Modeling phytoplankton blooms and carbon export production in the Southern Ocean: dominant controls by light and iron in the Atlantic sector in Austral spring 1992
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Abstract

The high nutrient low chlorophyll (HNLC) conditions of the Southern Ocean were explored with an ecological model (SWAMCO) describing the cycling of C, N, P, Si and Fe through different, aggregated, chemical and biological compartments of the plankton ecosystem. The structure of the model was chosen to take explicitly into account biological processes of importance in the formation and mineralization of carbon biomass in surface waters and in carbon export production. State variables include major inorganic nutrients (NO\textsubscript{3}, NH\textsubscript{4}, PO\textsubscript{4}, Si(OH)\textsubscript{4}), dissolved Fe, two groups of phytoplankton (diatoms and nanoagellates), bacteria, heterotrophic nanoagellates, microzooplankton, labile DOC and two classes of dissolved and particulate organic polymers with specific biodegradability. The model is closed by export production of particulate organic matter out of the surface layer and, when relevant, by metazooplankton, the grazing pressure of which is described as a forcing function. Parameterization was derived from the current knowledge on the kinetics of biological processes in the Southern Ocean and in other ‘HNLC’ areas. For its application in the Atlantic sector in spring 1992, the SWAMCO model was coupled ‘off-line’ to a 1D physical model forced by in situ meteorological and sea-ice conditions. The predictions of the model were successfully compared with chemical and biological observations recorded in the Antarctic circumpolar current (ACC) during the 1992 cruise ANTX/6 of RV Polarstern. In particular, the model simulates quite well the diatom bloom and carbon export event observed in the iron-enriched Polar Frontal region and the lack of ice-edge phytoplankton blooms in the marginal zone (MIZ) of the ACC area.
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Model analysis shows that sufficient light and iron concentrations above 0.5 µmol m\(^{-3}\) are the necessary conditions for enhancing diatom blooms and particulate carbon export production in the Southern Ocean. Low iron availability prevents diatom growth but is still adequate for nanophytoplankton, the biomass of which is, however, kept to Chl a levels less than 1 mg m\(^{-3}\) due to the loss by the ubiquitous micrograzers. Little carbon export is predicted under iron-limitation conditions. Sensitivity tests conducted on the parameters describing iron and silicon uptake by diatoms reveal the complex nature of Fe and Si limitation in regulating the magnitude and extent of diatom blooms and carbon and opal export production in the Southern Ocean.
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1. Introduction

The Southern Ocean is known to be a region with high nutrients but low chlorophyll (HNLC), and there is a need to understand this Antarctic Paradox. An understanding would allow to be addressed the role played by the Southern Ocean in global carbon cycling, hence its influence on global climate regulation. Within this region, the combined effects of wind stress and thermohaline circulation result in circumpolar divergence of surface waters and upwelling, which maintain high concentrations of all major nutrients in the surface layer (nitrate: 20–30 mmol m\(^{-3}\); phosphate: 1.6–2 mmol m\(^{-3}\); silicate: 30–100 mmol m\(^{-3}\) see e.g. Gordon et al., 1986). The light regime, highly seasonal, during summer reaches daily-integrated values as high as in the tropics (Campbell and Aarup, 1989). Despite the permanently high nutrient concentrations and seasonally high incident surface light, primary production is generally low (e.g. the review by Mathot et al., 1992). Mesoscale events of high productivity, however, do occur in (i) the Polar Front between 47\(^\circ\) and 50\(^\circ\)S (e.g. Bathmann et al., 1997); (ii) shallow, coastal embayments (e.g. Holm-Hansen and Mitchell, 1991); (iii) polynyas (e.g. Arrigo et al., 1998a) and (iv) the vicinity of the retreating ice-edge (e.g. Smith and Nelson, 1985). Nevertheless, recorded maximum phytoplankton biomasses seldom reach the 25 mg Chl a m\(^{-3}\) expected from the nutrient stocks (Mitchell and Holm-Hansen, 1991).

Several hypotheses have been proposed to explain the paradox of high nutrients and low Chl a concentrations in the Southern Ocean. In a recent review, de Baar and Boyd (1999) suggest that phytoplankton growth in the Southern Ocean is under the triple control of (i) light availability driven by incident light, ice cover and wind stress; (ii) iron availability and (iii) micrograzing pressure. However, the degree to which physical, chemical and biological factors are co-limiting phytoplankton bloom events is not fully understood, and their relative importance may vary with location, time and local meteorological conditions (Lancelot et al., 1993).

The major role played by ice cover and the turbulence of the water column in controlling available light to phytoplankton, hence bloom initiation, has been shown by numerous field data. It is now admitted that deep-mixed ice-free areas are not highly productive and are dominated by nanoplanckton communities (El-Sayed, 1984; Smetacek et al., 1990). On the other hand, many observations (e.g. Smith and Nelson,
1985, 1986; Nelson et al., 1987; Sullivan et al., 1988; Lancelot et al., 1991a, b) indicate that the circumpolar marginal ice zone is a region of enhanced primary production owing to the formation, at the time of ice melting, of a shallow vertically stable upper layer as a result of the production of melt water. Provided the ice-edge is well defined, these ice-edge related phytoplankton blooms trail the ice-edge as a narrow band 50–200 km wide (Smith and Nelson, 1985; Lancelot et al., 1993). Yet the phytoplankton biomass reached in these hydrodynamically stable areas, dominated by either nanophytoplankton (Hewes et al., 1990; Lancelot et al., 1993) or diatoms (Bianchi et al., 1993), remains modest (2–7 mg Chl \(a\) m\(^{-3}\)) considering the ambient nutrient concentrations. Furthermore, recent studies have showed that marginal ice zone phytoplankton blooms were absent at the receding ice-edge of the ACC in the Atlantic sector (Smetacek et al., 1997a,b) and in the Bellingshausen Sea (Turner and Owens, 1995).

Iron limitation of phytoplankton growth in this remote area, already suggested in 1931 (Gran, 1931), has been investigated since 1988 in several regions of the Southern Ocean in various Fe-enrichment experiments in shipboard microcosms: the Weddell and Scotia Sea (de Baar et al., 1990; Buma et al., 1991), the Drake Passage (Helbling et al., 1991), the Ross Sea (Martin et al., 1990) and the Atlantic sector of the Antarctic Circumpolar Current (van Leeuwe et al., 1997; Scharek et al., 1997). Bioassay results have shown that the addition of Fe consistently led to stimulation of the growth of the large diatoms. This impact of added Fe on large diatoms was also observed in other HNLC areas like the equatorial Pacific Ocean (Chavez et al., 1991; Fitzwater et al., 1996; Zettler et al., 1996) and the subarctic North Pacific Ocean (Boyd et al., 1996). More recently, the repeated intentional in situ iron enrichment experiment in the equatorial Pacific Ocean (Coale et al., 1996) also led to a diatom bloom (Cavenders-Bares et al., 1999). Apparently, diatom blooms depend on the availability of not only light and all three major nutrients N, P and Si but also some iron as suggested before (Harvey, 1933, 1937). From the modern evidence it can be concluded that the general low availability of dissolved Fe in HNLC areas is not limiting phytoplankton growth rate per se. Rather Fe availability is structuring the phytoplankton community, which in turn drives the structure of the dominant food web and export production (C-retaining microbial food-web versus C-exporting linear diatom to mesozooplankton food chain). The low Fe supply is indeed limiting the growth rate of large diatoms but is still sufficient for the development of pico- and nano-sized cells, better competitors at low nutrient concentration due to their larger surface:volume ratio (Morel et al., 1990). The biomass of these minute organisms is kept at a very low level by the grazing of the ubiquitous fast-growing protozoa (Frost and Franzen, 1992; Lancelot et al., 1993; Price et al., 1994). Recent bioassay studies on Antarctic diatoms (Takeda, 1998) show that iron limitation leads to more silificed, hence faster-sinking, diatoms, evidencing a more complex pattern of nutrient limitation interactions in HNLC ecosystems with consequences for the related biogeochemical cycles.

Considering the circumpolar variations in the distribution of dissolved iron (de Baar et al., 1999) and the large variability of meteorological conditions (in particular wind stress and sea ice prevailing at these high latitudes), the contribution of physical, chemical and biological factors to the control of phytoplankton bloom development is likely to greatly vary within the Southern Ocean, both geographically and temporally.
Phytoplankton experience forcing between two extremes — low trace metal concentration and windy meteorological conditions or sufficient trace metal concentration and serene meteorological conditions — giving rise to quite different phytoplankton species dominance and biomass, food-web structures and carbon export production.

Addressing the role of the Southern Ocean in global carbon cycling and its response to or influence on climate change requires the implementation of quite complex ecological models that incorporate the processes directing the structure of the planktonic system and their forcing functions. In particular, these models must explicitly describe trophic bifurcations, most notably the shift from the C-retaining microbial network towards the C-exporting linear food chain, under the triple control of light, nutrient availability and grazing pressure. Existing biological models of the Southern Ocean are generally limited to one phytoplankton and one zooplankton group (e.g. Goosse and Hecq, 1994) and include a maximum of 2 limiting nutrients — nitrate and silicic acid (e.g. Arrigo et al., 1998b). One exception is the biogeochemical model of Pondaven et al. (1998) developed for the simulation of the seasonal C, N and Si cycles at the ice-free Kerfix station located in the Indian Sector of the Southern Ocean. Their model structure includes 2 classes of phytoplankton and zooplankton and 3 nutrients (nitrate, ammonium, silicic acid). However, lacking iron as explicit nutrient it is not applicable for iron-limited areas. When we developed our simulation model there did not yet exist an ecosystem model incorporating iron as a limiting nutrient, either for the Southern Ocean or for any other oceanic region. Very recently, however, an iron-based ecosystem model has been reported for the central equatorial Pacific (Leonard et al., 1999), another HNLC area. Their model has nine components and includes nitrate, ammonium and iron as nutrient state variables. However, it does not explicitly consider the complex nature of nutrient-limitation interactions recently shown (Takeda, 1998; Hutchins and Bruland, 1998).

This paper presents the seawater microbial community (SWAMCO) model, a new version of the existing model of C and N cycling through the Antarctic microbial network (Lancelot et al., 1991a, b; 1993), upgraded with a view of extending its application at the scale of the whole Southern Ocean. In order to take into consideration the key role of iron in driving the structure and functioning of the Southern Ocean planktonic system and the related biogeochemical cycles, the structure of the biogeochemical model has been extended as follows: (i) all major nutrients (ammonium, nitrate, silicic acid and phosphate) and dissolved Fe are explicit state variables, allowing consideration of any nutrient limitation condition and any shift between limiting nutrients; (ii) two phytoplankton groups (nano-sized flagellates and large diatoms) are distinguished on the basis of their iron physiology, sinking rate and grazing control and (iii) the microbial network is explicitly described as composed of bacteria, autotrophic and bacterivorous nanoflagellates and microzooplankton, the last of which feed on both nanoflagellates (Becquevort, 1999). The parameterization procedure constitutes a key step for the successful implementation of an ecological model and the assessment of its prediction capability. The SWAMCO parameters were derived primarily from the available relevant data on Antarctic phytoplankton physiology and feeding activity of bacterivorous and herbivorous protozoa and, when such data did not exist, from the literature data on other HNLC areas.
The SWAMCO model was run in the Atlantic sector of the Southern Ocean covered by the ANT X/6 cruise of 1992 as a first assessment of the coherence of the model and of its capability to properly simulate phytoplankton bloom and carbon export events in the Southern Ocean under co-limitation of light and iron. This well-documented cruise was chosen because it had sampled repeatedly for 40 d along one section (63°W) crossing different water masses with contrasting ice coverage, hydrodynamical stability, iron concentration, diatom bloom and particulate export production (Smetacek et al., 1997a,b). The synergistic effects of light and iron in stimulating phytoplankton blooms and carbon export production in the Southern Ocean were further investigated with sensitivity tests of SWAMCO predictions to iron parameterization and iron-enrichment scenarios at contrasting latitudes of the ANT X/6 section. Finally, the recently reported interaction between iron limitation and diatom silicification and its consequence for opal export production was explored with sensitivity tests of SWAMCO predictions to the parameterization of diatom silicon uptake.

