

Response to reviewer #2 on “Synoptic scale analysis of mechanisms driving surface chlorophyll dynamics in the North Atlantic” by A. S. A. Ferreira et al.

We would like to thank the reviewer Fabrizio D’Ortenzio for the comments provided. We agree that our RPA metric required careful explanation. We, therefore, decided to rewrite the text where we explain the metric, as well as the figure. In addition, we have redefined the notation of the variables used to make it simpler for the reader to understand the process. We hope these changes satisfy both the reviewer and the editor.

The first explanation of the reviewer regarding our RPA metric matches what we did. Thus, his equation 1 is the correct one, namely  $RPA = \Delta CHL/g$ . We believe the confusion arose from the figure, which we have now drastically changed. The previous figure was perhaps misleading the reviewer to believe we had defined the RPA metric as “the difference in time between  $g$  and the corresponding  $g$ , though calculated on the year series”, *i.e.*, by using his equation 2:  $RPA = RP_0 - RP_{year}$ . If we were to use equation 2, we would be defining the maximum rate of increase of chlorophyll concentration (or maximum growth rate, MGR) for every year. As Ferreira et al (2014) showed, MGR is a highly uncertain metric and its noisy patterns would be amplified when calculated for every seasonal cycle.

With our new notation, equation 1 is defined as  $R_i(x, y) = \frac{c'_i(x, y, T_0) - \bar{c}(x, y, T_0)}{g(x, y)}$ . Further details are explained in the manuscript.

```

\documentclass[gb, manuscript]{copernicus}
\begin{document}
\linenumbers
\title{Synoptic scale analysis of mechanisms driving surface
chlorophyll dynamics in the North Atlantic}
\Author[1]{Ana Sofia de Ara\{u\}jo}{Ferreira}
\Author[2]{Hj\{a\}lmar}{H\{a\}t\{u\}n}
\Author[3]{Fran\{c\}ois}{Counillon}
\Author[1]{Mark R}{Payne}
\Author[1]{Andr\{e\} W}{Visser}
\affil[1]{Centre for Ocean Life, National Institute of Aquatic
Resources, Technical University of Denmark, Denmark}
\affil[2]{Faroe Marine Research Institute, N\{o\}at\{u\}n 1, P.O. Box
3051, FO 110 T\{o\}rshavn, Faroe Islands}
\affil[3]{Nansen Environmental and Remote Sensing Center, Thorm\o
hlensgate 47, Bergen, Norway}
\runningtitle{Surface chlorophyll blooms}
\runningauthor{Ferreira ASA, H\{a\}t\{u\}n H, Counillon F, Payne MR,
Visser AW}
\correspondence{Ana Sofia de Ara\{u\}jo Ferreira
(asofiaaferreira@gmail.com)}
\received{}
\pubdiscuss{}
\revised{}
\accepted{}
\published{}
\firstpage{1}
\maketitle
\begin{abstract}
Several hypotheses have been proposed for the onset of the spring
phytoplankton bloom in the North Atlantic. Our main objective is to
examine which bottom-up processes can best predict the annual
increase in surface phytoplankton concentration in the North Atlantic
by applying novel phenology algorithms to ocean colour data. We
construct indicator fields and time series which, in various
combinations, provide models consistent with the principle dynamics
previously proposed. Using a multimodel inference approach, we
investigate the evidence supporting these models, and how it varies
in space. We show that, in terms of bottom-up processes alone, there
is a dominant physical mechanism, namely mixed layer shoaling, that
best predicts the interannual variation in the initial increase in
surface chlorophyll across large sectors of the North Atlantic. We
further show that different regions are governed by different
physical phenomena, and that wind-driven mixing is a common component
with either heat flux or light as triggers. We believe these findings
to be relevant to the ongoing discussion on North Atlantic bloom
onset.
\end{abstract}
\section{Introduction}
About half of global primary production is performed by marine
phytoplankton. Phytoplankton production fuels marine ecosystems and
the harvesting of marine living resources, as well as playing an
important role in global carbon cycling \citep{1065}. In many parts
of the world's oceans, marine primary production undergoes a distinct
seasonal cycle, with the major part of production occurring in the
spring bloom \citep{784,768,887}. This seasonal cycle is particularly
apparent in the North Atlantic \citep{795}, where it imprints
seasonal variations in species abundance and annual routines
(\textit{e.g.} } spawning, migration) throughout the marine food web
from zooplankton \citep{979,1022,974}, to fish \citep{1303,1247} and
marine mammals \citep{1244}. In the North Atlantic, the progression
of primary production throughout the year, and its variation between
years, is commonly used as a proxy for ecosystem state

```

\citep{1023,948,783}. The North Atlantic spring bloom is an important biological event and has attracted considerable attention during the last decades \citep{774,1222,706}.

Phenology is the term used to describe the study of the timing of annual recurring biological events, such as the observed ``greening'' of the surface ocean, an indicator of bloom initiation. Phenology provides a staple for understanding the cascading fluctuations throughout the food web. To achieve this, a good phenology metric should be accurate, precise, and sensitive to the underlying environmental processes, both physical or biological \citep{1219}. Much of the recent interest in spring bloom dynamics \citep{774,1222} concerns the mechanisms that influence different characteristics of the annual cycle.

Chlorophyll concentration is, arguably, the most important ecological variable setting the pace of life in temperate and high latitude seas. In this study, we use surface chlorophyll concentrations as derived from satellite ocean colour to detect spring bloom initiation \citep{965,1141,1136,1128}. We thus assume that the chlorophyll concentration at the surface represents that of the surface mixed layer \citep{1031}. While we note that some aspects of bloom dynamics are more properly described by integrating phytoplankton biomass over the mixed layer \citep{774}, it is the surface chlorophyll that is the most readily accessible via the highly-resolved (both spatially and temporally) ocean colour products.

There are essentially three environmental processes that can change the surface chlorophyll concentration: phytoplankton growth (through light and nutrients); loss terms (\textit{e.g.} respiration, grazing, coagulation and sinking); and dilution (through mixed layer deepening). These processes are particularly important during two key phases of the seasonal cycle: 1) events that lead to an increase in phytoplankton biomass -- bloom initiations, and 2) conditions that halt the net increase in biomass - the peak of the bloom.

Phytoplankton biomass will increase whenever the growth rate exceeds the loss rate \citep{792}. This picture, with regards the distinction between biomass and surface chlorophyll concentration, is somewhat complicated by dilution; a deepening mixed layer dilutes the concentration but has no effect on the biomass, a process that has repercussion on the feeding success and thus population dynamics of grazers. However, a shoaling mixed layer has no direct influence on the concentration but remove biomass to some extent. These processes and their implications for phytoplankton, the resources they rely on, and their grazers, have been carefully considered in recent re-analyses of spring bloom dynamics \citep{1213,1226}.

It is also fair to say that the annual trajectory of phytoplankton biomass and surface phytoplankton concentration follow different dynamics \citep{1222}. While we recognise that phytoplankton biomass variation is an important aspect of spring bloom dynamics, in this paper, we examine which fundamental physical processes may best predict the timing of the increase in surface phytoplankton concentrations. Furthermore we do so since ocean surface colour is a readily available synoptic scale observable spanning many years of measurements. The interannual variability in bloom timing is evaluated in terms of how much the increase in surface layer chlorophyll is advanced or delayed compared to the day of climatological maximum rate of increase.

**\subsection{Mixed layer shoaling}**

Over the years, several theories have been put forwarded which, in one way or the other, try to model the growth and loss rates in terms of fundamental processes (Table \ref{tab:models} and Figure \ref{fig:models}). The classic application of the growth-loss view of bloom initiation relates to when photosynthetic production of organic

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: 1221,

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted:

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: .

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: is in regards

matter surpasses respiration \citep{792}, where respiration refers to all losses and is constant. This hypothesis is commonly referred to as the ``critical depth hypothesis'', which states that a bloom begins when the surface mixed layer shoals to a depth above the critical depth (where integrated production equals losses). The shoaling of the mixed layer means that individual phytoplankton cells remain longer in the euphotic zone \citep{727,792,809,1196}. By extension, this suggests that the light intensity integrated over the mixed layer is the most relevant factor driving phytoplankton blooms in the North Atlantic. Here, we term this hypothesis the ``critical depth model'' (Table \ref{tab:models}).

#### \subsection{Active mixing}

Mixed layer shoaling, however, is not the only process which can increase the residence time of primary producers in the well-lit surface ocean. Similar effects can be driven by periods of low surface mixing \citep{1245}. This has led to a series of alternative interpretations, which highlight active mixing (specifically the lack thereof) as a key ingredient \citep{1023,803,800}.

One of the first quantitative studies \citep{1023} examined the combined effects of wind-driven mixing and light: the hypothesis being that blooms can occur during periods when light is low but increasing and turbulent mixing weakens. These conditions can be met well before the surface mixed layer begins to shoal. We call this the ``critical light exposure model'' (Table \ref{tab:models}).

This type of reasoning can also lead to considering only the competing effects of stratification by solar heating, and destratification by wind-driven mixing. This view encapsulates the key elements of the ``critical turbulence model'' \citep{803,1038}, where brief interludes in mixing and heating produce a stable layer in which phytoplankton cells are retained within the euphotic layer. Thus, a balance between heat-flux and wind-driven mixing may explain North Atlantic phytoplankton seasonality (Table \ref{tab:models}). More recently, \citet{804} have shown that blooms may be detected much earlier than the shoaling of the mixed layer depth, and it has been proposed that blooms can be initiated as soon as deep convection ceases \citep{800}. That is, as soon as the ocean experiences a net inward heat flux. In this context, the timing of the transition from net cooling to net warming is a key element linked to the variability phytoplankton seasonality. We term this the ``critical heat flux model'' (Table \ref{tab:models}).

