

Supplementary Information for Practical Guide to Measuring Wetland Carbon Pools and Fluxes

Sheel Bansal^{1*}, Irena F. Creed², Brian A. Tangen¹, Scott D. Bridgman³, Ankur R. Desai⁴, Ken W. Krauss⁵, Scott C. Neubauer⁶, Gregory B. Noe⁷, Donald O. Rosenberry⁸, Carl Trettin⁹, Kimberly P. Wickland¹⁰, Scott T. Allen¹¹, Ariane Arias-Ortiz¹², Anna R. Armitage¹³, Dennis Baldocchi¹⁴, Kakoli Banerjee¹⁵, David Bastviken¹⁶, Peter Berg¹⁷, Matthew Bogard¹⁸, Alex T. Chow¹⁹, William H. Conner²⁰, Christopher Craft²¹, Courtney Creamer²², Tonya DelSontro²³, Jamie A. Duberstein²⁰, Meagan Eagle²⁴, M. Siobhan Fennessy²⁵, Sarah A. Finkelstein²⁶, Mathias Göckede²⁷, Sabine Grunwald²⁸, Meghan Halabisky²⁹, Ellen Herbert³⁰, Mohammad M.R. Jahangir³¹, Olivia F. Johnson^{1,32}, Miriam C. Jones⁷, Jeffrey J. Kelleway³³, Sara Knox³⁴, Kevin D. Kroeger²⁴, Kevin A. Kuehn³⁵, David Lobb³⁶, Amanda L. Loder³⁷, Shizhou Ma³⁸, Damien T. Maher³⁹, Gavin McNicol⁴⁰, Jacob Meier¹, Beth A. Middleton⁵, Christopher Mills⁴¹, Purbasha Mistry³⁸, Abhijit Mitra⁴², Courtney Mobilian²¹, Amanda M. Nahlik⁴³, Sue Newman⁴⁴, Jessica L. O'Connell⁴⁵, Patty Oikawa⁴⁶, Max Post van der Burg¹, Charles A. Schutte⁴⁷, Changchun Song⁴⁸, Camille L. Stagg⁵, Jessica Turner⁴⁹, Rodrigo Vargas⁵⁰, Mark P. Waldrop²², Marcus B. Wallin⁵¹, Zhaohui Aleck Wang⁵², Eric J. Ward⁵, Debra A. Willard⁷, Stephanie Yarwood⁵³, Xiaoyan Zhu⁵⁴

*Corresponding author: Sheel Bansal, sbansal@usgs.gov

Affiliations

¹ U.S. Geological Survey, Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center, Jamestown, ND, USA

² Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences, University of Toronto Scarborough, Toronto, ON, Canada

³ Institute of Ecology and Evolution, University of Oregon, Eugene, OR, USA

⁴ Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA

⁵ U.S. Geological Survey, Wetland and Aquatic Research Center, Lafayette, LA, USA

⁶ Virginia Commonwealth University, Department of Biology, Richmond, VA, USA

⁷ U.S. Geological Survey, Florence Bascom Geoscience Center, Reston, VA, USA

⁸ U.S. Geological Survey, Water Mission Area, Lakewood, CO, USA

⁹ U.S. Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Research Station, Davis, CA, USA

¹⁰ U.S. Geological Survey, Geosciences and Environmental Change Science Center, Denver, CO, USA

¹¹ Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Science, University of Nevada, Reno, Reno, NV, USA

¹² Ecosystem Science Division, Department of Environmental Science, Policy and Management, University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA.

¹³ Department of Marine Biology, Texas A&M University at Galveston, Galveston, TX, USA

¹⁴ Department of Environmental Science, Policy and Management, University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA

¹⁵ Department of Biodiversity and Conservation of Natural Resources, Central University of Odisha, Koraput, Odisha, India

¹⁶ Department of Thematic Studies – Environmental change, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden

¹⁷ Department of Environmental Sciences, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA, USA

