Supplementary Information

Table S1. Results of ascending hierarchical clustering for nutrient treatments. N-deficient (NN) and P-deficient (NP) oligopeptide compositions were, respectively, compared to control conditions (NC). The assignment to each cluster is expressed as a percentage of treatment replicates. Different treatments are codified according to strain name, treatment applied and day of sampling (*i.e.*, 265 NC t10 corresponds to UAM265, control conditions, day 10). *n* stands for number of replicates analyzed in each case.

Strain UAM	[254						Α
NN vs. NC				NP vs. NC			11
Treatment	п	Cluster A	Cluster B	Treatment	п	Cluster A	Cluster B
254 N t0	19	95%	5%	254 N t0	19	100%	0%
254 NC t6	20	95%	5%	254 NC t6	20	100%	0%
254 NC t10	20	100%	0%	254 NC t0	20	100%	0%
254 NC t15	20	5%	95%	254 NC t15	20	20%	80%
254 NC 115	20 79	73%	27%	254 NC	20 79	2070 80%	20%
254110	17	/5/0	2770	234 110	1)	0070	2070
254 NN t6	20	15%	85%	254 NP t6	20	100%	0%
254 NN t10	20	5%	95%	254 NP t10	20	100%	0%
254 NN t15	20	0%	100%	254 NP t15	20	100%	0%
254 NN	60	7%	93%	254 NP	60	100%	0%
Strain UAM	1264						В
NN vs. NC				NP vs. NC			
Treatment	n	Cluster A	Cluster B	Treatment	n	Cluster A	Cluster B
264 N t0	20	95%	5%	264 N t0	20	85%	15%
264 NC t6	20	100%	0%	264 NC t6	20	100%	0%
264 NC t10	20	100%	0%	264 NC t10	20	95%	5%
264 NC t15	20	100%	0%	264 NC t15	20	95%	5%
264 NC	80	99%	1%	264 NC	80	94%	6%
264 NN t6	20	95%	5%	264 NP t6	19	95%	5%
264 NN t10	19	84%	16%	264 NP t10	20	75%	25%
264 NN t15	20	100%	0%	264 NP t15	21	100%	0%
264 NN	59	93%	7%	264 NP	60	90%	10%
Studie UAN	12/5						С
Strain UAM	1203			NP vs. NC			C
Treatment	п	Cluster A	Cluster B	Treatment	п	Cluster A	Cluster B
265 N t0	20	85%	15%	265 N t0	20	85%	15%
265 NC t6	20	65%	35%	265 NC t6	20	65%	35%
265 NC t10		50%	50%	265 NC t10		50%	50%
265 NC t15	20	95%	5%	265 NC t15		95%	5%
265 NC t20	19	42%	58%	265 NC t20	19	42%	58%
265 NC	97	68%	32%	265 NC	97	68%	32%
265 NN t6	20	25%	75%	265 NP t6	20	45%	55%
265 NN t10	20	25%	75%	265 NP t10	20	50%	50%
265 NN t15	20	15%	85%	265 NP t15	20	40%	60%
265 NN t20	20	10%	90%	265 NP t20	20	5%	95%
265 NN	80	19%	81%	265 NP	80	35%	65%

Table S2. Results of ascending hierarchical clustering for light intensity treatments. One-hundred fifty micro-mole photons m-2 s-1 (LM) and 400 μ mol photons m-2 s-1 (LS) oligopeptide compositions were, respectively, compared to low light (LL). The assignment to each cluster is expressed as a percentage of treatment replicates. Different treatments are codified according to strain name, treatment applied and day of sampling (*i.e.*, 265 LL t10 corresponds to UAM265, low light conditions (control), day 10). *n* stands for number of replicates analyzed in each case.