#### \subsection{Other processes not considered}

There have been theories also focusing on specific regional effects. For instance, \citet{952} were able to link bloom onset to eddy-driven stratification, prior to net warming. Fronts were also found to trigger high-latitude blooms by reduced mixing, which explains high chlorophyll levels in light-limited regions \citep{804}. Other studies \citep{948,1220,946} have also linked spring bloom initiation to offshore advection, eddy-induced upwelling or river runoff. Finally, oceanic convection has been found responsible for a significant vertical transport, thus maintaining a winter stock of phytoplankton in the deep mixed layer that can potentially re-seed the spring bloom \citep{1262,1261}.

\citet{774} adopted a different approach by examining the influence of dynamic top-down controls, suggesting the ``dilution-recoupling hypothesis''. This is a concept that is implicit in \citet{1031}'s model. \citet{774}'s hypothesis proposes that a vertically integrated biomass increases in mid-winter with the increase of day length, even when the mixed layer depth is at its deepest, and reaches its maximum with the recoupling of grazers due to stratification. Unfortunately, as also noted by \citet{774}, data on top-down controls remain elusive at the spatial and temporal

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: reduced

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: encapsulated

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: not assuming constant

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: (as a proxy for spring),

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: are not available

resolutions necessary to test this hypothesis against the complex structure of North Atlantic phytoplankton seasonality. \\

When and why does a surface bloom start? \\

As noted by \cite{1366}, assessing the drivers of bloom initiation variability may lead to the understanding of what starts the bloom in the first place. Despite all of the above mentioned hypotheses, there is still no clear consensus regarding a single main driver of North Atlantic spring blooms. Additionally, the spatial application of these theories may not hold true in smaller regions, where local forcing plays a more important role. Nonetheless, the key process, and common to all hypotheses of surface bloom initiation, is based on the spring stabilization of the water column, where both light and nutrients are at sufficient levels: whether by mixed layer shoaling \cite{792}, or by weakening turbulent mixing \cite{803,1038,800,1023,804}. Their main differences reside in the physical proxy for bloom initiation: what physical indicator best predicts bloom timing?

While there are a number of metrics that can be used to delineate bloom initiation \cite{1043,727,1092}, our goal to seek a metric that can be credibly related to the processes proposed above, \textit{i.e.} those that relate to the preconditioning of the water column prior to surface bloom initiation. In this, any metric that uses the bloom peak (such as the popular 5 \% above annual median), or seasonally integrated chlorophyll, will be handicapped because it inherently takes into account not only what starts the bloom, but also what terminates it some weeks or months later. We seek instead a phenology metric that is not confounded by the bloom peak, does not require winter values, and is a straightforward indicator of the greening of the surface ocean as observed from space. Our metric is based on how advance or delayed the development of surface chlorophyll concentration, is in a particular year compared to the climatological date and rate of maximum concentration increase.

We construct four models based on the literature using a range of physical observations, primarily from satellite but also model data, and describe key processes observed in the North Atlantic (Table \ref{tab:models} and Figure \ref{fig:models}). In each case, we make the models as simple as possible - capturing the essential process dynamics in terms of at most two observable/estimated fields only. We use the Information Theoretic (IT) approach to investigate which model for surface blooms has the most support within the North Atlantic. The IT approach is a very useful tool when comparing different models. In particular, it provides a rigorous framework for evaluating the evidence in support of competing models. It does so by defining \textit{a priori} a set of ``multiple working hypotheses'' rather than a single alternative to the null hypothesis. The IT approach is then followed by expressing each hypothesis in quantitative terms that represent their strength of evidence to be further used in the model selection \cite{1208}.

We conduct our study, focusing on bottom-up controls that may trigger a North Atlantic phytoplankton surface bloom, and thus neglect the effect of top-down controls (grazing, \cite{774,1031,1248}). Information on top-down controls is not available at the spatial and temporal coverage needed to assess mesoscale physical forcing. In addition, as \cite{809} shows, the seasonal cycle of surface chlorophyll differs from the vertically-integrated chlorophyll. \cite{774}'s ?dilution-recoupling hypothesis? applied to vertically-integrated chlorophyll blooms, while the other hypotheses \cite{792,727,1196,803,1036,1038,1023,800,804} can be applied to surface chlorophyll. Our aim is to compare the latter ones, in which it is assumed that surface blooms only take off when the surface waters stabilise.

Material and Methods \\

Information Theoretic (IT) Approach

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: deeply understand

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: started

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: Therefore, we construct

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: maximum increase in

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: ,

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: point that we believe to be more closely connected

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: physical factors leading to the bloom than other commonly used metrics

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: on the subject by

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: mechanisms

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: observations and modeled

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: hypothesis

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: by only

The main aspects of the IT framework \citep{1208,1491,1341} in the context of our study include (1) identifying plausible mechanistic hypotheses, and (2) a strong reliance on the quantitative evidence of factor(s) affecting a response variable, rather than a formal assessment of the statistical significance of such factor(s). In our study, (1) is expressed through mathematical descriptions of the different hypotheses to be tested (see Table \ref{tab:models} and Section \ref{mechanisms}), while (2) is covered by ranking the spatial evidence of the models using the concept of model selection and multimodel inference (see \citet{1208} and Section \ref{analysis}).

\subsection{Physical mechanisms}\label{mechanisms}

We are particularly interested in knowing how much information from raw data is correlated to surface chlorophyll. Raw data refers to the original data in their simplest form, without pre-processing. Therefore, we quantitatively translate the fundamental physical processes that can be used to predict a phytoplankton surface bloom in the North Atlantic into simple and straight-forward models (Table \ref{tab:models} and Figure \ref{fig:models}).

\begin{description}

\item[Critical depth] - A bloom initiates if the mixed layer depth ( $MLD$ ,  $H$ ) shoals below the critical depth, so light (photosynthetically active radiation,  $PAR$ ,  $L$ ) becomes available to phytoplankton cells (Figure \ref{fig:models}a) \citep{792,727,1196}. Therefore, light  $L$  integrated over the  $H$  provides an estimate of the light available within the euphotic depth for phytoplankton to grow.

\item[Critical turbulence] - A bloom initiates if there is a balance between buoyancy (heat flux,  $Q$ ) and wind-driven mixing ( $M$ , Figure \ref{fig:models}b) \citep{803,1036,1038}.

\item[Critical light exposure] - A bloom initiates if wind-driven mixing ( $M$ ) is at a low enough level to allow cells to experience surface light conditions ( $L$ , Figure \ref{fig:models}c) \citep{1023}.

\item[Critical heat flux] - Bloom initiation is associated with the date when net warming starts ( $Q \geq 0$ ), and low wind-driven mixing ( $M$ ) increases the residence time of phytoplankton in the euphotic layer (Figure \ref{fig:models}d) \citep{800,804}.

\end{description}

\subsection{Data sets}

In order to gather the information necessary to formulate the models for the North Atlantic domain, we used satellite observations (chlorophyll concentration, attenuation coefficient and photosynthetically active radiation), model estimations for the variables where satellite data was not available (mixed layer depth), and model and observational merged data (wind stress and heat flux). We used products derived from the European Node for Global Ocean Colour (GlobColour Project, \url{http://www.globcolour.info/}). The GlobColour Project blends observational data from the Sea-viewing Wide Field-of-view Sensor (SeaWiFS), the Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS-AQUA), and the Medium Resolution Imaging Spectrometer (MERIS) instruments by using the Garver-Siegel-Maritorena (GSM) algorithm \citep{1122} to generate a merged, global ocean colour product. Combining the three sensors increases the data coverage in both time and space, thus providing significantly elevated spatio-temporal coverage \citep{757}, making it a common choice for phenology studies \citep{965,1127}. For this study, we chose to use daily,  $1/4^\circ$  resolution level 3 mean chlorophyll concentration ( $C$ ) and attenuation coefficient ( $K_d$ ) products (based on the analysis performed by \citet{1219}), from 1998 to 2010 inclusive, thus providing a total of 13 years of data.

- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: ( $\$$ )
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Formatted: Font color: Black
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: ( $\$$ )
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Formatted: Font color: Black
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted:  $\$PAR$
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted:  $MLD$  translates
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: HF
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: MIX
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: MIX
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: that allows
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: ( $\$PAR$ ) availability (
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted:  $\backslash, HF$ ), which is related to
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted:  $MIX$ ), and
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: CHL

The surface photosynthetically active radiation ( $PAR$ ,  $PAR_{LH}$ ) was obtained from the SeaWiFS data center (<http://oceancolor.gsfc.nasa.gov/>). We used daily, 9 km resolution product from 1998 to 2010. These data were further gridded onto  $1/4^\circ$  using linear interpolation to match the spatial resolution of the other data sets.

The mixed layer  $PAR$  ( $PAR_{LH}$ ) was defined as  $PAR_{LH}$  integrated from the surface to the depth of the mixed layer  $H$ :

$$L_H = \frac{L}{H} K_d \int_0^H (1 - e^{-K_d z}) dz$$

using the relevant  $K_d$ , reported by [Cite1042](#) and [Cite1366](#).

