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- Comments from the Referees are shown in bold.
- Page and Line numbers refer to the revised manuscript with changes shown.

Referee#1.

Authors studied the potential of the bloom-forming cyanobacterial species, Microcystis aeruginosa, for its ability to produce one of the most important greenhouse gases, N2O. This species is also responsible for quite toxic blooms and thus also important from the standpoint of water quality and safety. Most N in lakes is in the form of NO3 or NH4, not NO2, so the much lower level of N2O formation in the presence of NO3 and NH4 than in NO2 suggests this species is not a major N2O producer in lakes. It was interesting that there was no homolog to NirK (Table 2). While their work definitively demonstrated that this noxious bacterial species does indeed produce N2O in both dark and light-grown cultures, there were only allusions to its global importance as no field-relevant work was presented. Clearly studies involving eutrophic lakes/ponds are needed in order to establish the global significance of this species in greenhouse gas emissions. This study is a solid beginning.

We thank Referee#1 for his/her review.

We fully agree our results cannot be used to suggest Microcystis aeruginosa synthesise nitrous oxide (N2O) in natural environments, but we also argue we cannot infer that they do not: Significant N2O emissions were indeed reported from outdoor cultures of C. vulgaris fed nitrate (NO3-, Guieysse et al., 2013; Plouviez et al., 2017), despite this alga also producing much more N2O when fed nitrite (NO2-, Guieysse et al., 2013). We believe this was caused by NO2- intracellular accumulation under varying light, as this condition is known to have different impacts on the rate of NO3- reduction into NO2- by NR and the rate of NO2- reduction into NH4+ by NiR (Plouviez et al., 2017). We also respectfully note that N2O emissions under NO3- supply were low, but not negligible. We clarified this potential for emissions under NO3- supply in Section 2.4.

Therefore, without evidence from field measurements, we cannot conclude that Microcystis aeruginosa is or is not a major N2O producer in lakes. We clarified that point in Section 2.4 and as mentioned by us (Abstract, Section 2.4 and Conclusions) and the referee, further research is needed.

With regards to NirK, Microcystis aeruginosa possess a nitrate reductase (NiR) (Chen et al., 2009; Chen et al., 2015) but no homologs of C. reinhardtii NirK copper-containing nitrite reductase was found. Further research is needed to determine if NiR in Microcystis aeruginosa can also catalyse the reduction of NO2- into NO.
The work by Fabisik et al shows that the cyanobacteria Microcystis aeruginosa produces nitrous oxide. This work confirms predictions already made that organisms harbouring CYP55 and FLV genes are able to generate N2O in conditions that favour intracellular NO2- production (Plouviez et al, 2017; Burlacot et al, 2020). The novelty of this work relies on showing that these predictions already made for eukaryotes are valid in procaryotes.

The written of the article could be improved as some parts of sentences are difficult to understand (i.e. line 76 "Intracellular NO2 was not possible" or line 41-42 "N2O was only significant in cultures...")

Major comment: while the evidence shown in the article are clear that Microcystis is producing N2O when supplied with NO2-; it is unclear why the amount of cells does not seem to change the production of N2O (in Fig. 2). This discrepancy is not discussed by the authors who instead state wrongly that "Further assays showed a positive correlation between biomass concentration and N2O production (Fig. 2), confirming the biological origin of N2O synthesis" line 43-44. This should be discussed.

Minor comment: Line 69 the authors discuss the possibility of a light-dependent mechanism that could impact enzymatic activity for N2O production. However, they do not consider O2 production by photosynthesis...It has been shown at least for one the enzymes (FLV) that it can also catalyze the conversion of O2 into H2O, making it's production of N2O sensitive to O2 (Burlacot et al, 2020). Given the close chemical properties of NO and O2, it is likely the case for all enzymes converting NO to N2O.

Therefore, the hypothesis that the O2 (produced by photosynthesis during the light) would hamper N2O production by competitively limiting the number of enzymes available for converting NO to N2O is probably the most parcimonious (and already shown for one enzyme involved) and should be discussed.

We thank Referee#2 for his/her review.

