 nutrients interchange, signal transduction, genes transference and others (Kouzuma & Watanabe,
22 2015). In a study by Lubarsky and collaborators (Lubarsky *et al.*, 2010), it is shown that the
23 microalgal biomass was significantly lower in the axenic cultivate (antibiotics added) as

1 compared to the cultivate associated with bacteria. However, a more detailed study would be
2 necessary to access the actual cause of the observed effect.



3

4 **Figure 2.-** Growth rate of microalgae in culture with chloramphenicol (CPA) in final concentration of 50
5 mg L⁻¹ and Negative control culture without antibiotic per strain (Ctrl).
6
7


8 **Cryopreservation Test**

9 The *Coelastrrella* sp. A2 strain did not show any growth after cryopreservation with both DMSO-
10 sucrose or glycerol, which may be due to its very low initial stock before the process, which was
11 below the recommended for this method (Bui et al., 2013) (<2 × 10⁷ cell ml⁻¹). *Scenedesmus* sp.
12 R3 showed no significant difference in growth rate between before and after of cryopreservation,
13 unlike other 2 strains. Saadaoui *et al.* (2016) reported that *Scenedesmus* cells are rapidly
14 recovered after 1 month storage in liquid nitrogen using dimethyl sulfate as cryoprotectant.


1 *Chorella* sp. M2, *Chlorella* sp. M6 and *Scenedesmus* sp. R3 showed no significant difference in
2 growth rate between the two cryopreservants (two-way ANOVA, $F = 9.63, p = 0.0018, df = 2$; post-
3 hoc in Table 1) (Fig. 3, Top). This may be due to that in certain microalgae strain the
4 combination of permeable and impermeable cryopreservants such as DMSO-sucrose, is
5 necessary for preservation during freezing, because sucrose increases solution osmolarity
6 causing cell dehydration, working synergistically with DMSO to minimize intracellular ice
7 damage. While glycerol increases the total concentration of solute, consequently reduces the
8 amount of ice formed (Bui *et al.*, 2013). Moreover, Glycerol decrease the freezing-point of
9 water and biological fluids by colligative action (glycerol/water to a minimum of -46°C),
10 also, it prevent eutectic crystallization (Hubálek, 2003).

11 **Total Lipid**

12 The total lipid were analyzed in the biomass of microalgae strain with similar growths in both
13 cryopreservants. Higher lipid content was observed in biomass cryopreserved with glycerol,
14 thus, in *Chorella* sp. M2 y *Chorella* sp. M6, it is twice as high than in biomass cryopreserved
15 with DMSO + sucrose (Chi-Square= 6,300000 df = 2 p = 0,0429) (Fig. 3, Bottom). This might
16 be due to the fact that some algae can utilize glycerol as a carbon source, as the *Chlorella*
17 *vulgaris* achieved maximum lipid productivity in glycerol supplemented culture medium
18 (Sharma *et al.*, 2016), this could be the reason of the increase in lipid content observed.



1



2

3 **Figure 3.-** Top: Microalgae growth rate after cryopreservation with dimethyl sulfoxide and sucrose
 4 (DMSO + Suc) and Glycerol, plus a control with no cryopreservation (Ctrl). Bottom: Total lipids of
 5 microalgae after cryopreservation with with dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO + Suc) and Glycerol.
 6

7

Table 1.- Result of the post-hoc statistical analysis of the antibiotic chloramphenicol (CPA) and its negative control (NC); Cryopreservation treatments with Dimethyl sulfoxide + sucrose (DMSO+S) and Glycerol (Gly). All microalgae combinations are listed. The values given are p values. Values with $p < 0.05$ are presented in bold.