Mixed layer depth ( $MLD$ ,  $H$ ) data were obtained from TOPAZ 4 reanalysis [Cite1205](#). The TOPAZ system is a coupled ocean-sea ice data simulation system for the North Atlantic and Arctic Ocean with a resolution of 12–16 km, and is the main forecasting system for the Arctic Ocean in Copernicus (<http://www.myocean.eu/>) and the Norwegian contribution to the Global Ocean Data Assimilation Experiment (GODAE). It uses the Hybrid Coordinate Ocean Model (HYCOM, <http://hycom.org/hycom/>) [Cite1197](#). HYCOM is coupled to a EVP sea ice model [Cite1198](#) and a thermodynamic module [Cite1199](#). The model assimilates sea surface temperature, altimetry, ice concentration, ice drift, and available *in situ* measurements with the ensemble Kalman Filter [Cite1200](#). The model daily output is binned onto a  $1/4^\circ$  regular grid. The  $MLD$  is calculated using a density criteria with a threshold of 0.01  $\sigma_{\theta}$   $m^{-3}$  [Cite1160](#) from 1998 to 2010.

Wind stress ( $\tau_{wind}$ ) is used as a measure for wind-driven mixing ( $M$ ) [Cite1246,1211](#) and was estimated by using:  $M \propto \tau_{wind}^{3/2}$ , which is proportional to the power exerted by the wind on the surface ocean and the turbulent kinetic energy used in [Cite1221](#)'s calculations of the mixing length scale.

Both  $\tau_{wind}$  and heat flux ( $Q$ ) data were gathered on a spatial resolution of  $1.875^\circ \times 1.905^\circ$  from the National Centers for Environmental Prediction (NCAR) and the National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCEP) [Cite1218](#). These data sets were further gridded onto  $1/4^\circ$  using linear interpolation to match the spatial resolution of the other data sets. All data sets started on October 1, 1997. We only focused on latitudes north of  $40^\circ$  N due to the fact that lower latitudes have a less well-defined seasonal cycle [Cite731,1221](#).

### Subsection Metrics

One of the fundamental aspects of spring bloom is the rapid increase in surface chlorophyll concentration; a phenomenon that can be interpreted as bloom initiation. In this work, we choose a bloom initiation metric that relates how advanced or delayed the surface chlorophyll concentration is in a particular year, compared to the climatological date of maximum surface concentration increase. We term this the rate of change phenology anomaly (RPA,  $RPA$ ). This metric has the advantage of not depending on the maximum chlorophyll concentration (an indicator of the peak of the bloom). Neither does it depend on winter values, which are usually missing from remote sensing products [Cite1219](#); or on vertical integration [Cite774](#); all of which introduce extraneous factors into the mechanistic reasoning as to the onset of bloom. These are all limitations that occur in many other metrics used in the literature [Cite727,1095,1221](#). We decided to use an anomaly of surface chlorophyll because it is a more relevant measure in regards to higher trophic levels and is one we believe is closer to bloom preconditioning. Additionally, in order to use an integrated

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: Photosynthetically... [1]  
Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Formatted: Font color: Black

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: Light intensity integrated to the ...he mixe... [2]

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Formatted: Font color: Black

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted:  $PAR_{MLD}$ ...( $PAR_{LH}$ ) wa... [3]

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted:  $PAR_{MLD}$ ... $H$  = ... [4]

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: , where  $PAR$  is measured at the surface.

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: ( $\tau$ )

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Formatted: Font color: Black

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted:  $\tau$

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Formatted: Font color: Black

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted:  $M$ ...is calculated usi... [5]

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: ( $Q$ )... $\tau_{wind}$ ... [6]

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted:  $Q$ ... $M$ ... [7]

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted:  $Q$ ... $\tau_{wind}$ ... [8]

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: New studies (*e.g.*) [Cite1221](#) have been incorporating [Cite774](#)'s concept by using an integrated chlorophyll metric to look at bloom initiation in the North Atlantic...ne of the fundam... [9]

chlorophyll field, we would need to use modelled mixed layer depth, which is incompatible with testing one of our key models.

At each location  $(x, y)$  (each  $1/4^\circ$ ), we estimate the climatological pattern of surface chlorophyll concentration  $\bar{C}(x, y, t)$  by applying a generalized additive model (GAM) to the observations from 1998 to 2010 (Figure \ref{fig:RPAcalculation}). We then calculate the day of the year where the climatological mean exhibits the maximum rate of increase  $g(x, y) = \max\{d\bar{C}/dt\}$ . We define the climatological date of maximum increase as  $T_0 = t: d\bar{C}/dt = g$ , and the climatological chlorophyll concentration on that day we define as  $\bar{C}_0 = \bar{C}(x, y, T_0)$ . For each year ( $i$ ) and location, we fit a GAM with a smooth spline on the period  $T_0 \pm 15$  days for observed surface chlorophyll to produce  $C_i(x, y, t)$ . Lastly we define the rate of change phenology anomaly as  $R_i(x, y) = (C_i(x, y, T_0) - \bar{C}_0(x, y, T_0)) / g(x, y)$ . Thus, the RPA metric  $R_i(x, y)$  is a value in days and relates to how advanced or delayed the seasonal development of chlorophyll concentration is in each year  $i$  compared to the climatology of the bloom. We set a threshold that at least 3 observations must exist within the 30-day window for the RPA method to be valid. We apply a spatial kriging with a maximum radius of 250 km to fill in pixels where the method cannot be used, \textit{e.g.} due to missing data around  $T_0$  in some years, or low seasonality.

We investigated the spatially dependent ranking of the models (Table \ref{tab:models} and Figure \ref{fig:models}) using the IT approach. Thus, we constructed indicator fields and time series which, in various combinations, provide models consistent with the principle physical dynamics observed in the North Atlantic. At each location, we apply a centered moving average of 30 days, to physical driver observations and these will be referred to as  $L$ ,  $H$ ,  $M$  and  $Q$ . We also use  $Q_0$  for the date when  $Q$  becomes positive (start of net warming) and remains positive for seven consecutive days. We further applied an inverse distance weighted interpolation (using the weighted average of the values at the known pixels) to all thresholds to fill in the pixels where the thresholds could not be estimated. All pixels in waters shallower than 200 m were removed as coastal regions have higher associated biases \citep{757} due to high turbidity and consequent different optical properties \citep{1068,1057,1019,893}.

#### \subsection{Analysis} \label{analysis}

There are several model selection tools that can be used for comparing and ranking models. In our IT approach, we used the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) \citep{1208}, which is based on the residual sum of squares (RSS) from each model. By comparing and ranking the evidence from different models, their relative importance can be quantified. Since we only aimed at assessing 13 years of data (from 1998 to 2010), we used the AICc. The AICc is AIC corrected for small samples. Theoretically, as sample size increases, AICc converges to AIC. Another model selection unit is the Akaike weight, which can be either based on the AIC or the AICc. The Akaike weight is a value between 0 and 1 representing the weighted mean probability of each model, \textit{i.e.} the strength of evidence in support of each model.

Each model was formulated as a regression as shown in Table \ref{tab:models}. Based on the weight of each model, we could select the most supported model for each  $1/4^\circ$  pixel.

#### \section{Results}

From the four hypotheses considered (critical depth; critical turbulence; critical light exposure, and critical heat flux) within each  $1/4^\circ$  pixel, the one with the highest Akaike weight is selected as the winning hypothesis (Figure

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: incorporated ... [10]

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: Our metric, ...t each ... [11]

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: \$...method to work. ... [12]

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Formatted: Font color: Black

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: We...t each location ... [13]

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: one that explain variability in the ... [14]

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: dealt with...ormulat ... [15]



\ref{fig:rankingmodels\_weights}), where we see that the critical depth seems to be the most frequent winning hypothesis. The spatial distribution of winning hypotheses shows no systematic pattern with regards to basin, depth, or latitude (Figure \ref{fig:rankingmodels\_weights}). We also ran this analysis with two other bloom timing metrics: 5 \% above annual median \citep{727,965,1128,941,1071} and maximum increase in chlorophyll concentration \citep{1092,1095,1087,1128} and we found similar results: no systematic pattern (results not shown). In spite of the general dominance of the critical depth hypothesis, there are, however, regions that show some coherency: the critical turbulence appears to be well supported mainly off Newfoundland; the critical heat flux has local support north of Iceland and in the Labrador Sea; the critical light exposure appears to have a wider distribution with very low frequencies. Spatial distribution of Akaike weights (Figure A\ref{suppfig:weightofwinner}) indicate the strength of support for the "winning" hypothesis. There are regions where the weights are close to 1, indicating that the corresponding models are clear winners. Some of these regions are the same as the ones observed in Figure \ref{fig:rankingmodels\_weights}: for instance, offshore of Newfoundland, suggesting a strong support for the critical turbulence hypothesis in this region.

A pixel-wise multimodel inference approach also allows the quantification of the number of occurrences of each of the four alternative hypotheses as the winning (Figure \ref{fig:rankingmodels\_weights}). There are no clear differences in the ranking units of the three less frequent hypothesis (0.15, 0.11 and 0.07), whilst the critical depth showed a higher ranking unit (0.67).

To better understand the effect of each physical component ( $L' H$,  $L' S$ ,  $M' S$ ,  $Q' S$ ,  $Q' O$ ) within the four hypotheses (Figure \ref{fig:models}), we built single-variable models (linear regressions) using each component as variable for each location (Figure \ref{fig:rankingprocesses_weights}). The most frequent winning physical driver based on the Akaike weights is heat flux  $Q' S$ . Its spatial distribution dominates off Newfoundland, in the subpolar gyre and intermediate gyre regions, and in the Bay of Biscay. Its dominance is however only slightly greater than the other physical components.$

**\section{Discussion}**

The phenology of spring bloom characteristics (\textit{e.g. } initiation, peak) is thought to be controlled by a number of mechanisms including bottom-up and top-down processes. Here we specifically set out to test various bottom-up processes that can be used as indicators of phytoplankton surface blooms, testing several simplified hypotheses across a broad extent of the North Atlantic. In this regard, spring surface bloom initiation is problematic in that defining it has as much to do with what limits the bloom amplitude as what starts it in the first place. Moreover, limiting factor(s) can be the ultimate switching mechanism needed for a bloom to start. Instead, we seek to explain what bottom-up processes determine the interannual variability of bloom development around the time where, climatologically, one would expect the maximum rate of increase in surface chlorophyll concentration. By quantifying each physical mechanism independently, we observe that, even though there is no clear losing mechanism in the North Atlantic domain, \citep{792}'s classical theory (critical depth) still dominates; \textit{i.e.} it has a superior evidence supporting the interannual variability of timing across the greatest range of space in the North Atlantic (Figure \ref{fig:rankingmodels\_weights}).

