Summertime productivity and carbon export potential in the Weddell Sea, with a focus on the waters adjacent to Larsen C Ice Shelf
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Abstract
The Weddell Sea (WS) represents a point of origin in the Southern Ocean where globally-important water masses form. Biological activities in WS surface waters thus affect large-scale ocean biogeochemistry. During summer 2018/2019, we measured net primary production (NPP), nitrogen (nitrate, ammonium, urea) uptake, and nitrification in the western WS at the Antarctic Peninsula (AP) and Larsen C Ice Shelf (LCIS), in the southwestern Weddell Gyre (WG), and at Fimbul Ice Shelf (FIS) in the south-eastern WS. The highest average rates of NPP and greatest nutrient drawdown occurred at LCIS. Here, the phytoplankton community was dominated by colonial *Phaeocystis antarctica*, with diatoms increasing in abundance later in the season as sea-ice melt increased. At the other stations, NPP was variable, and diatoms known to enhance carbon export (e.g., *Thalassiosira* spp.) were dominant. Euphotic zone nitrification was always below detection, such that nitrate uptake could be used as a proxy for carbon export potential, which was highest in absolute terms at LCIS and the AP. Surprisingly, the highest f-ratios occurred near FIS rather than LCIS (average of 0.73 ± 0.09 versus 0.47 ± 0.08). We attribute this to partial ammonium inhibition of nitrate uptake at LCIS (where ammonium concentrations were 0.6 ± 0.4 μM, versus 0.05 ± 0.1 μM at FIS) driven by increased heterotrophy following the accumulation of nitrate-fuelled phytoplankton biomass in early summer. Across the WS, carbon export appears to be driven by a combination of physical, chemical, and biological factors, with the highest export flux occurring at the ice shelves and lowest in the central WG.
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1. Introduction

The Southern Ocean is an important driver of Earth’s climate as it transports large quantities of heat and dissolved gases, and supplies 65-85% of the global ocean’s nutrients (Keffer and Holloway 1988; Sarmiento et al. 2004; Frölicher et al. 2015; Keller et al. 2016). Despite the Southern Ocean’s central role in atmospheric CO₂ removal (DeVries 2014; Frölicher et al. 2015; Gruber et al. 2019), the incomplete drawdown of nutrients (i.e., nitrate, phosphate, and silicic acid) in its surface waters due to iron and light limitation of phytoplankton (Martin et al. 1991; Sunda and Huntsman 1997) represents a missed opportunity for CO₂ removal (Sarmiento and Toggweiler 1984). The Weddell Sea constitutes a point of origin in the Southern Ocean where water masses form and communicate with the atmosphere before subducting (Muench and Gordon 1995; Talley et al. 2011), thereby setting the initial physical and chemical conditions of the deep global ocean. Biogeochemical cycling in the surface Weddell Sea thus has implications for carbon transfer to and storage within the ocean interior (Hoppema et al. 2004; Kerr et al. 2018). The southern and western Weddell Sea are bounded by ice shelves, which promote high rates of summertime productivity, nutrient drawdown and carbon export (El-Sayed and Taguchi 1981; Hoppema and Goeyens 1999; Hoppema et al. 2000) largely because the surface ecosystem is less iron- and light-limited in the ice shelf-adjacent waters than in open waters (Klunder et al. 2014).

The Weddell Sea is separated from the Antarctic Circumpolar Current (ACC) and open Southern Ocean by the Weddell Sea fronts (Orsi et al. 1995). The general large-scale circulation takes the form of a cyclonic, wind-driven and topographically-steered gyre, the Weddell Gyre (WG) (Fahrbach et al. 1994, 1995; Orsi et al. 1995), that transports the relatively warm, saline waters of the ACC into the polar region where they are cooled and become more saline (Huhn et al. 2008; Nicholls et al. 2009; van Caspel et al. 2015). The production of dense bottom water is thought to occur at two sites in the Weddell Sea: at Filchner-Ronne Ice Shelf (FRIS) and Larsen C Ice Shelf (LCIS) (Gordon et al. 1993; Schröder et al. 2002; Schodel et al. 2002). Here, Modified Warm Deep Water (MWDW) intrudes onto the continental shelf and mixes with Antarctic Surface Water (ASW). ASW is cooled to freezing point through heat loss to the atmosphere, as well as being supercooled under the ice shelves, and increases in salinity due to brine rejection during sea-ice formation, which further increases its density (Brennecke 1921; Mosby 1934; Gill 1973). As MWDW flows throughout the WG, its physical and chemical properties are altered due to mixing with ASW, ultimately resulting in the formation of dense bottom waters. Upon reaching the Antarctic Peninsula (AP), the transformed bottom waters either spill out over the shelf and re-enter the ACC or are entrained into the eastward flowing limb of the WG (Orsi et al. 1993; Locarnini et al. 1993).

Weddell Sea surface waters are warm and saline while those over the continental shelf are relatively cool and fresh (Nicholls et al. 2004). These different waters are separated by the Antarctic Slope Front (ASF; Jacobs 1986; 1991), a fast-flowing jet situated between the 500 m and 1000 m isobath that separates the Open Ocean Zone (OOZ) from the Coastal and Continental Shelf Zone (CCSZ; Jacobs 1986; 1991; Muench and Gordon 1995). The Antarctic CCSZ has been observed to host high rates of productivity in the summer (e.g., Smith and Nelson 1990; Arrigo et al. 2008) as melting sea-ice supplies dissolved iron and increases water column stratification, yielding ideal conditions for phytoplankton growth (Lannuzel et al. 2008). Inputs of dissolved iron from continental shelf sediments and coastal runoff further elevate the ambient iron concentrations, such that the CCSZ seldom experiences iron-depletion (Klunder et al. 2014). As a result, the large phytoplankton blooms of the CCSZ can at
times almost completely deplete surface nitrate concentrations (Jennings et al. 1984; Hoppema et al. 2000; Henley et al. 2017), supporting high rates of carbon export (Arrigo et al. 2008). In contrast, the OOOZ is far less productive due to deeper mixed layer depths (MLD) that lead to light limitation of phytoplankton, along with persistent iron-deplete conditions (Klunder et al. 2011; De Jong et al. 2012). Here, surface nutrients are never fully consumed and carbon export rates are low (Boyd et al. 2008; Boyd and Ellwood 2010; Klunder et al. 2011; De Jong et al. 2012).

On an annual basis, phytoplankton growth in the eutrophic zone that is fuelled by nitrate supplied from below (i.e., “new production”) must be balanced by the export of sinking organic matter into the ocean interior (i.e., “export production”), thus driving CO₂ removal (Dugdale and Goering 1967; Eppley and Peterson 1979). By contrast, phytoplankton growth supported by nitrogen (N) sources that are recycled in the eutrophic zone, such as ammonium and urea (i.e., “regenerated production”), results in no net removal of CO₂ to the deep ocean. The biologically-driven flux of carbon from surface waters, termed the “biological pump”, transfers CO₂ to the isolated waters of the deep ocean, maintaining the atmospheric concentration of this greenhouse gas (Volk and Hoffert 1985). The high nutrient-low chlorophyll state of much of the Southern Ocean represents a “leak” in the ocean’s biological pump since by consuming mixed-layer nutrients more completely, phytoplankton could theoretically lower atmospheric CO₂ (Sarmiento and Toggweiler 1984). Indeed, a leading hypothesis for the 80-100 ppm decrease in atmospheric CO₂ that characterized the ice ages is more complete consumption of surface nutrients (i.e., a more efficient biological pump) in the open Southern Ocean (Sigman and Boyle 2000; Sigman et al. 2010; Martínez-García et al. 2014).

