



The importance of time and space in biogeochemical heterogeneity and processing along the reservoir ecosystem continuum

Whitney M. Woelmer¹ · Alexandria G. Hounshell^{1,3} · Mary E. Lofton¹ · Heather L. Wander¹ · Abigail S. L. Lewis¹ · Durelle Scott² · Cayelan C. Carey¹

Received: 24 June 2022 / Accepted: 14 March 2023 / Published online: 8 April 2023
© The Author(s) 2023

Abstract

Globally significant quantities of carbon (C), nitrogen (N), and phosphorus (P) enter freshwater reservoirs each year. These inputs can be buried in sediments, respired, taken up by organisms, emitted to the atmosphere, or exported downstream. While much is known about reservoir-scale biogeochemical processing, less is known about spatial and temporal variability of biogeochemistry within a reservoir along the continuum from inflowing streams to the dam. To address this gap, we examined longitudinal variability in surface water biogeochemistry (C, N, and P) in two small reservoirs throughout a thermally stratified season. We sampled total and dissolved fractions of C, N, and P, as well as chlorophyll-a from each reservoir's major inflows to the dam. We found that heterogeneity in biogeochemical concentrations was greater over time than space. However, dissolved nutrient and organic carbon concentrations had high site-to-site variability within both reservoirs, potentially as a result of shifting biological activity or environmental conditions. When considering spatially explicit processing, we found that certain locations within the reservoir, most often the stream–reservoir interface, acted as “hotspots” of change in biogeochemical concentrations. Our study suggests that spatially explicit metrics of biogeochemical processing could help constrain the role of reservoirs in C, N, and P cycles in the landscape. Ultimately, our results highlight that biogeochemical heterogeneity in small reservoirs may be more variable over time than space, and that some sites within reservoirs play critically important roles in whole-ecosystem biogeochemical processing.

Keywords Biogeochemical hotspot · Carbon · Nutrients · Primary productivity · Spatial variability · Temporal variability

Introduction

Of freshwater ecosystems, reservoirs in particular play a disproportionately large role in global biogeochemical cycles, transforming and burying large amounts of carbon (C), nitrogen (N), and phosphorus (P) (Harrison et al. 2009; Maavara et al. 2015, 2020; Powers et al. 2015; Shaughnessy et al. 2019; Stratton et al. 2019). Reservoirs receive a much higher quantity of nutrients (N, P) and organic C than many

naturally formed lakes due to their high watershed-to-surface area ratio and corresponding large terrestrial drainage area, making them important for biogeochemical processing within the landscape (Thornton et al. 1990; Harrison et al. 2009; Hayes et al. 2017).

Within a reservoir, multiple processes interact to control the biogeochemical cycling and fate of C, N, and P. Due to longer residence times in reservoir basins than incoming streams (Nilsson et al. 2005), organic matter and nutrients that enter the reservoir are altered via biotic transformation (e.g., uptake by organisms, decomposition; Harrison et al. 2009; Shaughnessy et al. 2019) or deposited within reservoir sediments as they travel downstream (Syvitski et al. 2005; Tranvik et al. 2009; Clow et al. 2015). Altogether, the balance of these physical and biogeochemical processes results in major changes in the quantity and quality of material leaving the reservoir and directly drives the stoichiometry of C, N, and P exported to downstream ecosystems (Maranger et al. 2018; Wang et al. 2018; Carey

✉ Whitney M. Woelmer
wwoelmer@vt.edu

¹ Department of Biological Sciences, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA 26060, USA

² Department of Biological Systems Engineering, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, VA 26060, USA

³ Present Address: National Center for Coastal Ocean Science, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Beaufort, NC 28516, USA




Fig. 1 Conceptual diagram showing **a** Thornton et al. (1990) a model of the spatial distribution of chlorophyll-a and nutrients (N and P) along the reservoir continuum, as well as selected field studies that have examined the distribution of **b** nitrogen (N), **c** chlorophyll-a (chl-a), and **d** phosphorus (P) in reservoirs across the globe. While Thornton et al. (1990) did not distinguish between N and P, or total and dissolved nutrient fractions, we delineate these pools here when possible (total nutrients in solid lines, dissolved nutrients in dashed

lines in panels **b** and **d**). We note that patterns of reservoir longitudinal distributions are meant to be qualitative and only represent relative minimums and maximums. Other than Marcé et al. (2021), we were unable to find analyses of the distributions of allochthonous and autochthonous carbon across the riverine, transitional, and lacustrine reservoir zones in the literature to match the model of Thornton et al. (1990) (color figure online)

et al. 2022a). Consequently, reservoirs can either act as nutrient and C sources (i.e., production within the waterbody) or sinks (i.e., burial in the waterbody or emission to the atmosphere; Harrison et al. 2009; Powers et al. 2015; Maranger et al. 2018). However, because most studies focus on biogeochemical processing at a single location within a reservoir, typically the deepest site (e.g., the US Environmental Protection Agency National Lake Assessment), less is known about the spatial variation in biogeochemistry, which may occur between a reservoir's inflow streams and its dam.

Reservoirs are physically heterogeneous ecosystems, which likely influences biogeochemical heterogeneity along the reservoir continuum. Here, we define “reservoir continuum” as the spatial gradient from the inflowing stream–reservoir interface to the reservoir dam. Thornton et al. (1990) proposed a heuristic model that described the reservoir continuum as a longitudinal gradient within a reservoir consisting of riverine, transitional, and lacustrine zones, each with distinct physical, chemical, and biological characteristics. Broadly, Thornton et al. (1990) posited that nutrient availability should decrease from the riverine to transitional to lacustrine zone because of decreasing water velocity, lower allochthonous inputs of sediment and organic matter, and increasing sedimentation of particulate fractions (Fig. 1a). According to this heuristic model, photosynthetic biological activity, or by proxy, chlorophyll-a (chl-a), should peak in the transitional zone (Fig. 1a) due to relatively high nutrient and light availability for primary production (Fig. 1a).

Empirical studies examining the spatial heterogeneity of biogeochemical variables in reservoirs have found inconsistent support for the heuristic model of Thornton et al. (1990) (Fig. 1b–d). Some studies have observed peak concentrations of nutrients and chl-a occasionally following the model of Thornton et al. (1990) (Fig. 1b–d; Borges et al. 2008; Rychtecky and Znachor 2011; Soares et al. 2012; Berberich et al. 2020), but often showing unclear or inconsistent patterns (Fig. 1b–d; Gloss et al. 1980; Borges et al. 2008; Varol et al. 2012; Woldeab et al. 2018; Carneiro and Bini 2020) or patterns contrary to expectations (Fig. 1b–d; Scott et al. 2009; Soares et al. 2012; Woldeab et al. 2018; Berberich et al. 2020). Observed discrepancies in spatial patterns of chl-a and nutrient concentrations among reservoirs may result from reservoir specific characteristics (e.g., morphology, land use, management, age, etc.), as well as differences in the behavior of varying solutes (e.g., NO_3 versus NH_4 , as well as total versus dissolved fractions), and other biogeochemical processes that were not accounted for in the original model of Thornton et al. (1990). Ultimately, differences in observed patterns of water chemistry and chl-a among reservoirs suggest that more research is needed to characterize reservoir biogeochemical cycling across space and through time.

While the heuristic model of Thornton et al. (1990) does not directly predict organic C concentrations or types along the reservoir continuum, it does propose patterns for the sedimentation of different types of organic C. Specifically, the heuristic model of Thornton et al. (1990) predicts

sedimentation of allochthonous C to be highest in the riverine region of the reservoir due to terrestrial material transported from the reservoir inflow. In contrast, autochthonous C sedimentation would be highest in the transitional zone, where chl-*a* is expected to peak, due to the contribution of algal biomass to autochthonous C production and sedimentation. These expectations regarding C sedimentation imply changes in organic C quantity and quality along the reservoir continuum are likely also occurring, potentially affecting multiple ecosystem processes including light penetration (Schindler et al. 1996; Solomon et al. 2015) and C lability (Guillemette et al. 2013), which is a critical control of decomposition rates (Strauss and Lamberti 2002; Jane and Rose 2018). Berberich et al. (2020) found that organic matter in sediments and porewater of the upstream riverine zone was dominated by terrestrially derived organic matter, and observed an increase in autochthonous organic matter within sediments and further downstream. However, to the best of our knowledge, only one study has examined longitudinal trends in surface water reservoir organic C quality. Marcé et al. (2021) identified a transition from terrestrially derived organic C to autochthonous organic C in surface water along the continuum of Sau Reservoir in Catalonia, Spain. Their findings suggest high rates of organic C processing within the reservoir from the one sampling day of the study, which motivates the need for more data over a longer period of time to examine the consistency of these spatial patterns, for both organic C and other biogeochemical variables.

Drivers that change temporally may play an equal or even more important role than drivers that change spatially in influencing biogeochemical heterogeneity within reservoirs. For example, seasonal changes in hydrology may be an important driver of biogeochemical heterogeneity (Williamson et al. 2021), both directly via loading or dilution of biogeochemical variables (Woldeab et al. 2018), as well as indirectly via reservoir residence time, which will vary throughout the year (Soares et al. 2012). Seasonality in air temperature and solar radiation alters biogeochemical processes such as mineralization, nutrient uptake, and biological growth rates (Wetzel 2001; Weathers et al. 2021), and can increase thermal stratification, resulting in decreased oxygen concentrations in reservoir bottom waters and increased release of certain nutrients from sediment in the summer (Nürnberg 1988; Rydin 2000; Boström et al. 1988). Temporally variable storm events can alter rates of primary production and respiration (Jennings et al. 2012; de Eyto et al. 2016; Kasprzak et al. 2017), as well as disrupt thermal stratification, mixing nutrient-rich hypolimnetic water into the surface. Changes in both allochthonous and autochthonous C are driven by seasonal dynamics, often with an influx of allochthonous material during snow melt or autumn leaf senescence, and autochthonous C (e.g., phytoplankton and macrophytes) typically peaking in spring or summer

(Sommer et al. 1986). Indeed, numerous studies examining seasonal variation in reservoirs have found significant trends in biogeochemical variables over the course of a year (Torres et al. 2007; Varol et al. 2012; Woldeab et al. 2018; Klippel et al. 2020; Waldo et al. 2021). Despite the many impacts of seasonality on biogeochemical variables, the relative magnitude of spatial and temporal heterogeneity in reservoir biogeochemistry remains unknown. In addition to naturally occurring changes over seasons, some reservoirs also experience substantial management activity, which can lead to temporal variability in biogeochemistry. For example, hypolimnetic oxygenation and reservoir drawdown can both disrupt typical seasonal limnological and biogeochemical trends, including thermal stratification, nutrient dynamics, and phytoplankton within the water column (e.g., Furey et al. 2004; Preece et al. 2019; Keller et al. 2021; Matsuzaki et al. 2022).