All of the four alternative hypotheses are expressed as simple interpretations of what potentially drives the surface blooms in the North Atlantic at the mesoscale (Figure \ref{fig:models}). The models

- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
**Deleted:** is frequently observed in
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
**Deleted:** Similar features as the ones observed off Newfoundland are observed in the spatial
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
**Deleted:** }).
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
**Deleted:**  $30d \setminus, PAR_{\{MLD\}}$,  $30d \setminus, PAR$,  $30d \setminus, MIX$,  $30d \setminus, HF$,  $0 \setminus, HF$$$$$
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
**Deleted:**  $\$1/4 \setminus \{ \circ \}$  pixel
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
**Deleted:** component
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
**Deleted:**  $\$30d \setminus, HF$
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
**Deleted:** , magnitude
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
**Deleted:** the phase
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
**Deleted:** the
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
**Deleted:** increase reaches its maximum
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
**Deleted:** Most of the authors assessing bloom phenology focus on the initiation phase, but how long does this phase really lasts? Since we built a different metric (and even indicator, see difference in \citep{1219}), a comparison of results is rather difficult. It is important to note that bloom initiation metrics, as suggested by \citep{1219}, fall within different phases of the bloom. Nevertheless, the most commonly used bloom initiation metrics may not be so different from our  $\$RPA\$$  metric. For instance, one of the most used phenology metrics, the 5 \% above annual median \citep{727}, usually falls within a date later than the initiation date and it is still considered an initiation metric. This could thus be considered a semantics issue. Additionally, the problem with this type of metrics still remains: they rely on the full cycle (or at least the peak) of chlorophyll concentration in order to be estimated. The ideal bloom phenology meti... [16]

are constructed so as to be as simple as possible, using at most two physical observables (light intensity, light intensity integrated over the mixed layer depth, wind-driven mixing and heat flux) in various combinations. Each model is based on one of the two classes of mechanisms discussed in the introduction: mixed layer shoaling (critical depth) or active mixing (critical turbulence, critical light exposure and critical heat flux). Our study shows the strength of the critical depth model and indicates a dominance of the mixed layer shoaling over the active mixing mechanism, but not everywhere. There is an apparent inconsistency between our results and some recently reported results, notably by \cite{1366} and \cite{1221}. In the former, the strongest relationship with bloom initiation was found with the date of zero heat flux ( $\dot{Q}'_0$ ), while in the latter it was with the shoaling of mixing length (essentially heat flux tempered by wind stress and stratification). There are however several reasons why the results may differ. Firstly, \cite{1221} tested the climatological bloom initiation date against the various drivers in a spatial context, rather than the interannual variations in a temporal context as we do here. In contrast, \cite{1366}, while maintaining the temporal aspect, reduced each seasonal cycle of potential drivers to a single annual metric, \textit{e.g.} the date when the mixed layer depth shoals most rapidly. Precisely how these different aggregation processes influence the outcome of statistical treatments remains unresolved. More importantly, the bloom initiation metric chosen by each of these studies are also different. \cite{1366} chose the 5% above annual median as their metric \cite{727}; a metric that may be less than reliable with regards to bloom initiation. \cite{1221} used the date of first increase of surface chlorophyll concentration ( $F'_0$ ), specifically given by  $F'_0 = t: d\bar{C}/dt=0$  rather than our date of maximum increase  $T_0 = t: d\bar{C}/dt=g$ . While it may be debated as to which of these have greater significance (and for which ecosystem process), it also underscores an important issue; that different milestones in the seasonal development of the spring bloom may well come under the influence of different dynamics.

In our study, even though the critical depth hypothesis is the winner (most spatially frequent), the spatial distribution of the winning model shows regions where the mixed layer shoaling mechanism seems not to be supported. For instance, there is a dominance of the critical turbulence and critical light exposure models in the Bay of Biscay. This may be due to the high degree of upwelling in this region; hence the failure of critical depth hypothesis to predict surface bloom dynamics. Another example occurs east of Newfoundland, where the critical turbulence and critical heat flux hypotheses dominate. Both of these hypotheses have wind-driven mixing as a common parameter. In addition, heat flux and light intensity are also key individual drivers in this region (as confirmed in Figure \ref{fig:rankingprocesses\_weights}). These findings suggest that spring bloom seasonality in these regions may be driven by periods of reduced active turbulent mixing, increasing exposure to light \cite{803,1036,1038,1211}. The region off Newfoundland is also very energetic (high physical forcing), highly influenced by the subpolar gyre, and serves as a path for the northward movement of the Gulf Stream waters. Even though we do not assess 3D processes in our study, they may still help the understanding of the dynamics of the North Atlantic system. The failure of critical depth to explain the bloom dynamics in this region may be due to subduction of cold waters from the subpolar gyre and the warm waters from the North Atlantic drift. This may explain why the critical turbulence and the critical heat flux were dominating in the region east of Newfoundland and into the central North Atlantic.

The explanatory power of the hypotheses that assume the mechanism of active mixing (critical turbulence; critical light exposure and

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: forms

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: In a similar approach, \cite{1221} found contrasting results. Their study does not support the theory that phytoplankton growth is triggered by shoaling of the seasonal thermocline. However, \cite{1221} tested a different range of theories by using a one-dimensional approach of climatological mixing length scales, which inhibits both mesoscale processes and interannual variability to be assessed.

critical heat flux) is fairly evenly distributed (Figure \ref{fig:rankingmodels\_weights}). These three hypotheses seem to operate with a switch-on mechanism, \textit{i.e.} a number of conditions has to be met for bloom growth, and any one may be the critical condition that triggers the growth spurt. This interpretation is supported by comparing Figures \ref{fig:rankingmodels\_weights} and \ref{fig:rankingprocesses\_weights}, where the critical depth model is a clear winner in the model inter-comparison, but only scores average when tested against individual parameters. In this case, the limiting conditions appear to be either light intensity or heat flux (since all three have wind-driven mixing as a common parameter). Our results show that there is no clear winning hypothesis among these three active mixing models, but there is a bias towards mechanisms involving heat flux (Figure \ref{fig:rankingprocesses\_weights}). This finding is supported by \cite{800}, where a bloom develops due to the start of net warming, weakening turbulent mixing, and subsequent increase of the residence time of phytoplankton cells within the euphotic layer. In order for this to happen, a standing stock of phytoplankton cells needs to exist \textit{a priori}. The ``seed stock'' is the left overs from the previous year that have been surviving all winter at depth due to convection. As suggested by \cite{1261,1262,809}, deep convection spreads out the overwintering remnants, but, as soon as stratification comes in, those lucky enough to be in the surface start to bloom. From our results (Figure \ref{fig:rankingmodels\_weights}), we confirm that heat flux is a strong physical driver. Thus, in regions where the critical depth is not the winning model, the active mixing mechanism (either triggered by light intensity or heat flux) seems to play an important role. The second most common physical property was wind-driven mixing (Figure \ref{fig:rankingprocesses\_weights}) and is the common parameter in the models concerning the active mixing mechanism. In the past, the importance of wind-driven mixing has been shown by \cite{803,1036,1038}, and confirmed by \cite{800,804}. The first group of authors stresses a balance between wind-driven mixing and sinking rates, so that an intermediate mixing allows both enough surface nutrient replenishment, and sufficient average light exposure. Recently, \cite{1211} suggested that wind forcing (wind stress as a proxy for wind surface mixing) played a key role in bloom timing and magnitude (see their Figures 5a and 5c). The results shown by these authors are based on single-parameter hypotheses (not including heat flux) and confirm that spring blooms are triggered by different physical properties in different mesoscale regions. Our results are thus in agreement, where wind stress is found as a common parameter within the North Atlantic domain. Winds have essentially two effects: turbulent mixing \cite{1261,1023} which is only shallow (around 50 m in mid-latitudes), and surface cooling which promotes deep convection \cite{1261,1221}. Together with the cessation of convective overturn, wind stress decreases during the spring. Deep mixing is therefore no longer active, and there is a shift from a deep-mixed regime to a shallow light-driven regime. However, it is important to note that the depth of the mixed layer is not the same as the depth of vertical mixing of plankton \cite{809}. These two depths only match when vertical mixing is at its limit \cite{800}. In the presence of low vertical mixing, a surface bloom can initiate even if critical depth conditions \cite{792} are not met, \textit{i.e.} even if the thermocline is deeper than the critical depth. This mechanism is presented by \cite{809} as the ``stratification-onset model'', in which the author contends that the critical depth hypothesis is valid during autumn and winter, when the deepening thermocline may suppress production due to downward mixing of plankton, but not in spring, since the upper layers are not well

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: (\textit{i.e.} cooling and heating of the ocean surface) is the dominant mechanism.