2. Model description

2.1. General structure of the swamco model

The structure of the SWAMCO model — state variables and processes linking them — is schematically illustrated in Fig. 1 and Table 1. It results from the assemblage of 3 sub-models reflecting the dynamics of the phytoplankton, the protozooplankton and the microbial loop. These model units, respectively, describe (i) the physiological growth of autotrophic nanoflagellates (NF) and diatoms (DA) according to the AQUAPHY conceptual model (Lancelot et al., 1991a); (ii) the bacterial degradation of both dissolved (D) and particulate (P) organic matter (for chemical elements C, N and P) according to the HSB model (Billen and Servais, 1988); (iii) the dynamics of herbivorous (microzooplankton MCZ) and bacterivorous (heterotrophic nanoflagellates HNF) protozoa (the HBP model, Becquevort, 1999). The uptake and regeneration fluxes of nitrate (NO$_3$), ammonia (NH$_4$), phosphate (PO$_4$) and dissolved iron (DFe) and silicon (DSi) are generated by the 3 sub-models, depicting the nutrient cycling.

The SWAMCO model is closed by mesozooplankton grazing pressure and export production out of the surface layer. The grazing by mesozooplankton on both diatoms and herbivorous protozoa is described as a forcing function, and no food preference is considered. Export production of key chemical elements C, N, Si and Fe into the deep ocean corresponds to the loss from the surface layer of particulate organic matter by sedimentation of both diatoms and dead (detrital) particulate matter (P), including fecal pellets. Due to their low density, the sedimentation of nanophytoplankton, bacteria and protozoa is neglected.

The differential equations describing the conservation of state variables are listed in Table 2. The kinetic expressions of the processes relative to the phytoplankton, protozooplankton and microbial loop modules are described in Table 3; process-related parameters are defined and listed in Table 4.
Fig. 1. Structure of the biogeochemical SWAMCO model (state variables and processes linking them are defined in Table 1).

2.2. Equations and parameterization

2.2.1. Phytoplankton dynamics

Each phytoplankton group (DA: diatoms; NF: nanoflagellates) is described by 3 state variables (functional cellular constituents F, reserve products R, monomeric substrates S) in order to distinguish between photosynthesis and growth processes (Lancelot et al., 1991a). Conceptually, this model is based on the notion of reserve product storage by phytoplankton cells, according to the future requirements of their growth. This was theoretically developed by Cohen and Parnas (1976) and experimentally demonstrated by Cuhel et al. (1984) and Lancelot et al. (1986). The photosynthetic process directly and the catabolism of storage products indirectly provide the energy and reductants required for the biosynthesis of new cellular material and for the maintenance of basal metabolism (Shuter, 1979). The production and loss processes are listed in Eqs. (V-1)–(V-6) (Table 2) and are described explicitly by Eqs. (P-1)–(P-15) (Table 3).

The rate of phytoplankton growth $\mu$ (Eq. (P-7), Table 3) is governed by the availability of intracellular monomers S and ambient inorganic nutrient N according
Table 1
SWAMCO model structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable/Process</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Unit/meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(a) State variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Micro-organisms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diatoms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional and structural metabolites</td>
<td>DAF</td>
<td>mmol C m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monomeric substrates</td>
<td>DAS</td>
<td>mmol C m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve material</td>
<td>DAR</td>
<td>mmol C m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biogenic Si</td>
<td>BSi</td>
<td>mmol Si m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autotrophic nanoflagellates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional and structural metabolites</td>
<td>NFF</td>
<td>mmol C m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monomeric substrates</td>
<td>NFS</td>
<td>mmol C m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve material</td>
<td>NFR</td>
<td>mmol C m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microzooplankton</td>
<td>MCZ</td>
<td>mmol C m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterotrophic nanoflagellates</td>
<td>HNF</td>
<td>mmol C m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacteria</td>
<td>BAC</td>
<td>mmol C m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organic matter</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monomeric substrates for bacteria</td>
<td>BSC</td>
<td>mmol C m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quickly biodegradable dissolved organic matter</td>
<td>DC1</td>
<td>mmol C m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organic matter</td>
<td>DN1</td>
<td>mmol N m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quickly biodegradable particulate organic matter</td>
<td>PC1</td>
<td>mmol C m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organic matter</td>
<td>PN1</td>
<td>mmol N m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slowly biodegradable dissolved organic matter</td>
<td>DC2</td>
<td>mmol C m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organic matter</td>
<td>DN2</td>
<td>mmol N m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slowly biodegradable particulate organic matter</td>
<td>PC2</td>
<td>mmol C m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organic matter</td>
<td>PN2</td>
<td>mmol N m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inorganic nutrients</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate</td>
<td>NO3</td>
<td>mmol N m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonium</td>
<td>NH4</td>
<td>mmol N m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphate</td>
<td>PO4</td>
<td>mmol P m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved silica (silicic acid)</td>
<td>DSi</td>
<td>mmol Si m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved iron</td>
<td>DFe</td>
<td>µmol Fe m(^{-3})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(b) C and nutrients fluxes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see process equations in Table 3 and diagrammatic representation in Fig. 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phytoplankton dynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>φ(_i)</td>
<td>Photosynthesis ((i = 1): diatoms; (i = 2): nanoflagellates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>lys(_i)</td>
<td>Autolysis ((i = 1): diatoms; (i = 2): nanoflagellates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>lys(_{Si})</td>
<td>Lysis of biogenic silica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(e_i)</td>
<td>Exudation ((i = 1): diatoms; (i = 2): nanoflagellates)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable/Process</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Unit/meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$s_i$</td>
<td>Synthesis of reserve products (R) ($i = 1$: diatoms; $i = 2$: nanoflagellates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$c_i$</td>
<td>Catabolism of reserve products (R) ($i = 1$: diatoms; $i = 2$: nanoflagellates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$\mu_i$</td>
<td>Growth ($i = 1$: diatoms; $i = 2$: nanoflagellates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>resp$_i$</td>
<td>Respiration ($i = 1$: diatoms; $i = 2$: nanoflagellates)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>sed$_{DA}$</td>
<td>Diatoms sedimentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>sed$_{BS}$</td>
<td>Biogenic silica sedimentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>upt$_{NO}$</td>
<td>Nitrate uptake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>upt$_{NH}$</td>
<td>Ammonium uptake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>upt$_{Fe}$</td>
<td>Dissolved iron uptake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>upt$_{Si}$</td>
<td>Silicic acid uptake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>upt$_{PP}$</td>
<td>Phosphate uptake</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Protozooplankton dynamics

Microzooplankton

| 16               | $\mu_{MCZ}$ | Growth |
| 17               | graz$_{MCZ}$ | Grazing |
| 18               | graz$_{MCNF}$ | Grazing on autotrophic nanoflagellates |
| 19               | graz$_{MCNF}$ | Grazing on heterotrophic nanoflagellates |
| 20               | lys$_{MCZ}$ | Autolysis |
| 21               | reg$_{MCZ}$ | Nitrogen regeneration |
| 22               | reg$_{MCZ}$ | Phosphorus regeneration |
| 23               | reg$_{MCZ}$ | Iron regeneration |

Heterotrophic nanoflagellates

| 24               | $\mu_{HNF}$ | Growth |
| 25               | graz$_{HNF}$ | Grazing |
| 26               | lys$_{HNF}$ | Autolysis |
| 27               | reg$_{HNF}$ | Nitrogen regeneration |
| 28               | reg$_{HNF}$ | Phosphorus regeneration |
| 29               | reg$_{HNF}$ | Iron regeneration |

Mesozooplankton

| 30               | graz$_{MSMC}$ | Grazing on microzooplankton |
| 31               | graz$_{MSDA}$ | Grazing on diatoms |

Microbial loop dynamics

Bacteria

| 32               | $\mu_{BAC}$ | Growth |
| 33               | upt$_{BAC}$ | Carbon uptake |
| 34               | upt$_{BAC}$ | Phosphorus uptake |
| 35               | upt$_{Fe}$ | Iron uptake |
| 36               | $\alpha_{BAC}$ | Ammonification |
| 37               | lys$_{BAC}$ | Autolysis |

Organic matter

| 38               | elys$_{D}$ | Ecto-cellular hydrolysis of DC1, DN1, DP1, DC2, DN2, DP2 |
| 39               | lys$_{P}$ | Ecto-cellular hydrolysis of PC1, PN1, PP1, PC2, PN2, PP2 |
| 40               | sed$_{P}$ | Sedimentation of particulate organic matter |
Table 2
SWAMCO model: conservation equations

**Phytoplankton**
DA: diatoms, NF: autotrophic nanoflagellates
F: functional, structural metabolites, S: monomeric substrates, R: reserve material

\[
\frac{d\text{DA}}{dt} = \mu_{\text{DA}} - \text{lys}_{\text{F}}^{\text{DA}} - (\text{graz}_{\text{MS}/\text{DA}} + \text{sed}_{\text{DA}}) \frac{\text{DA}}{\text{DA}}
\]  
(V-1)

\[
\frac{d\text{DAS}}{dt} = \varphi_{\text{DA}} + c_{\text{DAR}} - s_{\text{DAR}} - \mu_{\text{DA}} - \text{resp}_{\text{DA}} - \text{lys}_{\text{S}}^{\text{DA}} - e_{\text{DA}} - (\text{graz}_{\text{MS}/\text{DA}} + \text{sed}_{\text{DA}}) \frac{\text{DAS}}{\text{DA}}
\]  
(V-2)

\[
\frac{d\text{DAR}}{dt} = s_{\text{DAR}} - c_{\text{DAR}} - \text{lys}_{\text{R}}^{\text{DA}} - (\text{graz}_{\text{MS}/\text{DA}} + \text{sed}_{\text{DA}}) \frac{\text{DAR}}{\text{DA}}
\]  
(V-3)

\[
\frac{d\text{NFF}}{dt} = \mu_{\text{NF}} - \text{lys}_{\text{F}}^{\text{NF}} - \text{graz}_{\text{MC}/\text{NF}} \frac{\text{NFF}}{\text{NF}}
\]  
(V-4)

\[
\frac{d\text{NFS}}{dt} = \varphi_{\text{NF}} + c_{\text{NFR}} - s_{\text{NFR}} - \mu_{\text{NF}} - \text{resp}_{\text{NF}} - \text{lys}_{\text{S}}^{\text{NF}} - e_{\text{NF}} - \text{graz}_{\text{MC}/\text{NF}} \frac{\text{NFS}}{\text{NF}}
\]  
(V-5)

\[
\frac{d\text{NFR}}{dt} = s_{\text{NFR}} - c_{\text{NFR}} - \text{lys}_{\text{R}}^{\text{NF}} - \text{graz}_{\text{MC}/\text{NF}} \frac{\text{NFR}}{\text{NF}}
\]  
(V-6)

**Protozooplankton**
Micro-zooplankton (MCZ):

\[
\frac{d\text{MCZ}}{dt} = \mu_{\text{MCZ}} - \text{lys}_{\text{MCZ}} - \text{graz}_{\text{MS}/\text{MC}}
\]  
(V-7)

Heterotrophic nanoflagellates (HNF):

\[
\frac{d\text{HNF}}{dt} = \mu_{\text{HNF}} - \text{lys}_{\text{HNF}} - \text{graz}_{\text{MC}/\text{HNF}}
\]  
(V-8)