Since phytoplankton in the CCSZ of the Weddell Sea consume much of the nitrate supplied to the surface (Jennings et al. 1984; Hoppema et al. 2000), they should, by mass balance, drive the export of a significant amount of atmospheric CO₂ to depth, most of which will be subducted in newly-formed bottom waters to be sequestered for >1000 years (Ito et al. 2010). Understanding the controls on biological nutrient utilization in the Weddell Sea, particularly the CCSZ, is thus central to our understanding of its contribution to the Southern Ocean’s role in setting atmospheric CO₂. In general, phytoplankton growth in the Weddell Sea is regulated by the seasonal cycle of sea-ice, with the associated availability of light and iron imposing the main constraints (El-Sayed and Taguchi 1981). In winter, sea-ice formation and wind-driven mixing supply high concentrations of nutrients to ASW (Hoppema et al. 2007; 2015) that remain largely unconsumed due to the deep mixed layers and short days (Cota et al. 1992; Scharek et al. 1994; Spiridonov et al. 1996). Relief from light limitation in spring and early summer driven by increased water-column stratification from sea-ice melt combined with enhanced solar radiation leads to the development of phytoplankton blooms. The size and duration of these blooms is ultimately dependent on both macro- (e.g., nitrate and silicate) and micronutrient (e.g., iron) availability (Martín et al. 1991; Boyd 2004; Boyd and Ellwood 2010; Llort et al. 2015).

Observations suggest that Weddell Sea phytoplankton blooms are initially dominated by smaller phytoplankton (e.g., *Phaeocystis antarctica*; 2-6 μm) that are well-adapted to the low light conditions associated with the fairly deep springtime mixed layers (Schoemann et al. 2005). The ability of these smaller cells to rapidly grow and consume the available nutrients results in bloom initiation. However, their small size also means that *P. antarctica*
experience high rates of predation by microzooplankton and sink fairly slowly, which enhances their contribution to the microbial loop and decreases their carbon export potential (Hansen et al. 1994; 1997). As the season progresses, rising air temperatures leads to increased sea-ice melt and warmer sea surface temperatures (SST), resulting in an increasingly stratified upper water column that provides optimal conditions for the growth of larger phytoplankton such as diatoms (Goffart et al. 2000; Nissen and Vogt 2020). Diatoms tend to rely heavily on nitrate as their dominant N source (Malone 1980; Lomas and Gilbert 1999; Fawcett and Ward 2011; Gilbert et al. 2016) and are a major vector for carbon export in the Southern Ocean due to their rapid sinking rates that are facilitated by biogenic silica ballasting (Tréguer et al. 2017). The seasonal shift in the Weddell Sea community from small, non-silicified phytoplankton to larger, more heavily-silified species is thus associated with a significant increase in carbon export (Treguer and Jacques 1992; De Baar et al. 2005; Boyd et al. 2007). Sea-ice melt also supplies high concentrations of dissolved iron to surface waters (up to 7 nM in the western Weddell Sea; Lannuzel et al. 2008; Klunder et al. 2014), alleviating phytoplankton from iron limitation and supporting a high degree of surface nitrate drawdown (Klunder et al. 2011, 2014). Eventually, as surface iron (and occasionally, nitrate; Hoppema, et al., 2000) concentrations again become limiting, phytoplankton rely proportionally more on ammonium and other regenerated N sources that have become increasingly available due to heterotrophic processing of the accumulated (i.e., bloom) biomass (Goeyens et al. 1995; Semenеn et al. 1998). The phytoplankton community consequently shifts once more towards smaller species that are better adapted to low iron conditions and specialize in the consumption of regenerated N, ultimately leading to a decrease in carbon export (Goeyens et al. 1995).

The Weddell Sea is particularly understudied near LCIS where thick sea-ice conditions persist year-round. To our knowledge, the only biogeochemical study conducted in the vicinity of LCIS was undertaken in the austral summer of 1992/3. Using measurements of nutrient depletion, Hoppema et al. (2000) estimated primary production in the vicinity of LCIS to be 47.5-95 mmol C m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$, while in the central Weddell Sea it was substantially lower at 8.3 mmol C m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$. However, the study did not characterize the phytoplankton community, so the extent to which phytoplankton diversity may have influenced primary production and nutrient drawdown cannot be surmised. To evaluate the summertime fertility of the Weddell Sea and the potential importance of different phytoplankton groups for carbon production and export, we directly measured the rates of total, new, and regenerated production in the western Weddell Sea (predominantly at LCIS), as well as at Fimbul Ice Shelf (FIS) in the south-eastern Weddell Sea. Rates of nitrification were also quantified to account for any nitrate regenerated within the euphotic zone at the time of sampling as this N flux supports regenerated rather than new production (e.g., Yool et al. 2007; Peng et al. 2018; Mdutyana et al. 2020). We interpret our rate data in the context of concurrent measurements of regional hydrography, macronutrient concentrations and ratios, and phytoplankton community composition.

2. Methods

2.1. Field collections

Sampling was conducted in the austral summer of 2018/2019 during the Weddell Sea Expedition onboard the R/V SA Agulhas II. A total of 19 stations were sampled across the Weddell Sea and are categorised based on their geographic position as Antarctic Peninsula (AP), Larsen C Ice Shelf (LCIS), Weddell Gyre (WG), or Fimbul Ice Shelf (FIS) stations (Table 1; Figure 1). Hydrographic data were collected using a Seabird conductivity-
temperature-depth (CTD) profiler equipped with a photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) sensor. Density (sigma-theta; \(\sigma_0\)) was derived from CTD measurements of temperature, salinity and pressure, and was used to identify the water masses present. At all stations, the mixed layer depth (MLD) was determined as the depth at which the Brunt-Väisälä frequency squared (\(N^2\); a function of \(\sigma_0\)) reached a maximum (Schofield et al. 2015; Carvalho et al. 2017).

**Figure 1.** Maps of the Weddell Sea, Larsen C Ice Shelf (LCIS; insert a) and Fimbul Ice Shelf (FIS; insert b) showing the position of the stations where rate experiments were conducted during the Weddell Sea Expedition in January/February 2019. The symbols represent the different regions of the Wedde:ll Sea sampled during the expedition (circle – Antarctic Peninsula (AP); cross – FIS; triangle – LCIS; plus sign – Weddell Gyre (WG)). The general cyclonic circulation of the Weddell Gyre (dashed blue arrow) is illustrated on the central map, and the dashed black arrows indicate the input of modified water masses from Filchner-Ronne Ice shelf (FRIC) and LCIS (Gordon et al. 1993; Schröder et al. 2002; Schodlok et al. 2002). The hypothesized circulation at LCIS (Nicholls et al. 2004; Hutchinson et al. 2020) is shown by the dashed blue arrow in insert (a). The 3.125 km sea-ice concentration data shown in the central panel were taken from ftp://ftp-projects.cen.uni-hamburg.de/seaice/AMSR2/3.125km and the bathymetry data (inserts a and b) were taken from ETOPO1 (NOAA National Geophysical Data Center 2009).