47 18 Department of Biological Sciences, University of Lethbridge, Lethbridge, AB, Canada
48 19 Earth and Environmental Sciences Programme, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin,
49 Hong Kong SAR, China
50 20 Baruch Institute of Coastal Ecology and Forest Science, Clemson University, Georgetown,
51 SC, USA
52 21 O'Neill School of Public and Environmental Affairs, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN,
53 USA
54 22 U.S. Geological Survey, Geology, Minerals, Energy and Geophysics Science Center, Menlo
55 Park, CA, USA
56 23 Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON,
57 Canada
58 24 U.S. Geological Survey, Woods Hole Coastal & Marine Science Center, Woods Hole, MA,
59 USA
60 25 Departments of Biology and Environmental Studies, Kenyon College, Gambier, OH, USA
61 26 Department of Earth Sciences, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada
62 27 Max Planck Institute for Biogeochemistry, Department for Biogeochemical Signals, Jena,
63 Germany
64 28 Soil, Water and Ecosystem Sciences Department, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL,
65 USA
66 29 School of Environmental and Forest Sciences, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA
67 30 Ducks Unlimited, Memphis, TN, USA
68 31 Department of Soil Science, Bangladesh Agricultural University, Mymensingh, Bangladesh
69 32 Department of Biological Sciences, Kent State University, Kent, OH, USA
70 33 School of Earth, Atmospheric and Life Sciences and Environmental Futures Research
71 Centre, University of Wollongong, NSW, Australia
72 34 Department of Geography, McGill University, Montreal, Canada³⁵ School of Biological,
73 Environmental, and Earth Sciences, University of Southern Mississippi, Hattiesburg, MS,
74 USA
75 36 Department of Soil Science, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB, Canada
76 37 Department of Geography, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada
77 38 School of Environment and Sustainability, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, SK,
78 Canada; Shizhou Ma orcid (<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8407-6632>), Purbasha Mistry orcid
79 (<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9044-1149>)
80 39 Faculty of Science and Engineering, Southern Cross University, Lismore NSW, Australia
81 40 Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Illinois at Chicago, Chicago,
82 IL, USA
83 41 U.S. Geological Survey, Geology, Geophysics, and Geochemistry Science Center, Denver,
84 CO, USA
85 42 Department of Marine Science, University of Calcutta, Kolkata, West Bengal, India
86 43 U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Center for
87 Public Health and Environmental Assessments, Pacific Ecological Systems Division,
88 Corvallis, OR, USA
89 44 South Florida Water Management District, Everglades Systems Assessment Section, West
90 Palm Beach, FL, USA
91 45 Department of Marine Science, University of Texas at Austin Marine Science Institute, Port
92 Aransas, TX, USA

- 93 ⁴⁶ Department of Earth and Environmental Sciences, California State University, East Bay,
94 Hayward, CA, USA
- 95 ⁴⁷ Department of Environmental Science, Rowan University, Glassboro, NJ, USA
- 96 ⁴⁸ Key Laboratory of Wetland Ecology and Environment, Northeast Institute of Geography and
97 Agroecology, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Changchun, China
- 98 ⁴⁹ Freshwater and Marine Science, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI, USA
- 99 ⁵⁰ Department of Plant and Soil Sciences, University of Delaware, Newark, DE, USA
- 100 ⁵¹ Department of Aquatic Sciences and Assessment, Swedish University of Agricultural
101 Sciences, Uppsala, Sweden
- 102 ⁵² Department of Marine Chemistry and Geochemistry, Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution,
103 Woods Hole, MA, USA
- 104 ⁵³ Environmental Science and Technology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD, USA
- 105 ⁵⁴ Key Laboratory of Songliao Aquatic Environment, Ministry of Education, Jilin Jianzhu
106 University, Changchun, China

107

108 **Membrane inlet mass spectrometry (MIMS)**

109 Membrane inlet mass spectrometry (also termed as ‘membrane introduction mass
110 spectrometry’ or ‘membrane interface mass spectrometry’) (MIMS) was first used in 1963 (Hoch
111 and Kok 1963) to separate volatile organic compounds from water or air by a thin membrane and
112 has been employed in on-line and real-time analyses in industrial processes (e.g., fermentation,
113 water chlorination) and environmental monitoring (e.g., urban air plumes, municipal tap water)
114 (Ketola et al. 2002). Based on our knowledge, the first application of MIMS to wetland samples
115 for determination of carbon dioxide (CO₂) and methane (CH₄) concentrations was conducted by
116 Lloyd et al. (1986). Since then, MIMS has been used in the study of greenhouse gases (GHGs) in
117 marine sediments (Bell et al. 2012), peat cores (Benstead and Lloyd 1996; Beckmann et al.
118 2004), wetland soils (Askaer et al. 2010; Elberling et al. 2011), terrestrial ecosystems, and
119 grassland systems (Sheppard and Lloyd 2002).