Analyzing trends in spatial variability of biogeochemical variables may help identify important sites where reservoir processing disproportionately occurs (i.e., biogeochemical hotspots, McClain et al. 2003, or control points, Bernhardt et al. 2017). Hotspots of biogeochemical processing often occur at ecosystem interfaces due to the occurrence of gradients, which either deliver limiting nutrients or provide substrate for chemical reactions (McClain et al. 2003; Sadro et al. 2011; Hotchkiss et al. 2018). Within a reservoir, the inflowing stream–reservoir interface may be a critical point for processing incoming biogeochemical variables (DelSontro et al. 2011; Berberich et al. 2020; Linkhorst et al. 2021; Marcé et al. 2021). However, it is likely that the importance of this ecosystem interface may vary over time. Studies documenting spatial hotspots of biogeochemical processing in reservoirs are rare (although see Marcé et al. 2021 for estimates of organic C hotspots, and DelSontro et al. 2011, Berberich et al. 2020, McClure et al. 2020, and Linkhorst et al. 2021 for estimates of inorganic C hotspots), and to our knowledge none exist that examine hotspots across seasons or compare the relative importance of spatial heterogeneity with seasonal (or temporal) heterogeneity of multiple biogeochemical variables in reservoirs.

In this study, we examined the spatial and temporal heterogeneity of chl-*a*, C, N, and P along a reservoir continuum in two small, eutrophic reservoirs. Both reservoirs are located within ~ 3 km of each other, with similar age, geology, weather, and land use, allowing us to constrain external driving factors in biogeochemical heterogeneity. We sampled surface water along a longitudinal gradient from stream inflow to the reservoir dam and outflow in both reservoirs every month from April to October. Our main questions were as follows: (1) How do concentrations of biogeochemical variables change along the reservoir continuum? (2) What is the relative magnitude of spatial and temporal heterogeneity in biogeochemistry along the reservoir continuum? (3)

Are there “hotspots” of biogeochemical processing along the reservoir continuum?

Methods

Study sites

Falling Creek Reservoir (FCR) and Beaverdam Reservoir (BVR) are both small (0.119 km^2 and 0.39 km^2 , respectively), shallow (maximum depth 9.3 and 11 m, respectively, at the time of this study) dimictic reservoirs owned and operated by the Western Virginia Water Authority as drinking water supplies (Fig. 2). Both reservoirs are located in Vinton, Virginia, USA (FCR at 37.30325, -79.8373 ; BVR at 37.31288, -79.8159) and are primarily surface water effluent reservoirs with spillways as their primary outflows.

BVR is located in an adjacent watershed to FCR and the two reservoirs are connected seasonally (Fig. 2). BVR has an outflow pipe installed at an upstream site (B2), which delivers a small volume of water via an underground tunnel to the FCR watershed, feeding the inflow stream that enters FCR on the northeastern side of the reservoir (site FS2, Fig. 2b). The outflow pipe is installed at $\sim 2.4 \text{ m}$ below full pond (maximum reservoir depth 13.4 m). However, during the time of this study, water levels in BVR were 2.0–2.9 m below full pond, meaning that the pipe was either just under the surface (April–June 2019) or above the surface of the water (July–October 2019) throughout the study. As a result, delivery of water from BVR to FCR occurred only during the first three sampling events of this study (April–June 2019). Moreover, in our two focal reservoirs, there were no management drawdowns during the study period. While there is a hypolimnetic oxygenation system in Falling Creek Reservoir, seasonal thermal stratification was not disrupted throughout the study period (Fig. S4), so epilimnetic sampling was unlikely to be unaffected (Gerling et al. 2014).

We sampled the entire reservoir continua of BVR and FCR in this study. There are two major inflows to FCR, which we sampled immediately before they entered the reservoir at site FS1 located on a forested stream, and site FS2 located on a wetland–stream complex (Fig. 2b). BVR has multiple inflow streams, but we chose to focus on two major forested inflows in the western (site BS1) and eastern (site BS2) arms, which represent the subwatersheds with the largest contributing area within the major western and eastern arms, respectively (Fig. 2b, Text S1). In addition, we monitored discharge, but not water chemistry, at the spillway of FCR (FS3) to estimate the volume of water leaving the reservoir. Drinking water was not regularly extracted from either reservoir during the time of the study, so the primary export of water from FCR was via the surface spillway (site FS3), whereas BVR’s primary export was via a stream draining

below site B4. Consequently, the primary flow of water in both reservoirs was from the inflowing streams to the dam, as is typically found in run-of-river reservoirs.

Within each reservoir, we chose sites along a gradient from the stream inflows to the reservoir dam, resulting in four reservoir sites in FCR (F1, F2, F3, and F4 in order of increasing distance from the inflow streams) and five reservoir sites in BVR (B1a in the western arm, B1b in the eastern arm, and B2, B3, and B4 in order of increasing distance from the inflow streams; Table S2). We also monitored one site within each inflowing stream to FCR ($n = 2$) and BVR ($n = 2$) just upstream of the reservoir–stream interface, resulting in a total of 14 monitoring sites, 9 sites within each reservoir, 4 inflowing stream sites, and 1 stream site downstream of FCR (Fig. 2b).

Field sampling


We sampled all sites in both reservoirs (Fig. 2) on the same day once every month from April to October 2019 ($n = 7$ sampling days), which allowed us to capture broad spatial and temporal changes in reservoir biogeochemistry. On each sampling day, we sampled surface water from downstream to upstream (e.g., from F4 to F1 and then onto the stream sites).

We measured a suite of surface physicochemical variables (water temperature, dissolved oxygen, and specific conductance) using a handheld YSI and conductivity probe (Carey et al. 2022b). Additionally, water samples were collected from the surface at all sites and analyzed for chl-*a*, dissolved organic C (DOC), total N and P (TN, TP), and dissolved N and P (ammonium: NH_4 ; nitrate: NO_3 ; soluble reactive phosphorus: SRP) and DOC quality via excitation emission matrices (EEMs; Fellman et al. 2010). EEMs measure the natural fluorescence of dissolved organic matter to characterize DOC quality (Fellman et al. 2010); here, we specifically focused on metrics correlated with allochthonous versus autochthonous origin of DOC. We refer readers to Carey et al. (2021), Hounshell et al. (2021), and Carey et al. (2022b) for detailed methods on sample collection, storage, and analysis of total and dissolved N, P, and DOC; EEMS; and chl-*a*; respectively.

We measured discharge at all stream sites (FS1, FS2, FS3, and BS1, BS2) using either a salt slug or the flow meter method, depending on the stream site (for a detailed description of discharge measurement methods, see Carey et al. 2022c). Discharge data were used to calculate the transport of solutes from upstream to downstream and to calculate mass balance estimates. Because we did not have a sampling location at the spillway of Beaverdam Reservoir, we calculated outflow using a mass balance approach based on modeled inflow and reservoir volume (Text S3).

In addition, we collected data for other environmental variables that might be associated with spatial and

Fig. 2 Map of Falling Creek Reservoir (FCR) and Beaverdam Reservoir (BVR) with **a** watershed area, and locations of stream and reservoir sampling sites and **b** names of sampling sites on both reservoirs' bathymetry. Arrows in panel B indicate the approximate flow of water through the stream–reservoir continuum (color figure online)



temporal heterogeneity, including whole-reservoir water residence time (Fig. S1), meteorological variables (air temperature and precipitation; Fig. S2), surface water temperature and dissolved oxygen (Fig. S3), and thermal stratification metrics (thermocline depth and Schmidt stability; Fig. S4). Thermal stratification metrics were calculated at the deepest site of each reservoir (F4 and B4) using full water column temperature profiles, which were collected as part of both reservoirs' routine monitoring programs

(Carey et al. 2022d, 2022e). Water residence times were calculated by dividing the total reservoir volume by the summed inflow to the reservoir for a given day (following Gerling et al. 2016). Thermocline depth and Schmidt stability were calculated at the deepest site using the R package rLakeAnalyzer (Winslow et al. 2019). Distance between sites within each reservoir were measured using Global Positioning System (GPS) points and the Measure Tool in ArcGIS Pro (2021).

Chemical analyses

All chemical analyses were conducted within 6 months of collection following the standard methods outlined by Carey et al. (2020), Carey et al. (2021), and Hounshell et al. (2021). We used traditional peak-picking methods to identify broad types of autochthonous and allochthonous dissolved organic matter (DOM) within the EEMs (i.e., Fellman et al. 2010; Gabor et al. 2014), specifically focusing on peaks T (excitation: 275; emission: 340) and A (excitation: 260; emission: 400–460). These two metrics represent microbial-like and humic-like fractions of dissolved organic matter, which have been correlated with autochthonous-like (e.g., algal-derived) or allochthonous-like (e.g., terrestrial-derived) DOC, respectively (Fellman et al. 2010; Gabor et al. 2014). We used analytical limits of quantitation for nutrient and carbon analyses to interpret ecologically meaningful differences in concentrations (Table S3).

Examining biogeochemical distributions along the reservoir continuum

We first compared concentrations of nutrients and chl-a at each sampling site to expected spatial patterns of nutrients and chl-a from the riverine to the lacustrine zone according to the model of Thornton et al. (1990). We limited this visual analysis to variables that were included in Thornton's model (i.e., chl-a and nutrients: TN, TP, NH_4 , NO_3 , SRP). We also compared temporal variability in concentrations of all biogeochemical variables (i.e., chl-a and nutrients TN, TP, NH_4 , NO_3 , and SRP, as well as DOC and carbon quality: peaks T and A) across sampling days. Lastly, we examined nutrient stoichiometry to estimate the relative availability of N and P, which influences phytoplankton nutrient limitation, among other ecosystem processes (Klausmeier et al. 2004; Hessen et al. 2013; Sterner and Elser 2002). Specifically, we calculated molar ratios of TN:TP, dissolved inorganic nitrogen (DIN):SRP, SRP:TP, and DIN:TN. We calculated DIN as the sum of NH_4 and NO_3 .

Drivers of heterogeneity

To determine the relative magnitude of spatial and temporal heterogeneity of biogeochemistry within the reservoir continuum, we used the coefficient of variation (CV) as a metric of heterogeneity (following Sadro et al. 2012 and Soares et al. 2012). We calculated CV across both space (CV_{space}) and time (CV_{time}). CV_{space} was calculated across all sites within each individual reservoir (e.g., F1-4, B1-4, dark brown circles on Fig. 2) on a given sampling day separately for each of the seven sampling days. In contrast, CV_{time} was calculated individually for each reservoir site (four sites at FCR and five at BVR; i.e., dark brown circles on Fig. 2)

across all seven sampling dates. As a result, we calculated seven values of CV_{space} for FCR and seven values of CV_{space} for BVR, and four values of CV_{time} for FCR and four values of CV_{time} for BVR. We report the mean, minimum, and maximum of these distributions in Table S4.