Seawater was collected from discrete depths using a rosette of twenty-four 12 L Niskin bottles. At each CTD station, seawater samples for nutrient analysis were collected throughout the water column (typically at 15 discrete depths), while samples for phytoplankton taxonomy and rate experiments were taken from 3-6 depths (see below) that were selected based on profiles of temperature, fluorescence and PAR measured during the CTD down-casts.

Simulated *in situ* experiments were conducted to determine the rates of net primary production (NPP), N uptake (as nitrate (\(NO_3^-\)), ammonium (\(NH_4^+\)), and urea-N), and nitrite (\(NO_2^-\)) oxidation (a measure of nitrification). For NPP and N uptake, seawater was collected from three depths coinciding with the 55%, 10% and 1% PAR levels, then pre-screened through a 200 μm mesh to remove large grazers and transferred to six 1 L and six 2 L polycarbonate bottles per depth. \(^{15}\)N-labeled \(NO_3^-\), \(NH_4^+\), or urea-N was added to four of the twelve bottles (i.e., two 1 L and two 2 L bottles per N species) and NaH\(^{13}\)CO\(_3\) was added to the bottles amended with \(^{15}\)N-\(NH_4^+\). The tracers were added at ~5-10% of the assumed ambient concentrations, yielding final concentrations in each bottle of approximately 100 μM NaH\(^{13}\)CO\(_3\), 1 μM \(^{15}\)N-\(NO_3^-\), 0.05 μM \(^{15}\)N-\(NH_4^+\), and 0.1 μM \(^{15}\)N-urea-N. Bottles were
incubated on the deck for 4-6 hours in a custom-built incubator that was cooled with running surface (~7 m) seawater and equipped with neutral density filters to simulate the relevant light levels. Experiments were terminated via filtration onto 0.3 μm combusted (450°C for 8 hours) glass fibre filters (Sterlitech GF-75) that were stored frozen in combusted (500°C for 5 hours) foil envelopes at -80°C pending analysis.

Seawater samples for the NO$_3^-$ oxidation experiments were collected from the 55%, 10% and 1% light levels, just below the MLD, and at 200 m and 500 m. From each depth, seawater was transferred into duplicate 250 mL opaque high-density polyethylene (HDPE) bottles to which $^{15}$N-NO$_3^-$ was added to achieve a final tracer concentration of 0.1 μM. An initial 50 mL subsample ($T_{\text{initial}}$) was collected from each HDPE bottle immediately following tracer addition and frozen at -20°C until analysis ashore. The 55%, 10%, 1% and MLD sample bottles were incubated in the on-deck incubator for 20-30 hours while the 200 m and 500 m samples were incubated in a ~2°C cold room. The experiments were terminated by collection and freezing of 50 mL $T_{\text{final}}$ subsamples.

2.2. Nutrients

2.2.1. Nutrient concentration analysis

NO$_3^-$+NO$_2^-$ and silicic acid (Si(OH)$_4$) concentrations were measured using a Lachat QuickChem flow injection analysis platform following published auto-analysis protocols (Diamond 1994; Grasshoff 1976) in a configuration with a detection limit of 0.5 μM. Duplicate samples were measured for NO$_3^-$+NO$_2^-$ and Si(OH)$_4$ on different days, and the standard deviation for duplicates was ≤0.5 μM, with a lower standard deviation for lower-concentration samples. NO$_3^-$ concentrations were determined by subtraction of NO$_2^-$ from NO$_3^-$+NO$_2^-$ Concentrations of phosphate (PO$_4^{3-}$) and NO$_3^-$ were measured shipboard by standard benchtop colourimetric methods (Strickland and Parsons 1968; Bendschneider et al. 2020; Parsons et al. 1984) using a Thermo Scientific Genesis 30 Visible spectrophotometer. The detection limit was 0.05 μM and the standard deviation for duplicate samples was ≤0.05 μM. Aliquots of a certified reference material (JAMSTEC, Lot CG) were analysed during autoanalyser and manual runs to ensure measurement accuracy.

NH$_4^+$ concentrations were measured shipboard following the fluorometric method of Holmes et al. (1999) using a Turner Designs Trilogy fluorometer equipped with a UV module. The detection limit was <0.05 μM and the standard deviation for duplicate samples was ≤0.05 μM. The matrix effect (ME) that results from the calibration of seawater samples with Milli-Q water standards was calculated using the standard addition method (Saxberg and Kowalski 1979). All samples were corrected for the ME (Taylor et al. 2007), which was always <10% and typically ≤5%. Urea-N concentrations were measured following the colourimetric method of Revilla et al. (2005) using a Thermo Scientific Genesis 30 Visible spectrophotometer equipped with either a 1 cm- or 5 cm-pathlength cell. The detection limit was 0.05 μM and the standard deviation for duplicate samples was ≤0.05 μM. Hereafter, we use “urea” when referring to urea-N.

2.2.2. Estimating nutrient depletion

The net decrease in euphotic zone nutrient concentrations following nutrient recharge in winter (i.e., the extent of nutrient depletion due to consumption by phytoplankton), between the start of the growing season until the time of our sampling, can be estimated for each station as:

\[
\text{Nutrient Depletion} = \frac{\text{Nutrient Concentration} \text{ at Start of Growing Season} - \text{Nutrient Concentration} \text{ at Time of Sampling}}{\text{Time between Start of Growing Season and Time of Sampling}}
\]
where $[X]_{\text{source}}$ is the average $[\text{NO}_3^-]$, $[\text{Si(OH)}_4]$ or $[\text{PO}_4^{3-}]$ in winter water (WW; a shallow temperature minimum layer underlying ASW that is the remnant of the winter surface mixed layer and considered representative of the pre-bloom surface conditions) and $[X]_{\text{measured}}$ is the measured nutrient concentration (Le Corre and Minas 1983; Jennings et al. 1984; Goeyens et al. 1995; Rubin et al. 1998; Hoppema et al. 2007).

Seasonal melting of sea-ice in the Weddell Sea introduces low-salinity, low-nutrient waters to the mixed layer (Eicken 1993), potentially leading to an overestimate of phytoplankton-driven nutrient depletion. We thus correct X depletion for the effect of ice melt as:

$$X \text{ depletion (corrected)} = X \text{ depletion} - X \text{ depletion (melt water)} \quad (2a)$$

where $X \text{ depletion (melt water)}$ is the decrease in the surface $[\text{NO}_3^-]$, $[\text{Si(OH)}_4]$ or $[\text{PO}_4^{3-}]$ due to sea-ice melt (i.e., the dilution effect), calculated as:

$$X \text{ depletion (melt water)} = [X]_{\text{source}} - [X]_{\text{melt water}} \quad (2b)$$

where:

$$[X]_{\text{melt water}} = [X]_{\text{sea-ice}} (f_{\text{sea-ice}}) + [X]_{\text{source}} (1-f_{\text{sea-ice}}) \quad (2c)$$

Here, the nutrient concentrations in summertime sea-ice ($[X]_{\text{sea-ice}}$) are assumed to be: $[\text{NO}_3^-]_{\text{sea-ice}} = 1 \mu M$, $[\text{Si(OH)}_4]_{\text{sea-ice}} = 5 \mu M$, and $[\text{PO}_4^{3-}]_{\text{sea-ice}} = 0.3 \mu M$ (Fripiat et al. 2014), and:

$$f_{\text{sea-ice}} = \frac{\text{salinity}_{\text{measured}} - \text{salinity}_{\text{source}}}{\text{salinity}_{\text{measured}} - \text{salinity}_{\text{sea-ice}}} \quad (2d)$$

with salinity_{sea-ice} taken to be 5 based on measurements made during the cruise and salinity_{source} set to 34.2 at FIS and 34.4 at the other stations (the salinity of WW; Figure 2c insert). On average, correcting for sea-ice melt changed the estimates of X depletion by 0.4 ± 0.9%.