120 This approach typically uses a semi-permeable polymer to enrich certain analytes from
121 gaseous or liquid samples. As solutions tangentially cross the membrane, analytes are partitioned
122 across the membrane while the bulk of the matrix is rejected. Analytes pass through the
123 membrane at rates that depend on their solution concentration, their solubility in the membrane,
124 and their diffusivity in the membrane. Analyte concentration is at maximum on the high-pressure
125 side (sample side) of the membrane and falls to a minimal value on the vacuum side. These
126 separated analytes are then directly transferred as mixtures (often using a helium carrier gas
127 acceptor phase) to a mass spectrometer for their subsequent resolution and measurements.

128 The MIMS device consists of a vacuum inlet fitted with a permeable silicone tube. The
129 inlet allows gas to pass into the vacuum system, where it is routed through a cold trap (typically
130 dry ice) and into a quadrupole mass spectrometer. Water from samples or a standard is pumped
131 through the membrane using a peristaltic pump. Partial pressure data are acquired on the data
132 acquisition system in multiple ion-monitoring mode and can be processed using standard
133 spreadsheet software.

134 Typically, a long stainless steel gas inlet capillary probe (1.56 mm outside diameter, 0.5
135 mm inside diameter) with a 50 μm diameter orifice near the tip, is used to insert into the soil core
136 (Sheppard and Lloyd 2002). The advantage of MIMS is that it can be used to quantify a number
137 of gas species, continuously and simultaneously, and it can record spatial and temporal variations
138 in subsurface gas concentrations as low as 1 μM (Lloyd and Scott 1985; Lloyd and James 1987).

139 Based on the mass-to-charge ratio (m/Z) of characteristic positive ions of gases, a variety of
140 gases can be monitored (e.g., $m/z = 15$: CH_4 , $m/z = 32$: oxygen (O_2), $m/z = 44$: CO_2). This
141 technique enables the direct measurement of multiple gas species throughout soil cores with
142 minimal disturbance. The MIMS device is also a field portable instrument (Etzkorn et al. 2009).
143 Perhaps the only disadvantage is the high operating cost for purchasing and maintaining the
144 instrument. Although the instrument is considered portable, the gas chromatography–mass
145 spectrometry power requirement access to remote areas is still a difficult task.

146

147 **Macroalgae: Nutritional values and chemical analysis**

148 Marine macroalgae (seaweeds, kelp) are an economically valued, renewable resource of
149 food, biofuel, and biofertilizer. Food consumption of brown, red, and green macroalgae can be
150 largely attributed to its nutrition properties, which also make it sought-after for fodder, fertilizer,
151 cosmetics, and medicines (Robledo and Freile Pelegrín 1997; Dawes 1998; McHugh 2003;
152 Banerjee et al. 2020). In terms of human consumption and nutrition, macroalgae are excellent
153 sources of proteins, lipids, carbohydrates, minerals, vitamins, antioxidants, and phytochemicals,
154 and thus provide numerous health benefits (Table S1; Parekh and Chauhan 1982; Kumari et al.
155 2010; Holdt and Kraan 2011; van Ginneken et al. 2011; Banerjee et al. 2020; Ganesan et al.
156 2020; Lozano Muñoz and Díaz 2022). Globally, it is estimated that around 8 million tons of
157 macroalgae are harvested annually to support its many uses (McHugh 2003). The exploitation of
158 marine algae for nutritional purposes is primarily based on its biochemical constituents (Parekh
159 and Chauhan 1982). Macroalgae show great variation in nutrient content based on species, level
160 of maturity, geographical distribution, and environmental conditions like seawater temperature,
161 salinity, light, and nutrients (Dawes 1998).

