Biogeosciences Discuss., 5, S792–S796, 2008
www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/5/S792/2008/

Biogeosciences Discussions

Interactive comment on "A mathematical modelling of bloom of the coccolithophore *Emiliania huxleyi* in a mesocosm experiment" *by* P. Joassin et al.

P. Joassin et al.

Received and published: 10 June 2008

Dear reviewer,

We do thank you for the time you spent to read our manuscript. Your comments will indubitably help us to improve our work. Here below, you will find our answers to all your comments taken one by one.

General comment

The mesocosm experiment focused on the impact of the varying pCO2 on different Emiliania huxleyi cellular activities able to participate to an export of carbon, i.e. primary production, calcification and production of TEP. The main goal of our model is

to represent conjointly all these three cellular processes as they occurred in confined environment conditions like mesocosms. Our paper concerns the first stage of our model development for which the representation of the bloom is restricted to present-day pCO2 conditions. That first stage should have given a mathematical tool taking into account the various specificities of mescosm affecting Emiliania huxleyi bloom. The structural formulations and the parameters set tested in mesocosms of present-day pCO2 treatment should constitute the best reference model able to study the impact of higher pCO2 treatments, avoiding side-steps imputable to mesocosm conditions. This is why the good matching between model results and observations had to be underlined in the conclusion. Indeed, the choice of the parameters values was motivated by the good matching. We clarified this in the introduction.

Reviewer: “How the parameters are dependent up on the initial conditions? Do they have some generality which may be used in other modelling studied?”

This question is difficult to answer. Indeed, if you change the initial conditions, you change the framework of the experiment and thus, it is expected that experimental results will be different. It is therefore difficult to know whether the model will be able or not to reproduce the dynamics in this modified environment with our calibrated parameters set or whether a new calibration of model parameters will be necessary to reproduce the new experiment. What we can say is that our calibrated parameters remain in the range found in the literature models (e.g. Paasche, 2002; Tyrrell & Taylor, 2006); with these parameters, model results remain in the range of the three replicates. Microbial loop parameters (bacteria, labile and semi-labile DOC and DON) as well as POM (POC, PON) dynamics parameters have been taken unchanged from the work of Anderson and Williams (1998) (see our bibliography). This parameters set have been found able to simulate the microbial loop dynamics in mesoscoms (e.g. Van Den Meersche et al. , 2004) and in real sites such as the Ligurian Sea (e.g. Raick et al., 2005) and the Black Sea (Gregoire et al., 2008). We essentially focused our calibration efforts on the parameters associated to the dynamics of Emiliania huxleyi. The calibrated

BGD

5, S792–S796, 2008

parameters values are totally in the range proposed by Paasche (2002). Other parameters concern innovating formulations like the ones describing the enhanced mortality due to viral lysis. These parameters are calculated with the relevant data from the three replicates of present-day pCO2 mesocosms. However, in real oceanic case, the parameters set that we proposed for Emiliania huxleyi dynamics will have probably to be calibrated once again. The values we propose in this paper can be good initial starting values. The only way to know is to test the model in a real context. This is our aim in the Black Sea.

It must be recalled that one of the scopes of this paper was not only to provide parameters values but also to test mathematical formulations of processes such as calcification, extra-excretion, DOC aggregation. This mesocosm experiment offered a unique diversified data set to test these formulations. Indeed, in our knowledge, this is the first time that a dynamic model of coccolithophores disposes of such a diversified data set to be calibrated. For instance, alkalinity and DIC data allow the validation of the representation of the calcification process. Data on DOC, DIC and TEP allow the validation of the representation of the process of extra-excretion and TEP formation. Nitrate, Ammonium and phosphate data allow to test the formulation of DIN uptake by coccolithophores. Data on DIC, nutrients and chlorophyll allow assessing the uncoupling of carbon and nitrogen dynamics.

Reviewer: “The bloom period in the experiment was very short; about 5 days. However, Emiliania huxleyi blooms may last for more than a month in a real ocean. As I can see, the bloom period was limited by the viral effects. An experiment without this effect would be useful to further explore the performance of the model. If the cause of short bloom period was something else, it is also worth explaining it.”

Your comment concerning the relevance of the viral action is pertinent. The mesocosm experiment offered data permitting to develop equations relative to viral multiplication which is quite new. Actually, viruses affected the bloom dynamics only at the end of the experiment. Prior to the development of these viruses, the formulations concerning

BGD

5, S792–S796, 2008

only Emiliania huxleyi physiology could have been properly tested. The introduction of an enhanced cellular mortality due to viral lysis was imposed to minimise the impact of the enclosed experimental conditions on the conclusions given by the model concerning Emiliania huxleyi growth. Viral lysis had to be taken in consideration as the Emiliania huxleyi blooms seemed to be terminated by viral lysis in each mesocosms. As it was formulated, the complement of mortality induced by viral action is not a constant rate but is modulated by the density of viral agents and cellular hosts. This complement mortality (added to the constant natural mortality rate) acts thus as an interactive response to the promiscuity between Emiliania huxleyi cells and virus. Unfortunately, there was no replicate of present-day pCO2 mesocosms where viruses were totally absent. This makes impossible to test the model in conditions without viruses as you suggested it.

Reviewer: “The model is very successful but very complex and certainly provides considerable elaboration to the existing models. However, the model complexity limits its implementation to real oceanic cases in which the simulation of Emiliania huxleyi blooms is not the main interest but a part of the complex food web structure. As the authors have had extensive sensitivity tests, they should have some idea how much of the model can be simplified within tolerable limits of not loosing the model realism. A paragraph or two in the Discussion section will be helpful for the people who will have an interest its implementation to real cases.”

The model presented in the paper does not only deal with the representation of Emiliania huxleyi but also of the microbial loop and TEP production. We also add an explicit description of DIC, alkalinity and oxygen for the validation exercise. Indeed, the representation of alkalinity and DIC allows the validation of the representation of the calcification and photosynthesis processes. Oxygen has been added for a validation of primary production and respiration. If we are only interested in the development of Emiliania huxleyi, we need 2 state variables to represent its biomass in carbon and nitrogen. Model results have shown that the molar calcite to organic carbon ratio of an

BGD

5, S792–S796, 2008

Emiliania huxleyi cell remains quasi unchanged between values of 0.55 to 0.57 during the experiment. Regarding that fact, and within the condition that the model is applied in environmental conditions where dissolution of calcite cannot occur, we do not need to explicitly model the free and attached calcite. If you want to represent the impact of Emiliania huxleyi on the pCO2, you need to add a description of DIC and alkalinity.

Finally, it should be noted that the present model has been derived for mesocosm environments. It is not sure at all whether the model can be taken unchanged for being applied in real conditions. It will for sure require some adaptations but what we propose can be a good starting point. We add a paragraph in the discussion to answer your comment.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 5, 787, 2008.