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted:

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: cease

mixed in plankton. The model is consistent with the findings by \citet{800}, in which surface stratification results from cessation of convective overturn and low wind stress. Additionally, \citet{809} distinguished between a surface bloom and a vertically-integrated bloom. In our study, we show that the critical depth hypothesis can still be used to predict phytoplankton spring surface blooms. Our findings have, however, assumptions that are worth considering. Firstly, we based the critical depth hypothesis on Sverdrup's classical theory, thus only accounting for  $L_H$ . This makes the model inherently simpler. The other three hypotheses use two parameters separately, and are therefore somewhat handicapped (higher penalty due to higher number of parameters) when compared to the critical depth. We believe that this type of study would improve if similar combinations would be found for the remaining hypotheses: critical turbulence, critical light exposure and critical heat flux. For this reason, we tried to use a two-parameter approach (considering  $H$  and  $L_H$  separately) for the critical depth hypothesis, so that the four models would have the same number of parameters, and thus the AICc weights would be comparable. The critical depth explained by  $L_H$  alone showed to be inherently superior (with a much stronger signal) than the combined  $H$  and  $L_H$  model, thus we chose to keep our interpretation of the critical depth hypothesis using  $L_H$ . This underscores the point that physical reasoning can come a long way in improving model predictions. Secondly, we recognise that our study assumes that the same mechanism predicts surface bloom timing at a given location for the entire time frame (from 1998 to 2010). However, it is conceivable that different mechanisms may be best predictors in different years. Considering the high variability in the spatial distribution of the models (Figure \ref{fig:rankingmodels\_weights}), it is reasonable to expect similar high temporal variability. In the same way we observe that different mechanisms dominate in different regions, intuitively, one can assume that different mechanisms will also dominate in different years. Indeed, given the scatter in winning models, it is entirely conceivable that bloom timing is governed by a limiting factor; that multiple conditions have to be met, any one of which may be the trigger in any given year or location. Thirdly, we also recognise that our study fails at assessing top-down mechanisms. A key hypothesis that has been attempted by \citet{1221} is 'dilution-recoupling hypothesis' \citet{774}. \citet{1221} found very little correspondence between seasonal thermocline increases and integrated chlorophyll increases. However, as they noted, in order to successfully study this hypothesis, one would require temporally and spatially distributed data on grazing pressure and encounter rates between grazers and phytoplankton. Since such highly-resolved data sets are not available, top-down mechanisms cannot be properly assessed at this time.

#### \section{Conclusions}

The complexity of spring bloom dynamics in the North Atlantic has been discussed since \citet{792} published the 'critical depth hypothesis'. The discussion took a different direction when \citet{774} suggested a top-down control of the phytoplankton seasonal cycle with the 'dilution-recoupling hypothesis'. Various studies followed the same line of thought \citet{1212,1213,1136,1248}. However, bottom-up factors are still the most studied \citet{727,803,1023,800}, especially because data is more readily available than for top-down factors. The theories mentioned in the above sections (Figure \ref{tab:models}) do not necessarily disagree with this reasoning. Instead, each one adds a missing element necessary to fully understand spring bloom dynamics \citet{1226}. Even though satellite observations have provided great insight over the last decades, the picture is still one of

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: PARmld

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: MLD

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: PAR

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: PARmld

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: MLD

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: PAR

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: PARmld

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: no clear effect of

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: on

complexity. Our study thus confirms that a single hypothesis for what drives a North Atlantic spring bloom may be too simplistic.

A consensus is yet to be reached regarding the onset of spring phytoplankton blooms in the North Atlantic. Every theory published in the literature claims to best predict the timing of the spring bloom. However, one cannot adopt a single hypothesis simply because all of the theories seem to apply, either at shorter temporal or spatial scales. By revisiting four of the main hypotheses on the subject, we are able to confirm that phytoplankton surface bloom dynamics in the highly-variable North Atlantic are far too complex to be driven by the same mechanism in all places and in all years. We show that, in terms of bottom-up processes alone, there is a dominant physical mechanism (mixed layer shoaling) that best predicts the growing phase of North Atlantic phytoplankton blooms at the mesoscale. However, some regions show coherent patterns, supporting the idea that there are distinct physical phenomena driving spring surface blooms, rather than a single one. We believe these findings to be relevant for the ongoing discussion on North Atlantic bloom onset.

`\appendix`

`\section{Appendix A}`

Figure A\ref{suppfig:weightofwinner} - Map of the Akaike weights of the winner model.

`\begin{acknowledgements}`

The data outputs from this study can be obtained by contacting ASA Ferreira at asofiaaferreira@gmail.com. GlobColor data were provided by accessing the GlobColour's FTP server available at

`\url{ftp://ftp.acri.fr/}`, supported by EU FP7 MyOcean and ESA GlobColor projects, using ESA ENVISAT MERIS, NASA MODIS and SeaWiFS data. PAR was obtained from the SeaWiFS data center available at

`\url{http://oceancolor.gsfc.nasa.gov/}`. MLD was obtained from the Hybrid Coordinate Ocean Model (HYCOM) available at

`\url{http://hycom.org/hycom/}`. Wind stress and heat flux were obtained from the Earth System Research Laboratory, Physical Sciences Division, and are available at

`\url{http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd/data/gridded/tables/daily.html}`.

This paper is a deliverable of the Nordic Centre for Research on Marine Ecosystems and Resources under Climate Change (NorMER), which is funded by the Norden Top-level Research Initiative sub-programme 'Effect Studies and Adaptation to Climate Change'. AWV acknowledges the Danish Council for Strategic Research and its support for the NAACOS project. The research leading to these results has received funding from the European Union 7th Framework Programme (FP7 2007-2013) under grant agreement number 308299 (NACLIM project).

`\end{acknowledgements}`

`%%\bibliographystyle{copernicus}`

`%%\bibliography{refbib}`

`\begin{thebibliography}{71}`

`\providecommand{\natexlab}[1]{#1}`

`\providecommand{\url}[1]{\tt #1}`

`\providecommand{\urlprefix}{URL }`

`\expandafter\ifx\csname urlstyle\endcsname\relax`

`\providecommand{\doi}[1]{doi:\discretionary{}{}{}#1}\else`

`\providecommand{\doi}{doi:\discretionary{}{}{}#1}\begingroup`

`\urlstyle{rm}\Url\fi`

`\bibitem[{}Akaike(1973)]{1341}`

Akaike, H.: Information theory as an extension of the maximum likelihood

principle, pp. 267--281, Akademiai Kiado, Budapest, 1973.

`\bibitem[{}Antoine et al.(1996)Antoine, Andre, and Morel]{1057}`

Antoine, D., Andre, J., and Morel, A.: Oceanic primary production 2. Estimation

at global scale from satellite (coastal zone color scanner) chlorophyll,

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: developed

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted:  $(\frac{1}{4}^{\circ})$ .

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: \$

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Formatted: Font color: Black

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: \$

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: \$

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: \$

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Formatted: Font color: Black

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: \$wss\$

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: \$HF\$

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: 72

Global biogeochemical cycles, 10, 57--69, 1996.

`\bibitem[Backhaus et al.(1999)Backhaus, Wehde, Hegseth, and K{\a}mpf]{1262}`  
 Backhaus, J.-O., Wehde, H., Hegseth, E.-N., and K{\a}mpf, J.: 'Phyto-convection': the role of oceanic convection in primary production, Marine ecology. Progress series, 189, 77--92, 1999.

`\bibitem[Backhaus et al.(2003)Backhaus, Hegseth, Wehde, Irigoien, Hatten, and Logemann]{1261}`  
 Backhaus, J.-O., Hegseth, E.-N., Wehde, H., Irigoien, X., Hatten, K., and Logemann, K.: Convection and primary production in winter, Marine ecology. Progress series, 251, 1--14, 2003.

`\bibitem[Badcock and Merrett(1976)]{1247}`  
 Badcock, J. and Merrett, N.-R.: Midwater fishes in the eastern North Atlantic---I. Vertical distribution and associated biology in 30 N, 23 W, with developmental notes on certain myctophids, Progress in Oceanography, 7, 3--58 @ 0079--6611, 1976.

`\bibitem[Behrenfeld(2010)]{774}`  
 Behrenfeld, M.-J.: Abandoning Sverdrup's Critical Depth Hypothesis on phytoplankton blooms, Ecology, 91, 977--989, 2010.

`\bibitem[Behrenfeld et al.(2013{\natexlab{a}})Behrenfeld, Boss, and Banse]{1213}`  
 Behrenfeld, M.-J., Boss, E.-S., and Banse, K.: Resurrecting the Ecological Underpinnings of Ocean Plankton Blooms, Annual Review of Marine Science, 6, 16.1--16.28, 2013{\natexlab{a}}.

`\bibitem[Behrenfeld et al.(2013{\natexlab{b}})Behrenfeld, Doney, Lima, Boss, and Siegel]{1136}`  
 Behrenfeld, M.-J., Doney, S.-C., Lima, I., Boss, E.-S., and Siegel, D.-A.: Annual cycles of ecological disturbance and recovery underlying the subarctic Atlantic spring plankton bloom, Global biogeochemical cycles, 27, 526--540, `\doi{10.1002/gbc.20050}`, 2013{\natexlab{b}}.

`\bibitem[Behrenfeld et al.(2013{\natexlab{c}})Behrenfeld, Doney, Lima, Boss, and Siegel]{1212}`  
 Behrenfeld, M.-J., Doney, S.-C., Lima, I., Boss, E.-S., and Siegel, D.-A.: Reply to a comment by Stephen M. Chiswell on: ``Annual cycles of ecological disturbance and recovery underlying the subarctic Atlantic spring plankton bloom'' by MJ Behrenfeld et al. (2013), Global Biogeochemical Cycles, 27, 1294--1296, 2013{\natexlab{c}}.