We compared CV_{time} with CV_{space} across both reservoirs to estimate the relative magnitude of spatial and temporal heterogeneity. Additionally, we compared CV_{time} and CV_{space} between FCR and BVR to estimate differences between reservoirs. All comparisons were made using unpaired Wilcoxon tests (Alboukadel 2020).

Spatially explicit processing of biogeochemical variables

When analyzing reservoir biogeochemical processing, many studies calculate the mass balance of solutes coming into and out of a water body, thereby estimating whether the water body as a whole was a sink (retention of nutrients/carbon) or source (release of nutrients/carbon) for a given analyte (e.g., Vollenweider 1975; Torres et al. 2007; Brett and Benjamin 2008; Keys et al. 2019). However, because processing may not occur uniformly along a longitudinal gradient, we extended the mass balance approach to calculate a spatially explicit metric of change in biogeochemical mass standardized by the area between sampling sites along the stream–reservoir continuum in the surface water, Δ_{var} , using Eq. 1:

$$\Delta_{\text{var}} = \frac{\frac{[\text{var}]_d * Q_d}{\text{spcond}_d} - \frac{[\text{var}]_u * Q_u}{\text{spcond}_u}}{A_R} \quad (1)$$

where $[\text{var}]_d$ is the concentration of a given variable at the downstream reservoir site in units of $\mu\text{g/L}$, mg/L , or relative fluorescence unit (RFU) depending on the analyte (see Table S3); Q_d is the discharge at the downstream site (m^3/s), spcond_d is the specific conductance at the downstream reservoir site ($\mu\text{S/cm}$), included here to account for unobserved intrusions of solutes into the reservoir that may occur between sites (more detail below), and A_R is the area of the reservoir section between two sampling sites (Table S5); $[\text{var}]_u$, Q_u , and spcond_u are similarly defined but at the upstream site. Q_u was calculated for each stream site on each sampling day. We recognize that standardizing processing rates by the area between sampling sites assumes one-directional flow through the reservoir. As a check on this assumption, and following the precedent of other studies (e.g., Vollenweider 1975; Torres et al. 2007; Keys et al. 2019), we also calculated Δ_{var} without standardizing by area (Text S4, Eq. S1).

Using Eq. 1, we calculated Δ_{var} both for the whole reservoir ($\Delta_{\text{var}}^{\text{WR}}$) and along the reservoir continuum from one site to the next ($\Delta_{\text{var}}^{\text{Site}}$) in BVR and FCR. As a result,

$\Delta_{var}WR$ represents the traditional mass balance approach of estimating solutes coming into and leaving the whole reservoir corrected for the area of the whole reservoir. In comparison, $\Delta_{var}Site$ represents a localized version of the same metric, i.e., estimating solutes entering and leaving the surface water within a given location, calculated at multiple locations along the reservoir continuum and corrected for the area of the reservoir between sampling sites (Table S5). In the case of $\Delta_{var}WR$, the upstream site is the reservoir inflow(s) and the downstream site is the reservoir outflow; whereas for $\Delta_{var}Site$, the upstream and downstream sites are determined along the flow path of the reservoir continuum (e.g., when calculating $\Delta_{var}Site$ between F1 and F2, F1 is the upstream site and F2 is the downstream site). As a result, positive values indicate that the reservoir or site acted as a source of a given biogeochemical variable downstream, whereas negative values indicate that the reservoir or site acted as a sink. By comparing $\Delta_{var}WR$ for a given day to $\Delta_{var}Site$ throughout the reservoir, we can identify locations within the reservoir that disproportionately contribute to whole-reservoir biogeochemical processing, acting as biogeochemical hotspots.

For most reservoir sites, $\Delta_{var}Site$ was calculated as the difference between the single upstream and single downstream sites. However, when there were two upstream stream sites (e.g., at F1 when both FS1 and FS2 flow into FCR; Fig. 2b), the solute mass at both sites was summed to calculate the total input, divided by the reservoir area between sampling sites. At site B3, where the western and eastern arms of BVR converge, we calculated a weighted average of the mass of the two incoming sites, B2 and B1b, based on a weighted average of the incoming discharge rates.

Given the availability of data for this study, our spatially explicit mass balance approach provided a robust metric of spatial variability in reservoir biogeochemical processing with some caveats. First, given limited resources for monitoring discharge at within-reservoir sites, we used the same Q_d for all sites within a given reservoir on each day, measured at the outflow of the reservoir on each sampling date. Second, we strategically chose to monitor inflow streams to the reservoirs that contributed the most watershed area (Text S1), given limited resources for stream monitoring. This method assumed that the majority of incoming water was delivered through the streams we monitored, and additional sources of water and associated solutes were negligible. We accounted for any unmonitored intrusions of solutes (e.g., groundwater intrusion or smaller tributaries that were not monitored) through the use of specific conductance, which can be used as a conservative tracer due to limited biological uptake relative to C, N, or P at each site (Baker and Webster 2017; e.g., Triska et al. 1989; Casas-Ruiz et al. 2017). We assume that unknown, and thus unmeasured, sources to the reservoirs similarly follow this conservative tracer approach.

Third, while this method does not partition out the specific abiotic or biotic processes that may have occurred, it allowed us to estimate ecologically meaningful changes in biogeochemical variables along the reservoir continuum.

All analyses were conducted in R 4.0.3 (R Core Team 2022), all code to recreate the analyses is available in the Zenodo repository (Woelmer 2023), and all field and laboratory data are published with extensive metadata in the Environmental Data Initiative repository (Hounshell et al. 2021; Carey et al. 2020, 2021, 2022b, 2022c, 2022d, 2022e, 2022f).

Results

Distribution of biogeochemical variables along the reservoir continuum

In general, our observations of nutrients and chl-a (Fig. 3) did not follow the predicted patterns of the model of the reservoir continuum by Thornton et al. (1990) (Fig. 1a). Total nutrients (TN, TP) did not show a predictable decrease along the reservoir continuum in either reservoir, as was expected by the model of Thornton et al. (1990) (Fig. 3a, b, d and e). Similarly, dissolved nutrients (NH_4 , NO_3 , SRP) did not show a consistent pattern of decreased concentrations along the continuum in either reservoir (Fig. 3g–i). In FCR, we observed a marked increase in both NH_4 and NO_3 along the continuum (Fig. 3j–k), contrary to expectations, whereas BVR's patterns were more inconsistent (Fig. 3g–h). Lastly, we did not observe the expected peak in chl-a in the transitional zone within the reservoir, and concentrations remained relatively unchanged through the reservoir (Fig. 3c, f), except in BVR in later months when concentrations increased at upstream reservoir sites (Fig. 3c). Overall, FCR exhibited concentrations that were similar or higher than BVR for all biogeochemical variables. As a result, we focused our comparisons of spatial and temporal variability among sites within a single reservoir, rather than comparing between FCR and BVR.

For TN and TP, both BVR and FCR showed inconsistent spatial variability over time, with peak concentrations occurring in different regions of the reservoir in different months (Fig. 3a, b, d and e). Spatial variability, as estimated by differences in concentrations across sites, increased throughout the season with the largest range in concentrations across sites in BVR occurring in October for TN (258.5 $\mu\text{g/L}$) and in September for TP (11.6 $\mu\text{g/L}$). Similarly, the largest range in concentrations across sites in FCR occurred in September for TN (435.5 $\mu\text{g/L}$) and October for TP (14.8 $\mu\text{g/L}$). In both BVR and FCR, sampling days later in the year (August–October) tended to have higher ($> 2\times$) in




Fig. 3 Concentrations of biogeochemical variables along the reservoir continuum starting from the most upstream reservoir site of Beaverdam Reservoir (left panels) and Falling Creek Reservoir (right panels). Each panel represents a different biogeochemical variable, and colors represent the month of sampling, from 4 (April) to 10 (October). All units are denoted in each panel header. *TN* total nitrogen, *TP* total phosphorus, *chl-a* chlorophyll-a, *NH₄* ammonium, *NO₃*

nitrate, *SRP* soluble reactive phosphorus, *DOC* dissolved organic carbon, *T-autoch* peak T autochthonous carbon quality, *A-alloch* peak A allochthonous carbon quality. Because BVR has two upstream sites (one within each arm), these sites are plotted according to their distance from the corresponding stream site, meaning the first point on the x axis is B1a and the second point on the x axis is B1b (color figure online)

FCR) concentrations than earlier sampling days (April–July, Fig. 3a, b, d, and e).

Chl-a was relatively constant across space on all sampling days in FCR (Fig. 3f; max. range of 5.7 $\mu\text{g/L}$ in August, min. range of 0.2 $\mu\text{g/L}$ in April), with relatively similar concentrations throughout the reservoir. Chl-a in BVR was similarly homogeneous over space (Fig. 3c; max. range of 7.6 $\mu\text{g/L}$ in October, min. range of 0.5 $\mu\text{g/L}$ in June), with the exception of September and October when chl-a was higher in the riverine areas of the reservoir. Chl-a increased over the study period in both reservoirs, with the highest concentrations observed in September and October.

Dissolved N, P, and organic C were generally more variable over both space and time than total nutrients (Fig. 3). Both NH_4 and NO_3 were variable across space in FCR (Fig. 3j and k), showing peak concentrations of both variables in the most downstream location near the dam. NO_3 and NH_4 in BVR and SRP in both reservoirs varied both across space and time, but most observed values were below the limits of quantitation and therefore should be interpreted with caution (Table S3). Finally, DOC was highly variable over both space and time in BVR (Fig. 3m), with the largest range across sites occurring in July (2.4 mg/L), and the smallest range occurring in October (0.7 mg/L). While FCR did exhibit some spatial variability in DOC (Fig. 3p), the trend was inconsistent over time.

Over our sampling sites and dates, autochthonous (peak T) and allochthonous (peak A) C varied more over time than space (Fig. 3n, o, q, and r), with relative fluorescent intensities increasing throughout the year. The one exception to this pattern was in August in BVR, when peak T increased at the most downstream site B4 (range across sites 0.10 RFU). Given that both autochthonous (peak T) and allochthonous (peak A) metrics showed very little change along the reservoir continuum, our data do not support a clear shift between autochthonous C and allochthonous C sources among sites in our reservoirs. Overall, there was greater fluorescent intensity for both peaks A and T in FCR as compared with BVR across both time and space, reflective of higher DOC concentrations observed in FCR.

Nutrient stoichiometry was also highly variable over space and time (Fig. S5). Molar ratios of TN:TP at reservoir sites in FCR and BVR were typically above Redfield ratios of 16:1 (Redfield 1934), indicating potential P limitation in both systems (mean ratio of 28.9 ± 14.6 , 1 SD). However, these ratios were variable over space, with no consistent increase or decrease observed along the continuum. Molar DIN:SRP was similarly variable over space and time, but showed a consistent increase along the reservoir continuum in FCR, on average from 1.3 at the most upstream site to 3.8 at the dam (Fig S5). This pattern did not occur in BVR, which ranged from a ratio of DIN:SRP of 2.0 and 3.7 at the most upstream sites (B1a and B1b, respectively) to 2.1 at

the dam. Across FCR and BVR, mean molar DIN:TN ratios were $0.04 (\pm 0.02)$, indicating that the particulate fraction of N dominated the total N pool. In contrast, SRP:TP ratios were $0.6 (\pm 0.45)$ in both reservoirs.