We modified the manuscript to improve the readability. For instance:

The sentence "As can be seen in Fig. 1, N2O was only significant in cultures supplied NO2 as there was no significant production in the absence of the cyanobacterium (abiotic control or the absence of NO2 (negative control)).", has been modified to: 'As can be seen in Fig. 1, N2O production was only recorded in cultures supplied NO2 as there was no significant production in the absence of the cyanobacterium (abiotic control) or the absence of NO2 (negative control).' (P2 Li 41-43)

The sentence "Intracellular NO2 was not possible when NH4+ was supplied as the sole exogenous N source, explaining the absence of N2O production (p-value = 0.91, two samples t-test when compared with the negative controls)", has been modified to: 'Intracellular NO2 production and accumulation is not expected when cells assimilate NH4+ (Plouviez et al., 2019), explaining the absence of N2O production in the flasks supplied NH4+ as sole exogenous N source (p-value = 0.91, two samples t-test when compared with the negative controls)'. (P5 Li 84-86).

Regarding the major comment, we respectfully note that Figure 2 shows N2O production normalized per g-DW⁻¹. Because the production rates (slope of the near-linear production curves expressed in nmole of N2O produced per hour and per gram of cyanobacteria initially present in the flasks) are similar for the three biomass concentrations tested (Table 1), our results showed that there is a relation between biomass concentration (g-DW⁻¹) and N2O production (nmol N2O-hr⁻¹). Our statement is therefore correct. To improve clarity, we included "normalized N2O production" on the y axis and in the caption of Figure 2, and we included the data presented in Table 1 below as supplementary information S2.

**Table 1:** N2O production rates (nmol N2O·g DW⁻¹·h⁻¹) recorded from the linear regressions performed for each M. aeruginosa biomass concentrations (0.1, 0.2 and 0.4 g-DW·L⁻¹)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial biomass (g-DW·L⁻¹)</th>
<th>N2O (nmol N2O·g-DW⁻¹·h⁻¹)</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About the minor comment, we added P4-5 Li 71-77: "However, O2 production during photosynthesis could also influence N2O synthesis. Burlacot et al. (2020) indeed reported that one of the enzymes involved in NO reduction to N2O (Flavodiiron, as discussed in the next section) can also catalyse the reduction of O2 into H2O. Because of this dual activity and the reactivity of NO with O2, N2O production could be sensitive to O2. Further research is therefore needed to understand if O2 influence N2O production by competitive NO conversion to products such as nitrogen oxides and peroxynitrite, or/and by competitive O2 reduction into H2O instead of its reduction to N2O by the enzymes with nitric reductase ability."
Referee#3

In this manuscript, the authors investigate the production of nitrous oxide by the cyanobacterium Microcystis aeruginosa and find that the addition of oxidized Din species, and especially nitrite, fosters the production of N2O. The paper as such is well-structured and clearly written, and I find that the results as such are novel and clearly deserve publication as a letter in Biogeosciences.

However, I do have some comments regarding the biogeochemical relevance of the investigated process. I think addressing this may increase the impact of the manuscript. Generally, I would like to urge the authors to think towards environmental consequences and applications of the mechanisms they investigate – i.e., how likely is N2O synthesis under environmental conditions? Do you expect it at all, given that nitrite additions in the treatments by far exceeded environmental concentrations? And if so, what regions may be most sensitive or prone to N2O production? Do you expect N2O production to increase in the light of increasing oxygen minima, which may lead to increased environmental [NO2-]? Are there industrial applications where this N2O production needs to be considered (although I do not really expect M. aeruginosa in WWTPs)? Not all these questions need to be answered, but including this line of thought would in my opinion make the manuscript much more accessible to the readership of Biogeosciences.

We thank Referee#3 for his/her review and helpful recommendations. As can be seen in the responses to the specific comments below, we have considered all the comments and we have specifically expanded Section 2.4.