The approach outlined above for calculating $X \text{ depletion (corrected)}$ assumes, following correction for sea-ice melt, that nutrient drawdown is due to phytoplankton assimilation only, a reasonable assumption in the Weddell Sea in summer.

### 2.3. Uptake rates

Incubation filters were oven-dried for 24 hours at 40°C, then folded into tin cups. Samples were analysed using a Flash Elemental Analyser 1112 Series coupled to a Delta V Plus isotope ratio mass spectrometer (IRMS) in a configuration with a detection limit of 2 µg C and 1 µg N. Blanks (combusted unused filters + tin cups) and laboratory running standards, calibrated to certified IAEA reference materials, were run after every five samples.
The specific rates of carbon fixation ($V_C$) and NO$_3^-$, NH$_4^+$ and urea uptake ($V_{NO3^−}$, $V_{NH4^+}$, $V_{urea}$; d$^{-1}$) were calculated according to equation 2 in Dugdale and Wilkerson (1986). NPP and the absolute rates of NO$_3^-$, NH$_4^+$ and urea uptake ($\rho$NO$_3^−$, $\rho$NH$_4^+$ and purea; $\mu$M d$^{-1}$) were then determined by multiplying $V_C$ by the concentration of particulate organic carbon ([POC]) and $V_{NO3^−}$, $V_{NH4^+}$ and $V_{urea}$ by the concentration of particulate organic nitrogen ([PON]) (Dugdale and Wilkerson 1986; equation 3).

### 2.4. NO$_3^-$ oxidation rates

The $T_{\text{initial}}$ and $T_{\text{final}}$ samples collected from the NO$_3^-$ oxidation incubations were measured for the $\delta^{15}$N of NO$_3^-$ ($\delta^{15}$N$_{\text{NO3}}$; where $\delta^{15}$N = ([$^{15}$N$_{\text{sample}}$/$^{15}$N$_{\text{standard}}$]$^{15}$N$_{\text{standard}}$) - 1) $\times$ 1000) using the denitrifier method (Sigman et al. 2001; McIlvin and Casciotti 2011). Prior to isotopic analysis, all samples were treated with sulfamic acid to remove NO$_3^-$ as the denitrifier method converts both NO$_3^-$ and NO$_2^-$ to N$_2$O gas (Granger and Sigman 2009); the difference in $\delta^{15}$N$_{\text{NO3}}$ between the $T_{\text{final}}$ and $T_{\text{initial}}$ samples was then taken as the $^{15}$NO$_3^-$ enrichment due to $^{15}$NO$_3^-$ oxidation (Peng et al. 2015). Results were referenced to atmospheric N$_2$ using certified reference materials (IAEA-NO-3, USGS-34, and USGS-32; Gonfiantini 1984; Böhlke and Coplen 1995; Böhlke et al. 2003). The rate of NO$_3^-$ oxidation ($V_{NO3^−}$; nM d$^{-1}$) was calculated following Peng et al. (2015) as:

$$V_{NO3^−} = \frac{\Delta^{[15]NO3^−}}{\delta^{[15]NO3^−} \times \tau}$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where $\Delta^{[15]NO3^−}$ is the difference in the concentration of $^{15}$NO$_3^-$ between the end and the start of the experiment (i.e., $T_{\text{final}} - T_{\text{initial}}$) due to NO$_3^-$ oxidation. $f^{15}$NO$_3^-$ is the fraction of $^{15}$NO$_3^-$ at the start of the incubation, and $\tau$ is the length of the incubation (days). The detection limit for $V_{NO3^−}$ ranged from 0.06-0.46 nM d$^{-1}$ (calculated following Santoro et al. 2013). We take $V_{NO3^−}$ as an appropriate measure of the nitrification rate given that NO$_3^-$ oxidation is the step in the nitrification pathway that produces NO$_3^-$.

To determine relative carbon export potential at each station, we calculated the f-ratio (a measure of new production relative to total (i.e., new+regenerated) production) using the absolute N uptake and NO$_3^-$ oxidation rates and a modified version of the Epplle and Peterson (1979) equation:

$$f\text{-ratio}_{\text{excluding urea}} = \frac{\rho_{NO3^−} - V_{NO3^−}}{\rho_{NO3^−} + \rho_{NH4^+}}$$ \hspace{1cm} (4a)

$$f\text{-ratio}_{\text{including urea}} = \frac{\rho_{NO3^−} - V_{NO3^−}}{\rho_{NO3^−} + \rho_{NH4^+} + \text{purea}}$$ \hspace{1cm} (4b)

Equation 4 accounts for euphotic zone nitrification ($V_{NO3^−}$), which yields regenerated rather than new NO$_3^-$ that is then available for phytoplankton to consume. Not accounting for $V_{NO3^−}$ could result in the f-ratio being overestimated. Equation 4b accounts for urea uptake, that was either measured (at the LCIS stations and WG1) or calculated (at the AP, FIS and WG2) using equation 7 (see section 3.3.4 below).
2.5. Phytoplankton taxonomy and carbon biomass

At all stations, microphytoplankton samples were collected between the surface and 30 m using a HYDROBIOS conical plankton net (r = 12.5 cm; h = 50 cm) with a mesh size of 55 μm. Samples were transferred to 50 mL centrifuge tubes, fixed with 10 μL of 25% glutaraldehyde and stored at room temperature in the dark until later analysis via light and scanning electron microscopy. Additionally, samples for flow cytometry were collected in 50 mL centrifuge tubes from Niskin bottles fired at the 55%, 10% and 1% light depths. These samples were fixed with 10 μL of 25% glutaraldehyde and stored at 4°C until analysis.

In the onshore laboratory, each preserved net-sample was homogenized, and one drop (40 μL) was wet mounted on a slide. All the cells on the slide with intact chloroplasts (i.e., alive at the time of sampling) were counted at 400x or 630x magnification using a Zeiss AxioScope A1 light microscope (LM). The number of cells/L was calculated as:

\[
\text{cells per litre} = A \frac{L}{V} \frac{1}{n} \quad (5)
\]

where \(A\) = number of cells per drop; \(L\) = volume of water sampled (1470 L; computed using the volume of a cylinder, \(\pi r^2 h\), where \(r = 0.125\) m and \(h = 30\) m depth); \(n\) = volume of the concentrated sample; and \(V\) = volume of 1 drop.