**Bacteria (BAC), C and N monomeric substrates for bacteria (BSC, BSN)**

\[
\frac{d\text{BAC}}{dt} = \mu_{\text{BAC}} - \text{lys}_{\text{BAC}} - \text{graz}_{\text{HNF}}
\]  
(V-9)

\[
\frac{d\text{BSC}}{dt} = \text{elys}_{\text{D}1} + \text{elys}_{\text{D}2} + \text{lys}_{\text{S}}^{\text{DA}} + \text{lys}_{\text{S}}^{\text{NF}} + \text{e}_{\text{DA}} + \text{e}_{\text{NF}} - \text{upt}_{\text{BAC}}
\]  
(V-10)

\[
\frac{d\text{BSN}}{dt} = \text{elys}_{\text{D}1} \frac{\text{DN}_{1}}{\text{DC}_{1}} + \text{elys}_{\text{D}2} \frac{\text{DN}_{2}}{\text{DC}_{2}} - \text{upt}_{\text{BAC}} \frac{\text{BSN}}{\text{BSC}}
\]  
(V-11)

**Organic matter** (D = dissolved, P = particulate, i: 1. quickly, 2. slowly biodegradable substrates)

\[
\frac{d\text{DC}}{dt} = \text{e}_{\text{D}1} \text{lys}_{\text{bio}} + \text{lys}_{\text{PC}} - \text{elys}_{\text{D}}
\]  
(V-12)

\[
\frac{d\text{PC}}{dt} = \text{e}_{\text{P}1} \text{lys}_{\text{bio}} - \text{lys}_{\text{PC}} - \text{sed}_{\text{PC}}
\]  
(V-13)

(continued on next page)
Table 2 (continued)

with

\[ \text{lys}_{\text{bio}} = \text{lys}_{\text{DAF}}^\Delta + \text{lys}_{\text{NF}}^\Delta + \text{lys}_{\text{MCZ}} + \text{lys}_{\text{HNF}} + \text{lys}_{\text{BAC}} \]

\[ \frac{\text{dDN}_i}{\text{dt}} = \varepsilon_i \text{lys}_{\text{bio}} - \text{elys}_{\text{DC}} \frac{\text{DN}_i}{\text{DC}_i} \] (V-14)

\[ \frac{\text{dPN}_i}{\text{dt}} = \varepsilon_i \text{lys}_{\text{bio}} - \text{elys}_{\text{sed}} \text{PN}_i (V-15) \]

with

\[ \text{lys}_{\text{bio}} = \frac{\text{lys}_{\text{DAF}}^\Delta + \text{lys}_{\text{NF}}^\Delta}{\text{CN}_{\text{PHY}}} + \frac{\text{lys}_{\text{MCZ}} + \text{lys}_{\text{HNF}}}{\text{CN}_{\text{ZOO}}} + \frac{\text{lys}_{\text{BAC}}}{\text{CN}_{\text{BAC}}} \]

\[ \frac{\text{dDP}_i}{\text{dt}} = \varepsilon_i \text{lys}_{\text{bio}} - \text{elys}_{\text{DC}} \frac{\text{DP}_i}{\text{DC}_i} \] (V-16)

\[ \frac{\text{dPP}_i}{\text{dt}} = \varepsilon_i \text{lys}_{\text{bio}} - \text{elys}_{\text{sed}} \text{PP}_i \] (V-17)

with \[ \text{lys}_{\text{bio}} = \frac{\text{lys}_{\text{DAF}}^\Delta + \text{lys}_{\text{NF}}^\Delta}{\text{CP}_{\text{PHY}}} + \frac{\text{lys}_{\text{MCZ}} + \text{lys}_{\text{HNF}}}{\text{CP}_{\text{ZOO}}} + \frac{\text{lys}_{\text{BAC}}}{\text{CP}_{\text{BAC}}} \]

Nutrients

\[ \frac{\text{dNO}_3}{\text{dt}} = - \text{upt}_{\text{PHY}} \] (V-18)

\[ \frac{\text{dNH}_4}{\text{dt}} = \text{z}_{\text{BAC}} + \text{reg}_{\text{MCZ}}^N + \text{reg}_{\text{HNF}}^N - \text{upt}_{\text{PHY}}^N \] (V-19)

\[ \frac{\text{dPO}_4}{\text{dt}} = \text{elys}_{\text{DA}} \frac{\text{DP}_1}{\text{DC}_1} + \text{elys}_\text{PP1} + \text{elys}_{\text{DA}} \frac{\text{DP}_2}{\text{DC}_2} + \text{elys}_{\text{PP2}} + \text{reg}_{\text{MCZ}}^P + \text{reg}_{\text{HNF}}^P - \text{upt}_{\text{PHY}}^P - \text{upt}_{\text{BAC}}^P \] (V-20)

\[ \frac{\text{dDSi}}{\text{dt}} = \text{lys}_{\text{BSi}} - \text{upt}_{\text{DA}}^S \] (V-21)

\[ \frac{\text{dBSi}}{\text{dt}} = \text{upt}_\text{DA}^S - \text{lys}_{\text{BSi}} - \text{sed}_{\text{BSi}} \] (V-22)

\[ \frac{\text{dDFe}}{\text{dt}} = \text{reg}_{\text{MCZ}}^F + \text{reg}_{\text{HNF}}^F + \text{lys}_{\text{bio}}^F - \text{upt}_{\text{PHY}}^F - \text{upt}_{\text{BAC}}^F \] (V-23)

with \[ \text{lys}_{\text{bio}}^F = \text{lys}_{\text{DAF}}^F \text{FeC}_{\text{DA}} + \text{lys}_{\text{NF}}^F \text{FeC}_{\text{NF}} + (\text{lys}_{\text{MCZ}} + \text{lys}_{\text{HNF}}) \text{FeC}_{\text{ZOO}} + \text{lys}_{\text{BAC}} \text{FeC}_{\text{BAC}} \]

to a multiplicative Michaelis–Menten kinetics characterized by 3 constants: the maximum specific growth rate \( \mu_{\text{MAX}} \) and the half-saturation constants for the assimilation of \( S (k_S) \) and nutrient. One single nutrient is considered as limiting phytoplankton growth. It corresponds to the nutrient that displays the lowest ambient concentration compared to the half-saturation constant for phytoplankton uptake. Conceptually, it can be either inorganic N (\( \text{NO}_3 + \text{NH}_4 \)), Si, PO4 or Fe, and the
Table 3
SWAMCO model: kinetic expressions of the processes

**Diatoms** DA, **nanoflagellates** NF

### Photosynthesis

\[ \varphi_i = k_{\text{max}} \left( 1 - e^{-\alpha_i/\text{grow}} \right) e^{-\beta_i/\text{grow}} F_i \]  

(P-1)

with

\[ I = I_0(1 - a_{\text{ice}}) + (1 - a_{\text{sea}})(1 - \text{ice})e^{-\eta}, \quad a_{\text{ice}} = 0.95; \quad a_{\text{sea}} = 0.15 \]

where \( I_0 \) is the incident PAR [\( \mu \text{mole m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1} \)]; \( \eta \) the depth [m]; and ice the ice cover [fraction]

\[ \eta = 0.042 + 0.025 \sum_i \frac{F_i}{\text{DA, NF}} \]

### Lysis and exudation

\[ \text{lys}_i^F = k_{\text{lys}} F_i; \quad \text{lys}_i^S = k_{\text{lys}} S_i; \quad \text{lys}_i^R = k_{\text{lys}} R_i \]  

(P-2)

\[ \text{lys}_i^\text{BSi} = k_{\text{lys}} \text{BSi} \]  

(P-3)

\[ \epsilon_i = \epsilon \varphi_i \]  

(P-4)

### Synthesis (s) and catabolism (c) of reserve products

\[ s_i^R = \rho_s \frac{S_i^m}{S_i^m + k_s} F_i \quad \text{with} \quad S_i^m = S_i/F_i - Q_s \]  

(P-5)

\[ c_i^R = k_c R_i \]  

(P-6)

### Growth and respiration

\[ \mu_i = \mu_{\text{max}} \frac{S_i^m}{S_i^m + k_s} N F_i \]  

(P-7)

with

\[ N = \min \left( \frac{N_i^m}{N_i^m + k_N}, \frac{P_i^m}{P_i^m + k_P}, \frac{F_i^c}{F_i^c + k_F}, \left[ \frac{S_i^m}{S_i^m + k_S} \right] \right) \]

\[ N_i^m = \text{NO}_3 + \text{NH}_4 - k_v/10 \]

\[ P_i^m = \text{PO}_4 - k_P/10 \]

\[ F_i^c = \text{DFe} - k_i/10 \]

\[ S_i^m = \text{DSi} - k_S/10 \quad (\text{diatoms only}) \]

\[ \text{resp}_i = K_F F_i + \bar{\zeta} \mu_i \]  

(P-8)

with

\[ \bar{\zeta} = \text{ecs}_{\text{NH}}(1 - f_{\text{NO}}) + \text{ecs}_{\text{NO}} f_{\text{NO}}, \quad \text{(metabolic cost)} \]

### Sedimentation (diatoms, biogenic silica)

\[ \text{sed}_{\text{DA}} = k_{\text{sed}} (\text{DAF} + \text{DAS} + \text{DAR}) \]  

(P-9)

\[ \text{sed}_{\text{BSi}} = k_{\text{sed}} \text{BSi} \]  

(P-10)

with \( k_{\text{sed}} = V_{\text{sed}}/2 \text{WML-depth} \)

(continued on next page)
Table 3 (continued)

Nutrients uptake:
\[
\text{upt}_{\text{NO}} = \frac{f_{\text{NO}}}{C_{\text{NO}}} \sum_{i \in \text{DA,NF}} \mu_i \tag{P-11}
\]
with \( f_{\text{NO}} = 1 - I_m \text{NH}_4/(\text{NH}_4 + K_i) \)

\[
\text{upt}_{\text{NH}} = \frac{1 - f_{\text{NO}}}{C_{\text{NH}}} \sum_{i \in \text{DA,NF}} \mu_i \tag{P-12}
\]

\[
\text{upt}_{\text{Fe}} = \sum_{i \in \text{DA,NF}} (\mu_i \text{FeC}_i) \tag{P-13}
\]

\[
\text{upt}_{\text{Si}} = \mu_{\text{DA, SiC}} \tag{P-14}
\]

with \( \text{SiC} = [\text{Si} : \text{C}]_0 + \Phi \text{DFe} \)

\[
\text{upt}_{\text{P}} = \frac{1}{C_{\text{P}}} \sum_{i \in \text{DA,NF}} \mu_i \tag{P-15}
\]

Protozooplankton dynamics

Microzooplankton

Grazing on nano-flagellates:
\[
\mu_{\text{MCZ}} = y_{\text{ZOO graz MCZ}} \tag{P-16}
\]

\[
\text{graz}_{\text{MCZ}} = \text{graz}_{\text{MCZ max}} \frac{f_u}{f_u + k_{\text{max}} \text{MCZ}} \tag{P-17}
\]
with
\[
f_u = (\text{NFF} + \text{NFS} + \text{NFR}) + \text{HNF} - \text{th}_{\text{MCZ}}
\]

\[
\text{graz}_{\text{MCZ,NF}} = \text{graz}_{\text{MCZ}} \frac{\text{NF}}{\text{NF} + \text{HNF}} \tag{P-18}
\]

\[
\text{graz}_{\text{MCZ,HNF}} = \text{graz}_{\text{MCZ}} \frac{\text{HNF}}{\text{NF} + \text{HNF}} \tag{P-19}
\]

Lysis:
\[
\text{ly}_{\text{MCZ},d} = k_{\text{ZOO}} \text{MCZ} \tag{P-20}
\]