As can be seen in our response to Referee#1 we cannot conclude that M. aeruginosa (or other species) is or is not a major N2O producer in lakes and other aquatic environments without evidence from field measurements. Indeed, high nitrite (NO2-) concentrations are rare in natural and engineered ecosystems environments, which would suggest insignificant microalgal N2O production in most context. But our experience is that significant N2O emissions can still be observed under very low exogenous NO2- concentration, potentially due to the intracellular accumulation of this metabolite of the nitrate assimilation pathway (Plouviez et al., 2017a,b). The aim of this work was/is indeed to raise awareness and to trigger further research in the field. The work from Weathers and Niedziewski (1986) and ours suggest that Nostoc spp., Aphanocapsa (PCC 6308), Aphanocapsa (PCC 6714) and M. aeruginosa have the ability to synthesize N2O. Consequently, other cyanobacteria species may also have this ability. Considering the wide distribution of cyanobacteria in the environment (including in some wastewater treatment systems, Romanis et al., 2021), extensive monitoring (i.e. long-term with wide spatial coverage and high sampling frequency) of several types of microalgae-rich environments are required (see the expanded Section 2.4).

In addition, I have a few specific comments listed below:

Lines 58/59 and Figure 3 – this is about the only mention (and use) of enzyme kinetics and characteristics. I think that in Biogeosciences, this would either need some more information, or it may be moved to the supplementary material to make room for discussion of environmental consequences. You do not really discuss the kinetics anyway, and I think a supplement would not harm the overall scope of the manuscript. In Figure 3, please indicate vmax and Km.

The figure was moved to the supplementary material S3, and we included Vmax and Km on the Figure.

Typos – please change nmole to nmol (Fig 1), and check for typos, such as numerous brackets opened and not closed, e.g. lines 91, 92

We changed the y axis label (Fig 1, P3) and we corrected typos and missing punctuation.

Line 76 – “intracellular NO2- was not possible...” Odd wording. Additionally, I am not sure whether it really is “not possible”, given that cyanobacteria may always come up with O2 from somewhere. Please rephrase.

We agree that our initial sentence was unclear and as can be seen in our response to Referee#2 we rephrased to: ‘Intracellular NO2- production and accumulation is not expected when cells assimilate NH4+’ (Plouviez et al., 2019b), explaining the absence of N2O production in the flasks supplied NH4+ as sole exogenous N source (p-value = 0.91, two samples t-test when compared with the negative controls)’ (P5 Li 84-86).

Lines 77 – 81 – I am not sure what the authors want to say here, why is the regulation with regards to light relevant? Especially given that there is so little difference in N2O production? I cannot really see what the (environmental) applications would be.

Our results showed that N2O synthesis was lower in light than in darkness as previously reported for other species in the laboratory (Guijysse et al., 2013, Plouviez et al., 2017b). However, N2O production was positively correlated with light supply in C. vulgaris grown outdoors and supplied NO3- (Plouviez et al., 2017a). Plouviez et al., 2017a suggested that NR activation by light generated intracellular NO3- from NO2- reduction (as part of the normal nitrate assimilation pathway) and that a small amount of this intracellular NO3- was converted to N2O (see reply to Referee#1), the main fraction being ‘normally’ further reduced and assimilated into proteins and other biomolecules. The gene encoding NR in M. aeruginosa has the same function than in C. vulgaris i.e. convert NO3- to NO2-. Because NR activity is influenced by light and the availabilities of NO3- and NO2- in M. aeruginosa (Chen et al., 2009; Ohashi et al., 2011; Chen and Liu, 2015), it is possible that light influences NR
activity (i.e. the rate of intracellular NO\textsubscript{2} production) and, thereby, the rate of N\textsubscript{2}O synthesis under outdoor conditions. In addition, as suggested by Referee#2, light might also indirectly influence N\textsubscript{2}O synthesis by influencing the activity of FLVs via O\textsubscript{2} synthesis during photosynthesis (as can be seen in the response to Referee#2, this will be discussed in the new version of the manuscript).

**Lines 94/95 – is this your result, correct? The mix of results and discussion section makes this sometimes hard to distinguish, please clarify.**

This is indeed our results. We rephrased as follow (P5 Li 98): ‘Interestingly, NO\textsubscript{2} reduction into NO by nitrate reductase (narB) has been demonstrated in *M. aeruginosa* (Tang et al., 2011; Song et al., 2017) and here we found that *M. aeruginosa* possesses homologs of the CYP55, FLVs, and HCPs found in *C. reinhardtii* (Table. 2).’

