

Diatom-driven carbon export during the North Atlantic Spring Bloom: coupled physical-biological modelling and variational data assimilation

Witold Bagniewski^{1, 2}, Katja Fennel², Mary Jane Perry¹, Eric D'Asaro³, Nathan Briggs¹, Eric Rehm³, Michael Sieracki⁴

¹University of Maine, ²Dalhousie University, ³University of Washington; ⁴Bigelow Laboratory for Ocean Sciences. Corresponding author: witold bagniewski@dal.ca

T15L-05

1. Motivation

The North Atlantic Spring Bloom is one of the main events that lead to carbon export to the deep ocean. driving CO₂ uptake from the atmosphere. The NAB08 experiment was carried out south of Iceland, where a Lagrangian float and four seagliders followed a phytoplankton patch, providing a 3-D coverage over time. The autonomously measured data was calibrated with in situ samples from three supporting cruises. During the experiment we observed a major export event of diatom aggregates. We have implemented this behavior in an ecosystem model describing the bloom, where a 1-D physical model is coupled to three biological model variants of different complexity. We applied variational data assimilation to optimize the models and compared them based on their performance in replicating the bloom and its associated carbon export.

2. Observed data

Lagrangian float Operated south of Iceland April 4, 2008 - May 25, 2008. Drifted in the mixed layer and made daily profiles down to 250 m. Provided direct and proxy data for Temperature, Salinity, Chlorophyll, PON, Oxygen and DIN. Bottle measurements

Ancillary measurements taken during a cruise on R/V Knorr May 2, 2008 - May 21, 2008. Provided bottle data on Silicate. Gave us insight into the evolution of the phytoplankton community and captured a massive sinking of diatom cysts at ~50 m/day, observed in spikes in optical measurements and in sediment traps.

4. Data assimilation

Variational data assimilation varied biological model parameters to minimize the misfit between the model and observations. The misfit is measured by a cos

st function F:

$$F(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i}^{n} \frac{(X_i^{obs} - X_i^{mod}(\mathbf{p}))^2}{\sigma_i^2}$$

An additional cost term, F_P, utilized the qualitative knowledge that phytoplankton community shifted from diatom dominated to small phytoplankton dominated between May 12 and May 16. The optimized model variables were Chl, PON (Phy + $Dia + Det_N + Zoo)$, DIN, Oxy and Si (top 100 m). Cost function was minimized by a gradient descent routine (Gilbert and Lemarechal, 1989). To avoid local minima, we applied this routine many times for randomly chosen initial parameter values (Fig. 1).



Conditioning of the minimization problem and a posteriori parameter errors were estimated by analyzing the Hessian matrix of the cost function (Fennel et al., 2001)

References

- A Oschlies V Garcon 1999 An ed Atlantic. Global Geochem, Cycles, 13: 135-160. S.Doney, D.Glover, R.Najjar 1996 A new coupled upper access the first statement of the statemen
- ou. pled. one-dimensional biological-physical model for the Applications to the JGOFS Bermuda Atlantic Time Series Study (BATS) site. Deep Sea
- upper ocean: Applic Res. II, 43:591-624

- Res. II. 43:591-624 K. Fennel, E. Boss. 2003. Subsurface maxima of phytoplankton and chkrophyk. Steady state solutions from a simple model. Limn. and Oceanogr. 48: 152-1534. R. Celder, H. McInny, T. Kana. 1989. A dynamic regulatow model of phytoplanktonic acdimation to light.nutrients and temperature. Limn. and Oceanogr. 43: 673-684. Kahary et al. 1969. The NCEPN/CAR MAY loger reanalysis project. Bull. Arer: Meteo. Soc., 77, 437-470 J. Gibert, C. Lenarechai. 1989. Some numerical experiments with variable-storage quasi-Newton adjorithms. Mathem Programming 46 (1984) 407-435. K. Fennel, M. Losch, J. Schridter, M. Warzal. 2001. Testing a marine ecosystem model: sensitivity analysis and parameter optimization. Joun. of Mar. Syst. 24: 54-563.

Model optimization obtained the following cost function minima: 1p1s model: F=5.57; 2p1s model: F=5.01; 2p2s model: F=4.60

Most of the optimized parameters were very similar between the models, except for those directly affecting zooplankton. The optimized 2p2s model shows the best match with the observations (figures below).



50-100 m dept

0 110 115 120 125 130 135 140 145 19 Apr 24 Apr 29 Apr 4 May 9 May 14 May 19 May 24 Ma

50-100 m depth

120 125 130 135 140 145 29 Apr 4 May 9 May 14 May 19 May 24 May

The simulated carbon export is similar for the three models. In the 2p2s model ~32% of the export comes with sinking cysts, which in the 1p1s and 2p1s models is replaced with more sinking detritus (Table 1).

	1p1s	2p1s	2p2s
Detritus	1.275	1.212	0.7496
Small Phy	0.078	0.0037	0.0151
Diatoms	-	0.3291	0.3349
Cysts	-	-	0.5099
Total	1.353	1.5448	1.6095
Table 1: Components of model carbon export at 100 m integrated over the time of the experiment [Mol-C/m ²].			

Cyst formation is the main process ending the bloom in the 2p2s model (Fig. 3), what agrees with the spikes in optical measurements and the sediment trap data. In the other models the bloom ends mostly due to grazing, but we have no zooplankton data to verify this. General patterns of model small phytoplankton agree with the

sparse nanophytoplankton flow cytometry data (Fig. 4), even though the later was not used in data assimilation. and ROC (up C/l) at 10 m







Figure 5: Depth-time profiles of variables simulated with the 2p2s model. White line represents the mixed layer depth.

6. Conclusions

· Increasing model complexity improved the match with observations, the 2p2s model is most successful · Silica cycle is important for modelling the Spring Bloom - it is likely the only limiting nutrient · Diatom cyst formation and rapid sinking during silica deficiency best explain the decline of the bloom 1p1s and 2p1s models must have high grazing timed with silica depletion to achieve a similar result · Some zooplankton observations would be useful in the future to verify the importance of grazing Carbon export at 100 m in 32 days, predicted by the 2p2s model is 1.61 Mol-C/m², largely diatom-driven





The biological models are embedded into a 1D physical model (General Ocean Turbulence Model, www.gotm.net), implemented for the experiment location. It describes the top 200 m of the ocean with a vertical resolution of 1 m. It is forced with wind speeds, air pressure, air temperature, humidity and solar radiation from NCEP/NCAR reanalysis data set (Kalnay et al. 1996). Its temperatures and salinities are strongly nudged to their corresponding observations and mimic the physical conditions along the track of the float.

5. Model-data comparison