Ancillary environmental variables showed expected seasonal trends. Discharge at all four stream sites showed a clear decreasing trend over the course of the study period from April to October (Fig. 4a). Specific conductance, which we used as a conservative tracer in our study, increased over time throughout the year at all study sites. In addition, specific conductance showed very little variation over space within the reservoir (Fig. 4b), except for lower specific conductance (on average by $8.4 \mu\text{S/cm}$) in reservoir sites than stream sites. Following Eq. 1, which used specific conductance as a conservative tracer throughout the reservoir, this difference in specific conductance had a negligible effect on Δ_{varSite} , and may have resulted in underestimation of biogeochemical processing at the stream–reservoir interface (Fig. S7). Over our study period, water residence times were approximately three times longer in BVR than FCR, with a mean water residence time of 475 ± 301 (1 SE) days for FCR and 1300 ± 335 days for BVR. The longest residence times occurred during October (Fig. S1), which were eight times longer in BVR and 73 times longer in FCR than the shortest residence times in April. Text S2 includes a description of meteorological variables (air temperature and

precipitation, Fig. S2), surface water temperature and dissolved oxygen (Fig. S3), and thermal stratification metrics (thermocline depth and Schmidt stability, Fig. S4) over the study period.

Heterogeneity across space and time

Across both reservoirs, heterogeneity over time (CV_{time}) was significantly higher than heterogeneity across space (CV_{space}) for TN, TP, chl-a, SRP, peak T, and peak A (Fig. 5a–c, f, h, and i; SRP $p = 0.046$; all others $p < 0.0001$). For the remaining variables (NH_4 , NO_3 , and DOC; Fig. 5d, e, and g), there was no significant difference in heterogeneity across space and time. FCR and BVR were significantly different from each other in heterogeneity of both space and time for most biogeochemical variables (Fig. 5). FCR was significantly more temporally heterogeneous than BVR for several variables: TP, NH_4 , NO_3 , DOC, peak T, and peak A (Fig. 5b, d, e, g–i). In contrast, BVR was significantly more temporally heterogeneous than FCR only for chl-a (mean CV_{time} BVR 0.84; mean CV_{time} FCR 0.75; Table S4). Over space, FCR was not significantly more heterogeneous than BVR for any variable, and BVR was more heterogeneous over space than FCR for chl-a only (mean CV_{space} BVR 0.21; mean CV_{space} FCR 0.1; Table S4, Fig. 5c).




Fig. 4 **a** Discharge at all stream (inflow and outflow) sites on all sampling dates, with Falling Creek Reservoir (FCR) sites represented in blue and Beaverdam Reservoir (BVR) sites in green. Site S1 refers to sites FS1 or BS1, while Site S2 refers to sites FS2 or BS2, with reservoir designated by color and panel. Sites designated as “Out” represent the outflow dynamics for each reservoir and were estimated

at FS3 at FCR and B4 in BVR. **b** Specific conductance at all sites and for all sampling dates, with colors representing the month of sampling, from 4 (April) to 10 (October). Stream sites are represented by triangles or squares, while sites within the reservoir are represented by circles. Specific conductance was not collected at BVR sites in September (color figure online)




Fig. 5 Heterogeneity, as measured by coefficient of variation, over space (CV_{space}) and time (CV_{time}) for BVR and FCR for total nutrients, a) TN and b) TP, c) chl-a, dissolved nutrients d) NH_4 , e) NO_3 , f) SRP, g) dissolved organic carbon quantity (DOC), and dissolved organic carbon quality h) peak T, autochthonous, and i) peak A,

allochthonous. Bars above pairing represent the pairing of groups for significance testing. ns denotes a nonsignificant relationship ($p > 0.05$), * $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.0001$, **** $p < 0.00001$ (color figure online)

CV_{space} and CV_{time} were not significantly different from each other for the nutrient ratios, with the exception of SRP:TP, which was more heterogeneous over time than space (Fig. S6, $p < 0.05$). Similarly, BVR and FCR were not significantly different in the magnitude of heterogeneity for any variables, except for CV_{space} for SRP:TP.

Spatially explicit processing of biogeochemical variables

When calculating spatially explicit processing between sites ($\Delta_{var}Site$), we found that the highest rates of processing typically occurred at the inflowing stream–reservoir interface, regardless of whether we used a processing metric standardized by area (Fig. 6) or not (Fig. S8). This pattern is exemplified by peak values of $\Delta_{var}Site$ in the regions between the stream sites and the most upstream reservoir sites in both reservoirs (i.e., between FS1/FS2 and F1; BS1 and B1a; BS2 and B1b). We found that the stream–reservoir interface disproportionately contributed to whole-reservoir dynamics, in which the magnitude and direction of the whole-ecosystem processing (as indicated by $\Delta_{var}WR$) matched that of

$\Delta_{var}Site$ at these locations. For example, the $\Delta_{var}Site$ data for DOC in BVR highlight that a majority of changes in DOC occurred between the inflowing stream sites and upstream areas of the reservoir, with negligible change occurring in the downstream areas of the reservoir. Consequently, the upstream areas of the reservoir were primarily responsible for the magnitude and directionality of $\Delta_{var}WR$, which shows that BVR was a source of DOC on most days (Fig. 6m; e.g., among BS1 and B1a and BS2 and B1b, Fig. 2b), despite some sites in the intermediate area of the reservoir (e.g., sites B2 and B3) functioning as a small sink of DOC on some days, especially in April. Within BVR, we found that while both arms of the reservoir typically had higher $\Delta_{var}Site$ values than sites further downstream, $\Delta_{var}Site$ between BS1 and B1a showed greater values than BS2 and B1b (e.g., Fig. 6a), indicating that this metric was sensitive to the distance between the incoming stream site and the reservoir site (Fig. 2, Table S5).

Large values of $\Delta_{var}Site$ at the stream–reservoir interface were often coincident with large values of $\Delta_{var}WR$, indicating that processing at the stream–reservoir interface disproportionately impacted whole-reservoir ($\Delta_{var}WR$) dynamics.




Fig. 6 The change in biogeochemical variables, Δ_{var} , along the reservoir continuum corrected by specific conductance and standardized by the area of the reservoir between sampling sites with each variable represented in individual panels for TN (panels a and d), TP (b and e), chl-a (c and f), NH₄ (g and j), NO₃ (h and k), SRP (i and l), DOC (m and p), Peak T-autochthonous (n and q), and Peak A-allochthonous (o and r), in BVR and FCR, respectively. $\Delta_{var}Site$, which represents the change between sites, is shown at each sampling site along the reservoir continuum and $\Delta_{var}WR$, which represents the change from inflow stream sites and the furthest downstream site, is shown in diamond-shaped points at the furthest downstream site on the x axis to the right of the vertical line. Note that the secondary (right) y axis corresponds to $\Delta_{var}WR$ (large diamond points at far right of each panel) and presents the same units as $\Delta_{var}Site$ but on a smaller

scale to show the range of variability in these values (which are of a smaller magnitude than $\Delta_{var}Site$ due to being standardized by the area of the entire reservoir). See *Methods: Spatially explicit processing of biogeochemical variables* for a full description of $\Delta_{var}Site$ and $\Delta_{var}WR$ (Eq. 1). Because BVR has two upstream sites (one within each arm), these are plotted according to their distance from the corresponding stream site, meaning the first point on the x axis is B1a and the second point on the x axis is B1b. The color represents the month in which the sample was collected, from 4 (April) to 10 (October). BGV UNIT is the individual units of each biogeochemical variable, which are listed in each panel label. Samples were not collected at stream sites in September and are excluded from this analysis (color figure online)

This pattern was consistent for TN, TP, chl-a, NH₄, DOC, and peaks T and A in BVR, and almost all biogeochemical variables in FCR, with the exception of DOC. The changes along the reservoir continuum in $\Delta_{var}Site$ for peak T (a metric of autochthonous organic C) indicates an increase in autochthonous sources of C between the incoming stream and upstream reservoir sites for both reservoirs, with the exception of some months (July in BVR and June in FCR, Fig. 6n, q). Interestingly, $\Delta_{var}Site$ for peak A (a metric of allochthonous C) followed a similar pattern, with an increase in allochthonous sources of C (peak A) between incoming stream sites and upstream reservoir sites, except for July in BVR, and June and August in FCR. Overall, patterns of DOC, peak A, and peak T were similar across days and sites in BVR.

Despite that the stream–reservoir interface often dominated whole-reservoir dynamics, there were some biogeochemical variables and sampling days for which sink–source dynamics changed throughout the reservoir, indicating that the reservoir functioned as both a sink and a source at different locations. These variables included TN in both reservoirs

(Fig. 6a, d), NO₃ and SRP in BVR (Fig. 6h, i), and peaks T and A in FCR (Fig. 6q, r). For example, changes in $\Delta_{var}Site$ of peak T were variable along the reservoir continuum in FCR, with some sampling days showing decreases from site to site in the intermediate region of the reservoir (e.g., site F2). Values of $\Delta_{var}Site$ for SRP in BVR were also spatially variable, in which the reservoir exhibited source dynamics at upstream sites, sink dynamics in the intermediate sites of the reservoir, and source dynamics again near the dam on a single sampling day (e.g., April, August, and October). This variability over both space and time highlights that likely multiple interacting mechanisms were driving the processing of these biogeochemical variables along the reservoir continuum.

Further, the presence of large values of $\Delta_{var}Site$ at sites throughout the reservoir (e.g., NO₃ in BVR, which exhibited numerous fluctuations between sink and source dynamics, Fig. 6h) were more common in BVR than in FCR, where large $\Delta_{var}Site$ values were primarily found in upstream areas of the reservoir. Variability in the location of peak values of $\Delta_{var}Site$ as well as increases in the magnitude of $\Delta_{var}WR$

were more common in FCR during April, when the discharge into the reservoir was more than four times higher than any other sampling days. This result indicates that our metrics of processing were sensitive to large changes in hydrology and emphasizes the importance of time-discrete changes in the location of processing “hotspots.”

According to the whole-reservoir metric of processing, $\Delta_{var}WR$, BVR and FCR acted similarly as a sink of both NO_3 and TP at the whole-reservoir scale, and both reservoirs acted as a source of TN, DOC, and chl-a on most or all days (Fig. 6). On all days, BVR was a sink for NH_4 , and on most days FCR was a sink or passive transporter (meaning no substantial change between the inflow and outflow) for NH_4 , but acted as a source of NH_4 in April. Sink–source dynamics of SRP differed between FCR and BVR, with FCR primarily serving as a sink of SRP, whereas BVR switched from a sink to a source through time.