`\bibitem[Bleck(2002)]{1197}`  
 Bleck, R.: An oceanic general circulation model framed in hybrid isopycnic-Cartesian coordinates, Ocean modelling, 4, 55--88, 2002.

`\bibitem[Brody and Lozier(2014)]{1221}`  
 Brody, S.-R. and Lozier, M.-S.: Changes in dominant mixing length scales as a driver of subpolar phytoplankton bloom initiation in the North Atlantic, Geophysical Research Letters, 41, 3197--3203, 2014.

\bibitem[Brody et al.(2013)Brody, Lozier, and Dunne]{1128} Brody, S.-R., Lozier, M.-S., and Dunne, J.-P.: A comparison of methods to determine phytoplankton bloom initiation, *Journal of Geophysical Research*, 118, 2345--2357, 2013.

\bibitem[Burnham and Anderson(2002)]{1491} Burnham, K.-P. and Anderson, D.-R.: Model selection and multimodel inference: a practical information-theoretic approach, Springer, New York, 2002.

\bibitem[Burnham et al.(2011)Burnham, Anderson, and Huyvaert]{1208} Burnham, K.-P., Anderson, D.-R., and Huyvaert, K.-P.: AIC model selection and multimodel inference in behavioral ecology: some background, observations, and comparisons, *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 65, 23--35, 2011.

\bibitem[Chiswell(2011)]{809} Chiswell, S.-M.: Annual cycles and spring blooms in phytoplankton: don't abandon Sverdrup completely, *Marine ecology progress series*, 443, 39--50, 2011.

\bibitem[Chiswell et al.(2013)Chiswell, Bradford-Grieve, Hadfield, and Kennan]{1222} Chiswell, S.-M., Bradford-Grieve, J., Hadfield, M.-G., and Kennan, S.-C.: Climatology of surface chlorophyll a, autumn-winter and spring blooms in the southwest Pacific Ocean, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 118, 1003--1018, 2013.

\bibitem[Cole et al.(2012)Cole, Henson, Martin, and Yool]{965} Cole, H., Henson, S., Martin, A., and Yool, A.: Mind the gap: The impact of missing data on the calculation of phytoplankton phenology metrics, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, C08\,030, \doi{10.1029/2012JC008249}, 2012.

\bibitem[Cole et al.(2015)Cole, Henson, Martin, and Yool]{1366} Cole, H.-S., Henson, S., Martin, A.-P., and Yool, A.: Basin-wide mechanisms for spring bloom initiation: how typical is the North Atlantic?, *ICES Journal of Marine Science: Journal du Conseil*, p. fsu239, \doi{10.1093/icesjms/fsu239}, 2015.

\bibitem[Drange et al.(1996)Drange, Simonsen, Environmental, and Center]{1199} Drange, H., Simonsen, K., Environmental, N., and Center, R.-S.: Formulation of air-sea fluxes in the ESOP2 version of MICOM, Nansen Environmental and Remote Sensing Center, Norway, 1996.

\bibitem[Evans and Parslow(1985)]{1031} Evans, G.-T. and Parslow, J.-S.: A model of annual plankton cycles, *Biological Oceanography*, 3, 327--347, 1985.

\bibitem[Evensen(2003)]{1200} Evensen, G.: The ensemble Kalman filter: Theoretical formulation and practical implementation, *Ocean dynamics*, 53, 343--367, 2003.

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: 1-488,

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: ?

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: the

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: pp

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: %@ 1054--3139,

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: \doi{10.1093/icesjms/fsu239},

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: \bibitem[Demarcq et al.(2012)Demarcq, Reygondeau, Alvain, and . ... [17]

\bibitem[{{Ferreira et-al.(2014)Ferreira, Visser, MacKenzie, and Payne}}]{1219}  
 Ferreira, A. S.-A., Visser, A.-W., MacKenzie, B.-R., and Payne, M.-R.: Accuracy and precision in the calculation of phenology metrics, *Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans*, 119, \doi{10.1002/2014JC010323}, \urlprefix\url{http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/2014JC010323}, 2014.

\bibitem[{{Field et-al.(1998)Field, Behrenfeld, Randerson, and Falkowski}}]{1065}  
 Field, C., Behrenfeld, M., Randerson, J., and Falkowski, P.: Primary production of the biosphere: integrating terrestrial and oceanic components, *Science*, 281, 237--240, 1998.

\bibitem[{{Follows and Dutkiewicz(2011)}}]{731}  
 Follows, M.-J. and Dutkiewicz, S.: Modeling Diverse Communities of Marine Microbes, *Annual Review of Marine Science*, 3, 427--451, 2011.

\bibitem[{{Frajka-Williams and Rhines(2010)}}]{948}  
 Frajka-Williams, E. and Rhines, P.-B.: Physical controls and interannual variability of the Labrador Sea spring phytoplankton bloom in distinct regions, *Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers*, 57, 541--552, 2010.

\bibitem[{{Gaard(2000)}}]{979}  
 Gaard, E.: Seasonal abundance and development of *Calanus finmarchicus* in relation to phytoplankton and hydrography on the Faroe Shelf, *ICES Journal of Marine Science: Journal du Conseil*, 57, 1605--1611, 2000.

\bibitem[{{Gar{\c c}on et-al.(2001)Gar{\c c}on, Oschlies, Doney, McGillicuddy, and Waniek}}]{946}  
 Gar{\c c}on, V.-C., Oschlies, A., Doney, S.-C., McGillicuddy, D., and Waniek, J.: The role of mesoscale variability on plankton dynamics in the North Atlantic, *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, 48, 2199--2226, 2001.

\bibitem[{{Gislason and Silva(2012)}}]{1022}  
 Gislason, A. and Silva, T.: Abundance, composition, and development of zooplankton in the Subarctic Iceland Sea in 2006, 2007, and 2008, *ICES Journal of Marine Science: Journal du Conseil*, 69, 1263--1276, 2012.

\bibitem[{{Heath et-al.(2000)Heath, Fraser, Gislason, Hay, J{\o}nasd{\o}ttir, and Richardson}}]{974}  
 Heath, M.-R., Fraser, J.-G., Gislason, A., Hay, S.-J., J{\o}nasd{\o}ttir, S.-H., and Richardson, K.: Winter distribution of *Calanus finmarchicus* in the Northeast Atlantic, *ICES Journal of Marine Science: Journal du Conseil*, 57, 1628--1635, 2000.

\bibitem[{{Henson et-al.(2010)Henson, Sarmiento, Dunne, Bopp, Lima, Doney, John, and Beaulieu}}]{1071}

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: n/a--n/a,



Henson, S., Sarmiento, J., Dunne, J., Bopp, L., Lima, I., Doney, S., John, J., and Beaulieu, C.: Detection of anthropogenic climate change in satellite records of ocean chlorophyll and productivity, *Biogeosciences*, 7, 621--640, 2010.

\bibitem[{{Huisman and Sommeijer(2002)}}]{1036}  
Huisman, J. and Sommeijer, B.: Maximal sustainable sinking velocity of phytoplankton species, *Marine ecology progress series*, 244, 39 -- 48, 2002.

\bibitem[{{Huisman et-al.(1999)Huisman, Oostveen, and Weissing}}]{803}  
Huisman, J., Oostveen, P.-v., and Weissing, F.-J.: Critical Depth and Critical Turbulence: Two Different Mechanisms for the Development of Phytoplankton Blooms, *Limnology and oceanography*, 44, 1781--1787, 1999.

\bibitem[{{Huisman et-al.(2002)Huisman, Array{'a}s, Ebert, and Sommeijer}}]{1038}  
Huisman, J., Array{'a}s, M., Ebert, U., and Sommeijer, B.: How Do Sinking Phytoplankton Species Manage to Persist??, *The American Naturalist*, 159, 245--254, 2002.

\bibitem[{{Hunke and Dukowicz(1997)}}]{1198}  
Hunke, E. and Dukowicz, J.: An elastic-viscous-plastic model for sea ice dynamics, *Journal of Physical Oceanography*, 27, 1849--1867, 1997.

\bibitem[{{Irigoiien et-al.(2005)Irigoiien, Flynn, and Harris}}]{1248}  
Irigoiien, X., Flynn, K., and Harris, R.: Phytoplankton blooms: a 'loophole' in microzooplankton grazing impact?, *Journal of Plankton Research*, 27, 313--321  
%@ 0142--7873, 2005.

\bibitem[{{Irwin et-al.(2012)Irwin, Nelles, and Finkel}}]{1042}  
Irwin, A.-J., Nelles, A.-M., and Finkel, Z.-V.: Phytoplankton niches estimated from field data, *Limnology and oceanography*, 57, 787--797, 2012.

\bibitem[{{Kahru et-al.(2011)Kahru, Brotas, Manzano-Sarabia, and Mitchell}}]{1127}  
Kahru, M., Brotas, V., Manzano-Sarabia, M., and Mitchell, B.: Are phytoplankton blooms occurring earlier in the Arctic?, *Global Change Biology*, 17, 1733--1739, 2011.

\bibitem[{{Kalnay et-al.(1996)Kalnay, Kanamitsu, Kistler, Collins, Deaven, Gandin, Iredell, Saha, White, and Woollen}}]{1218}  
Kalnay, E., Kanamitsu, M., Kistler, R., Collins, W., Deaven, D., Gandin, L., Iredell, M., Saha, S., White, G., and Woollen, J.: The NCEP/NCAR 40-year reanalysis project, *Bulletin of the American meteorological Society*, 77, 437--471  
%@ 1520--0477, 1996.