162

163 **Protein, carbohydrate, lipid, and astaxanthin chemical analyses**

164 Protein analysis following the method originally from Lowry et al. (1951). About 0.1 g of
165 powdered macroalgae is extracted with trisodium phosphate (Na_3PO_4) (buffer pH = 0.7) and
166 centrifuged. An aliquot of sample extract is added to a reagent of sodium carbonate (Na_2CO_3)
167 and another reagent of copper(II) sulfate (CuSO_4). Then, Folin-Ciocalteu phenol reagent (2:1) is
168 added and left undisturbed for 30 minutes for color development. The intensity of the color is
169 measured at 660 nm. For quantifying the protein content of the sample, a standard curve is
170 prepared with a known concentration of bovine serum albumin as standard. The value is
171 expressed in percentage. For additional information regarding protein measurement using the
172 Folin phenol reagent (Lowry et al. 1951) see reviews by Peterson (1979) and Singleton et al.
173 (1999), an application by Ledoux and Lamy (1986), and an assessment of the Folin-Ciocalteu
174 reagent by Everette et al. (2010).

175 Carbohydrate content can be estimated by using the procedure of Sadasivam and
176 Manickam (2007). Dried macroalgae powder (0.1 g) is extracted with 80% methanol and
177 centrifuged. This extraction is repeated twice, and the pooled supernatant is evaporated until the
178 methanol is removed. The sample extract is then combined with anthrone reagent and the
179 absorbance is measured at 630 nm using a spectrophotometer. The value is expressed as mg g^{-1}
180 (dry weight) or percentage using glucose as standard.

181 The lipid contents of dried macroalgal samples can be determined by continuous
182 extraction in a lipid extractor (Soxhlet Apparatus, Folch et al. 1957) for 3 hours using petroleum
183 ether as a solvent. Astaxanthin content can be estimated using the procedure of (Banerjee et al.

184 2009). Dried powdered seaweed is extracted with dimethyl sulfoxide and centrifuged until the
185 extract is colorless. Absorbance is measured at 471 to 477 nm.

186 Macroalgal biomass often varies seasonally and can be affected by several abiotic and
187 biotic factors such as salinity, temperature, pH, and nutrient concentrations (Banerjee et al.
188 2009). Thus, it is important to collect key covariates and ancillary variables when sampling
189 macroalgae (Fig. S1).

190




191 **Fig. S1** Macroalgal (seaweed) growth on rocky surfaces along the coast of India. Student Prajna
192 Paramita Mohapatra (Banerjee lab) collecting macroalgae (seaweeds) by hand scraping biomass
193 from within a sample quadrat from Vishakhapatnam coast of Andhra Pradesh in western Bay of
194 Bengal, India. Images with permission from Banerjee and Mohapatra

195
196
197

198
199
200

Table S1. Health benefits of macroalgae, see Lozano Muñoz and Díaz (2022) and citations within. Photo credit: Kakoli Banerjee

Constituent	Percentages	
Nutrients	Protein: 12% Calories: 2% Carbohydrate: 2% Dietary Fiber: 1%	
Vitamins	Vitamin A: 104% Vitamin C: 65% Folate: 37% Riboflavin: 10%	
Minerals	Manganese: 49% Copper: 13% Iron: 10% Potassium: 10%	
Health Benefits		
Useful in maintaining healthy digestion	Helps to prevent colon cancer and leukemia	
Protects skin against harmful effects of ultraviolet B radiation and slows down aging process		
Effective in exerting anti-diabetic effects	Helps to detoxify and cleanse body	
Reduces risk of mental deliberation and goiter hypothyroidism		
Helps to strengthen eyes and hairs	Benefits in improving heart and dental health	
Prevents threat of stroke and coagulation	Helps to protect against influenza B virus	
Caution: Excess intake may raise levels of thyroid-stimulation hormone. Avoid usage during pregnancy and lactation.		
% Daily value per 100 g of seaweed (laver) provides 65% of daily requirement of vitamin C.		