Nutrient regeneration
\[
\text{reg}_{\text{MCZ}} = \text{graz}_{\text{MCZ}} \text{NFF/CN} + \frac{\text{HNF/CN}_{\text{ZOO}}}{\text{NF} + \text{HNF}} - \mu_{\text{MCZ}/\text{CNZOO}} \tag{P-21}
\]

\[
\text{reg}_{\text{MCZ}} = \text{graz}_{\text{MCZ}} \frac{\text{NFF/CP} + \text{HNF/CP}_{\text{ZOO}}}{\text{NF} + \text{HNF}} - \mu_{\text{MCZ}/\text{CPZOO}} \tag{P-22}
\]

\[
\text{reg}_{\text{MCZ}} = \text{graz}_{\text{MCZ}} \frac{\text{NFF FeC}_{\text{NF}} + \text{HNFFeC}_{\text{ZOO}}}{\text{NF} + \text{HNF}} - \mu_{\text{MCZFeCZOO}} \tag{P-23}
\]
Table 3 (continued)

**Heterotrophic nano-flagellates**

Grazing on bacteria:

\[
\mu_{\text{HNF}} = y_{\text{ZOO}} \text{graz}_{\text{HNF}} \quad \text{(P-24)}
\]

\[
\text{graz}_{\text{HNF}} = \frac{f_{\mu}}{f_{\mu} + k_g} \text{HNF} \quad \text{(P-25)}
\]

with \( f_{\mu} = \text{BAC} - \text{th}_{\text{HNF}} \)

Lysis:

\[
\text{lys}_{\text{HNF}} = k_g^{\text{ZOO}} \text{HNF} \quad \text{(P-26)}
\]

Nutrient regeneration:

\[
\text{reg}_{\text{HNF}}^N = \frac{\text{graz}_{\text{HNF}}}{\text{CN}_{\text{BAC}}} - \frac{\mu_{\text{HNF}}}{\text{CN}_{\text{ZOO}}} \quad \text{(P-27)}
\]

\[
\text{reg}_{\text{HNF}}^P = \frac{\text{graz}_{\text{HNF}}}{\text{CP}_{\text{BAC}}} - \frac{\mu_{\text{HNF}}}{\text{CP}_{\text{ZOO}}} \quad \text{(P-28)}
\]

\[
\text{reg}_{\text{HNF}}^{Fe} = \text{graz}_{\text{HNF}} \text{FeC}_{\text{BAC}} - \mu_{\text{HNF}} \text{FeC}_{\text{ZOO}} \quad \text{(P-29)}
\]

Grazing by mesozooplankton on diatoms and microzooplankton

\[
\text{graz}_{\text{MS/MC}} = \frac{\text{graz}_{\text{MSZ}}}{\text{MCZ} + \text{DA}} \quad \text{(P-30)}
\]

\[
\text{graz}_{\text{MS/DA}} = \frac{\text{graz}_{\text{MSZ}}}{\text{DA} + \text{MCZ} + \text{DA}} \quad \text{(P-31)}
\]

with \( \text{DA} = \text{DAF} + \text{DAS} + \text{DAR} \) \( \text{graz}_{\text{MSZ}} \): forcing function.

**Microbial loop dynamics**

**Bacteria**

**Growth:**

\[
\mu_{\text{BAC}} = \text{upt}_{\text{BAC}} y_{\text{BAC}} \quad \text{(P-32)}
\]

\[
\text{upt}_{\text{BAC}} = b_{\max} \frac{S^m}{S^m + k_{\text{BSC}}} \text{BAC} \quad \text{(P-33)}
\]

with \( S^m = \text{BSC} - \frac{k_{\text{BSC}}}{10} \)

**P and Fe uptake:**

\[
\text{upt}_{\text{BAC}}^P = \frac{\mu_{\text{BAC}}}{\text{CP}_{\text{BAC}}} \quad \text{(P-34)}
\]

\[
\text{upt}_{\text{BAC}}^{Fe} = \mu_{\text{BAC}} \text{FeC}_{\text{BAC}} \quad \text{(P-35)}
\]

**Ammonification:**

\[
\text{upt}_{\text{BAC}}^N = \frac{\text{upt}_{\text{BAC}} \text{BSN}}{\text{BSC}} - \frac{\mu_{\text{BAC}}}{\text{CN}_{\text{BAC}}} \quad \text{(P-36)}
\]

(continued on next page)
selection is determined at each time step by the minimum function described in Eq. (P-7) (Table 3).

The photosynthetic process $\varphi$ (Eq. (P-1), Table 3) is governed by the photosynthetically available irradiance (PAR) or $I$ according to the relationship of Platt et al. (1980). It is characterized by three parameters normalized to the functional cellular constituents: (i) the maximal photosynthetic capacity $K_{\text{max}}$, (ii) the photosynthetic efficiency $\alpha$ and (iii) a description of the photoinhibition $\beta$. The ambient light $I$ is calculated from (i) the incident PAR $I_0$ in combination with (ii) ice cover, assuming an albedo of sea-ice and water of 0.95 and 0.15, respectively, and $I$ decreases with depth according to (iii) the Beer–Lambert equation parametrized by the coefficient of vertical light attenuation $\eta$ (Eq. (P-1), Table 3), which is calculated from phytoplankton biomass according to the empirical relationship determined by Lancelot et al. (1991a) for Antarctic waters. The simple photosynthesis model was preferred to other more sophisticated bio-optical models based on the chlorophyll specific absorption spectrum of phytoplankton and the vertical field of the light spectrum (e.g. Arrigo et al., 1998b; Pondaven et al., 1998), in keeping with the observational data set available for parameterization of photosynthesis by autotrophic flagellates and diatoms.

The synthesis of reserve products $s_R$ (Eq. (P-5), Table 3) is governed by the availability of the intracellular monomers S following Michaelis–Menten kinetics characterized by the constants $\rho_{\text{max}}$ (the maximum specific rate of reserve products synthesis $R$), and $k_s$, the half-saturation constant for the assimilation of S. The catabolism of the reserve products $c_R$ is postulated to obey first-order kinetics characterized by the constant $k_c^R$ (Eq. (P-6), Table 3).

The metabolic costs are met primarily by cellular respiration $\text{resp}$. This process is expressed by the sum of two terms (Eq. (P-8), Table 3), associated with maintenance processes and the synthesis of new cellular material (Shuter, 1979). Maintenance is
### Table 4
SWAMCO model: parameterization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Phytoplankton dynamics</td>
<td>State variables: F (functional and structural metabolites), R (reserve products), S (monomers)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{max}}$</td>
<td>Photosynthesis optimal specific rate</td>
<td>h$^{-1}$</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>Photosynthetic efficiency</td>
<td>m$^2$ s (µmol h)$^{-1}$</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>Photoinhibition index</td>
<td>m$^2$ s (µmol h)$^{-1}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_{\text{max}}$</td>
<td>Maximum specific rate of F synthesis</td>
<td>h$^{-1}$</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_s$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2}$ Saturation constant of S assimilation</td>
<td>mol C (mol C)$^{-1}$</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_s$</td>
<td>Cellular quota of monomeric substrates</td>
<td>mol C (mol C)$^{-1}$</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_{\text{max}}$</td>
<td>Optimal specific rate of R synthesis</td>
<td>h$^{-1}$</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{R}}^c$</td>
<td>Specific rate of R catabolism</td>
<td>h$^{-1}$</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_F$</td>
<td>Specific rate of maintenance metabolism</td>
<td>h$^{-1}$</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{ecs}_{\text{NH}_4}$</td>
<td>Energy cost of F synthesis (NH$_4$ source)</td>
<td>mol C (mol C)$^{-1}$</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{ecs}_{\text{NO}_3}$</td>
<td>Energy cost of F synthesis (NO$_3$ source)</td>
<td>mol C (mol C)$^{-1}$</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{lyso}}$</td>
<td>Specific rate of cell autolysis</td>
<td>h$^{-1}$</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon$</td>
<td>Exudation constant</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{\text{sed}}$</td>
<td>Sedimentation velocity</td>
<td>m h$^{-1}$</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Nutrients uptake**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$k_N$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2}$ Saturation constant for N uptake</td>
<td>mmol N m$^{-3}$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_P$</td>
<td>$\frac{1}{2}$ Saturation constant for P uptake</td>
<td>mmol P m$^{-3}$</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{Si}}$</td>
<td>Saturation constant for DSi uptake(DA)</td>
<td>mmol Si m$^{-3}$</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{DA}}^{\text{Fe}}$</td>
<td>Saturation constant for DFe uptake (DA)</td>
<td>µmol Fe m$^{-3}$</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{Fe}}^{\text{NF}}$</td>
<td>Sat. const. for Fe uptake (NF)</td>
<td>µmol Fe m$^{-3}$</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$I_m$</td>
<td>NO$_3$ Uptake inhibition by NH$_4$: max. rate</td>
<td>mol N (mol N)$^{-1}$</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_i$</td>
<td>NO$_3$ Uptake inhibition by NH$_4$: max. rate</td>
<td>mmol N m$^{-3}$</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cellular stoichiometry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN$_{\text{PHY}}$</td>
<td>C–F: N ratio*</td>
<td>mol C (mol N)$^{-1}$</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP$_{\text{PHY}}$</td>
<td>C–F: P ratio*</td>
<td>mol C (mol P)$^{-1}$</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeC$_{\text{DA}}$</td>
<td>Fe: C–F ratio (diatoms)*</td>
<td>mmol Fe (mol C)$^{-1}$</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>i, j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeC$_{\text{NF}}$</td>
<td>Fe: C–F ratio (nanoflagellates)*</td>
<td>mmol Fe (mol C)$^{-1}$</td>
<td>0.0025</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued on next page)
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \Phi )</td>
<td>Si: C–F dependency to dissolved Fe (slope)⁷</td>
<td>mol Si (mol C l mol Fe m⁻³)⁻¹</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{SiC}_0 )</td>
<td>Si: C–F dependency to diss. Fe (intercept)⁷</td>
<td>mol Si (mol C)⁻¹</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \chi )</td>
<td>Conversion factor (Chl a/C–F)</td>
<td>g Chl a (mol C)⁻¹</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Protozooplankton dynamics

| \( \text{graz}_{\text{MCZ}}^{\text{max}} \) | MCZ max. specific ingestion rate | h⁻¹ | 0.02 | p |
| \( \text{graz}_{\text{HNF}}^{\text{max}} \) | HNF max. specific ingestion rate | h⁻¹ | 0.03 | p |
| \( k_g \) | ½ Saturation constant of ingestion | mmol C m⁻³ | 0.25 | p |
| \( \text{ths}_{\text{MCZ}} \) | Prey threshold for food ingestion (MCZ) | mmol C m⁻³ | 0.083 | p |
| \( \text{ths}_{\text{HNF}} \) | Prey threshold for food ingestion (HNF) | mmol C m⁻³ | 0.33 | p |
| \( \gamma_{\text{ZOO}} \) | Growth efficiency | Dimensionless | 0.38 | q |
| \( k_{d}^{\text{ZOO}} \) | Autolysis specific rate | h⁻¹ | 0.001 | r |

(Cellular stoichiometry)

| \( \text{CN}_{\text{ZOO}} \) | C : N ratio | mol C (mol N)⁻¹ | 5 | o |
| \( \text{CP}_{\text{ZOO}} \) | C : P ratio | mol C (mol P)⁻¹ | 80 | s |
| \( \text{FeC}_{\text{ZOO}} \) | Fe : C ratio | mmolFe (mol C)⁻¹ | 0.0024 | t |