**Line 107 – as a biogeochemist, the allelopathic response is unclear to me. Please add a short explanation/definition.**

To improve clarity, we modified the sentence to (P6 Li 111-112): ‘Interestingly, NO stimulates the production of secondary metabolites (e.g. linoleic acid) by *M. aeruginosa* that inhibit the growth of competitors (Song et al., 2017). NO also promotes the growth of this cyanobacteria (Tang et al., 2011).’

**Lines 108 – 110 – is this hypothesis yours, or can you back it up with references? The reference to further research should be deleted here, this is rather suitable for conclusions.**

This hypothesis is ours and we removed “Further research is needed.”

**Line 113 – which groups of microalgae have been found to synthesize N2O? Please specify.**

In section 2.4 we already indicated that: “the N\textsubscript{2}O synthesis rates reported during our study are in the same order of magnitude as the rate previously reported for members of the green microalgae, cyanobacteria, and diatoms (Bauer et al., 2016; Plouviez et al., 2019b).”

However, we modified section 2.4 (see below) and we included the following sentence (P6 Li117-119):

‘Microalgae species from at least 3 divisions (Chlorophyta, Bacillariophyta, Cyanobacteria) have the ability to synthesize NO (Kim et al., 2008; Kumar et al., 2015; Plouviez et al., 2017b; Tang et al., 2011) and/or N\textsubscript{2}O (Weathers, 1984; Weathers and Niedzielski, 1986; Guieysse et al., 2013; Kamp et al., 2013; Plouviez et al., 2017a, b, this study).’

**Generally, I think this section 2.4 might be expanded, please see my general comments above.**

We expanded Section 2.4 to (P6 Li117 – P7 Li 156):

Microalgae species from at least 3 divisions (Bacillariophyta, Chlorophyta, Cyanobacteria) have the ability to synthesize NO (Kim et al., 2008; Kumar et al., 2015; Plouviez et al., 2017b; Tang et al., 2011) and/or N\textsubscript{2}O (Weathers, 1984; Weathers and Niedzielski, 1986; Guieysse et al., 2013; Kamp et al., 2013; Plouviez et al., 2017a, b, this study). All these observations suggest that the ability to synthesize N\textsubscript{2}O is widely distributed among microalgae. Critically, N\textsubscript{2}O emissions from aquatic environments where microalgae abound, such as oceans, lakes and engineered cultivation systems, have been repeatedly reported (Bauer et al., 2016; Plouviez et al., 2019b; Plouviez et al., 2019a; Zhang et al., 2022) even under very low exogenous N\textsubscript{2}O concentrations (Plouviez et al., 2019b). These emissions can be explained by intracellular N\textsubscript{2}O production during reductive nitrate assimilation (Plouviez et al., 2017a, b, 2019b) under conditions when excess N\textsubscript{2}O production (Bristow et al., 2015; French et al., 1983; Mortonson and Brooks, 1980; Schaefer and Hollibaugh, 2018) could support N\textsubscript{2}O synthesis.

Based on the data available, DelSontro et al. (2018) and Plouviez and Guieysse, (2020) estimated that global N\textsubscript{2}O emissions from eutrophic lakes alone could represent 110 to 450 kt N-N\textsubscript{2}O yr\textsuperscript{-1}, which represent 14-56% of the natural and anthropogenic N\textsubscript{2}O emissions reported from inland and coastal waters (Tian et al., 2020). Importantly, DelSontro et al. (2018) predicted that N\textsubscript{2}O emissions from lakes and impoundments would increase with lake size and chlorophyll a concentration. The N\textsubscript{2}O synthesis rates reported during our study are in the same order of magnitude as the rate previously reported for members of the green microalgae, cyanobacteria, and diatoms (Bauer et al., 2016; Plouviez et al., 2019a). However, we cannot conclude that *M. aeruginosa* (or other species) is or is not a major N\textsubscript{2}O producer in lakes and other aquatic environments without evidence from field measurements. Indeed, high N\textsubscript{2}O concentrations are rare in natural and engineered ecosystems environments, which would suggest insignificant microalgal N\textsubscript{2}O production in most contexts. Nevertheless, significant N\textsubscript{2}O emissions were reported from outdoor cultures of *C. vulgaris* fed N\textsubscript{2}O (Guieysse et al., 2013; Plouviez et al., 2017), despite this alga also producing much more N\textsubscript{2}O when fed NO\textsubscript{2} (Guieysse et al., 2013). Plouviez et al. (2017) suggested this was caused by NO\textsubscript{2} intracellular accumulation under varying light, as this condition is known to have different impacts on the rate of NO\textsubscript{2} reduction into NO\textsubscript{2} by NR and the rate of NO\textsubscript{2} reduction into NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} by NiR. During our study, N\textsubscript{2}O emissions under NO\textsubscript{2} supply were low, but not negligible. Because NR activity is also influenced by light and the availability of NO\textsubscript{2} and NO\textsubscript{2} in *M. aeruginosa* (Chen et al., 2009; Ohashi et al., 2011; Chen and Liu, 2015), N\textsubscript{2}O synthesis by this microalgae could possibly occur in environments where NO\textsubscript{2} is the main nitrogen source.