201

202 **Disclaimer:** Any use of trade, firm, or product names is for descriptive purposes only and does
203 not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

204
205
206

References

- 207 Askaer L, Elberling B, Glud RN, Kühl M, Lauritsen FR, Joensen HP (2010) Soil heterogeneity
208 effects on O₂ distribution and CH₄ emissions from wetlands: In situ and mesocosm
209 studies with planar O₂ optodes and membrane inlet mass spectrometry. *Soil Biology and*
210 *Biochemistry* 42:2254–2265. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soilbio.2010.08.026>
- 211 Banerjee K, Ghosh R, Homechaudhuri S, Mitra A (2009) Seasonal variation in the biochemical
212 composition of red seaweed (*Catenella repens*) from Gangetic delta, northeast coast of
213 India. *Journal of Earth System Science* 118:497–505. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s12040-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12040-009-0045-2)
214 [009-0045-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12040-009-0045-2)
- 215 Banerjee K, Turuk AS, Paul R (2020) Seaweed: The blue crop for food security as mitigation
216 measure to climate change. *Plant Archives* 20:2045–2054. [http://plantarchives.org/20-](http://plantarchives.org/20-1/2045-2054%20(5892).pdf)
217 [1/2045-2054%20\(5892\).pdf](http://plantarchives.org/20-1/2045-2054%20(5892).pdf)
- 218 Beckmann M, Sheppard SK, Lloyd D (2004) Mass spectrometric monitoring of gas dynamics in
219 peat monoliths: effects of temperature and diurnal cycles on emissions. *Atmospheric*
220 *Environment* 38:6907–6913. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.atmosenv.2004.08.004>
- 221 Bell RJ, Savidge WB, Toler SK, Byrne RH, Short RT (2012) In situ determination of porewater
222 gases by underwater flow-through membrane inlet mass spectrometry. *Limnology and*
223 *Oceanography: Methods* 10:117–128. <https://doi.org/10.4319/lom.2012.10.117>
- 224 Benstead J, Lloyd D (1996) Spatial and temporal variations of dissolved gases (CH₄, CO₂, and
225 O₂) in peat cores. *Microbial Ecology* 31:57–66. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00175075>
- 226 Dawes CJ (1998) *Marine botany*, 2nd edn. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York
- 227 Elberling B, Askaer L, Jørgensen CJ et al (2011) Linking soil O₂, CO₂, and CH₄ concentrations
228 in a wetland soil: Implications for CO₂ and CH₄ fluxes. *Environmental Science &*
229 *Technology* 45:3393–3399. <https://doi.org/10.1021/es103540k>
- 230 Etzkorn JM, Davey NG, Thompson AJ et al (2009) The use of MIMS-MS-MS in field locations
231 as an on-line quantitative environmental monitoring technique for trace contaminants in
232 air and water. *Journal of Chromatographic Science* 47:57–66.
233 <https://doi.org/10.1093/chromsci/47.1.57>
- 234 Everette JD, Bryant QM, Green AM, Abbey YA, Wangila GW, Walker RB (2010) Thorough
235 study of reactivity of various compound classes toward the Folin–Ciocalteu reagent.
236 *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry* 58:8139–8144.
237 <https://doi.org/10.1021/jf1005935>
- 238 Folch J, Lees M, Stanley GHS (1957) A simple method for the isolation and purification of total
239 lipides from animal tissues. *Journal of biological chemistry* 226:497–509.
240 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9258\(18\)64849-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0021-9258(18)64849-5)
- 241 Ganesan AR, Subramani K, Shanmugam M et al (2020) A comparison of nutritional value of
242 underexploited edible seaweeds with recommended dietary allowances. *Journal of King*
243 *Saud University - Science* 32:1206–1211. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jksus.2019.11.009>
- 244 Hoch G, Kok B (1963) A mass spectrometer inlet system for sampling gases dissolved in liquid
245 phases. *Archives of Biochemistry and Biophysics* 101:160–170.
246 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-9861\(63\)90546-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-9861(63)90546-0)

247 Holdt SL, Kraan S (2011) Bioactive compounds in seaweed: Functional food applications and
 248 legislation. *Journal of Applied Phycology* 23:543–597. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10811-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10811-010-9632-5)
 249 010-9632-5