(c) Microbial loop dynamics

*Organic matter dynamics*

| \( \xi_{1} \) | D1 fraction in lysis products | — | 0.3 | r |
| \( \xi_{2} \) | D2 fraction in lysis products | — | 0.2 | r |
| \( \eta_{1} \) | P1 fraction in lysis products | — | 0.1 | r |
| \( \eta_{2} \) | P2 fraction in lysis products | — | 0.4 | r |
| \( k_1 \) | P1 hydrolysis rate | h⁻¹ | 0.005 | k |
| \( k_2 \) | P2 hydrolysis rate | h⁻¹ | 25 \times 10⁻⁵ | k |
| \( e_{1,\text{max}}^{\text{**}} \) | Max. spec. rate of D1 exoenzymatic hydrolysis | h⁻¹ | 0.75 | u |
| \( e_{2,\text{max}}^{\text{**}} \) | Max. spec. rate of D2 exoenzymatic hydrolysis | h⁻¹ | 0.25 | u |
| \( k_d^{1} \) | ½ sat. const. For D1 exoenzymatic hydrolysis | mmol C m⁻³ | 8.3 | u |
| \( k_d^{2} \) | ½ sat. const. For D2 exoenzymatic hydrolysis | mmol C m⁻³ | 83 | u |

*Bacteria metabolism*

| \( b_{\text{max}}^{\text{**}} \) | Max. specific rate of BS uptake | h⁻¹ | 0.18 | u |
| \( k_{\text{BSC}} \) | ½ saturation constant for BS uptake | mmol C m⁻³ | 0.83 | u |
| \( \gamma_{\text{BAC}} \) | Growth efficiency | — | 0.25 | x |
| \( k_{d}^{\text{BAC},\text{**}} \) | Autolysis specific rate | h⁻¹ | 0.01 | u |
Table 4 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CN&lt;sub&gt;BAC&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>C : N ratio</td>
<td>mol C (mol N)^(-1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP&lt;sub&gt;BAC&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>C : P ratio</td>
<td>mol C (mol P)^(-1)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FeC&lt;sub&gt;BAC&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Fe : C ratio</td>
<td>mmolFe (mol C)^(-1)</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Temperature dependence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T&lt;sub&gt;opt&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Optimal temperature</td>
<td>°C</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔT</td>
<td>Temperature interval</td>
<td>°C</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Lancelot et al. (1991a).
* Penning De Vries et al. (1974).
* Scharek et al. (1997).
* Lancelot et al. (1986).
* Redfield et al. (1963).
* Muggli et al. (1996).
* Lancelot et al. (1997).
* Price et al. (1994).
* Morel et al. (1990).
* Adapted from Pondaven et al. (1998).
* Tortell et al. (1996).
* Becquevort (1999).
* Adjusted.
* Redfield et al. (1963).
* Chase and Price (1997).
* Billen and Servais (1988).
* Redfield et al. (1963).
* Lancelot et al. (1991b).
* C–F: functional and structural metabolites of phytoplanktonic cells (see Table 1).
** Dependence to temperature expressed as follows: \( p = p'(0.1 + 0.9e(T - T_{opt})^2/\Delta T^2) \).
only the diatoms (Eq. (P-9), Table 3) and biogenic silica (Eq. (P-10), Table 3) and is described by first-order rate parameterized by the constant $k_{sed}$.

The physiological parameters relevant to phytoplankton growth were determined experimentally by fitting the set of equations (Lancelot et al., 1991, 1997; Mathot et al., 1992) to experimental field $^{14}$C data describing the photosynthesis–light relationship and time-course $C$ assimilation in phytoplankton cellular constituents over a 24-h cycle. When conducted at iron-replete concentration, no significant difference in either photosynthetic or growth parameters of the nanophytoplankton-dominant or diatom-dominant communities could be shown (Lancelot et al., 1997). Furthermore, no significant difference in the biochemical composition of controls and iron-enriched field populations has been recorded in iron enrichment bioassay experiments (van Leeuwe et al., 1997). Combining these results allows us to choose just one set of parameters to characterize the carbon metabolism (photosynthesis, growth, respiration, catabolism, exudation) of both phytoplankton groups (Table 4). Furthermore, this set of parameters holds for the whole Southern Ocean because of the lack of significant temperature dependence observed in the range $-1.8$ and $+3.5 \, ^{\circ}C$ (Lancelot et al., 1991a, 1997; Mathot, 1995). Consequently, the physiological growth of diatoms (DA) and nanophytoplankton (NF) in the SWAMCO model is differentiated by the physiology of Fe assimilation, i.e. the differences in cellular Fe requirements and kinetic parameters of Fe uptake. The observed ability of nanophytoplankton to outcompete large diatoms in the low-iron waters of the Southern Ocean has been attributed to their higher affinity for dissolved iron uptake (low $K_{Fe}^c$) and their lower biochemical iron requirements (Sunda and Huntsman, 1995; Hutchins, 1995). Half-saturation constants for uptake of dissolved Fe by nanophytoplankton and diatoms were chosen at 0.03 $\mu$mol m$^{-3}$ (Price et al., 1994) and 1.2 $\mu$mol m$^{-3}$, respectively (Table 4). The latter concentration was calculated from Fe-enrichment experiments conducted in the Atlantic sector of the Southern Ocean (Scharek et al., 1997; van Leeuwe et al., 1997), assuming that Fe supply in a low Fe environment stimulates only the diatom component of the phytoplankton community. The half-saturation constants are expressed as dissolved Fe to be consistent with the measured dissolved Fe in the ambient seawater during the 1992 campaign (de Baar et al., 1995; Lösch et al., 1997). The role of chemical speciation of the Fe in solution is ignored, because in 1992 this had not yet been investigated. In a subsequent 1995 expedition in the remote Pacific sector (Nolting et al., 1998) the organic complexation of Fe was about 98% leaving only 2% for Fe$^+$, which is the sum of all inorganic Fe(III) species, ignoring reduced Fe(II) forms. When applied to the above $K_{Fe}^c$ values for the large diatoms this would correspond to a half-saturation value $K_{Fe}^c$ of 0.024 $\mu$mol m$^{-3}$. This concentration corresponds well with $K_{Fe}^c$ values of order 0.05–0.08 $\mu$mol m$^{-3}$ for a large neritic diatom Chaetoceros calcitrans grown in the laboratory in EDTA manipulated cultures (Timmermans et al., unpublished results). Otherwise the paradigm of Fe$^+$ being the master variable has arisen from EDTA-manipulated cultures, in which the chemical speciation of Fe has little resemblance to natural seawater (Gerringa et al., 2000). For natural seawater there currently does not yet exist a study in which all the three major forms (Fe$^+$, Fe(III)-organic chelates, reduced Fe(II)) have been assessed simultaneously, let alone the availability of one or more of these forms for uptake by
phytoplankton. For example, the recent study (Hutchins et al., 1999) reports that different phytoplankton species apparently prefer different organic chelates of Fe, implicitly suggesting that more than just the inorganic Fe(III) is affecting plankton growth. Ongoing research of this type, including that in our group, towards unraveling Fe chemical speciation and phytoplankton growth in natural seawater may eventually lead to refinement of ecosystem models like the one here presented.

The cellular Fe requirement (Fe : C) was derived from the literature (Morel et al., 1990; Brand, 1991; Sunda et al., 1991; Muggli et al., 1996) and fixed at 0.2 for diatoms (DA) and 0.0025 mmol : mol nanophytoplankton (NF) (Table 4). The model further considers the negative regulation by ambient Fe of the silicification (Si : C) by diatoms as recently shown by Takeda (1998) and Hutchins and Bruland (1998). The empirical equation described in (P-14) (Table 3) is derived from the bioassay experiments of Takeda (1998) on Antarctic diatoms. Here the term $[\text{Si : C}]_0$ is the silicification level at depleted Fe, and $\Phi$ is the slope of the negative correlation.

The sedimentation rate $v_{sed}$ was fixed at 0.08 m h$^{-1}$ in order to take into consideration an average forcing of Fe stress (Muggli et al., 1996) and aggregation.

### 2.2.2. Protozooplankton dynamics

The marine protozoan community includes a large range of microorganisms which are able to ingest bacteria or auto- and heterotrophic flagellates. Food competitive experiments run on several field communities (Lancelot et al., 1997; Becquevort, 1999) show, however, that the Antarctic protozoan community is highly food selective, allowing it to be represented by two state variables. These are the bacterivorous heterotrophic nanoflagellates HNF feeding on the only bacteria BAC and the microzooplankton MCZ grazing on autotrophic (NF) and heterotrophic (HNF) nanoflagellates. The whole community undergoes grazing pressure by metazoans and krill (Eqs. (V-7) and (V-8), Table 2).

The protozoan ingestion rate $graz$ (Eqs. (P-17) and (P-25), Table 3) is governed by food availability and obeys Michaelis–Menten kinetics above a threshold value (ths) below which no grazing is likely (Becquevort, 1997). In the absence of food selectivity, the fraction of microzooplankton grazing activity on nanophytoplankton corresponds to the relative abundance of the latter over the total nanoflagellate community (Eqs. (P-17)–(P-19)). A constant fraction $y_{zoo}$ of the ingested food by microzooplankton (MCZ) and bacterivorous heterotrophic nanoflagellates (HNF) is converted into biomass (Eqs. (P-16) and (P-24), Table 3), the remaining being respired. The rate of cell autolysis for both groups ($\text{lys}_{MCZ}$ and $\text{lys}_{HNF}$ in Eqs. (P-20) and (P-26)) is described by first order kinetics, in which $k_{zoo}$ is a first-order constant. Microzooplankton mortality by grazing corresponds to the part of overall metazoan grazing (considered here as a biological constraint) on microzooplankton (MCZ) with respect to diatoms (DA), in the assumed absence of food selectivity (Eq. (P-30), Table 3).

Protozoan feeding parameters (Table 4) were determined by fitting the process equations to data from kinetic experiments measuring the ingestion rate of natural assemblages of protozoa in the presence of various concentrations of prey (Lancelot et al., 1997; Becquevort, 1999). Half-saturation constants for prey ingestion were remarkably similar for bacterivorous nanoflagellates and microzooplankton, around
0.25 mmol C m$^{-3}$ (Table 4). Unexpectedly, the threshold food concentration below which no grazing was occurring was significantly lower for microzooplankton (MCZ) than for bacterivorous heterotrophic nanoflagellates (HNF), emphasizing a strong coupling between microzooplankton and their prey consisting of both auto- and heterotrophic nanoflagellates (NF and HNF). The common value of 0.38 was considered as typical for the growth efficiency of Antarctic protozoa (Björnsen and Kuparinen, 1991).

2.2.3. Microbial loop dynamics

The model of organic matter degradation by bacteria considers one single bacterio- plankton group BAC (including both free-living and attached bacteria on particles and aggregates) and five pools of organic substrates (the monomeric substrates for bacteria BS; the rapidly biodegradable dissolved and particulate organic matter $D_1$ and $P_1$; the slowly biodegradable dissolved and particulate organic matter $D_2$ and $P_2$). The growth of the bacteria is directly dependent on the concentration of their substrate (BS), the organic monomers available for transfer into bacteria. These monomers are supplied either directly by phytoplankton exudation or indirectly after bacterial ectoenzymatic hydrolysis of the dissolved and particulate polymers ($D_i$ and $P_i$). The elemental composition of organic polymers includes carbon (DC; PC$_i$), nitrogen (DN$_i$; PN$_i$) and phosphorus (DP$_i$; PP$_i$). That of the monomers include carbon (BSC) and nitrogen (BSN). Conservation equations are listed in Table 2 (Eqs. (V-9)–(V-17).