\bibitem[{{L{'e}vy et-al.(2005)L{'e}vy, Lehahn, Andr{'e}, M{'e}mery, Loisel, and Heifetz}}]{783}  
L{'e}vy, M., Lehahn, Y., Andr{'e}, J.-M., M{'e}mery, L., Loisel, H., and Heifetz, E.: Production regimes in the northeast Atlantic: A study based on

Sea-viewing Wide Field-of-view Sensor (SeaWiFS) chlorophyll and ocean general circulation model mixed layer depth, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Oceans*, 110, C07S10, \doi{10.1029/2004JC002771}, 2005.

\bibitem[{{Lindemann and St-John(2014)}}]{1226}

Lindemann, C. and St-John, M.: A seasonal diary of phytoplankton in the North Atlantic, *Frontiers in Marine Science*, 1, 1--6, 2014.

\bibitem[{{Longhurst(1995)}}]{784}

Longhurst, A.: Seasonal cycles of pelagic production and consumption, *Progress in Oceanography*, 36, 77--167, 1995.

\bibitem[{{Longhurst et-al.(1995)Longhurst, Sathyendranath, Platt, and Caverhill}}]{1019}

Longhurst, A., Sathyendranath, S., Platt, T., and Caverhill, C.: An estimate of global primary production in the ocean from satellite radiometer data, *Journal of Plankton Research*, 17, 1245--1271, 1995.

\bibitem[{{Mahadevan et-al.(2012)Mahadevan, D'Asaro, Lee, and Perry}}]{952}

Mahadevan, A., D'Asaro, E., Lee, C., and Perry, M.-J.: Eddy-Driven Stratification Initiates North Atlantic Spring Phytoplankton Blooms, *Science*, 337, 54--58, 2012.

\bibitem[{{Maritorena et-al.(2002)Maritorena, Siegel, and Peterson}}]{1122}

Maritorena, S., Siegel, D.-A., and Peterson, A.-R.: Optimization of a semianalytical ocean color model for global-scale applications, *Applied Optics*, 41, 2705--2714, 2002.

\bibitem[{{Maritorena et-al.(2010)Maritorena, d'Andon, Mangin, and Siegel}}]{757}

Maritorena, S., d'Andon, O. H.-F., Mangin, A., and Siegel, D.-A.: Merged satellite ocean color data products using a bio-optical model: Characteristics, benefits and issues, *Remote Sensing of Environment*, 114, 1791--1804, 2010.

\bibitem[{{Martinez et-al.(2011)Martinez, Antoine, D'Ortenzio, and de-Boyer-Montegut}}]{768}

Martinez, E., Antoine, D., D'Ortenzio, F., and de-Boyer-Montegut, C.: Phytoplankton spring and fall blooms in the North Atlantic in the 1980s and 2000s, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 116, C11\,029, \doi{10.1029/2010JC006836}, 2011.

\bibitem[{{McCain et-al.(2006)McCain, Hooker, Feldman, and Bontempi}}]{1068}

McCain, C., Hooker, S., Feldman, G., and Bontempi, P.: Satellite data for ocean biology, biogeochemistry, and climate research, *Eos, Transactions American Geophysical Union*, 87, 337--343, 2006.

\bibitem[{{McGillicuddy et-al.(2007)McGillicuddy, Anderson, Bates, Bibby, Buesseler, Carlson, Davis, Ewart, Falkowski, and Goldthwait}}]{1220}

McGillicuddy, D.-J., Anderson, L.-A., Bates, N.-R., Bibby, T., Buesseler, K.-O., Carlson, C.-A., Davis, C.-S., Ewart, C., Falkowski, P.-G., and Goldthwait, S.-A.: Eddy/wind interactions stimulate extraordinary mid-ocean

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: . s.-T

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: .

... [18]

plankton blooms, *Science*, 316, 1021--1026, doi:10.1126/science.1138755, 2007.

**\bibitem**[{Pauly et al.(1998)Pauly, Trites, Capuli, and Christensen}]{1244}  
 Pauly, D., Trites, A., Capuli, E., and Christensen, V.: Diet composition and trophic levels of marine mammals, *ICES Journal of Marine Science: Journal du Conseil*, 55, 467--481, 1998.

**\bibitem**[{Petrenko et al.(2013)Petrenko, Pozdnyakov, Johannessen, Counillon, and Sychov}]{1160}  
 Petrenko, D., Pozdnyakov, D., Johannessen, J., Counillon, F., and Sychov, V.: Satellite-derived multi-year trend in primary production in the Arctic Ocean, *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 34, 3903--3937, 2013.

**\bibitem**[{Platt et al.(1991)Platt, Bird, and Sathyendranath}]{1196}  
 Platt, T., Bird, D.-F., and Sathyendranath, S.: Critical depth and marine primary production, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences*, 246, 205--217, 1991.

**\bibitem**[{Platt et al.(2003)Platt, Fuentes-Yaco, and Frank}]{706}  
 Platt, T., Fuentes-Yaco, C., and Frank, K.-T.: Marine ecology: Spring algal bloom and larval fish survival, *Nature*, 423, 398--399, 2003.

**\bibitem**[{Platt et al.(2010)Platt, Sathyendranath, White, Fuentes-Yaco, Zhai, Devred, and Tang}]{887}  
 Platt, T., Sathyendranath, S., White, G., Fuentes-Yaco, C., Zhai, L., Devred, E., and Tang, C.: Diagnostic Properties of Phytoplankton Time Series from Remote Sensing, *Estuaries and Coasts*, 33, 428--439, 2010.

**\bibitem**[{Racault et al.(2012)Racault, Le-Qu{e}r{e}, Buitenhuis, Sathyendranath, and Platt}]{941}  
 Racault, M.-F., Le-Qu{e}r{e}, C., Buitenhuis, E., Sathyendranath, S., and Platt, T.: Phytoplankton phenology in the global ocean, *Ecological Indicators*, 14, 152--163, 2012.

**\bibitem**[{Rolinski et al.(2007)Rolinski, Horn, Petzoldt, and Paul}]{1092}  
 Rolinski, S., Horn, H., Petzoldt, T., and Paul, L.: Identifying cardinal dates in phytoplankton time series to enable the analysis of long-term trends, *Oecologia*, 153, 997--1008, 2007.

**\bibitem**[{Sakov et al.(2012)Sakov, Counillon, Bertino, Lis{ae}ter, Oke, and Korablev}]{1205}  
 Sakov, P., Counillon, F., Bertino, L., Lis{ae}ter, K.-A., Oke, P.-R., and Korablev, A.: TOPAZ4: an ocean-sea ice data assimilation system for the North Atlantic and Arctic, *Ocean Sci.*, 8, 633--656, doi:10.5194/os-8-633-2012, doi:10.5194/os-8-633-2012, <http://www.ocean-sci.net/8/633/2012/>, 2012.

**\bibitem**[{Sasaoka et al.(2011)Sasaoka, Chiba, and Saino}]{1141}  
 Sasaoka, K., Chiba, S., and Saino, T.: Climatic forcing and phytoplankton phenology over the subarctic North Pacific from 1998 to 2006, as observed from ocean color data, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 38, [L15\,609](#),

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: ¶ 1054--3139

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Formatted: Font color: Black

`\doi{10.1029/2011GL048299}`, 2011.  
`\bibitem[{{Sathyendranath et-al.(2001)Sathyendranath, Cota, Stuart, Maass, and Platt}}]{893}`  
 Sathyendranath, S., Cota, G., Stuart, V., Maass, H., and Platt, T.: Remote sensing of phytoplankton pigments: A comparison of empirical and theoretical approaches, *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 22, 249--273, 2001.  
`\bibitem[{{Sharples et-al.(2006)Sharples, Ross, Scott, Greenstreet, and Fraser}}]{1095}`  
 Sharples, J., Ross, O., Scott, B., Greenstreet, S., and Fraser, H.: Inter-annual variability in the timing of stratification and the spring bloom in the North-western North Sea, *Continental Shelf Research*, 26, 733--751, 2006.  
`\bibitem[{{Siegel et-al.(2002)Siegel, Doney, and Yoder}}]{727}`  
 Siegel, D.-A., Doney, S.-C., and Yoder, J.-A.: The North Atlantic Spring Phytoplankton Bloom and Sverdrup's Critical Depth Hypothesis, *Science*, 296, 730--733, 2002.  
`\bibitem[{{Simpson et-al.(1981)Simpson, Crisp, and Hearn}}]{1246}`  
 Simpson, J., Crisp, D., and Hearn, C.: The shelf-sea fronts: Implications of their existence and behaviour [and discussion], *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences*, 302, 531--546 %@ 1364--503X, 1981.  
`\bibitem[{{Sverdrup(1953)}}]{792}`  
 Sverdrup, H.-U.: On Conditions for the Vernal Blooming of Phytoplankton, *Journal du Conseil*, 18, 287--295, 1953.  
`\bibitem[{{Taboada and Anad{\o}n(2014)}}]{1211}`  
 Taboada, F.-G. and Anad{\o}n, R.: Seasonality of North Atlantic phytoplankton from space: impact of environmental forcing on a changing phenology (1998--2012), *Global change biology*, 20, 698--712, 2014.  
`\bibitem[{{Taylor and Ferrari(2011{\natexlab{a}})}}]{800}`  
 Taylor, J.-R. and Ferrari, R.: Shutdown of turbulent convection as a new criterion for the onset of spring phytoplankton blooms, *Limnology and oceanography*, 56, 2293--2307, 2011{\natexlab{a}}.  
`\bibitem[{{Taylor and Ferrari(2011{\natexlab{b}})}}]{804}`  
 Taylor, J.-R. and Ferrari, R.: Ocean fronts trigger high latitude phytoplankton blooms, *Geophysical Research Letters*, 38, L23\,601, `\doi{10.1029/2011GL049312}`, 2011{\natexlab{b}}.  
`\bibitem[{{Townsend et-al.(1992)Townsend, Keller, Sieracki, and Ackleson}}]{1245}`  
 Townsend, D.-W., Keller, M.-D., Sieracki, M.-E., and Ackleson, S.-G.: Spring phytoplankton blooms in the absence of vertical water column stratification, *Nature*, 360, 59--62 %@ 0028--0836, 1992.  
`\bibitem[{{Townsend et-al.(1994)Townsend, Cammen, Holligan, Campbell, and Pettigrew}}]{1023}`

Townsend, D.-W., Cammen, L.-M., Holligan, P.-M., Campbell, D.-E., and Pettigrew, N.-R.: Causes and consequences of variability in the timing of spring phytoplankton blooms, Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers, 41, 747--765, 1994.