250 Ketola RA, Kotiaho T, Cisper ME, Allen TM (2002) Environmental applications of membrane
 251 introduction mass spectrometry. *Journal of Mass Spectrometry* 37:457–476.
 252 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jms.327>

253 Kumari P, Kumar M, Gupta V, Reddy CRK, Jha B (2010) Tropical marine macroalgae as
 254 potential sources of nutritionally important PUFAs. *Food Chemistry* 120:749–757.
 255 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodchem.2009.11.006>

256 Ledoux M, Lamy F (1986) Determination of proteins and sulfobetaine with the folin-phenol
 257 reagent. *Analytical Biochemistry* 157:28–31. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-2697(86)90191-0)
 258 2697(86)90191-0

259 Lloyd D, Davies KJP, Boddy L (1986) Mass spectrometry as an ecological tool for in situ
 260 measurement of dissolved gases in sediment systems. *FEMS Microbiology Ecology*
 261 2:11–17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6968.1986.tb01933.x>

262 Lloyd D, James CJ (1987) The Pasteur effect in yeasts: Mass spectrometric monitoring of
 263 oxygen uptake, and carbon dioxide and ethanol production. *FEMS Microbiology Letters*
 264 42:27–31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-6968.1987.tb02294.x>

265 Lloyd D, Scott RI (1985) Mass spectrometric monitoring of dissolved gases. In: Poole RK and
 266 Dow CS (eds) *Microbial gas metabolism: Mechanistic, metabolic, and biotechnological*
 267 *aspects* Academic Press, New York, pp 304

268 Lowry OH, Rosebrough NJ, Farr AL, Randall RJ (1951) Protein measurement with the Folin
 269 phenol reagent. *Journal of biological chemistry* 193:265–275

270 Lozano Muñoz I, Díaz NF (2022) Minerals in edible seaweed: Health benefits and food safety
 271 issues. *Critical Reviews in Food Science and Nutrition* 62:1592–1607.
 272 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10408398.2020.1844637>

273 McHugh DJ (2003) A guide to the seaweed industry. *FAO Fisheries Technical Paper* 441.
 274 <http://www.fao.org/3/y4765e/y4765e00.htm>

275 Parekh RG, Chauhan VD (1982) Seasonal variations in the chemical constituents of the marine
 276 alga *Ulva* sp. and seawater. *Seaweed Research and Utilization* 5:1–4

277 Peterson GL (1979) Review of the folin phenol protein quantitation method of lowry,
 278 rosebrough, farr and randall. *Analytical Biochemistry* 100:201–220.
 279 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-2697\(79\)90222-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-2697(79)90222-7)

280 Robledo D, Freile Pelegrín Y (1997) Chemical and mineral composition of six potentially edible
 281 seaweed species of Yucatán. *Botanica Marina* 40:301–306.
 282 <https://doi.org/10.1515/botm.1997.40.1-6.301>

283 Sadasivam S, Manickam A (2007) *Biochemical methods*, 3rd edn. New Age International Pvt.
 284 Ltd, New Delhi

285 Sheppard SK, Lloyd D (2002) Effects of soil amendment on gas depth profiles in soil monoliths
 286 using direct mass spectrometric measurement. *Bioresource Technology* 84:39–47.
 287 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-8524\(02\)00012-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0960-8524(02)00012-3)

288 Singleton VL, Orthofer R, Lamuela-Raventós RM (1999) [14] Analysis of total phenols and
 289 other oxidation substrates and antioxidants by means of folin-ciocalteu reagent. In:
 290 Packer L (ed) *Methods in Enzymology—Volume 299: Oxidants and Antioxidants Part A*.
 291 Academic Press, pp 152–178. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0076-6879\(99\)99017-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0076-6879(99)99017-1)

292 van Ginneken VJT, Helsper JPF, de Visser W, van Keulen H, Brandenburg WA (2011)
293 Polyunsaturated fatty acids in various macroalgal species from north Atlantic and tropical
294 seas. *Lipids in Health and Disease* 10:104. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1476-511X-10-104>

295