Microalgae	CPA	NC	DMSO+S	Gly
<i>Chlorella</i> sp. M2 – <i>Chlorella</i> sp. M6	0,0124	0,8426	0,0199	0,5385
<i>Chlorella</i> sp. M2. – <i>Scenedesmus</i> sp. R3	0,0003	0,0008	0,0007	0,0024
<i>Chlorella</i> sp. M2 – <i>Coelastrrella</i> sp. A2.	0,9950	0,4770		
<i>Chlorella</i> sp. M6 - <i>Scenedesmus</i> sp. R3	0,0002	0,0004	0,0186	0,0063
<i>Chlorella</i> sp. M6 - <i>Coelastrrella</i> sp. A2.	0,0153	0,9004		
<i>Scenedesmus</i> sp. R3- <i>Coelastrrella</i> sp. A2	0,0003	0,0003		

Conclusion

The cultivation process can affect the microalgal productivity of tropical freshwater microalgae isolates, as chloramphenicol can reduce microalgae growth when used at concentration of 50 mg L⁻¹; however, the effectivity of using lower concentrations of CAP is the same in the elimination of bacteria from the cultures is still to be demonstrate. It is still necessary to be determined if the observed deleterious effect of high CAP concentration in algal growth rate is long lasting in the strains after they are subsequently cultured.

1 Both DMSO-sucrose and glycerol are effective microalgae cryopreservants in most cases,
2 especially in *Scenedesmus*. However, the above results show that cryopreservation might not be
3 suitable for all algae, like *Coelastrella* sp. A2.

4 The lipid content of the algae is significantly affected by the cryopreservation method, so species
5 like *Chlorella* sp. M2 and *Chlorella* sp. M6 should be cryopreserved with glycerol when
6 cultivation to obtain a higher lipid gain per cell. As with the antibiotics, is necessary to further
7 determine if the negative effects of DMSO-sucrose in the algal lipid content are whether
8 temporary or carried forward in future cultures.

9 The results highlight the relevance of choosing an appropriate method for obtaining axenic
10 cultures and their posterior storage as the methods use can severely affect the biological
11 performance of different species of tropical freshwater microalgae isolates, although is still to
12 determine if this effects are long lasting.

13

14 **Acknowledgements**

15 The authors want to acknowledge Dr. Patricia Manzano and Dr. Washington Cardenas for
16 support with laboratory material, and Viviana Santander for assistance. This project was funded
17 by the Dean of Research at ESPOL, by the grant G1-DI-2015. This project was executed within
18 the Join postgraduate VLIR NETWORK Master Program in Applied Biosciences.

19

20

21

22

1 **References**

- 2 Amann RI., Krumholz L., Stahl DA. 1990. Fluorescent-oligonucleotide probing of whole cells
3 for determinative, phylogenetic, and environmental studies in microbiology. *Journal of*
4 *Bacteriology* 172:762–770.
- 5 Baytut Ö., Gürkanlı CT., Özkoç İ., Gönülođ A. 2013. Assessing 18S rDNA Diversity of the
6 Chlorophytes among Various Freshwaters of the Central Black Sea Region. *Turkish*
7 *Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 13:811–818.
- 8 Béchet Q., Muñoz R., Shilton A., Guieysse B. 2013. Outdoor cultivation of temperature-tolerant
9 *Chlorella sorokiniana* in a column photobioreactor under low power-input. *Biotechnology*
10 *and Bioengineering* 110:118–126. DOI: 10.1002/bit.24603.
- 11 Bock C., Pröschold T., Krienitz L. 2011. Updating the Genus *Dictyosphaerium* and Description
12 of *Mucidosphaerium* Gen. Nov. (trebouxiophyceae) Based on Morphological and
13 Molecular Data1. *Journal of Phycology* 47:638–652. DOI: 10.1111/j.1529-
14 8817.2011.00989.x.
- 15 Bui TV., Ross IL., Jakob G., Hankamer B. 2013. Impact of procedural steps and
16 cryopreservation agents in the cryopreservation of Chlorophyte microalgae. *PloS one*
17 8:e78668.
- 18 Campa-Córdova AI., Luna-González A., Ascencio F., Cortés-Jacinto E., Cáceres-Martínez CJ.
19 2006. Effects of chloramphenicol, erythromycin, and furazolidone on growth of
20 *Isochrysis galbana* and *Chaetoceros gracilis*. *Aquaculture* 260:145–150. DOI:
21 10.1016/j.aquaculture.2006.06.014.