An aliquot of 5 mL from each preserved sample was cleaned by removing carbonate particles and organic matter using 10% hydrochloric acid and 37% hydrogen peroxide, respectively. After thorough rinsing with distilled water, permanent slides were prepared by pipetting the cleaned material onto acid-washed coverslips, air drying overnight and mounting the cover slips onto glass slides using Naphrax® mountant (refractive index 1.7). The permanent slides were examined using a Zeiss AxioScope A1 LM equipped with differential interference contrast (DIC) at 1000x magnification (under oil immersion) for identification of the diatom cells to the lowest taxonomic classification possible. Stubs were also prepared from the cleaned material for Scanning Electron Microscopy (SEM), with a JEOL JSM 7001F field emission SEM used to visualize the morphological features not evident under LM.

The average size (μm) and carbon content (pg C cell\(^-1\)) of each identified diatom species was taken from Leblanc et al. (2012) for high latitude locations (50 – 70°S) (Table S1), and the carbon content of colonial \(P.\) \textit{antarctica} was estimated as 13.6 pg C cell\(^-1\) (Mathot et al. 2000) for single cells within a colony. Since the majority of \(P.\) \textit{antarctica} were in spherical colony form, the total colony carbon biomass (\(C_{\text{COL}}\)) was calculated as:

\[
C_{\text{COL}} = [13.60 \times N_C] + C_M \quad (6)
\]

where \(N_C\) is the number of cells counted per litre; \(C_M\) is the mucus-related carbon calculated as \(C_M = 0.213 \times V_{\text{COL}} + 4.58\); and \(V_{\text{COL}}\) is the volume of the spherical colony, calculated as \(V_{\text{COL}} = 417 \times N_C^{1.67}\) (Mathot et al. 2000).
All flow cytometry samples were analyzed using a BD LSR II SORP flow cytometer with blue/red/green laser configuration. Prior to analysis, sample tubes were gently agitated to homogenize the contents, then 1 mL of sample was transferred to a 5 mL polycarbonate test tube. The size-class to which each cell belonged was defined based on its forward scatter area (FSC-A) relative to the FSC-A of 2.8 μm and 20 μm beads (Figure S1a). Once categorized as either picoplankton (<2.8 μm), nanoplanктон (2.8-20 μm) or microplankton (>20 μm), the cells were grouped into six populations based on their orange fluorescence (indicative of phycoerythrin; PE) relative to their red fluorescence (indicative of chlorophyll-a; chl-a): two Synechococcus populations (Syn 1 and Syn 2), one picoeukaryote population (PicoEuk), two nanoeukaryote populations (NanoEuk 1 and NanoEuk 2), and one microeukaryote population (MicroEuk; see section S2 in the Supplemental Information for details of population identification). The biovolumes of the eukaryotic populations were estimated based on their FSC-A relative to that of six beads of known size and volume (Figure S1c; Table S2). Synechococcus had an unrealistically high FSC-A, which is an artefact of this group having a high ratio of photosystem I to photosystem II compared to the other phytoplankton populations. This increases electron chain activity, leading to an increase in the emission spectrum and low excitation of the Synechococcus populations (Kaprelyants and Kell 1993; Sunda and Huntsman 2015). The biovolume of Synechococcus was thus assumed to be 1 μm³ (Kana and Glibert 1987; Paulsen et al. 2015). Biovolume is taken here as a proxy for biomass.

3. Results
3.1. Water column hydrography
Throughout the study region, relatively cool and fresh (-2 to 0°C and 33.0 to 34.5) ASW occurred between the surface and 135 m (Figure 2). Through this layer and down to 200 m, salinity increased with depth while temperature decreased, reaching a local minimum (-1.6°C) at ~100 m. These hydrographic changes are characteristic of WW, which is considered a summertime record of winter conditions and a reflection of the initial state from which the mixed layer evolves over the spring/summer growing season (Altabet and Francois 2001). Below WW at the AP and WG stations, salinity remained constant while temperature increased with depth, reaching a local maximum (0.5°C) at 500 m and 300 m for the AP and WG, respectively. This feature is characteristic of Warm Deep Water (WDW), a temperature maximum layer that is a modified form of Circumpolar Deep Water (CDW) (Muench and Gordon 1995; Fahrbach et al. 1995). Below WW at the LCIS and FIS stations, salinity increased and temperature decreased with depth, reaching a local salinity maximum (34.6 at LCIS and 34.3 at FIS) and temperature minimum (≤ -1.8°C). The increase in salinity is characteristic of High Salinity Shelf Water (HSSW) produced by brine rejection during sea-ice formation, while the decrease in temperature is characteristic of Ice Shelf Water (ISW) produced by the supercooling of ASW under the ice shelves (Fahrbach et al. 1995; Nicholls et al. 2009; Hutchinson et al. 2020). The densities of WW, WDW, HSSW and ISW are contiguous, with the mixed product of these waters termed Modified Warm Deep Water (MWDW) (Fahrbach et al. 1995). Below WDW at the AP and WG stations, temperature decreased due to the presence of Weddell Sea Deep Water (WSDW; temperature range of -0.7 to 0°C) and Weddell Sea Bottom Water (WSBW; temperature ≤ -0.7°C) (Fahrbach et al. 1995; Muench and Gordon 1995).

Variability in the density of ASW was observed among the stations (Figure 2a). The surface density profiles at the AP, WG and early-summer FIS stations were very similar, while the late-summer density profile at FIS...
revealed lower-density waters over the upper 100 m. At LCIS, the surface density profiles were highly variable,
and no consistent pattern was observed, although the most northern stations (L9 and L10; Figure 1) were
caracterised by the lowest densities. Stations L1 and L3, situated closest to the ice shelf, were characterised by
the highest densities, contiguous with the underlying WW layer.

The MLD appeared most strongly controlled by salinity at all stations and was always shallower than the depth
of the euphotic zone ($Z_{eu}$; Table 1), the latter defined as the depth to which 1% of surface PAR penetrated (Kirk
1994). The deepest MLD and $Z_{eu}$ were observed at FIS in early summer (average MLD of 103 ± 36.6 m and $Z_{eu}$
of 91.7 ± 14.4 m; n = 3), while the shallowest MLD and $Z_{eu}$ were observed at LCIS (average MLD of 13.9 ± 5.9
m and $Z_{eu}$ of 28.5 ± 9.1 m; n = 10) (Figure 2d; Table 1). The rates of NPP, N uptake and nitrification were therefore
trapezoidally-integrated to $Z_{eu}$ rather than to the MLD since we assume that phytoplankton were active at least to
the depth of 1% PAR.
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**Figure 2.** Depth profiles (0–100 m) of (a) potential density ($\sigma_{0}$), (b) potential temperature, (c) absolute salinity,
and (d) photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) at all stations. The inserts in panels (a), (b) and (c) show the
profiles down to 1500 m, with the various water masses present at each station identified from their temperature
and salinity ranges (WSBW – Weddell Sea Bottom Water, WSDW – Weddell Sea Deep Water, WDW – Warm
Deep Water, MWDW – Modified Warm Deep Water, ISW – Ice Shelf Water, HSSW – High Salinity Shelf Water,
WW – Winter Water, ASW – Antarctic Surface Water). The station positions are indicated by the different
colours: red – Antarctic Peninsula, green – Larsen C Ice Shelf, blue –Weddell Gyre, light purple – early summer
Fimbul Ice Shelf, and dark purple – late summer Fimbul Ice Shelf.