The dissolved and particulate polymers ($D_i$ and $P_i$) are supplied by lysis of phytoplankton, bacteria and protozoa. The model defines as $e_D^i$ and $e_P^i$ the fractions of $D_i$ and $P_i$ of the bulk of organic matter released by lysis (Eqs. (V-12)–(V-17), Table 2). The hydrolysis rate of particulate polymers $\text{lys}_{P_i}$ (Eq. (P-39), Table 3) is described by first-order kinetics characterized by 2 constants $k_{h1}^i$ and $k_{h2}^i$. The involvement of attached bacteria in this process is indirectly considered by assuming a temperature dependence for the hydrolysis constant $k_{h1}^i$ such as described in Eq. (P-41) (Table 3). The ectoenzymatic hydrolysis elys $D_i$ of dissolved organic polymers (Eq. (P-38), Table 3) obeys a Michaelis–Menten kinetics (Somville and Billen, 1983) characterized by two sets of two specific parameters (the maximum specific rate of ectoenzymatic hydrolysis $e_{\text{max}}^i$ and the half-saturation constant $k_D^i$ for hydrolysis of $D_i$), owing to the different susceptibilities to enzymatic hydrolysis of the two classes of dissolved polymers (Billen, 1990).

The bacterial uptake of monomeric substrates (BS) $\text{upt}_{BAC}$ is assumed to obey Michaelis–Menten kinetics (Eq. (P-33), Table 3) where $b_{\text{max}}$ and $k_{\text{SBC}}$ are the maximum specific rate and half-saturation constant of substrate uptake by bacteria. A constant fraction $\gamma_{BAC}$ of the amount of substrates taken up is used for biomass production (Eq. (P-32), Table 3), the remaining part being respired and remineralized.

Parameters were determined experimentally (Billen and Becquevort, 1991; Lancelot et al., 1991b; Servais et al., 1987). Values are reported in Table 4. Contrasting with eukaryotic cells, bacterial activity in the Southern Ocean was found to be governed by ambient temperature according to the sigmoid relationship (Eq. (P-41), Table 3) described in Billen and Becquevort (1991).
2.2.4. Inorganic nutrients loop

Nitrate, ammonium, phosphate, iron and silicate (NO$_3^-$, NH$_4^+$, PO$_4^{3-}$, DFe and DSi) are the inorganic nutrients considered by the model (Eqs. (V-18)–(V-23), Table 2). Both algal groups, the diatoms and the nanoflagellates, take up nitrate, preferably ammonia, phosphate and iron, all to be assimilated into the only functional constituents F (Lancelot et al., 1986). The ratio of phytoplankton nitrate uptake to the total inorganic N uptake ($f_{NO3}$; (Eq. (P-11) in Table 3) is governed by ammonia according to the non-competitive inhibition equation suggested by Harrison et al. (1996) and parameterized by Elskens et al. (1997), (Table 4). Silicate is used only by the diatoms and is released into the surrounding medium after diatom autolysis. Uptake rates of N, P, Si and Fe (Eqs. (P-11)–(P-15), Table 3) are deduced from the computed phytoplankton growth rate (Eq. (P-7), Table 3) and the cellular stoichiometry of diatoms and nanophytoplankton (Table 4). Iron and phosphorus requirements of the bacteria are met by direct uptake of both nutrients. In contrast, NH$_4^+$ can be either taken up or released by bacteria according to the N : C ratio of their substrates and their own biochemical requirements (Eq. (P-36), Table 3). The ammonia, phosphate and iron are released by protozoa as products of their metabolism (Hutchins et al., 1995). Regenerating processes are computed by comparing the N, P and Fe content of food resources with their biochemical requirements (Eqs. (P-21)–(P-23), Eqs. (P-27)–(P-29), Table 3). Autolysis of micro-organisms further releases iron into the surrounding medium (Eq. (V-23), Table 2). Stoichiometric ratios (Fe : N : Si : C) were derived from literature values (Morel et al., 1990; Chase and Price, 1997; Sunda and Huntsman, 1997; Tortell et al., 1996) and are reported in Table 4 for phytoplankton, protozooplankton and bacterioplankton.

3. Model results: application to the conditions of ANTX/6 cruise of RV Polarstern

3.1. The 1992 spring bloom in the Atlantic sector of the Southern Ocean

The ANTX/6 sampling site at 6°W and between 48 and 60° S in the Atlantic sector of the Southern Ocean is crossed by two eastward flowing but contrasting water masses (de Baar et al., 1995; Veth et al., 1997). These are the iron-depleted ($\approx 0.4$ nM) but sea-ice-associated southern branch of the Antarctic Circumpolar Current ACC ($\approx 51$–$56^o$S) and the iron-enriched (1.8 nM) Polar Frontal region PFr ($\approx 47$–$50^o$S). Transects extending from the ice edge of the eastern Weddell Sea, across the southern branch of the ACC into the Polar Front had repeatedly been sampled over more than a one-month period (Fig. 2), at the early beginning of the 1992 growth season. Meteorological conditions were severe in particular during the first half of the cruise, when storm events with wind velocities higher than 15 m s$^{-1}$ were frequent (Fig. 3a). Results are well documented [see the special issue of DSR Part II, 44(1–2) edited by Smetacek et al., 1997a,b] and include a large data set (Rommets et al., 1997) of spatio-temporal distributions of inorganic nutrients and dissolved iron (Lö cher et al., 1997), Chl $a$ (Bathmann et al., 1997), biogenic silica (Quéguiner et al., 1997), diatoms and nanophytoplankton (Bathmann et al., 1997), bacteria (Lochte et al., 1997),
Fig. 2. Latitude vs. time cruise track on the 6°W meridian of ANT X/6 aboard R.V. Polarstern. Transects number and the change in ice-edge position are indicated.

microzooplankton (Becquevort, 1997) and metazooplankton (Fransz and Gonzales, 1997; Dubischar and Bathmann, 1997) that can be used for comparison with model results.

One of the major findings of the cruise was the negligible build-up of phytoplankton biomass at the retreating ice-edge. Chl $a$ concentrations were significantly less than 1 mg m$^{-3}$ (Bathmann et al., 1997). The spring microbial community was organized in a complex microbial network composed of autotrophic nanoflagellates, bacteria, bactivorous (heterotrophic flagellates) and protistovorous protozoa (microprotozoa) of low and relatively stable biomass (Becquevort, 1997). This was in contrast with the Polar Frontal region where concentrations of Chl $a$ as high as 3 mg m$^{-3}$ were observed at the end of the sampling period (Bathmann et al., 1997), when meteorological conditions were improving (Fig. 3a). In this region Chl $a$ increased from 0.6–1.6 to 1.2–2.4 mg m$^{-3}$ within about three weeks, while dissolved iron exhibited a concomitant seasonal decrease of almost 1 μmol m$^{-3}$ (de Baar et al., 1995). Elevated rates of primary production between 80 and 250 mmol C m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$, mostly synthesized by the largest (>20 μm) phytoplankton, were measured (Jochem et al., 1995), and the phytoplankton community was dominated by neritic diatoms such as Corethron criophilum and Fragilariopsis kerguelensis (Veth et al., 1997). Accordingly, significant export production of particulate carbon had been estimated in this area from $^{234}$Th deficiencies (Rutgers van der Loeff et al., 1997).

3.2. SWAMCO model implementation

For its application in the Antarctic Circumpolar Current during the 1992 cruise ANTX/6 of RV Polarstern, the SWAMCO model was coupled with a one-dimensional
Fig. 3. Evolution of in situ wind speed (a) and simulated wind mixed layer depth (b) in the Polar Frontal region (PFr, at 48°S) and the marginal ice zone (MIZ, at 56°S) over the period of the ANT X/6 cruise.

The 1D-SWAMCO model was tested by running simulations over the 40 d cruise period (20 October–30 November 1992) and for the physico-chemical conditions covering latitudes between 47°S and 58°S, with a half-degree definition. The sea ice conditions, irradiance and meteorological data reconstructed from continuous shipboard measurements and satellite information were used as physical forcing functions. Metazoan grazing pressure was disregarded for this application because of its
Table 5
SWAMCO model: Initial conditions of phytoplankton, protozooplankton, bacteria, organic matter and nutrients for the 3 investigated hydrographic regions (Polar Frontal region, ice-free Southern ACC, Marginal Ice Zone). Data are surface waters averaged concentrations recorded along the first transect (Tr. 2, Fig. 2), extracted from the CD-ROM database of the JGOFS ANT X/6 cruise (Rommets et al., 1997).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State variable</th>
<th>Hydrographic region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phytoplankton</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diatoms mg Chl a m⁻³</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanoflagellates mg Chl a m⁻³</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protozooplankton</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>microzooplankton mmol C m⁻³</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterotrophic nanoflagellates mmol C m⁻³</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bacteria mmol C m⁻³</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organic matter</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved organic carbon mmol C m⁻³</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate organic carbon mmol C m⁻³</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved organic nitrogen mmol N m⁻³</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate organic nitrogen mmol N m⁻³</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nutrients</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrate mmol N m⁻³</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammonium mmol N m⁻³</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phosphate mmol P m⁻³</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silicic acid mmol Si m⁻³</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissolved iron µmol Fe m⁻³</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

negligible contribution at this period of the year (Dubischar and Bathmann, 1997). The temporal variation of the state variables was calculated by integrating the differential equations of the model (Table 2, Eqs. (V-1)–(V-23)) according to the Runge–Kutta fourth order procedure, with a step of 30 min and to a depth of 100 m. The vertical resolution is one meter. The values of the state variables within the upper mixed layer were averaged at each time step. Initial values of chemical and biological state variables (Table 5) were those observed at the first cross-section (Transect 2, Fig. 2) and were extracted from the database of Rommets et al. (1997).

3.3. 1D-SWAMCO model results

3.3.1. Time evolution of wind mixed layer depth and surface layer nutrients and phytoplankton in the Polar Frontal region and at the receding ice-edge

The ability of the SWAMCO model to reproduce the contrasting phytoplankton bloom conditions recorded in spring 1992 in the Polar Frontal region and at the receding ice edge (Marginal Ice Zone, MIZ) was first appraised by comparing model simulations at 48 and 56°S (Figs. 3 and 4) latitude. Fig. 3b shows the daily evolution of
- PFr
- MIZ

(a) Chl a [mg m\(^{-2}\)]
(b) Nanphyto. Chl a [mg m\(^{-2}\)]
(c) Nitrate [nmol m\(^{-3}\)]
(d) Ammonium [nmol m\(^{-3}\)]
(e) Silicic acid [nmol m\(^{-3}\)]
(f) Dissolved iron [nmol m\(^{-3}\)]
(g) Phosphate [nmol m\(^{-3}\)]
(h) POC [nmol m\(^{-3}\)]
the depth of the upper mixed layer over the 40-d cruise period as predicted by running the physical model under in situ meteorological forcing (Fig. 3a). Similar high fluctuations of the wind mixed layer depth (between 10 and 60 m; Fig. 3b) are predicted at both latitudes in response to frequent events of extreme wind (Fig. 3a), while predicted deep wind mixing events are more intense during the first three weeks of the simulated period (Fig. 3b). Also a deeper convection is generally predicted at latitude 56°S, due to the combination of higher winds (Fig. 3a) and sea-ice cooling. At both latitudes a more stable surface layer of about 20 m is predicted during the final ten days of the simulated period (Fig. 3b) coinciding with a lower average wind speed (\(\sim 7 \text{ m s}^{-1}\)) and a decrease of storm frequency (Fig. 3a). The light and iron co-limitation of diatom growth is shown by comparing 1D-SWAMCO simulations of diatom-Chl a (Fig. 4a), dissolved Fe (Fig. 4f) and wind mixed layer depth (Fig. 3b) at both latitudes. In agreement with observations (Bathmann et al., 1997; Veth et al., 1997), a significant diatom build-up, reaching 2.8 mg Chl a m\(^{-3}\), is simulated in the surface layer of the iron-enriched 48°S latitude (Fig. 4a). Maximum Chl a concentrations are predicted at the end of the simulated period, when ambient light is optimal because of the increased stability of the surface layer (Fig. 3b). Concomitant with the increase of diatom-Chl a the model predicts decreases of silicate, nitrate and iron of 10 mmol m\(^{-3}\) (Fig. 4e), 3 mmol m\(^{-3}\) (Fig. 4c) and 1.8 \(\mu\)mol m\(^{-3}\) (Fig. 4f). The simulated imbalance between the nitrate and silicate drop (Figs. 4c and e) fits perfectly with observations at the Polar Front (de Baar et al., 1997) and most likely reflects the iron dependence of the diatom silicification considered in the SWAMCO model (Table 4a). The diatom decline of 0.5 mg Chl a m\(^{-3}\) predicted at the end of the simulated period (Fig. 4a) reflects shortage of dissolved iron (0.16 \(\mu\)mol m\(^{-3}\); Fig. 4f) under optimal light conditions (Fig. 3b). As expected from field observations (Veth et al., 1997) no real diatom bloom is simulated in the iron-deficient ice-covered region where predicted diatom-Chl a remains at concentration less than 0.1 mg m\(^{-3}\) (Fig. 4a). Still a slight increase of diatom-Chl a is predicted at the end of the simulated period coinciding with disappearance of the sea-ice and an enhanced vertical stability (Fig. 3b). This diatom build-up (0.1 mg Chl a m\(^{-3}\)) under optimal light conditions remains trivial, though, because of growth limitation by the low ambient dissolved iron (Fig. 4f). Interestingly, the time evolution of predicted nanophytoplankton-Chl a is constant and similar for both latitudes (Fig. 4b). The low and unchanging concentrations of its Chl a (less than 0.1 mg Chl a m\(^{-3}\); Fig. 4b) predicted under the varied conditions of light and iron reflect the grazer control of autotrophic nanoflagellates.