1 Chiu S-Y., Kao C-Y., Chen T-Y., Chang Y-B., Kuo C-M., Lin C-S. 2015. Cultivation of
2 microalgal *Chlorella* for biomass and lipid production using wastewater as nutrient
3 resource. *Bioresource Technology* 184:179–189. DOI: 10.1016/j.biortech.2014.11.080.

4 Christie WW. 1994. *Gas chromatography and lipids: a practical guide*. Ayr, Scotland: The Oily
5 Press.

6 Dogaris I., Welch M., Meiser A., Walmsley L., Philippidis G. 2015. A novel horizontal
7 photobioreactor for high-density cultivation of microalgae. *Bioresource Technology*
8 198:316–324. DOI: 10.1016/j.biortech.2015.09.030.

9 Encarnaç o T., Pais AACC., Campos MG., Burrows HD. 2015. Cyanobacteria and microalgae:
10 A renewable source of bioactive compounds and other chemicals. *Science Progress*
11 98:145–168. DOI: 10.3184/003685015X14298590596266.

12 Fuller BJ., Lane N., Benson EE. 2004. *Life in the Frozen State*. CRC Press.

13 Gellenbeck KW. 2011. Utilization of algal materials for nutraceutical and cosmeceutical
14 applications—what do manufacturers need to know? *Journal of Applied Phycology*
15 24:309–313. DOI: 10.1007/s10811-011-9722-z.

16 Guillard RR., Ryther JH. 1962. Studies of marine planktonic diatoms. I. *Cyclotella nana* Hustedt,
17 and *Detonula confervacea* (Cleve) Gran. *Canadian Journal of Microbiology* 8:229–239.

18 Hub alek Z. 2003. Protectants used in the cryopreservation of microorganisms. *Cryobiology*
19 46:205–229. DOI: 10.1016/S0011-2240(03)00046-4.

20 IOC, UNESCO. 2010. *Microscopic and molecular methods for quantitative phytoplankton*
21 *analysis*.

22 Jiang W., Cossey S., Rosenberg JN., Oyler GA., Olson BJSC., Weeks DP. 2014. A rapid live-
23 cell ELISA for characterizing antibodies against cell surface antigens of *Chlamydomonas*

1 reinhardtii and its use in isolating algae from natural environments with related cell wall
2 components. *BMC plant biology* 14:244. DOI: 10.1186/s12870-014-0244-0.

3 Kearse M., Moir R., Wilson A., Stones-Havas S., Cheung M., Sturrock S., Buxton S., Cooper A.,
4 Markowitz S., Duran C., Thierer T., Ashton B., Meintjes P., Drummond A. 2012.
5 Geneious Basic: an integrated and extendable desktop software platform for the
6 organization and analysis of sequence data. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)* 28:1647–
7 1649. DOI: 10.1093/bioinformatics/bts199.

8 Kouzuma A., Watanabe K. 2015. Exploring the potential of algae/bacteria interactions. *Current*
9 *Opinion in Biotechnology* 33:125–129. DOI: 10.1016/j.copbio.2015.02.007.

10 Krienitz L., Hegewald EH., Hepperle D., Huss VAR., Rohr T., Wolf M. 2004. Phylogenetic
11 relationship of *Chlorella* and *Parachlorella* gen. nov. (Chlorophyta, Trebouxiophyceae).
12 *Phycologia* 43:529–542. DOI: 10.2216/i0031-8884-43-5-529.1.

13 Lai H-T., Hou J-H., Su C-I., Chen C-L. 2009. Effects of chloramphenicol, florfenicol, and
14 thiamphenicol on growth of algae *Chlorella pyrenoidosa*, *Isochrysis galbana*, and
15 *Tetraselmis chui*. *Ecotoxicology and Environmental Safety* 72:329–334. DOI:
16 10.1016/j.ecoenv.2008.03.005.