Strain UAM	[254						Α
LM vs. LL				LH vs. LL			
Treatment	n	Cluster A	Cluster B	Treatment	n	Cluster A	Cluster B
254 L t0	20	100%	0%	254 L t0	20	100%	0%
254 LL t6	20	100%	0%	254 LL t6	20	100%	0%
254 LL t10	18	89%	11%	254 LL t10	18	94%	6%
254 LL t15	19	95%	5%	254 LL t15	19	100%	0%
254 LL t20	19	84%	16%	254 LL t20	19	95%	5%
254 LL t40	20	80%	20%	254 LL t40	20	85%	15%
254 LL	116	91%	9%	254 LL	116	96%	4%
254 LM t6	20	95%	5%	254 LH t6	20	95%	5%
254 LM t10	16	38%	63%	254 LH t10	19	79%	21%
254 LM t15	20	0%	100%	254 LH t15	20	0%	100%
254 LM t20	20	0%	100%	254 LH t20	20	0%	100%
254 LM	76	33%	67%	254 LH	79	43%	57%
Strain UAM	12(4						_
							P
	1264			I H vg I I			В
LM vs. LL		Cluster A	Cluster B	LH vs. LL Treatment	и	Cluster A	
LM vs. LL Treatment	n	Cluster A		Treatment	<i>n</i> 19		Cluster B
LM vs. LL Treatment 264 L t0	n 19	79%	21%	Treatment 264 L t0	19	79%	Cluster B 21%
LM vs. LL Treatment 264 L t0 264 LL t6	n 19 20	79% 90%	21% 10%	Treatment 264 L t0 264 LL t6	19 20	79% 90%	Cluster B 21% 10%
LM vs. LL Treatment 264 L t0 264 LL t6 264 LL t10	n 19 20 20	79% 90% 75%	21% 10% 25%	Treatment 264 L t0 264 LL t6 264 LL t10	19 20 20	79% 90% 75%	Cluster B 21% 10% 25%
LM vs. LL Treatment 264 L t0 264 LL t6 264 LL t10 264 LL t15	n 19 20 20 19	79% 90% 75% 37%	21% 10% 25% 63%	Treatment 264 L t0 264 LL t6 264 LL t10 264 LL t15	19 20 20 19	79% 90% 75% 37%	Cluster B 21% 10% 25% 63%
LM vs. LL Treatment 264 L t0 264 LL t6 264 LL t10 264 LL t15 264 LL t20	n 19 20 20 19 19	79% 90% 75% 37% 84%	21% 10% 25% 63% 16%	Treatment 264 L t0 264 LL t6 264 LL t10 264 LL t15 264 LL t20	19 20 20 19 19	79% 90% 75% 37% 84%	Cluster B 21% 10% 25% 63% 16%
LM vs. LL Treatment 264 L t0 264 LL t6 264 LL t10 264 LL t15	n 19 20 20 19	79% 90% 75% 37%	21% 10% 25% 63%	Treatment 264 L t0 264 LL t6 264 LL t10 264 LL t15	19 20 20 19	79% 90% 75% 37%	Cluster B 21% 10% 25% 63%
LM vs. LL Treatment 264 L t0 264 LL t6 264 LL t10 264 LL t15 264 LL t20 264 LL t40	n 19 20 20 19 19 20	79% 90% 75% 37% 84% 80%	21% 10% 25% 63% 16% 20%	Treatment 264 L t0 264 LL t6 264 LL t10 264 LL t15 264 LL t20 264 LL t40	19 20 20 19 19 20	79% 90% 75% 37% 84% 80%	Cluster B 21% 10% 25% 63% 16% 20%
LM vs. LL Treatment 264 L t0 264 LL t6 264 LL t10 264 LL t15 264 LL t20 264 LL t40	n 19 20 20 19 19 20	79% 90% 75% 37% 84% 80%	21% 10% 25% 63% 16% 20%	Treatment 264 L t0 264 LL t6 264 LL t10 264 LL t15 264 LL t20 264 LL t40	19 20 20 19 19 20	79% 90% 75% 37% 84% 80%	Cluster B 21% 10% 25% 63% 16% 20%
LM vs. LL Treatment 264 L t0 264 LL t6 264 LL t10 264 LL t15 264 LL t20 264 LL t40 264 LL	n 19 20 20 19 19 20 117	79% 90% 75% 37% 84% 80% 73%	21% 10% 25% 63% 16% 20% 27%	Treatment 264 L t0 264 LL t6 264 LL t10 264 LL t15 264 LL t20 264 LL t40 264 LL	19 20 20 19 19 20 117	79% 90% 75% 37% 84% 80% 75%	Cluster B 21% 10% 25% 63% 16% 20% 25%
LM vs. LL Treatment 264 L t0 264 LL t6 264 LL t10 264 LL t15 264 LL t20 264 LL t40 264 LL 264 LL	n 19 20 20 19 19 20 117 19	79% 90% 75% 37% 84% 80% 73% 63%	21% 10% 25% 63% 16% 20% 27% 37%	Treatment 264 L t0 264 LL t6 264 LL t10 264 LL t15 264 LL t20 264 LL t40 264 LL 264 LL	19 20 20 19 19 20 117 20	79% 90% 75% 37% 84% 80% 75% 30%	Cluster B 21% 10% 25% 63% 16% 20% 25% 70%
LM vs. LL Treatment 264 L t0 264 LL t6 264 LL t10 264 LL t15 264 LL t20 264 LL t40 264 LL 264 LM t6 264 LM t10	n 19 20 20 19 19 20 117 19 20	79% 90% 75% 37% 84% 80% 73% 63% 70%	21% 10% 25% 63% 16% 20% 27% 37% 30%	Treatment 264 L t0 264 LL t6 264 LL t10 264 LL t15 264 LL t20 264 LL t40 264 LL 264 LH t6 264 LH t10	19 20 20 19 19 20 117 20 20 20	79% 90% 75% 37% 84% 80% 75% 30% 35%	Cluster B 21% 10% 25% 63% 16% 20% 25% 70% 65%
LM vs. LL Treatment 264 L t0 264 LL t6 264 LL t10 264 LL t15 264 LL t20 264 LL t40 264 LL 264 LM t6 264 LM t10 264 LM t15	n 19 20 20 19 19 20 117 19 20 20	79% 90% 75% 37% 84% 80% 73% 63% 70% 10%	21% 10% 25% 63% 16% 20% 27% 37% 30% 90%	Treatment 264 L t0 264 LL t6 264 LL t10 264 LL t15 264 LL t20 264 LL t40 264 LL 264 LH t6 264 LH t10 264 LH t15	19 20 20 19 19 20 117 20 20 20 20	79% 90% 75% 37% 84% 80% 75% 30% 35% 15%	Cluster B 21% 10% 25% 63% 16% 20% 25% 70% 65% 85%

Strain UAM	265	С		
LM vs. LL				
Treatment	п	Cluster A	Cluster B	
265 L t0	19	89%	11%	
265 LL t6	20	60%	40%	
265 LL t10	20	25%	75%	
265 LL t15	20	80%	20%	
265 LL t20	20	95%	5%	
265 LL t40	20	35%	65%	
265 LL	119	65%	35%	
265 LM t6	20	70%	30%	
265 LM t10	20	15%	85%	
265 LM t15	20	0%	100%	
265 LM t20	20	30%	70%	
265 LM	80	29%	71%	

Table S2. Cont.

 \bigcirc 2013 by the authors; licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/).