Our findings support past predictions of the global relevance of photosynthetic N\textsubscript{2}O emissions from eutrophic aquatic bodies as Microcystis is globally found and often the dominant genus in these ecosystems (Qian et al., 2010; Kataoka et al., 2020;
Zhou et al., 2020). The work from Weathers and Niedzielski (1986) and ours suggest that *Nostoc spp.*, *Aphanocapsa* (PCC 6714) and *M. aeruginosa* have the ability to synthesize N$_2$O. Consequently, other cyanobacteria species may also have this ability. Further research is now needed to quantify N$_2$O emissions from eutrophic aquatic ecosystems where cyanobacteria abound. This is especially timely considering that the frequency and geographic distribution of harmful algae blooms have increased due to anthropogenic activities (Paerl et al., 2018; Kataoka et al., 2020). In addition, algae blooms can lead to the decrease of O$_2$ in oceans, coastal waters and lakes (Jenny et al., 2015; Rabalais and Turner, 2019), a condition that can increase the accumulation of NO$_2^-$ in aquatic ecosystems (Schaefer and Hollibaugh, 2018; Bristow et al., 2015). Because microalgal N$_2$O synthesis is rapid and influenced by factors such as the cell biology (Plouviez et al., 2019b) and, as observed during our study, the type and concentration of the nitrogen source microalgae receive, extensive monitoring (i.e. long-term with wide spatial coverage and high sampling frequency) of several types of microalga-rich environments are required (e.g. hypoxic waters).

Conclusions section – as it is, this section is a bit weak and merely a repetition of the abstract. This would be another good location to discuss environmental consequences.

We modified the conclusions to (P8 Li158-173):

‘We herein present the first demonstration that *M. aeruginosa* synthesizes N$_2$O. *M. aeruginosa* synthesized N$_2$O when supplied with NO$_2^-$ in darkness (198.9 nmol∙g-DW$^{-1}$∙h$^{-1}$ after 24 hours) and illumination (163.1 nmol∙g-DW$^{-1}$∙h$^{-1}$ after 24 hours), and this production was positively correlated to the initial NO$_2^-$ and *M. aeruginosa* concentrations. A protein database search also revealed *M. aeruginosa* possesses proteins homologues to eukaryotic microalgae known to catalyse the successive reduction of NO$_2^-$ into NO and N$_2$O. Further studies are needed to confirm the genes/proteins involved as a better understanding of the biochemical pathway involved during microalgal N$_2$O synthesis is critical to efficiently monitor (i.e. identify the source) and mitigate N$_2$O emissions.

Our study is another evidence of the ability of photosynthetic microorganisms, especially cyanobacteria, to synthesize N$_2$O. Preliminary estimation showed that N$_2$O emissions from eutrophic lakes alone could represent 110 to 450 kt N-N$_2$O∙yr$^{-1}$, which represent 14-56% of the natural and anthropogenic N$_2$O emissions reported from inland and coastal waters. However, how much microalgae contribute to these emissions is currently unknown. As *M. aeruginosa* is globally distributed, further research (including field monitoring with wide spatial coverage, high sampling frequency and water type) is now needed to evaluate the significance of N$_2$O synthesis by these cyanobacteria under relevant conditions (especially in terms of N supply).’
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