Discussion

Our study demonstrates that, in two small reservoirs, multiple biogeochemical variables were more heterogeneous over time than space. While the two reservoirs did show substantial spatial variability in surface water biogeochemistry, these patterns were inconsistent over time, contrary to the heuristic model of Thornton et al. (1990), which describes distinct and consistent longitudinal zones along a reservoir continuum. Moreover, we observed “hotspots” of processing along the reservoir continuum where biogeochemical variables consistently and substantially changed, indicating that some locations disproportionately contributed to changes in biogeochemistry within a reservoir. For multiple variables we found that this hotspot location was frequently the interface between the stream and the reservoir, supporting other studies that posit that ecosystem boundaries or transitions often result in “hotspots” of biogeochemical processing (McClain et al. 2003; Bernhardt et al. 2017; Marcé et al. 2021). Ultimately, our analysis emphasizes the importance of examining spatial patterns and biogeochemical processing along the reservoir continuum.

Spatial and temporal variability in biogeochemistry along the reservoir continuum

BVR and FCR exhibited substantial variability in biogeochemistry across the reservoir continuum (space) and throughout the study period (time) (Fig. 3). However, spatially, most variables either showed inconsistent longitudinal variability over different sampling dates (e.g., NH_4 and DOC in BVR, SRP in FCR) or patterns contrary to previous expectations (e.g., NH_4 and NO_3 in FCR, chl-a in BVR). Ultimately, our results provide limited support for the model

of Thornton et al. (1990) that biogeochemical variables change predictably along the reservoir continuum (following Fig. 1). However, a major caveat of Thornton et al.’s (1990) model is the absence of an explicit time-dynamic component, which may be a key factor constraining the generality of their proposed trends. Our findings follow other studies that found inconsistent or divergent trends in reservoir spatial dynamics (Carneiro and Bini 2020; Borges et al. 2008; Varol et al. 2012; Woldeab et al. 2018; Scott et al. 2009; Soares et al. 2012), adding to a body of work examining longitudinal biogeochemistry in reservoirs.

A number of reservoir-specific characteristics may influence the strength of longitudinal gradients along the reservoir continuum, and help explain why we observed differences in biogeochemical distributions between BVR and FCR. Reservoir morphology, the number and location of tributaries, and reservoir size may all influence the strength of biogeochemical gradients and the heterogeneity within a reservoir (Carneiro and Bini 2020). While BVR and FCR are of similar age and have similar land use within their watersheds (Gerling et al. 2016), they differ in several other important characteristics. FCR is a single-arm reservoir with two main upstream inflows. In contrast, the morphology of BVR is more complex, with two main tributaries feeding separate arms that converge downstream within the reservoir, potentially leading to additional hotspots at the confluence of the distinct parcels of water. Indeed, for some variables, especially chl-a, SRP, and on some days DOC and peaks T and A, we did see that the confluence at B3 showed larger rates of processing (Fig. 6c, i, m–o), although the pattern did not occur consistently.

While we cannot attribute differences between FCR and BVR to reservoir size given their relatively small, comparable surface areas, there are several factors that may influence the relationship between size and biogeochemical heterogeneity in reservoirs. First, the pelagic region in larger reservoirs may be less heterogeneous due to increased flow through the reservoir, leading to a flushing effect as residence time decreases (Drastik et al. 2008; Carneiro and Bini 2020). However, larger reservoirs are likely to have a higher shoreline development index, leading to more microhabitats in nearshore areas and thereby increasing the localized influence of tributaries (e.g., DelSontro et al. 2011). Lastly, larger reservoirs may be more likely to be advection-dominated systems, which may cause substantial spatial heterogeneity (Gloss et al. 1980), as delivery and uptake of nutrients in riverine regions cause distinct patterns over space. However, the influence of advective flow on surface water heterogeneity is likely to vary throughout the season with changing river and reservoir water temperatures (Gloss et al. 1980). Altogether, given the global prevalence of small waterbodies ($< 1 \text{ km}^2$) like BVR and FCR (Downing et al. 2006), a better understanding of the biogeochemical heterogeneity of small

reservoir ecosystems is critical to quantifying the overall role of reservoirs in global biogeochemical cycles.

Additionally, BVR is typically much more strongly stratified than FCR (Fig. S4). This difference in thermal stratification strength is likely due to differences in volume, with FCR ~ 2 m shallower and 30% smaller in surface area (difference of 0.27 km²) than BVR. Because BVR was more strongly stratified than FCR, internal nutrient loading from sediment fluxes may have been less likely to influence surface water concentrations in BVR than in FCR, and may have prevented increases in some nutrients downstream, such as we observed in FCR for NO₃ (Fig. 3j). Overall, these differences in morphology may have led to our observations of increased spatial heterogeneity in BVR as compared with FCR (as exemplified by greater spatial heterogeneity in NH₄, NO₃, DOC, and SRP in BVR than FCR, Fig. 3), as BVR has generally more complex morphology.

Nutrient concentrations in FCR were consistently higher than BVR. We expected to see this pattern during the periods when surface water from BVR was delivered to FCR (April to June during this study) due to both increased connectivity, leading to higher nutrients in downstream ecosystems (Wurtsbaugh et al. 2005; Sadro et al. 2012; Brown et al. 2008; Stachelek and Soranno 2019), as well as lower spatial heterogeneity in FCR due to shorter water residence times in cascading reservoirs (Barbosa et al. 1999; Drastik et al. 2008). While we did observe shorter residence times during the first three sampling dates when BVR was connected to FCR, nutrient concentrations were higher later in the season when the reservoirs were not connected. This pattern likely indicates that seasonal changes in water temperature and oxygen dynamics leading to favorable conditions for phytoplankton growth or internal nutrient loading may be more important for driving nutrient concentrations in FCR than inflow connectivity. Moving forward, examining spatial and temporal distributions of biogeochemistry across a range of reservoir ages, land-uses, morphologies, tributaries, and landscape positions will help build upon this work and inform generalizable trends in reservoir biogeochemical distributions across space and time.

Implications of time as a dominant axis of heterogeneity

Despite observing substantial spatial variation in the biogeochemistry of both BVR and FCR, heterogeneity over time was significantly higher than over space for most biogeochemical variables (Fig. 5). Seasonal succession has long been considered a critical driver of variability in freshwater ecosystems (e.g., Sommer et al. 1986; De Senerpont Domis et al. 2013). However, our study adds an important novel comparison between the relative magnitude of spatial and temporal heterogeneity, a central question in the study of

reservoirs (Thornton et al. 1990). Similar to our findings, many studies have documented that spatial heterogeneity of biogeochemistry is substantial, and also highly variable over time (Gloss et al. 1980; Shaughnessy et al. 2019; Borges et al. 2008; Soares et al. 2012; Stratton et al. 2019; Linkhorst et al. 2020).

While we cannot directly parse the mechanisms driving temporal heterogeneity in our reservoirs, a number of changing seasonal dynamics could be connected. For example, Collins et al. (2019) found that both winter precipitation, which may influence delivery of organic matter and nutrients during spring runoff (Pierson et al. 2013; Brown et al. 2008), as well as summer temperature, which is directly related to biological activities such as primary production and mineralization, were able to predict lake water quality across ~ 11,000 US lakes, highlighting the importance of temporal variation in climate variables. Another study found that seasonal changes in temperature, nutrient availability, and hydrology also directly influenced phytoplankton communities across a reservoir continuum (Lv et al. 2014). In our study, which was focused on the summer thermally stratified period, we were unable to examine the effect of winter precipitation, but did observe that the later months with the warmest temperatures (July and August, Fig. S3) had higher concentrations of chl-a, total nutrients, and both autochthonous and allochthonous organic C indicators (Fig. 3). The highest concentrations of these variables tended to occur even later in the season (September and October) after water temperatures had begun to decline, indicating that other seasonally variable drivers such as increased residence time (Fig. S1) may also play a role. For example, it may be that nutrient availability peaked in the fall months due to degradation of phytoplankton biomass, while residence times decreased, leaving nutrients to remain longer within the reservoir.

We did observe that spatial heterogeneity was higher for some variables; specifically, NH₄, NO₃, and DOC showed a nonsignificant difference between heterogeneity in space and time (Fig. 5). Thus, because neither time nor space was significantly more important in the heterogeneity of these variables, we infer that drivers which change over space may be relatively more important for influencing variability in dissolved nutrients (e.g., NH₄, NO₃, DOC, and SRP) than for total nutrients, metrics of C quality, and chl-a, which showed significantly greater heterogeneity over time than space. Consequently, the drivers of dissolved nutrient dynamics (e.g., microbial communities, microhabitats with varying temperature or oxygen) may be more variable spatially than temporally. Overall, dissolved nutrient concentrations are generally considered more variable and harder to predict than total nutrients (Robson and Dourdet 2015; Soares and Calijuri 2021), which may be related to their increased spatial variability and rapid uptake times.

Lastly, nutrient stoichiometry, i.e., the ratios of molar N to P, as well as ratios of total to dissolved fractions of these nutrients, were highly variable over time and space (Fig. S5). We did not observe any significant differences between CV_{space} and CV_{time} for any of the ratios except for SRP:TP, indicating an important role of drivers over both space and time in influencing variability in stoichiometry (Fig. S6). While most of these ratios show highly variable patterns, DIN:SRP tended to increase along the reservoir continuum in FCR, with the highest values found nearest the dam. This was strongly driven by increases in dissolved N (Fig. 3j, k; NH_4 and NO_3), which were observed in FCR and is evidence for increased P limitation in the downstream regions of the reservoir. Despite that some individual nutrient constituents did not exhibit consistent change spatially within our reservoirs (Fig. 3), the relative availability of N and P did change, with potentially important implications for controlling phytoplankton community composition (Watson et al. 1997; Downing et al. 2001). For example, greater P limitation downstream in FCR could result in the promotion of non-N-fixing phytoplankton upstream and N-fixing cyanobacteria downstream (Vanni et al. 2011; Hamre et al. 2018).

Importance of biogeochemical processing “hotspots”

Examining spatially explicit processing suggests that along the reservoir continuum, the stream–reservoir interface can be disproportionately important for whole-reservoir biogeochemical processing. Our spatially explicit metric of processing, $\Delta_{var}Site$, highlights that the stream–reservoir interface most consistently acts as a “hotspot” of biogeochemical processing, as shown in the largest values of $\Delta_{var}Site$ at the farthest upstream location in the reservoir for most variables (Fig. 6). This finding is in line with previous conceptual frameworks (McClain et al. 2003; Bernhardt et al. 2017), field measurements (Marcé et al. 2021; Sadro et al. 2011; Ward et al. 2022), and laboratory experiments (Lambert and Perga 2019), which also suggest that ecosystem boundaries, particularly those between stream and lake ecosystems, serve as ecosystem hotspots. This result is likely driven by multiple mechanisms. First, inflowing streams provide subsidies of nutrients and C, which can be processed and transformed by organisms either via primary production or decomposition (Wetzel 2001). Second, physical processes may also play an important role. For example, if incoming stream water is much colder than reservoir surface water, the parcel of stream water may plunge to the bottom of the reservoir, resulting in delivery of organic matter and nutrients deeper within the water column or in the sediments (Thornton et al. 1990), where they would not be measurable via our sampling method in surface waters. In FCR and BVR, it is

likely that both of these mechanisms play a role in driving the importance of the stream–reservoir interface in biogeochemical processing, as the inflowing streams in FCR and BVR were 3.9 °C and 4.7 °C colder, respectively than the average reservoir site water temperature (Text S2, Fig. S3). Altogether, our data suggest that the stream–reservoir interface is a key location of biogeochemical processing, which can inform reservoir field monitoring programs to better understand how reservoirs function as sinks or sources of biogeochemical variables.