3.3.2. Geographical variations of nutrients and phytoplankton along Transect 11

The overall performance of the SWAMCO model was best assessed by reconstructing transect 11 of the cruise track (Fig. 2) from the model predictions of dissolved inorganic nutrients and Chl a averaged within the upper mixed layer and comparing them with the corresponding field observations (Fig. 5). Transect 11 was chosen because at that time the phytoplankton distribution was more geographically contrasted and a noticeable diatom bloom was recorded in the Polar Frontal region (Fig. 5a). Fairly good agreement is reached between predictions and available observations (Fig. 5). The model simulates remarkably well the observed geographical distribution
Fig. 5. SWAMCO model predictions (●) vs. field observations (▽) along transect 11 of the ANT X/6 cruise of diatom-Chl a (a), nanoflagellate-Chl a (b), POC (c), biogenic silica (d), nitrate (e), ammonium (f), silicic acid (g), phosphate (h).
of Chl $a$ characterized by elevated concentrations at the Polar Front (Fig. 5a) and the lack of phytoplankton build up at the receding ice-edge (Fig. 5b). More than 90% of the predicted phytoplankton biomass in the Polar Frontal region is diatoms (Fig. 5a), with negligible contribution of nanophytoplankton (Fig. 5b). The model predicts an increase of diatomaceous Chl $a$ of 1.8 mg m$^{-3}$ over the one-month simulated period. This corresponds to a predicted accumulation of 2.5–2.8 mg Chl $a$ m$^{-3}$ (Fig. 5a) and of about 7 mmol m$^{-3}$ biogenic silica (Fig. 5d), both of which compare very well with field measurements (Bathmann et al., 1997; Quéguiner et al., 1997). Significant decreases of dissolved iron and silicate of 1.7 µmol m$^{-3}$ and 10 mmol m$^{-3}$ (Figs. 4e and f) but negligible decreases of nitrate (2 mmol m$^{-3}$; Fig. 4c) and ammonium (0.1 mmol m$^{-3}$; Fig. 4d) are simulated for the same period. Altogether these nutrient simulations are in fine agreement with field data from the Polar Front (de Baar et al., 1997; Löscher et al., 1997; Quéguiner et al., 1997). Model predictions show clearly that depletions of both dissolved Fe and Si are associated with the diatom bloom in the Polar Frontal region, while nitrates are little used and never depleted (Fig. 5e). This gives a computed NO$_3$ : DSi drawdown of 0.22 for the duration (40 d) of the ANT X/6 cruise, very close to that calculated from nutrient vertical profiles (0.27; Löscher et al., 1997). Such a low NO$_3$ : DSi consumption ratio explains the observed and simulated shift in the molar NO$_3$ : DSi signature of surface layer from $\sim$1 (1.2) in winter towards $\sim$3 at the end of the simulated period. In contrast the predicted NO$_3$ : PO$_4$ drawdown occurs at a molar ratio of 14.5, close to Redfield et al. (1963), in close agreement with observations (14.2; Löscher et al., 1997), and not very far from the averaged value for the entire vegetative season in the Weddell Sea (15.2; Hoppema and Goeyens, 1999). Altogether these simulations give support to the statement that summer ‘NO$_3$-replete–DSi-depleted’ oceanic surface waters could be a reliable diagnostic indicator of Fe-limited upwelled waters.

On the other hand, the model predicts low (0.1–0.2 mg Chl $a$ m$^{-3}$) to negligible (<0.1 mg Chl $a$ m$^{-3}$) phytoplankton biomass in the iron-depleted waters of the ice-free southern ACC (sACC) and the Marginal Ice Zone (MIZ) (Figs. 5a and b). Interestingly and in accordance with the field data (Bathmann et al., 1997; Becquevort, 1997), the predicted phytoplankton community is dominated by nanophytoplankton in the MIZ and by diatoms in the sACC area (Figs. 5a and b). Accordingly, only a modest increase of biogenic silica is predicted in the ice-free sACC (Fig. 5d), which agrees with field measurements (Quéguiner et al., 1997).

4. Discussion

4.1. Food web structure and particulate export production in the surface layer of the PFr and sACC in spring 1992

4.1.1. Iron availability and food web structure

The role of iron in structuring the Antarctic food web was investigated by comparing the budgets of C, N and Fe in the surface layer as calculated from SWAMCO predictions in the iron-enriched PFr (48°S) and iron-depleted MIZ (56°S) for the 1992 spring period (Fig. 6). One major result of this calculation is the occurrence at both
Fig. 6. SWAMCO model prediction of carbon (a, b), nitrogen (c, d) and iron (e, f) budgets within the upper layer (100 m) of the Polar Front region (a, c, e) and the marginal ice zone (b, d, f) integrated over the period of the ANT X/6 cruise. Units: mmol C m$^{-2}$ (a, b), mmol N m$^{-2}$ (c, d), μmol Fe m$^{-2}$ (e, f).
latitudes of a common basal microbial food chain proceeding at about the same rate, independent of iron and light availability. In both areas, nanophytoplankton are heavily controlled by microzooplankton, which ingest more than 95% of the net nanophytoplankton production (Figs. 6a and b). The strong coupling between nanophytoplankton iron uptake and regeneration from microzooplankton catabolic activity (Figs. 6e and f) suggests that the microbial food chain is sustained by regenerated iron. Surprisingly, the model predicts that nitrate rather than ammonium fulfills the nitrogen needs of nanophytoplankton (Figs. 6c and d). We estimate a value of \( f_{\text{NO}_3} \approx 0.8 \) for the ratio between nitrate uptake and inorganic N uptake of nanophytoplankton production. Such a high \( f_{\text{NO}_3} \) argues against an ammonia regeneration-based microbial food web (Goeyens et al., 1992) but agrees with the view of a nitrate-based late winter-early spring production (Kristiansen et al., 1992). Predicted diatom production in the MIZ is as low as that of the grazer-controlled nanophytoplankton (0.16 mol C m\(^{-2}\); Fig. 6b) with resulting negligible export production of C and biogenic elements (Figs. 6b, d and f). In contrast, in the iron-enriched Polar Frontal region, a significant diatom production of 1.8 mol C m\(^{-2}\) (Fig. 6a) controlled by new sources of iron (Fig. 6e) and sustained by nitrates as the nitrogen source (Fig. 6c) is superimposed on the basal microbial food chain. In the absence of mesograzers the model predicts that 25% of the photo-assimilated carbon (0.7 mol m\(^{-2}\); Fig. 6a) and about 50% of the nitrate (0.09 mol m\(^{-2}\); Fig. 6c) and iron (0.09 mmol m\(^{-2}\); Fig. 6e) assimilated by diatoms are directly exported from the surface layer to the deep ocean. The remaining production is accumulated in the surface layer, partly as diatom biomass and partly as particulate and dissolved organic matter supplied by the lysis of ungrazed diatoms. The latter process clearly enhances bacterial production by one order of magnitude compared to that computed for the MIZ bacteria (Figs. 6a and b) and fuels the microbial network through the grazing of the bactivorous heterotrophic flagellates (Fig. 6a). Altogether the model predicts that the bacterial pathway fuels 17% of microzooplankton grazing (Fig. 6a).

4.1.2. Diatom blooms and particulate export production

Export production out of the upper 100 m of particulate carbon and nutrient elements were calculated from SWAMCO model runs for the ANTX/6 cruise period. Results of this calculation are given for three distinct areas: the iron-enriched PFr, the ice-free sACC and the MIZ. The last two have low ambient iron but contrasting phytoplankton dominance (Fig. 5). For all 3 regions the modeled export was compared with independent estimates based on field measurements (Table 6).

The predictions of particulate carbon export compare quite fairly with the estimates derived from deficiencies of the inventories of the natural tracer \(^{234}\)Th (Rutgers van der Loeff et al., 1997) within the Polar Front and the southern branch of the ACC (Table 6). The estimates from \(^{234}\)Th in units of carbon depend strongly on the adopted conversion factor for \(^{234}\)Th : C, which has considerable uncertainty (Rutgers van der Loeff et al., 1997) giving rise to the reported ranges of field values (Table 6). Otherwise the SWAMCO predictions are within or near these ranges and thus confirm that events of high particulate export production are associated with diatom production that occurred in the Polar Front during the second half of the cruise, when
Table 6
Primary production and export production integrated over the period of the ANT X/6 cruise, for three contrasting hydrographic regions (Polar Frontal region, ice-free Southern ACC, Marginal Ice Zone). Units: mmol m\(^{-2}\) (except elemental ratios)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hydrographic region</th>
<th>PFr</th>
<th>SACC</th>
<th>MIZ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) SWAMCO predictions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary production</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate organic carbon</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate organic carbon (% primary production)</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Particulate organic nitrogen</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opal</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C : N [mol C : mol N]</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si : C [mol Si : mol C]</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe : C [mmol Fe : mol C]</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Comparison between SWAMCO predictions and field estimations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary production</td>
<td>SWAMCO</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>¹⁴C incubations⁵</td>
<td>2449</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon export production</td>
<td>SWAMCO</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>²³⁴Th⁶</td>
<td>430–860</td>
<td>150–310</td>
<td>120–240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O₂ consumption (Ba)⁷</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Jochem et al. (1995).
⁵Rutgers van der Loeff et al. (1997).
⁶De hairs et al. (1997).

