

Table 6. *Photosynthetic cover (based on chlorophyll a m<sup>-2</sup>) for communities of submerged aquatic phototrophs*

Community	mg chlorophyll a m <sup>-2</sup>	References
Freshwater epipellic	2-66	Moss (1968; data for algae other than Characeae)
Freshwater epilithic	127-1200	
Freshwater epiphytic	110-2350	
Freshwater epipsammic	86	
Freshwater algal mats	189-269	
Freshwater Characeae	5000-8000	Westlake (1975b)
Freshwater magnoliophytes	5000-8000	
Soda lake plankton ( <i>Spirulina</i> )	300	Talling <i>et al.</i> (1973)
Marine, epilithic cyanobacteria (top of littoral)	270-800	Gifford & Odum (1961)
Marine epilithic <i>Fucus</i> (mid-littoral)	1470	
Marine, epilithic <i>Chondrus/Ceramium/Polysiphonia/Dasya</i> (lower littoral)	1040	
Marine, epilithic <i>Laminaria</i> (sub-littoral)	400-8000	Seybold & Egle (1938); Mann (1972a, b); Blinks, (1955)
Marine, rhizophytic <i>Posidonia oceanica</i>	2100	Drew (1978)
Marine coastal phytoplankton	40	Talling (1975)
Marine open-ocean phytoplankton	15	
Marine, epipsammic foraminifera with algal symbionts	57-907	Sournia (1976)
Marine reef corals ( <i>Porites</i> ) with dinophyte symbionts	2000-2500	Odum <i>et al.</i> (1959); Burkholder & Burkholder (1960)
Marine coral reef	500	Odum, McConnell & Abbot (1958)
Marine epilithic <i>Macrocystis</i> (sub-littoral)	700-900	Macfarland and Prescott (1959)
Marine epilithic <i>Codium</i> (sub-littoral)	3200	Frolick & Mathieson (1973); Head & Carpenter (1975); Wassman & Ramus (1973)
Intertidal 'ephemeral' community on cleared area ( <i>Ulva/Porphyra/Enteromorpha/Calothrix</i> ) on rocky shore (epilithic)	300	Niell (1979); (cf. Connell and Slatyer, 1977)
Intertidal 'canopy dominant' community re-established on cleared area after dominance of ephemerals ( <i>Pelvetia/Fucus/Himanthalia</i> ) on rocky shore (epilithic)	1200	
Reef corals	100-1400	Maragas (1972)

Chlorophyll a m<sup>-2</sup> is usually higher for benthic than for planktonic communities (less disturbed environment, except for shallow East African salt lake). Among benthic communities, larger chlorophyll a m<sup>-2</sup> is associated with less disturbed environments, i.e. where rhizophytes and haptophytes can grow to a size large enough to offset low nutrient availability by seasonal nutrient uptake and the storage and re-utilization of nutrients. Data are mainly for communities not subject to extreme light deprivation. Anderson (1967) suggests that the 'usable' chlorophyll in natural communities is 600 mg m<sup>-2</sup>.