Interestingly, we did find some exceptions to the stream–reservoir interface dominating the location of processing “hotspots.” These exceptions (i.e., large $\Delta_{var}Site$ values) occurred inconsistently at different sites throughout the reservoir. However, they occurred more often in BVR than in FCR, and in FCR during our April sampling, when discharge was highest. These results suggest that some reservoirs may be more spatially variable than others in locations of hotspots and that changes in stream inflow volume, or temporary increases in the relative importance of smaller, unmonitored tributaries along the continuum, can influence processing rates. In larger, more morphologically variable reservoirs (e.g., with multiple inflow streams along the reservoir, higher shoreline development indices), biogeochemical processing may occur less consistently in the furthest upstream stream–reservoir interface due to additional inflow streams entering the reservoir downstream or greater influence of overland runoff. Similarly, increased inflow volumes are directly connected to shorter water residence times, which may limit processing upstream and instead favor processing occurring further along the reservoir continuum where water flows have slowed (i.e., in the transitional and lacustrine regions, as we observed in April in FCR).

Comparing values of $\Delta_{var}Site$ with the traditional method of estimating whole-reservoir function, $\Delta_{var}WR$, suggests limitations of traditional whole-ecosystem mass balance approaches that tend to focus on sources into and out of the reservoir. Because most monitoring programs sample at stream sites and the deepest lacustrine sites only, current methods would provide biased estimates of reservoir functioning according to our results. For example, the estimate of whole-reservoir function, $\Delta_{var}WR$, shows that BVR was a sink of NO_3 on all sampling days. However, the reservoir was both a sink and a source of NO_3 at different locations within the reservoir on a single sampling day according to $\Delta_{var}Site$ (Fig. 6). We see a similar pattern for most variables in BVR (i.e., a mismatch between $\Delta_{var}WR$ and individual values of $\Delta_{var}Site$ along the continuum), indicating that complex dynamics occur along the reservoir continuum which are ignored by measuring only one reservoir site. Identifying and monitoring reservoir biogeochemical hotspots is critical to improving our ability to predict variability in biogeochemical processing, enhancing our understanding of

global biogeochemical cycles, and informing water quality management.

Strengths and limitations of study design and directions for future research

Our study provides a novel examination of spatial and temporal variability of biogeochemical concentrations and processing in reservoirs, motivating future research. First, both of our study reservoirs are relatively small and shallow. While reservoirs of similar size (less than 1 km²) make up ~99% of reservoirs globally (Lehner et al. 2011), larger reservoirs may have more complex morphology and as a result exhibit different patterns and drivers of spatial variability. Second, BVR is mesotrophic (mean TP of 15.5 µg/L, mean chl-a of 6.35 µg/L) and FCR is eutrophic (FCR mean TP of 28.7 µg/L, mean chl-a of 8.95 µg/L; following Carlson and Simpson 1996), with algal blooms occurring regularly in FCR (Carey et al. 2022d). Research in a hyper-eutrophic lake of similar size shows that the presence of algal blooms can dramatically increase spatial heterogeneity as the blooms move from one location to another (Ortiz and Wilkinson 2021). Studies conducted in additional systems, especially those which are oligotrophic, may illuminate different patterns in spatial heterogeneity and highlight differences among systems of diverse trophic states.

Third, additional spatial data may help increase the utility of our biogeochemical processing metric, $\Delta_{var}Site$. For example, by estimating the location of the stream plunge-point (i.e., where the incoming stream water plunges into the reservoir), Marcé et al. (2021) were able to specifically pinpoint locations of processing and associated changes in dissolved organic matter composition. Because we sampled at discrete, set locations within each reservoir region irrespective of stream plunge points, we were unable to identify the exact location where processing occurred, but rather regions within which high rates of processing likely occurred.

Fourth, because water residence time is dependent on depth and bathymetry, it is likely to change within a reservoir along the longitudinal continuum. Calculating reservoir site-specific residence times, as opposed to using the outflow of the entire reservoir, could improve our spatial processing metric. Our Eq. 1, which was based on using specific conductance to account for changing hydrology, likely resulted in more conservative estimates of $\Delta_{var}Site$ processing than what actually occurred because of small differences in specific conductance between the inflowing stream and most upstream reservoir sites. Higher values of specific conductance at stream sites resulted in lower calculations of incoming nutrient and C loads for the stream component of Eq. 1, thereby resulting in smaller values of $\Delta_{var}Site$. Standardizing specific conductance at stream sites to be equal to the

observed specific conductance at the first within-reservoir site (Fig. S7) indicates that our Eq. 1 calculations likely underestimated values of $\Delta_{var}Site$ at the stream–reservoir interface, increasing our confidence in this region as a major site of biogeochemical processing.

Finally, collecting samples of biogeochemical variables throughout the water column, as opposed to just the surface, may also help inform some of the patterns we observed. For example, by sampling throughout the water column, we may be able to parse additional sources of nutrients within the reservoir, e.g., via sediment release or interflow. Altogether, a more detailed approach to sampling nutrients and C within reservoir continua will help inform the fate of biogeochemical variables and advance our understanding of how these variables change across ecosystems.

Conclusions

Our study informs future research on spatial and temporal heterogeneity across lentic ecosystems. While we focus on reservoirs which primarily release surface waters downstream, our results likely hold for reservoirs with selective depth water withdrawal, as well as naturally formed lakes with surface water outflows. Given that these waterbodies are typically only sampled at their deepest point, we are likely missing important spatial variability influencing whole-ecosystem biogeochemical dynamics. Our work points to the need for more data examining the role of the stream–reservoir interface as “hotspots” of biogeochemical processing, as well as the need for understanding when and why these hotspots dominate whole-ecosystem dynamics. Finally, our study provides support for temporal sampling that occurs over multiple months to capture the full variability in reservoir functioning. Ultimately, a better quantification of when and where biogeochemical variables are processed within reservoirs will advance our understanding of the important role reservoirs play in global biogeochemical cycles.

Supplementary Information The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00027-023-00959-7>.

Acknowledgements We thank the Western Virginia Water Authority for their long-term access to field sites and continuing support and engagement in this research. We thank many field and lab assistants, especially Rose Thai, James Maze, Jacob Wynne, Ryan McClure, Dexter Howard, Nicholas Hammond, Kait Farrell, and Bethany Bookout for their critical help in field and lab work, as well as B. Niederlehner for her tireless efforts in sample analysis. We thank the Virginia Tech Stream Team, especially Stephen Plont and Erin Hotchkiss, the Carey Lab and Reservoir Group, and the Global Lake Ecological Observatory Network for their support and feedback on this study.

Author contributions W.W.M., A.G.H., and C.C.C. co-conceived the design of the study. W.W.M. and A.G.H. led field sampling, with

assistance from A.S.L., H.L.W., and M.E.L. W.M.W., A.G.H., and H.L.W. analyzed water chemistry samples, with analytical support from D.S. A.S.L. contributed to figure design, and C.C.C., M.E.L., and D.S. contributed to conceptual development, which substantially improved the quality of the manuscript. W.M.W. led the writing of the manuscript with C.C.C., A.G.H., and M.E.L., and all authors contributed to manuscript editing.

Funding This work was supported by the National Science Foundation (DEB-1753639, DBI-1933016, DBI-1933102, DEB-1926050, DGE-1651272), the Fralin Life Sciences Institute, and the Western Virginia Water Authority.

Data availability All data used in this study are published and available within the Environmental Data Initiative repository (Hounshell et al. 2021; Carey et al. 2020, 2021, 2022b, 2022c, 2022d, 2022e, 2022f). All code used to download data, generate data specific to this study, and conduct analyses are available in a Zenodo repository (Woelmer 2023).

Declarations

Conflict of interest The authors declare no competing interests.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