17 Lubarsky HV., Hubas C., Chocholek M., Larson F., Manz W., Paterson DM., Gerbersdorf SU.
18 2010. The Stabilisation Potential of Individual and Mixed Assemblages of Natural
19 Bacteria and Microalgae. *PLOS ONE* 5:e13794. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0013794.

20 Mahapatra DM., Ramachandra TV. 2013. Algal biofuel: bountiful lipid from *Chlorococcum* sp.
21 proliferating in municipal wastewater. *Curr Sci* 105:47–55.

22 Mara DD. 2004. *Domestic wastewater treatment in developing countries*. London ; Sterling, VA:
23 Earthscan Publications.

- 1 Maurya R., Paliwal C., Chokshi K., Pancha I., Ghosh T., Satpati GG., Pal R., Ghosh A., Mishra
2 S. 2016. Hydrolysate of lipid extracted microalgal biomass residue: An algal growth
3 promoter and enhancer. *Bioresource Technology* 207:197–204. DOI:
4 10.1016/j.biortech.2016.02.018.
- 5 Müller J., Day JG., Harding K., Hepperle D., Lorenz M., Friedl T. 2007. Assessing genetic
6 stability of a range of terrestrial microalgae after cryopreservation using amplified
7 fragment length polymorphism (AFLP). *American Journal of Botany* 94:799–808. DOI:
8 10.3732/ajb.94.5.799.
- 9 Pruesse E., Quast C., Knittel K., Fuchs BM., Ludwig W., Peplies J., Glöckner FO. 2007. SILVA:
10 a comprehensive online resource for quality checked and aligned ribosomal RNA
11 sequence data compatible with ARB. *Nucleic Acids Research* 35:7188–7196. DOI:
12 10.1093/nar/gkm864.
- 13 Rodrigues DB., Menezes CR., Mercadante AZ., Jacob-Lopes E., Zepka LQ. 2015. Bioactive
14 pigments from microalgae *Phormidium autumnale*. *Food Research International* 77:273–
15 279. DOI: 10.1016/j.foodres.2015.04.027.
- 16 Saadaoui I., Emadi MA., Bounnit T., Schipper K., Jabri HA. 2016. Cryopreservation of
17 microalgae from desert environments of Qatar. *Journal of Applied Phycology* 28:2233–
18 2240. DOI: 10.1007/s10811-015-0743-x.
- 19 Seoane M., Rioboo C., Herrero C., Cid Á. 2014. Toxicity induced by three antibiotics commonly
20 used in aquaculture on the marine microalga *Tetraselmis suecica* (Kylin) Butch. *Marine*
21 *Environmental Research* 101:1–7. DOI: 10.1016/j.marenvres.2014.07.011.

1 Sharma AK., Sahoo PK., Singhal S., Patel A. 2016. Impact of various media and organic carbon
2 sources on biofuel production potential from *Chlorella* spp. *3 Biotech* 6. DOI:
3 10.1007/s13205-016-0434-6.

4 Shiraishi H. 2016. Cryopreservation of the edible alkalophilic cyanobacterium *Arthrospira*
5 *platensis*. *Bioscience, Biotechnology, and Biochemistry* 80:2051–2057. DOI:
6 10.1080/09168451.2016.1189320.

7 Silkina A., Nelson GD., Bayliss CE., Pooley CL., Day JG. 2017. Bioremediation efficacy—
8 comparison of nutrient removal from an anaerobic digest waste-based medium by an
9 algal consortium before and after cryopreservation. *Journal of Applied Phycology*:1–11.
10 DOI: 10.1007/s10811-017-1066-x.

11 Wehr JD. 2003. 22 - Brown Algae. In: *Freshwater Algae of North America*. Aquatic Ecology.
12 Burlington: Academic Press, 757–773.

13 Zhu F., Massana R., Not F., Marie D., Vaultot D. 2005. Mapping of picoeucaryotes in marine
14 ecosystems with quantitative PCR of the 18S rRNA gene. *FEMS microbiology ecology*
15 52:79–92. DOI: 10.1016/j.femsec.2004.10.006.

16
17
18