`\bibitem`[{Trenkel et-al.(2014)Trenkel, Huse, MacKenzie, Alvarez, Arrizabalaga, Castonguay, Go{\~n}i, Gr{\'e}goire, H{\'a}t{\'u}n, and Jansen}]{1303}

Trenkel, V., Huse, G., MacKenzie, B., Alvarez, P., Arrizabalaga, H., Castonguay, M., Go{\~n}i, N., Gr{\'e}goire, F., H{\'a}t{\'u}n, H., and Jansen, T.: Comparative ecology of widely distributed pelagic fish species in the North Atlantic: implications for modelling climate and fisheries impacts, Progress in Oceanography, 129, 219--243, `\doi`{10.1016/j.pocean.2014.04.030}, 2014.

`\bibitem`[{Wiltshire et-al.(2008)Wiltshire, Malzahn, Wirtz, Greve, Janisch, Mangelsdorf, Manly, and Boersma}]{1087}

Wiltshire, K., Malzahn, A., Wirtz, K., Greve, W., Janisch, S., Mangelsdorf, P., Manly, B., and Boersma, M.: Resilience of North Sea phytoplankton spring bloom dynamics: An analysis of long-term data at Helgoland Roads, Limnology and oceanography, 53, 1294--1302, 2008.

`\bibitem`[{Yoder and Kennelly(2003)}]{1043}

Yoder, J.-A. and Kennelly, M.-A.: Seasonal and ENSO variability in global ocean phytoplankton chlorophyll derived from 4 years of SeaWiFS measurements, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 17, 1112, `\doi`{10.1029/2002GB001942}, 2003.

`\bibitem`[{Yoder et-al.(1993)Yoder, McClain, Feldman, and Esaias}]{795}

Yoder, J.-A., McClain, C.-R., Feldman, G.-C., and Esaias, W.-E.: Annual cycles of phytoplankton chlorophyll concentrations in the global ocean: A satellite view, Global Biogeochem. Cycles, 7, 181--193, 1993.

`\end{thebibliography}`

`\begin{figure}[gp]`

`\centering`

`\noindent\includegraphics`[width=\textwidth]{models\_m1par.pdf}

`\caption`{Definitions of each mechanism: a) critical depth; b) critical turbulence; c) critical light exposure; d) critical heat flux (Table `\ref`{tab:models}). Grey vertical area: 30 days prior to the date of climatological maximum rate of change in chlorophyll concentration; open circles: average conditions during the 30 days. Lines show: mixed layer depth (`$H$`, light blue), photosynthetic active radiation (`$L$`, dashed red), integrated light over the MLD, (`$L_H$`, filled red), heat flux (`$Q$`, orange), and wind-driven mixing (`$M$`, dark blue).}

`\label`{fig:models}

`\end{figure}`

`\begin{figure}[gp]`

`\centering`

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: MLD

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: PAR

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: \$PAR\$ at

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: \$

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Formatted: Font color: Black

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: \$ (\$PAR\_{MLD})\$,

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: HF

Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08

Deleted: MIX

```

\noindent\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{RPAcalculation.pdf}
\caption{Calculation of the rate of change phenology anomaly for
each location  $(x,y)$ , \textit{i.e.} each  $1/4^{\circ}$  pixel,
 $\langle R_i(x,y) \rangle$ . (a) Each seasonal cycle (dashed, black lines) is used
to estimate the climatology  $\langle \bar{C}(x,y,t) \rangle$ , darkred line). (b) The
maximum increase  $\Delta C$  in  $\langle \bar{C} \rangle$  and the day on which it occurs
 $\langle T_0 \rangle$  are used as a reference to estimate how delayed or advanced
each year surface bloom is. (c) A 30-day window around the  $T_0$  is
isolated for each year seasonal cycle.  $R_i(x,y)$  is estimated from
difference between annual  $\langle C' \rangle(T_0)$  and climatology  $\langle \bar{C} \rangle(T_0)$ 
and  $\Delta C$ . The  $R_i(x,y)$  is thus a value in days.}
\label{fig:RPAcalculation}
\end{figure}
\begin{figure}[gp]
\centering

\noindent\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{rankingmodels_weights_mlp
ar.pdf}
\caption{Selected model for each  $1/4^{\circ}$  pixel (top), and
relative frequency of each model (bottom). C. depth: critical depth;
C. turbulence: critical turbulence; C. light exposure critical light
exposure; C. heat flux: critical heat flux. Only pixels where the
weight of the winning model is higher than 30 \%, and the bottom
depth exceeds 200 m are used for the map.}
\label{fig:rankingmodels_weights}
\end{figure}
\begin{figure}[gp]
\centering

\noindent\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{rankingprocesses_weights_
mlpar.pdf}
\caption{Selected variable for each  $1/4^{\circ}$  pixel (top), and
relative frequency of each single-variable model (bottom). PARmld:
 $\langle L' \rangle$ ; HS:  $\langle L \rangle$ ; PAR:  $\langle L' \rangle$ ; MIX:  $\langle M \rangle$ ; HF:  $\langle Q \rangle$  and OHF:  $\langle Q' \rangle$ . Only pixels
where the weight of the winner model is higher than 30 \%, and the
bottom depth exceeds 200 m are used for the map.}
\label{fig:rankingprocesses_weights}
\end{figure}
\setcounter{figure}{0}
\begin{figure}[gp]
\renewcommand{\figurename}{Figure A}
\centering

\noindent\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{weightofwinner_mlp
ar.pdf}
\caption{Akaike weights of the selected model for each
 $1/4^{\circ}$  pixel as in Figure \ref{fig:rankingmodels_weights} in
the main manuscript. Only pixels where the weight of the winner model
is higher than 30 \%, and the bottom depth exceeds 200 m are used for
the map.}
\label{suppfig:weightofwinner}
\end{figure}
\begin{table}[!htbp]
\centering
\caption{Models to explain the Rate of change Phenology Anomaly  $\langle \Delta R \rangle$ 
were built based on published theories regarding the bloom onset
\cite{792,727,803,1023,800}. These are indicators of physical
processes observed in the North Atlantic.}
\begin{tabular}{p{1.7cm}|p{3cm}|p{3.5cm}|p{3cm}}
\hline\hline
Name & Parameters & Mathematical expression & References\\
\hline

```

- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted:
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: ( $\langle RPA \rangle$ ).
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: grey and
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: (
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: day of
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: ( $\langle SRP \rangle$ )
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: in chlorophyll concentration ( $\langle CHL \rangle$ ) is
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: This is done by calculating the rate of increase ( $\Delta C$ ) at  $\langle SRP \rangle$
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: and the
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: in the  $\langle CHL \rangle$  on that day in the
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: each year seasonal cycle ( $\langle \Delta CHL \rangle$ ).
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted:  $\langle RPA \rangle$
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: represents the tim... [19]
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: of each year seas... [20]
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted:  $30d \setminus$ ,
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Formatted: Font color: Black
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted:  $\langle MLD \rangle$ ; PAR:  $30d \setminus$ , PAR
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted:  $30d \setminus$ , MIX
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted:  $30d \setminus$ , HF
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted:  $\setminus$ , HF
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: 2
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: (RPA)
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: 4cm
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: 4cm

```

Critical depth &  $\alpha_{L,H}$ : light intensity ( $I_L$ ) integrated from the
surface to the mixed layer depth ( $H$ ) &  $\alpha_{1,L}$   $H + \beta_1$ 
\cite{792,727}
\cline{1-4}
Critical turbulence &  $Q$ : heat flux.  $M$ : wind-driven mixing &  $R$ 
\sim  $\alpha_{2a}$   $Q' + \alpha_{2b}$   $M' + \beta_2$  &
\cite{803,1036,1038}
\cline{1-4}
Critical light exposure &  $I_L$ : light intensity.  $M$ : wind-driven
mixing &  $R$   $\sim \alpha_{3a}$   $L' + \alpha_{3b}$   $M' + \beta_3$  &
\cite{1023}
\cline{1-4}
Critical heat flux &  $Q$ : heat flux.  $M$ : wind-driven mixing &  $R$ 
\sim  $\alpha_{3a}$   $Q' + \alpha_{3b}$   $M' + \beta_3$  &
\cite{800,804}
\hline
\end{tabular}
\label{tab:models}
\end{table}
\end{document}

```

- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: PAR\_{MLD}
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: PAR
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: MLD & RPA
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: 30d, PAR\_{MLD}
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: HF
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: MIX
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: RPA
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: \, 30d, HF
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: \, 30d, MIX
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: PAR
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: MIX
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: RPA
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: \, 30d, PAR
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: \, 30d, MIX
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: HF
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: MIX
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: RPA
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: \,
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: \, HF
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: \, 30d, MIX
- Sofia Ferreira 1/5/15 16:08  
Deleted: .