References

- Alboukadel, K (2020) ggpubr: 'ggplot2' based publication ready plots. R package version 0.4.0. <https://www.CRAN.R-project.org/package=ggpubr>. Accessed on 30 March 2023
- ArcGIS Pro (Version 2.2.0) Esri Inc (2021) <https://www.esri.com/en-us/arcgis/products/arcgis-pro/overview>. Accessed on 30 March 2023
- Baker M, Webster J (2017) Conservative and reactive solute dynamics. In: Lamberti GA, Richard Hauer F (eds) Methods in stream ecology volume 2: ecosystem function, 3rd edn. Academic Press, London, pp 129–145
- Barbosa FAR, Padisák J, Espindola ELG et al (1999) The Cascading Reservoir Continuum Concept (CRCC) and its application to the river Tietê-basin, São Paulo State, Brazil. Sao Pedro, Brazil. Theor Ecol Appl 425–439
- Berberich ME, Beaulieu JJ, Hamilton TL et al (2020) Spatial variability of sediment methane production and methanogen communities within a eutrophic reservoir: importance of organic matter source and quantity. Limnol Oceanogr 65(6):1336–1358. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lno.11392>
- Bernhardt ES, Blaszczyk JR, Ficken CD et al (2017) Control points in ecosystems: moving beyond the hot spot hot moment concept. Ecosystems 20:665–682. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-016-0103-y>
- Borges PAF, Train S, Rodrigues LC (2008) Spatial and temporal variation of phytoplankton in two subtropical Brazilian reservoirs. Hydrobiologia 607:63–74. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-008-9367-3>
- Boström B, Andersen JM, Fleischer S, Jansson M (1988) Exchange of phosphorus across the sediment-water interface. In: Persson G, Jansson M (eds) Phosphorus in freshwater ecosystems. Developments in hydrobiology, vol 48. Springer, Dordrecht. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-3109-1_14
- Brett MT, Benjamin MM (2008) A review and reassessment of lake phosphorus retention and the nutrient loading concept. Freshw Biol 53:194–211. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.2007.01862.x>
- Brown PD, Wurtsbaugh WA, Nydick KR et al (2008) Lakes and forests as determinants of downstream nutrient concentrations in small mountain watersheds. Arct Antarct Alp Res 40(3):462–469. [https://doi.org/10.1657/1523-0430\(07-052\)\[BROWN\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1657/1523-0430(07-052)[BROWN]2.0.CO;2)
- Carey CC, Lofton ME, Woelmer WM et al (2020) Filtered chlorophyll a time series for Beaverdam Reservoir, Carvins Cove Reservoir, Claytor Lake, Falling Creek Reservoir, Gatewood Reservoir, Smith Mountain Lake, and Spring Hollow Reservoir in southwestern Virginia, USA during 2014–2019 ver 1. Environ Data Initiat. <https://doi.org/10.6073/pasta/4103be6062b768867e1f3b016665a35c>
- Carey CC, Wander HL, Woelmer WM et al (2021) Water chemistry time series for Beaverdam Reservoir, Carvins Cove Reservoir, Falling Creek Reservoir, Gatewood Reservoir, and Spring Hollow Reservoir in southwestern Virginia, USA 2013–2020 ver 9. Environ Data Initiat. <https://doi.org/10.6073/pasta/6343e979a970e8a2590b4a450e851dd2>
- Carey CC, Hanson PC, Thomas RQ et al (2022a) Anoxia decreases the magnitude of the carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorus sink in freshwaters. Glob Change Biol. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.16228>
- Carey CC, Wander HL, McClure RP et al (2022b) Secchi depth data and discrete depth profiles of photosynthetically active radiation, temperature, dissolved oxygen, and pH for Beaverdam Reservoir, Carvins Cove Reservoir, Falling Creek Reservoir, Gatewood Reservoir, and Spring Hollow Reservoir in southwestern Virginia, USA 2013–2021 ver 10. Environ Data Initiat. <https://doi.org/10.6073/pasta/887d8ab8c57fb8fdf3582507f3223cd6>
- Carey CC, Breef-Pilz A, Howard DW et al (2022c) Manually-collected discharge data for multiple inflow tributaries entering Falling creek reservoir, Beaverdam Reservoir, and Carvins Cove reservoir, Vinton and Roanoke, Virginia, USA from 2019–2021 ver 5. Environ Data Initiat. <https://doi.org/10.6073/pasta/9992f38175e38a03ce5aa794eefec857>
- Carey CC, Lewis AS, McClure RP et al (2022d) Time series of high-frequency profiles of depth, temperature, dissolved oxygen, conductivity, specific conductance, chlorophyll a, turbidity, pH, oxidation-reduction potential, photosynthetic active radiation, and descent rate for Beaverdam Reservoir, Carvins Cove Reservoir, Falling Creek Reservoir, Gatewood Reservoir, and Spring Hollow Reservoir in Southwestern Virginia, USA 2013–2021 ver 12. Environ Data Initiat. <https://doi.org/10.6073/pasta/c4c45b5b10b4cb4cd4b5e613c3effbd0>
- Carey CC, Breef-Pilz A, Woelmer WM et al (2022e) Time series of high-frequency sensor data measuring water temperature, dissolved oxygen, pressure, conductivity, specific conductance, total dissolved solids, chlorophyll a, phycocyanin, and fluorescent dissolved organic matter at discrete depths in Falling Creek Reservoir, Virginia, USA in 2018–2021 ver 6. Environ Data Initiat. <https://doi.org/10.6073/pasta/81c6c76f4fe22434a20aa8c00f2d4ad1>
- Carey CC, Breef-Pilz A, Bookout BJ (2022f) Time series of high-frequency meteorological data at Falling Creek Reservoir, Virginia, USA 2015–2021 ver 6. Environ Data Initiat. <https://doi.org/10.6073/pasta/35d8d3f9390408f12d39e44e3f03abbe>

- Carlson RE, Simpson J (1996) A coordinator's guide to volunteer lake monitoring methods. *N Am Lake Manag Soc* 96:305
- Carneiro FM, Bini LM (2020) Revisiting the concept of longitudinal gradients in reservoirs. *Acta Limnol Bras*. <https://doi.org/10.1590/s2179-975x1319>
- Casas-Ruiz JP, Catalán N, Gómez-Gener L et al (2017) A tale of pipes and reactors: controls on the in-stream dynamics of dissolved organic matter in rivers. *Limnol Oceanogr* 62:S85–S94. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lno.10471>
- Clow DW, Stackpoole SM, Verdin KL et al (2015) Organic carbon burial in lakes and reservoirs of the conterminous United States. *Environ Sci Technol* 49:7614–7622. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.est.5b00373>
- Collins SM, Yuan S, Tan PN et al (2019) Winter precipitation and summer temperature predict lake water quality at macroscales. *Water Resour Res* 55:2708–2721. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018WR023088>
- de Eyto E, Jennings E, Ryder E et al (2016) Response of a humic lake ecosystem to an extreme precipitation event: physical, chemical, and biological implications. *Inland Waters* 6:483–498. <https://doi.org/10.1080/IW-6.4.875>
- De Senerpont Domis LN, Elser JJ, Gsell AS et al (2013) Plankton dynamics under different climatic conditions in space and time. *Freshw Biol* 58:463–482. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.12053>
- Delontro T, Kunz MJ, Kempter et al (2011) Spatial heterogeneity of methane ebullition in a large tropical reservoir. *Environ Sci Tech* 45(23):9866–9873. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es2005545>
- Downing JA, Watson SB, McCauley E (2001) Predicting cyanobacteria dominance in lakes. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci* 58:1905–1908. <https://doi.org/10.1139/f01-143>
- Downing JA, Prairie YT, Cole JJ, Duarte CM, Tranvik LJ, Striegl RG, McDowell WH, Kortelainen P, Caraco NF, Melack JM, Middelburg JJ (2006) The global abundance and size distribution of lakes, ponds, and impoundments. *Limnol Oceanogr*. <https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2006.51.5.2388>
- Drastik V, Kubecka J, Tuser M et al (2008) The effect of hydropower on fish stocks: comparison between cascade and non-cascade reservoirs. *Hydrobiologia* 609:25. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-008-9393-1>
- Fellman JB, Hood E, Spencer RGM (2010) Fluorescence spectroscopy opens new windows into dissolved organic matter dynamics in freshwater ecosystems: a review. *Limnol Oceanogr* 55:2452–2462. <https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2010.55.6.2452>
- Furey PC, Nordin RN, Mazumder A (2004) Water level drawdown affects physical and biogeochemical properties of littoral sediments of a reservoir and a natural lake. *Lake Reserv Manage* 20(4):280–295. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07438140409354158>
- Gabor R, Baker A, McKnight DM, Miller M (2014) Fluorescence indices and their interpretation. In: Coble P, Lead J, Baker A, Reynolds D, Spencer RGM (eds) *Aquatic organic matter fluorescence*. Cambridge Univ Press, Cambridge, pp 303–338. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139045452.015>
- Gerling AB, Browne RG, Gantzer et al (2014) First report of the successful operation of a side stream supersaturation hypolimnetic oxygenation system in a eutrophic, shallow reservoir. *Water Res* 67:129–143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.watres.2014.09.002>
- Gerling AB, Munger ZW, Doubek JP et al (2016) Whole-catchment manipulations of internal and external loading reveal the sensitivity of a century-old reservoir to hypoxia. *Ecosystems* 19:555–571. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-015-9951-0>
- Gloss SP, Mayer LM, Kidd DE (1980) Advective control of nutrient dynamics in the epilimnion of a large reservoir. *Limnol Oceanogr* 25(2):219–228. <https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.1980.25.2.0219>
- Guillemette F, McCallister SL, del Giorgio PA (2013) Differentiating the degradation dynamics of algal and terrestrial carbon within complex natural dissolved organic carbon in temperate lakes. *J Geophys Res* 118:963–973. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jgrg.20077>
- Hamre KD, Lofton ME, McClure RP et al (2018) In situ fluorometry reveals a persistent, perennial hypolimnetic cyanobacterial bloom in a seasonally anoxic reservoir. *Freshw Sci* 37:000–000. <https://doi.org/10.1086/699327>
- Harrison JA, Maranger RJ, Alexander RB et al (2009) The regional and global significance of nitrogen removal in lakes and reservoirs. *Biogeochemistry* 93:143–157. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10533-008-9272-x>
- Hayes NM, Deemer BR, Corman JR et al (2017) Key differences between lakes and reservoirs modify climate signals: a case for a new conceptual model. *Limnol Oceanogr Lett* 2:47–62. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lo2.10036>
- Hessen DO, Elser JJ, Sterner RW, Urabe J (2013) Ecological stoichiometry: an elementary approach using basic principles. *Limnol Oceanogr* 58:2219–2236. <https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2013.58.6.2219>
- Hotchkiss ER, Sadro S, Hanson PC (2018) Toward a more integrative perspective on carbon metabolism across lentic and lotic inland waters. *Limnol Oceanogr Lett* 3:57–63. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lo2.10081>
- Hounshell AG, Thai RH, Peeler KA et al (2021) Time series of optical measurements (absorbance, fluorescence) for Beaverdam and Falling Creek Reservoir in Southwestern Virginia, USA 2019–2020 ver 1. *Environ Data Initiat*. <https://doi.org/10.6073/pasta/d1062b14ed1df86507414afe8d45dc75>
- Jane SF, Rose KC (2018) Carbon quality regulates the temperature dependence of aquatic ecosystem respiration. *Freshw Biol*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13168>
- Jennings E, Jones S, Arvola L et al (2012) Effects of weather-related episodic events in lakes: an analysis based on high-frequency data. *Freshw Biol* 57:589–601. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.2011.02729.x>
- Kasprzak P, Shatwell T, Gessner MO et al (2017) Extreme weather event triggers cascade towards extreme turbidity in a clear-water lake. *Ecosystems* 20:1407–1420. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-017-0121-4>
- Keller PS, Marcé R, Obrador B, Koschorreck M (2021) Global carbon budget of reservoirs is overturned by the quantification of draw-down areas. *Nat Geosci* 14(6):402–408. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41561-021-00734-z>
- Keys TA, Caudill MF, Scott DT (2019) Storm effects on nitrogen flux and longitudinal variability in a river—reservoir system. *River Res Appl*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/rra.3433>
- Klausmeier CA, Litchman E, Levin SA (2004) Phytoplankton growth and stoichiometry under multiple nutrient limitation. *Limnol Oceanogr* 49:1463–1470. https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2004.49.4_part_2.1463
- Klippel G, Macêdo RL, Branco CWC (2020) Comparison of different trophic state indices applied to tropical reservoirs. *Lakes and Reserv* 25:214–229. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lre.12320>
- Lambert T, Perga ME (2019) Non-conservative patterns of dissolved organic matter degradation when and where lake water mixes. *Aquat Sci* 81:1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00027-019-0662-z>
- Lehner B, Liermann CR, Revenga C et al (2011) High-resolution mapping of the world's reservoirs and dams for sustainable river-flow management. *Front Ecol Environ* 9:494–502. <https://doi.org/10.1890/100125>
- Linkhorst A, Hiller C, DelSontro T et al (2020) Comparing methane ebullition variability across space and time in a Brazilian reservoir. *Limnol Oceanogr* 65(7):1623–1634. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lno.11410>
- Linkhorst A, Paranaíba JR, Mendonça et al (2021) Spatially resolved measurements in tropical reservoirs reveal elevated methane ebullition at river inflows and at high productivity. *Global*