### 3.2. Nutrient concentrations

The concentrations of the regenerated N forms (i.e., NH$_4^+$ and urea) were generally low in the surface and
increased with depth to reach a maximum below $Z_{eu}$ before decreasing again to below detection by 200–300 m
(Figure 3a and b; Table 1). A sharp maximum in the NH$_4^+$ concentration was observed at $Z_{eu}$ at all stations,
indicative of the depth of maximum net remineralisation. Urea was more variable, likely due to variability in the
processes that produce this N form (e.g., bacterial excretion; Berges and Mulholland 2008). The highest average
concentrations of regenerated N in the euphotic zone were observed at LCIS and FIS in late summer (0.62 ± 0.30
µM for NH$_4^+$ and 0.21 ± 0.07 µM for urea), while the lowest concentrations were observed at FIS in early summer
(below detection for both NH$_4^+$ and urea). Elevated regenerated N concentrations were also observed at the AP
stations (euphotic zone average of 0.8 ± 0.3 µM for NH$_4^+$ and 0.2 ± 0.06 µM for urea), while low concentrations
were observed at the WG stations (euphotic zone average of 0.3 ± 0.1 µM for NH$_4^+$ and 0.1 ± 0.0 µM for urea).
The concentrations of NO\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{-} were generally low throughout the euphotic zone, and decreased to below detection by 120 m at the FIS, AP, and WG stations (with the exception of a single sample from the early-summer FIS), and by 500 m at LCIS (Figure 3c). A high degree of variability was observed, with the highest surface-layer NO\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{-} concentrations occurring in the WG and at FIS in late summer (average euphotic zone NO\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{-} concentrations of 0.08 ± 0.06 µM and 0.12 ± 0.03 µM, respectively).

Figure 3. Depth profiles (0-500 m) of the concentrations of (a) NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+}, (b) urea-N, (c) NO\textsubscript{2}\textsuperscript{-}, (d) NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-}, (e) Si(OH)\textsubscript{4} and (f) PO\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{3-}. For all panels, the error bars represent ± 1 SD replicate samples (n = 2-3). Where applicable, the error has been propagated according to standard statistical practices.

The euphotic zone concentrations of NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-}, Si(OH)\textsubscript{4} and PO\textsubscript{4}\textsubscript{3-} decreased towards the surface due to assimilation by phytoplankton (Figure 3d-f). The lowest surface concentrations of NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-} and PO\textsubscript{4}\textsubscript{3-} were observed at LCIS (16.6 ± 3.8 µM and 1.3 ± 0.4 µM, respectively) and of Si(OH)\textsubscript{4} was observed at FIS in late summer (46.1 ± 0.8 µM). The highest surface concentrations of NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-}, PO\textsubscript{4}\textsubscript{3-} and Si(OH)\textsubscript{4} occurred in early summer at FIS (26.5 ± 0.32 µM, 2.0 ± 0.04 µM and 61.6 ± 0.5 µM, respectively). Elevated Si(OH)\textsubscript{4} and PO\textsubscript{4}\textsubscript{3-} concentrations were observed between 200 and 500 m at the AP and WG stations due to the presence of WDW at these stations versus shelf waters (i.e., ISW and HSSW) at LCIS and FIS. WDW has the longest residence time of all water masses in the Weddell Sea and has therefore undergone the greatest modification by physical and biogeochemical processes (Whitworth and Nowlin 1987; Hoppema et al. 2015). The depth of maximum remineralisation in the open Weddell Sea is 300-500 m, the depth range occupied by WDW (Vernet et al. 2019, and references therein). The high rates of remineralisation, and therefore nutrient accumulation, in WDW account for the elevated nutrient concentrations observed in WDW relative to the shelf water masses (Whitworth and Nowlin 1987). Estimates of NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-}, Si(OH)\textsubscript{4} and PO\textsubscript{4}\textsubscript{3-} depletion (i.e., X depletion\textsubscript{corrected}; equation 2) were highest at LCIS (average NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-} depletion of 8.3 ±
3.9 \mu M, Si(OH)\textsubscript{4} depletion of 8.3 ± 4.0 \mu M and PO\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{3-} depletion of 0.6 ± 0.3 \mu M), while the lowest nutrient depletions occurred in early summer at FIS (average NO\textsubscript{3} depletion of 0.3 ± 0.3 \mu M, Si(OH)\textsubscript{4} depletion of 0.6 ± 0.6 \mu M and PO\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{3-} depletion of 0.00 ± 0.02 \mu M) (Figure 4a-c; Table 1).
deviations in the NO$_3$-:PO$_4^{3-}$ depletion ratio. For example, in regions dominated by *P. antarctica*, Arrigo et al. (1999) observed a NO$_3$-:PO$_4^{3-}$ depletion ratio of ~20:1, while in those dominated by iron-deplete diatoms, it was ~10:1. The NO$_3$-:PO$_4^{3-}$ depletion ratios can thus also yield insights into the dominant phytoplankton species active in the upper water column. In our study, the average euphotic zone Si(OH)$_4$-NO$_3$- depletion ratios ranged from 0.5 to 6.1 (Table 1), with the highest ratios estimated for the WG stations (average of 5.4 ± 5.5) and FIS stations F3 and F4 (average of 2.7 ± 2.8; the same station occupied in early- (F3) and late summer (F4)). The euphotic zone average NO$_3$-:PO$_4^{3-}$ depletion ratios were more variable, ranging from 3.7 ± 1.5 to 48.6 ± 11.5, with the lowest ratios computed for the WG stations (average of 4.1 ± 1.5) and the highest for FIS in early summer (average of 33.7 ± 3.6).

3.3. Upper ocean biomass, NPP and N uptake rates

3.3.1. Particulate organic carbon and nitrogen

The highest concentrations of POC and PON were observed in the surface at all stations (Figure 5a), decreasing towards $Z_{eu}$ (Figure 5e). Averaged over the euphotic zone, the lowest POC and PON concentrations occurred in early summer at FIS (4.6 ± 1.5 µM and 0.3 ± 0.1 µM, respectively) and the highest at LCIS (17.9 ± 7.3 µM and 2.5 ± 0.8 µM, respectively; Table 2). Across the region, the biomass C:N ratio was fairly uniform throughout the euphotic zone, except at stations F1, F2 and the WG stations (Figure 5b, d and f). In general, the FIS and WG stations were characterized by significantly higher C:N ratios than those expected from Redfield stoichiometry (C:N = 6.63:1), averaging 16.5 ± 8.8 and 12.3 ± 1.8, respectively. At the LCIS stations, the biomass C:N ratios were close to the Redfield ratio (7.4 ± 1.9), while the AP stations were characterized by slightly higher C:N ratios (8.3 ± 2.5).
Figure 5. Bar plots of (a, c, e) PON concentrations and (b, d, f) biomass C:N ratios measured at the 55% (a-b), 10% (c-d) and 1% light levels (e-f). The dotted black line in panels (b), (d), and (f) indicates the Redfield C:N ratio of 6.63. The error bars represent ± 1 SD of replicate samples (n = 2-6). Where applicable, the error has been propagated according to standard statistical practices.