Meteorological conditions were favorable (Figs. 3 and 5). As calculated by Rutgers van der Loeff et al. (1997), the predicted C export production is significantly higher in the iron-enriched PFr than in the sACC and MIZ. When compared with the level of primary production, however, the percentage of particulate C export is about 40% (Table 6) and does not differ much between areas. This would suggest that the algal concentration reached by the Polar Front bloom of 1992 was below the critical level for physical aggregation of phytoplankton and the formation of rapidly sinking aggregates (Jackson, 1990). Opal export production in the upper 100 m, calculated similarly from model runs, provides additional evidence of the role of diatom blooms in driving particulate export production. Predicted opal export production in the PFr is one order of magnitude higher than in the sACC and MIZ (Table 6). Also iron export production is strongly associated with the bloom of diatoms, which exports 44% of the iron assimilated by the diatom community in the upper 100 m (Table 6). Altogether the computed Si : C, N : C and Fe : C ratios indicate regional difference in the quality of the exported material. This material is significantly enriched in silicon and iron in the PFr compared to the sACC and MIZ (Table 6). The high particulate Si : C ratio in the
Polar Front region is expected to enhance the settling velocity (Muggli et al., 1996), hence enhance the transfer of heavy diatom-derived material from the surface waters into the deep ocean and the sediments. Such more rapid settling would help to minimize the bacterial degradation and mineralisation that occur during this transfer. Indeed evidence for undegraded diatom material reaching the sediments has recently been reported elsewhere in the Southern Ocean (Fileman et al., 1998). In our region indirect estimates of the subsurface (200–400m-intermediate layer) mineralisation rates computed from vertical profiles of barium and oxygen consumption are given by Dehairs et al. (1997); see our Table 6. Combining values of Table 6 with SWAMCO predictions indicates that export production within the sACC and MIZ is almost totally remineralised below 400 m. In the PFr, only 36% of the production exported from the surface layer is remineralised within the first 400 m; the remainder, about 0.5 mol m$^{-2}$, is exported into the deep ocean. Interestingly the latter number compares fairly well with the annual carbon export production of 0.75 mol C m$^{-2}$ estimated in this region from the accumulation of excess barium in the sediments (Dehairs et al., unpublished results). This comparison provides additional support to the important role of episodic diatom blooms in driving export production from the surface waters to the sediment.

4.2. Sensitivity testing based on SWAMCO model scenarios

4.2.1. Iron enrichment scenarios

Current knowledge of the structure and functioning of the Antarctic food chain (de Baar and Boyd, 1999; Lancelot et al., 1993; Lancelot et al., 1997) suggests that the timing, the amplitude and the extent of Antarctic diatom blooms are determined by the combined action of the light environment, under control of sea ice and wind stress; grazing pressure by micro- and mesozooplankton and krill; and iron availability. The interplay among these factors is however not unique over the whole Southern Ocean, either temporally or geographically. The successful application of the SWAMCO model to the sampling section of the cruise ANTX/6 of R/V Polarstern in the Atlantic sector of the Southern Ocean indicates that the model is able to properly integrate the complex interactions between physical, chemical and biological factors as co-limiting agents of diatom bloom developments and food-web structures. Next, the dual role of iron and light in driving the magnitude of diatom blooms and of export production was investigated by testing the response of the SWAMCO model to iron-enrichment scenarios simulating several continuous atmospheric inputs under the in situ meteorological forcing. These scenarios were conducted at two contrasted latitudes: 48°S in the iron-enriched and ice-free Polar Front region (Fig. 7) and 56°S in the iron-depleted marginal ice zone of the sACC (Fig. 8).

Model simulations over the 40-d period clearly shown the key role of Fe availability and meteorological conditions in driving diatom blooms and carbon export production (Figs. 7 and 8). No effect of iron enrichment on diatom growth is predicted at either latitude during the two first weeks of the simulation (Figs. 7 and 8). The frequent deep mixing events prevailing during this period (Fig. 3b) prevent any bloom development no matter how much iron is added. This light limitation effect is exacerbated by
Fig. 7. SWAMCO model response of diatom-Chl a (a), carbon export production (b), nitrate (c), phosphate (d), silicic acid (e), and dissolved iron (f) to continuous atmospheric inputs of iron (0–100 mg m\(^{-2}\) yr\(^{-1}\)) in the Polar Front region (PFr) over the period of the ANT X/6 cruise.

the presence of ice cover at latitude 56°S, slowing down dramatically the build up of diatoms. The maximum effect of iron enrichment on diatom blooms is predicted during the last 10 d of the simulation (Figs. 7 and 8), when favorable meteorological conditions are reached and maintained (wind speed less than 10 m s\(^{-1}\); Fig. 3a). Under such conditions of enhanced vertical stability, the predicted maximum biomass reached by the diatom bloom is obviously determined by the magnitude of the iron
enrichment above 0.5 \mu mol m^{-3} (Figs. 7 and 8). Below this concentration no phytoplankton accumulation is predicted (Fig. 8). Initial diatom abundance at the time of sufficient light and iron fertilization is important as well (Figs. 7 and 8) and determines the timing of the bloom. This indicates that the resulting effect of natural (de Baar et al., 1995) or intentional (SOIREE, Boyd et al., in preparation) iron enrichment will depend on both the meteorological conditions and the pre-existing diatom biomass.
Table 7
Sensitivity of the diatom production, \( f \) ratio (NO\(_3\) uptake/N\(_{\text{nat}}\) uptake), export production (carbon, opal, Si : C ratio) to continuous atmospheric iron inputs, tested by the SWAMCO model in the Polar Frontal region (PFr) and the Marginal Ice Zone (MIZ) during austral spring 1992. All constraints except iron are those met during ANTX/6 cruise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fe input (mg m(^{-2}) yr(^{-1}))</th>
<th>Diatom-C production (mol m(^{-2}))</th>
<th>( f ) ratio</th>
<th>Carbon export (mol m(^{-2}))</th>
<th>Opal export (mol m(^{-2}))</th>
<th>[Si : C] export (mol : mol)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PFr 0</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIZ 0</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One major result of the SWAMCO scenarios is the simulated shift in nutrient limitation of diatoms, from iron to silicate limitation, under the scenario of maximum iron enrichment in the PFr (Figs. 7a, e and f). At the same time nitrates are never depleted (Fig. 7c). Combined with the predicted \( f_{\text{NO}_3} \) of 0.80 (Table 7) this indicates that such an imbalance between nitrate and silicate assimilation by diatoms results from the high silicification level of diatoms. From these scenarios, the maximum spring diatom biomass reached in the PFr can be evaluated at 7.5 mg Chl \( \text{a m}^{-3} \) (Fig. 7a). The corresponding maximum predictions for the spring diatom and export production are, respectively, 2.45 and 1.08 mmol C m\(^{-2}\) (Table 7). As a general trend the export production of particulate carbon is linearly related to diatom production for values of the latter which are higher than 0.1–0.2 mmol C m\(^{-2}\) (Table 7). Under such conditions and in the absence of mesozooplankton, the model calculates that 50% of diatom production is exported out of the surface layer (Table 7). On the other hand, opal export production does not increase significantly with iron enrichment (Table 7) due to the negative dependence of diatom silicification on ambient iron (Table 4). In other words, the computed Si : C ratios of export production are negatively related to available iron (Table 7).

4.2.2. Sensitivity of the SWAMCO prediction of diatom blooms to iron and silicon parameterization

Considering the key role of Fe and Si in regulating diatom blooms and opal export production, several SWAMCO runs were conducted at the Polar Frontal region to explore the model response to changing values of the parameters describing the diatom Fe and Si uptake. These are the half-saturation constant for Fe and Si uptake \([K_{\text{FeDIA}}\text{ and } K_{\text{Si}}]\) and the cellular Fe and Si content \([\text{Fe : C and Si : C}]\). The ranges of tested values were those reported for diatoms by Sunda and Huntsman (1997) and
Table 8
SWAMCO model: Sensitivity test to iron and silicon physiology parametrization (cellular stoichiometry and 1/2 saturation constant of uptake). Diatom production, export production, in the upper 100 m, integrated over the period of the ANT X/6 cruise (austral spring 1992, Polar Frontal region)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Diatom-C production (mol m$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>BSi production (mol m$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>C export (mol m$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>Si export (mol m$^{-2}$)</th>
<th>Si : C$_{\text{export}}$ (mol : mol)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Iron</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fe : C (mol : mol)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.2$^a$</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.35</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.82</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.54</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{Fe}$ (µmol m$^{-3}$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2$^b$</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.35</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.82</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.54</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Silicon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Si : C (mol : mol)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.52–0.39 [Fe]$^a$</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.35</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.77</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.82</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.44</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.54</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{Si}$ (mmol m$^{-3}$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4$^a$</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data in bold: reference simulation.

Brzezinski (1985) for Fe and by Conley et al. (1989) and Nelson and Tréguer (1992) for Si. Results of these scenarios are analyzed in terms of diatom production and carbon and opal export production (Table 8). The magnitude of the diatom bloom and the carbon export production are not much dependent on the half-saturation constant for Fe uptake in the range 0.18–1.8 µmol Fe m$^{-3}$ (Table 8a). More sensitive is the dependence on the iron to carbon stoichiometry, which shows a +22 and −35% variation of the SWAMCO reference diatom production with tested values of Fe : C between 0.02 and 0.2 (Table 8a). Furthermore, model scenarios show that the exported fraction of carbon production is positively related to the cellular iron content (Table 8a). The variability of the computed Si : C ratio of export production (Table 8a) results from the dependence of the diatom silicification level on ambient iron. This is clearly evidenced by scenarios testing the variability of opal export production and Si : C ratios for different parameterization of the diatom Si stoichiometry between 0.13 and 1.4 (Table 8b). Opal export production simulated with the currently used Si : C of 0.13, chosen as typical of coastal diatoms (Brzezinski, 1985), is 5 times less than the flux calculated with the iron-dependent silicon stoichiometry. On the contrary, little dependence to $K_{Si}$ of opal production and export production is predicted for values up to 20 mmol m$^{-3}$. Only the less probable $K_{Si}$ value of 80 mmol m$^{-3}$ shows a strong
limitation of diatom production (Table 8b). These results reveal the complex interplay of Si and Fe limitation in regulating diatom blooms and the associated biogeochemical cycles in the Southern Ocean, as already suggested by laboratory and field observations (Takeda, 1998; Hutchins and Bruland, 1998; de Baar et al., 1999). These SWAMCO scenarios strongly indicate that more investigations on the nutrient dynamics of phytoplankton are needed to understand mechanisms driving export production events in the Southern Ocean. They indicate as well that simple models based on a limitation of phytoplankton production by a single element are not suitable for investigation of the carbon cycle in the Southern Ocean.

5. Concluding remarks

Ever since Brandt (1899) the paradigm of a single limiting factor for phytoplankton blooms has repeatedly been invoked in plankton ecology. For the Southern Ocean singular limitation by either light, grazing losses or Fe limitation has now and then been advocated (Tranter, 1982; Martin and Fitzwater, 1988; Mitchell and Holm-Hansen, 1991; Dugdale and Wilkerson, 1990). The paradigm of a single controlling factor has been argued against (de Baar, 1994), as being an inappropriate extrapolation of the law of the minimum (Liebig von et al., 1840) beyond its validity for harvested crops, and having to give way to a realistic concept of ever-changing complex interactions of multiple growth and loss factors. The latter concept now appears confirmed by the complex interplay of rate and state variables in the SWAMCO model being required to be able to simulate the austral spring 1992 observations in the Antarctic Ocean.

Clearly, one is beginning to understand some first basic principles of plankton dynamics of the Southern Ocean, but more is to be learned. The generic design of the model appears robust but will have to be further verified with new observational data sets of similar extent and coherence as SO-JGOFS ANT X/6 but in other regions and seasons of the Southern Ocean, in particular to address the role of metazooplankton in food-web export. Also the model, while complicated, is modest when one reflects on the very intricate and diverse plankton community in real oceanic waters. For instance, the non-siliceous Phaeocystis colonies, which form massive blooms in the Ross Sea and Prydz Bay, have yet to be incorporated in the current model for further application at the scale of the global Southern Ocean. Ongoing research on the speciation of different chemical forms of Fe in seawater affecting uptake of Fe by the cell will provide the basis for further refinements in the model. Finally, several physical forcing functions known to exist have inadequate (e.g. meandering of Polar Front) or virtually non-existing (stabilizing mechanisms at Polar Front in 1992) observational data sets for validation, hence cannot yet be incorporated into the model.
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