- Biogeochem Cy 35(5):1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2020GB006717>
- Lv H, Yang J, Liu L et al (2014) Temperature and nutrients are significant drivers of seasonal shift in phytoplankton community from a drinking water reservoir, subtropical China. *Environ Sci Pollut Res* 21:5917–5928. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-014-2534-3>
- Maavara T, Parsons CT, Ridenour C et al (2015) Global phosphorus retention by river damming. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 112:15603–15608. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1511797112>
- Maavara T, Chen Q, Van Meter K et al (2020) River dam impacts on biogeochemical cycling. *Nat Rev Earth Environ* 1:103–116. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-019-0019-0>
- Maranger R, Jones SE, Cotner JB (2018) Stoichiometry of carbon, nitrogen, and phosphorus through the freshwater pipe. *Limnol Oceanogr Lett* 3:89–101. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lol2.10080>
- Marcé R, Verdura L, Leung N (2021) Dissolved organic matter spectroscopy reveals a hot spot of organic matter changes at the river–reservoir boundary. *Aquat Sci*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00027-021-00823-6>
- Matsuzaki SS, Kohzu A, Tsuchiya K, Shinohara R, Nakagawa M, Fukumori K, Yamaguchi H, Kondo NI, Kadoya T (2022) Water-level drawdowns can improve surface water quality and alleviate bottom hypoxia in shallow, eutrophic water bodies. *Freshwater Biol*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.14020>
- McClain ME, Boyer EW, Dent CL et al (2003) Biogeochemical hot spots and hot moments at the interface of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems. *Ecosystems*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-003-0161-9>
- McClure RP, Lofton ME, Chen S, Krueger KM, Little JC, Carey CC (2020) The magnitude and drivers of methane ebullition and diffusion vary on a longitudinal gradient in a small freshwater reservoir. *J Geophys Res-Biogeosci* 125:e2019JG005205. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JG005205>
- Nilsson C, Reidy CA, Dynesius M, Revenga C (2005) Fragmentation and flow regulation of the world's large river systems. *Science* 308:405–408. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1107887>
- Nürnberg GK (1988) Prediction of phosphorus release rates from total and reductant-soluble phosphorus in anoxic lake sediments. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci* 45:453–462. <https://doi.org/10.1139/f88-054>
- Ortiz DA, Wilkinson GM (2021) Capturing the spatial variability of algal bloom development in a shallow temperate lake. *Freshw Biol* 66:2064–2075. <https://doi.org/10.1111/fwb.13814>
- Pierson DC, Samal NR, Owens EM et al (2013) Changes in the timing of snowmelt and the seasonality of nutrient loading: can models simulate the impacts on freshwater trophic status? *Hydrol Process* 27:3083–3093. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hyp.9894>
- Powers SM, Tank JL, Robertson DM (2015) Control of nitrogen and phosphorus transport by reservoirs in agricultural landscapes. *Biogeochemistry* 124:417–439. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10533-015-0106-3>
- Preece EP, Moore BC, Skinner et al (2019) A review of the biological and chemical effects of hypolimnetic oxygenation. *Lake Reserv Manage* 35(3):229–246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10402381.2019.1580325>
- R Core Team (2022) R: A Language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Redfield AC (1934) On the proportions of organic derivatives in sea water and their relation to the composition of plankton. *James Johnstone Memorial, Liverpool*, pp 176–192
- Robson BJ, Dourdet V (2015) Prediction of sediment, particulate nutrient and dissolved nutrient concentrations in a dry tropical river to provide input to a mechanistic coastal water quality model. *Environ Model Softw* 63:97–108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2014.08.009>
- Rychtecky P, Znachor P (2011) Spatial heterogeneity and seasonal succession of phytoplankton along the longitudinal gradient in a eutrophic reservoir. *Hydrobiologia* 663:175–186. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-010-0571-6>
- Rydin E (2000) Potentially mobile phosphorus in Lake Erken sediment. *Water Res* 34:2037–2042. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354\(99\)00375-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0043-1354(99)00375-9)
- Sadro S, Melack JM, MacIntyre S (2011) Spatial and temporal variability in the ecosystem metabolism of a high-elevation lake: integrating benthic and pelagic habitats. *Ecosystems* 14:1123–1140. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-011-9471-5>
- Sadro S, Nelson CE, Melack JM (2012) The influence of landscape position and catchment characteristics on aquatic biogeochemistry in high-elevation lake-chains. *Ecosystems* 15:363–386. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-011-9515-x>
- Schindler DW, Curtis PJ, Parker BR, Stainton MP (1996) Consequences of climate warming and lake acidification for UV-B penetration in North American boreal lakes. *Nature* 379:705–708. <https://doi.org/10.1038/379705a0>
- Scott JT, Stanley JK, Doyle RD et al (2009) River—reservoir transition zones are nitrogen fixation hot spots regardless of ecosystem trophic state. *Hydrobiologia* 625:61–68. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-008-9696-2>
- Shaughnessy AR, Sloan JJ, Corcoran MJ, Hasenmueller EA (2019) Sediments in agricultural reservoirs act as sinks and sources for nutrients over various timescales. *Water Resour Res*. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018WR024004>
- Soares LMV, do Calijuri MC (2021) Deterministic modelling of freshwater lakes and reservoirs: current trends and recent progress. *Environ Model Softw* 144:105143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2021.105143>
- Soares MCS, Marinho MM, Azevedo SMOF et al (2012) Eutrophication and retention time affecting spatial heterogeneity in a tropical reservoir. *Limnologia* 42:197–203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.limno.2011.11.002>
- Solomon CT, Jones SE, Weidel BC et al (2015) Ecosystem consequences of changing inputs of terrestrial dissolved organic matter to lakes: current knowledge and future challenges. *Ecosystems* 18:376–389. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-015-9848-y>
- Sommer U, Maciej Gliwicz Z, Lampert W, Duncan A (1986) The PEG-model of seasonal succession of planktonic events in fresh waters. *Arch Für Hydrobiologie* 106:433–471
- Stachelek J, Soranno PA (2019) Does freshwater connectivity influence phosphorus retention in lakes? *Limnol Oceanogr* 64:1586–1599. <https://doi.org/10.1002/lno.11137>
- Sterner R, Elser JJ (2002) Ecological stoichiometry: the biology of elements from molecules to the biosphere. Princeton University Press, Princeton
- Stratton LE, Haggerty R, Grant GE (2019) The importance of coarse organic matter and depositional environment to carbon burial behind dams in mountainous environments. *J Geophys Res Earth* 124(8):2118–2140. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2019JF005005>
- Strauss EA, Lamberti GA (2002) Effect of dissolved organic carbon quality on microbial decomposition and nitrification rates in stream sediments. *Freshw Biol* 47:65–74. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2427.2002.00776.x>
- Syvitski JPM, Vorosmarty CJ, Kettner AJ, Green P (2005) Impact of humans on the flux of terrestrial sediment to the global coastal ocean. *Science* 308:376–381
- Thornton KW, Kimmel BL, Payne FE (1990) Reservoir limnology-ecological perspectives. John Wiley and Sons, New York
- Torres I, Resck R, Pinto-Coelho R (2007) Mass balance estimation of nitrogen, carbon, phosphorus and total suspended solids in the urban eutrophic, Pampulha Reservoir, Brazil. *Acta Limnol Bras* 19:79–91

- Tranvik LJ, Downing JA, Cotner JB et al (2009) Lakes and reservoirs as regulators of carbon cycling and climate. *Limnol Oceanogr* 54:2298–2314. https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2009.54.6_part_2.2298
- Triska FJ, Kennedy VC, Avanzino RJ et al (1989) Retention and transport of nutrients in a third-order stream in northwestern California: hyporheic processes. *Ecology* 70(6):1893–1905. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1938120>
- Vanni MJ, Renwick WH, Bowling AM et al (2011) Nutrient stoichiometry of linked catchment-lake systems along a gradient of land use. *Freshw Biol* 56:791–811. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.2010.02436.x>
- Varol M, Gökot B, Bekleyen A, Şen B (2012) Spatial and temporal variations in surface water quality of the dam reservoirs in the Tigris River basin, Turkey. *CATENA* 92:11–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.catena.2011.11.013>
- Vollenweider RA (1975) Input-output models—with special reference to the phosphorus loading concept in limnology. *Schweizerische Z Für Hydrologie* 37:53–84. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02505178>
- Waldo S, Beaulieu JJ, Barnett W et al (2021) Temporal trends in methane emissions from a small eutrophic reservoir: the key role of a spring burst. *Biogeosciences* 18(19):5291–5311. <https://doi.org/10.5194/bg-18-5291-2021>
- Wang F, Maberly SC, Wang B, Liang X (2018) Effects of dams on riverine biogeochemical cycling and ecology. *Inland Waters* 8:130–140. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20442041.2018.1469335>
- Ward NK, Brentrup JA, Richardson DC, Weathers KC, Hanson PC, Hewett RJ, Carey CC (2022) Dynamics of the stream—lake transitional zone affect littoral lake metabolism. *Aquat Sci* 84(3):1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00027-022-00854-7>
- Watson SB, McCauley E, Downing JA (1997) Patterns in phytoplankton taxonomic composition across temperate lakes of differing nutrient status. *Limnol Oceanogr* 42:487–495. <https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.1997.42.3.0487>
- Weathers KC, Strayer DL, Likens GE (2021) Fundamentals of ecosystem science. Academic Press, San Diego
- Wetzel RG (2001) Limnology, 3rd edn. Academic Press, San Diego
- Williamson TJ, Vanni MJ, Renwick WH (2021) Spatial and temporal variability of nutrient dynamics and ecosystem metabolism in a hyper-eutrophic reservoir differ between a wet and dry year. *Ecosystems* 24:68–88. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-020-00505-8>
- Winslow L, Read J, Woolway R et al (2019) rLakeAnalyzer: Lake physics tools. R package version 1.11.4.1. <https://www.CRAN.R-project.org/package=rLakeAnalyzer>. Accessed on 30 March 2023
- Woelmer WM (2023) wwoelmer/ReservoirContinuum: release following revisions to MS at aquatic sciences (AquaticSciences_MS_Feb23_v20). Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7646740>
- Woldeab B, Beyene A, Ambelu A et al (2018) Seasonal and spatial variation of reservoir water quality in the southwest of Ethiopia. *Environ Monit Assess* 190:1. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-018-6527-4>
- Wurtsbaugh WA, Baker MA, Gross HP, Brown PD (2005) Lakes as nutrient “sources” for watersheds: a landscape analysis of the temporal flux of nitrogen through sub-alpine lakes and streams. *Internationale Ver Für Theoretische Und Angewandte Limnologie: Verhandlungen* 29(2):645–649. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03680770.2005.11902758>

Publisher's Note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.