3.3.2. Rates of NPP and N uptake

At all stations, NPP was highest at the surface (Figure 6a) and decreased towards Z\textsubscript{eu} (Figure 6i). The highest depth-specific rates were observed at LCIS (except at station L10 where the rates were very low), while the lowest rates occurred in early summer at FIS (with particularly low rates at station F1; Figure 6a, e and i). At the WG stations and at FIS in late summer, rates of NPP were comparable to the lower end of the rates observed at LCIS, while NPP along the AP increased shoreward to values similar to those at LCIS (i.e., the lowest rates were observed at AP1 and the highest at AP3). The highest euphotic zone-integrated rate of NPP were observed at AP3 (65.0 ± 0.1 mmol m\textsuperscript{-2} d\textsuperscript{-1}) and L5 (61.0 ± 0.7 mmol m\textsuperscript{-2} d\textsuperscript{-1}), while the lowest occurred at L10 (1.8 ± 0.04 mmol m\textsuperscript{-2} d\textsuperscript{-1}) (Table 2).

As per NPP, the rates of ρNO\textsubscript{3} decreased towards Z\textsubscript{eu} at all stations (Figure 6b, f and j), as did the extent of NO\textsubscript{3} depletion (Figure 4a). The depth-specific rates of ρNO\textsubscript{3} were highest at LCIS and lowest in early summer at FIS. However, because the euphotic zone was generally shallower at LCIS than at the other stations, the euphotic zone-integrated rates of ρNO\textsubscript{3} were fairly similar across the study region, with the largest variability observed at LCIS (Table 2). In late summer at FIS, the rates of ρNO\textsubscript{3} were on average higher than at LCIS (3.9 ± 0.03 mmol m\textsuperscript{-2} d\textsuperscript{-1} at F4 versus an average of 2.2 ± 1.1 mmol m\textsuperscript{-2} d\textsuperscript{-1} at LCIS), with depth-specific rates that were double those...
measured at FIS in early summer. The sea-ice at FIS had completely melted by late summer, which likely contributed to the increase in $\rho NO_3^-$ later in the season. The highest euphotic zone-integrated rates of $\rho NO_3^-$ were observed at stations F3 and L5 (4.8 ± 0.07 mmol m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$ and 4.7 ± 0.04 mmol m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$, respectively). At L5, this elevated rate coincided with low euphotic zone NO$_3^-$ concentrations (12.0 ± 1.9 µM; Figure 3d) and a high degree of NO$_3^-$ depletion (10.9 ± 2.3 µM; Figure 4a). The lowest euphotic zone-integrated rates of $\rho NO_3^-$ occurred at station L10 (0.5 ± 0.0 mmol m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$).

Across all stations, rates of $\rho NH_4^+$ increased with depth, reaching a maximum at $Z_{en}$ (Figure 6c, g and k). The highest depth-specific rates of $\rho NH_4^+$ were observed at LCIS and the lowest at FIS in early summer. Euphotic zone-integrated rates of $\rho NH_4^+$ at the AP stations were comparable to those observed at LCIS (regional average of 3.3 ± 2.2 mmol m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$ and 2.5 ± 1.3 mmol m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$, respectively), while the rates at the WG stations and at FIS in late summer were comparable to the lower end of the LCIS rates (regional averages of 2.0 ± 0.2 mmol m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$ at WG and 1.9 ± 0.0 mmol m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$ at FIS). The early- to late-summer rise in the euphotic zone-integrated rates of $\rho NH_4^+$ at FIS coincided with an increase in the average euphotic zone NH$_4^+$ concentration from below detection to 0.2 ± 0.1 µM (Figure 3a). At the AP, LCIS and WG stations, the rates of $\rho NH_4^+$ were similar to the coincident rates of $\rho NO_3^-$, while at FIS, $\rho NH_4^+$ was less than half of $\rho NO_3^-$ (Table 2). The highest euphotic zone-integrated rates of $\rho NH_4^+$ were observed at station AP3 (5.8 ± 0.0 mmol m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$), coincident with high average euphotic zone NH$_4^+$ (1.1 ± 0 µM). The lowest euphotic zone-integrated rates occurred at station F1 (0.4 ± 0.0 mmol m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$) where the concentration of NH$_4^+$ in the euphotic zone was below detection.

Rates of urea were only measured at the LCIS stations and WG1 (Figure 6d, h and l; Table 2). A high degree of variability in the rates of urea was observed at LCIS, with euphotic zone-integrated rates ranging from 0.2 to 1.1 mmol m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$ (regional average of 0.6 ± 0.3 mmol m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$). This variability appears to be related to the urea concentrations, with the highest rates of urea occurring where the ambient urea concentrations were highest (e.g., station L5), and vice versa (e.g., station L4) (Figure 3b). On average, the rates of urea in the WG were half the coincident rates of $\rho NH_4^+$, and urea concentrations were low (Figure 3b; Table 2).
Figure 6. Daily rates of (a, e, i) NPP, (b, f, j) $\rho$NO$_3^-$, (c, g, k) $\rho$NH$_4^+$ and (d, h, l) $\rho$urea for the 55% (a-d), 10% (e-h) and 1% light level (i-l). Where there are no bars in panels (d), (h) and (l), no data are available. The error bars represent ± 1 SD of replicate samples ($n=2$).

3.3.3. Rates of nitrite oxidation

Rates of $V_{NO_2}$ were low throughout the euphotic zone across the study region (average of 20.8 $\pm$ 31.3 $\mu$mol m$^{-2}$ d$^{-1}$), equivalent to 0 to 3.6% (average of 0.7 $\pm$ 1.1%) of $\rho$NO$_3^-$, and rapidly increased below $Z_{eu}$ (Figure 7). The highest euphotic zone rates were observed at WG1 (average of 6.3 $\pm$ 5.0 nM d$^{-1}$), while the lowest rates occurred at the AP (regional average of 0.0 $\pm$ 0.04 nM d$^{-1}$; Figure 7).

Figure 7. Depth profiles of the NO$_2^-$ oxidation rates measured at each station (a) between the surface and 500 m, and (b) within the euphotic zone only.
3.3.4. f-ratio estimates

Urea uptake was measured at the LCIS stations and WG1 (at 11 out of 19 stations; Figure 6; Table 2) where it accounted for 8 ± 6% of total N uptake (i.e., ρNO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{−} + ρNH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} + urea). Excluding urea uptake when calculating the f-ratio would therefore overestimate the fraction of potentially exportable carbon by ~8%. We estimated urea uptake at the stations where it was not measured as:

\[ ρ\text{urea} = (ρ\text{NO}_3^- + ρ\text{NH}_4^+) \times 0.08 \]  

Equation 7 may overestimate urea uptake at some of the stations, particularly where low urea concentrations were measured. Theoretically, urea can also be estimated by assuming that total N uptake should equal NPP/6.63 (i.e., assuming balanced phytoplankton growth), such that any difference between ρNO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{−} + ρNH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} and NPP/6.63 is due to urea uptake. However, this approach underestimated urea uptake at all the stations where it was directly measured. We therefore chose to use equation 7 to estimate urea uptake for the stations lacking urea measurements as this approach will yield a more conservative (i.e., lower) estimate of the fraction of potentially exportable carbon. Figure 8 shows how including urea uptake affected the f-ratio throughout the sample region, with the white (no urea uptake measured) and hashed bars (urea uptake measured) indicating the amount by which the f-ratio decreased when urea uptake was included (i.e., equation 4b versus equation 4a).

The euphotic zone-integrated f-ratios were highest at FIS in early summer (average f-ratio\textsubscript{excluding urea} of 0.79 ± 0.1 and f-ratio\textsubscript{including urea} of 0.73 ± 0.09) and lowest at LCIS (average f-ratio\textsubscript{excluding urea} of 0.50 ± 0.09 and f-ratio\textsubscript{including urea} of 0.47 ± 0.08) (Figure 8; Table 2). The variability in the f-ratios among stations appears to be related to the availability of NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+}. For example, at FIS in early summer there was no NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} available to the phytoplankton and the highest f-ratios were observed (average f-ratio\textsubscript{excluding urea} of 0.82 ± 0.08 and f-ratio\textsubscript{including urea} of 0.76 ± 0.07), while in late summer, NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} concentrations were elevated (0.2 ± 0.1 μM) and the f-ratio declined (f-ratio\textsubscript{excluding urea} of 0.68 ± 0.16 and f-ratio\textsubscript{including urea} of 0.63 ± 0.15).

---

Figure 8. Euphotic zone-integrated f-ratios at each station. The hashed and white bars show the difference between the f-ratio\textsubscript{excluding urea} (higher value) and the f-ratio\textsubscript{including urea} (lower value), with the hashed bars representing the stations where urea uptake was measured and the white bars where it was estimated (see text for details).
3.3.5. Phytoplankton community composition

The flow cytometry data suggest that the phytoplankton community was numerically dominated by picoplankton at all stations, with *Synechococcus* emerging as the most abundant group (59 ± 19% of the total phytoplankton cells counted), except at stations L5 and L6 where picoeukaryotes were dominant (51 ± 1%; Figure 9a-b). The microeukaryotes were the least abundant group at all stations (average abundance across the sampling region of 8 ± 3%); however, due to their large biovolume, they contributed most to the biomass (average contribution to biomass across the sampling region of 80 ± 7%; Figure 9c). In the configuration used here, flow cytometry is best suited for enumerating small cells (<15 µm; Dubelaar and Jonker 2000), such that the larger microplankton present at the time of sampling were likely underestimated via this technique. We thus take the phytoplankton net collections as more representative of the microplankton community and colonial nanoplanckton groups.

From the samples collected using the phytoplankton net (i.e., single or colonial cells >55 µm), the dominant phytoplankton species at LCIS was the prymnesiophyte, *P. antarctica* (83 ± 17% of the total phytoplankton cells counted), while the phytoplankton community at the other stations was dominated by diatoms (mainly *Corethron pinnatum*, Chaetoceros spp. (six species), Cylindrotheca closterium, *Fragilariopsis ritscheri*, *Fragilariopsis curta*, *Fragilariopsis kerguelensis*, Fragilariopsis rhombica, *Leptocylindrus mediterraneus*, Odontella weisflogii, *Pseudo-nitzschia alanata* and several *Thalassioira* spp., constituting 92 ± 6% of the total phytoplankton cells counted; Figure 9d-e). At LCIS, the stations sampled earlier in the season tended to be dominated by *P. antarctica* (e.g., station L3) while those sampled later hosted a more diatom-dominated community (e.g., station L8). In addition, the resident diatoms at LCIS (mainly *F. ritscheri*, *O. weisflogii* and *Thalassioira* spp.) were much larger than the numerically dominant *P. antarctica* (by ~30- to 50-fold). For example, at station L8, the 32 diatom species present (1603 cells L⁻³) contributed 1.80 pg C L⁻³ (Leblanc et al. 2012) compared to 0.14 pg C L⁻³ resulting from the 7812 cells L⁻³ of *P. antarctica* (Mathot et al. 2000). The LCIS stations with the highest relative abundance of diatoms (e.g., station L8) were characterized by some of the highest rates of pNO₃ and greatest extent of NO₃ depletion. More broadly, the LCIS stations with the lowest SSTs and nutrient uptake rates (i.e., stations L1 and L3) had the lowest phytoplankton counts, while those with the highest SSTs and nutrient uptake rates (i.e., station L5) had the highest phytoplankton counts (Figure 9a and d; Table 1).
Figure 9. The (a, d) cell counts, (b, e) relative cell abundance, (c) log-transformed biovolume and (f) carbon biomass of all phytoplankton groups identified from the (a-c) surface flow cytometry samples and (d-f) phytoplankton net samples. Where there are no bars in panels (d), (e), and (f), no data are available. Carbon biomass estimates in panel (f) are only available for the prymnesiophyte, *P. antarctica*, and the diatom species.
Table 1. Euphotic zone-averaged nutrient concentrations, nutrient depletions, and nutrient depletion ratios at each station occupied in the Weddell Sea in summer 2018/2019. Values shown are averages ± 1 SD (n ≥ 2). "-" indicates no available data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station position</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Sampling date</th>
<th>MLD (m)</th>
<th>$Z_m$ (m)</th>
<th>NH$_4$ (μM)</th>
<th>Urea-N (μM)</th>
<th>NO$_2$ (μM)</th>
<th>NO$_3$ depletion (pM)</th>
<th>Si(OH)$_4$ depletion (pM)</th>
<th>PO$_4$ depletion (pM)</th>
<th>Si(OH)$_4$/NO$_3$ depletion</th>
<th>NO$_3$/PO$_4$ depletion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FIS Average</td>
<td>FIS</td>
<td>21 ± 51</td>
<td>79 ± 28</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>250 ± 2.8</td>
<td>0.7 ± 1.4</td>
<td>1.6 ± 3.0</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>2.0 ± 0.9</td>
<td>26.4 ± 19.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finsen</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>01/01/19</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0 ± 0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26.4 ± 0.5</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.5</td>
<td>0.5 ± 1.6</td>
<td>0.0 ± 0.0</td>
<td>3.2 ± 3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finsen</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>02/01/19</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0 ± 0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26.5 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.0 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.5 ± 2.1</td>
<td>48.6 ± 11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finsen</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>03/01/19</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.0 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 ± 0.0</td>
<td>20.0 ± 0.3</td>
<td>0.7 ± 0.3</td>
<td>1.2 ± 0.5</td>
<td>0.0 ± 0.0</td>
<td>1.8 ± 0.6</td>
<td>18.8 ± 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finsen</td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>28/02/19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>20.2 ± 1.9</td>
<td>3.7 ± 2.0</td>
<td>8.7 ± 0.6</td>
<td>0.3 ± 0.1</td>
<td>2.3 ± 0.5</td>
<td>11.7 ± 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Average</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>23 ± 8</td>
<td>45 ± 9</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.3 ± 0.1</td>
<td>24.9 ± 0.6</td>
<td>2.5 ± 1.7</td>
<td>1.1 ± 0.8</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.6 ± 0.2</td>
<td>19.8 ± 16.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antarctic Peninsula</td>
<td>AP1</td>
<td>09/01/19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.6 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>25.6 ± 1.4</td>
<td>2.6 ± 0.7</td>
<td>1.4 ± 0.4</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.4</td>
<td>14.1 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antarctic Peninsula</td>
<td>AP2</td>
<td>09/01/19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.7 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>25.9 ± 1.0</td>
<td>1.0 ± 1.1</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.8 ± 1.1</td>
<td>6.8 ± 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antarctic Peninsula</td>
<td>AP3</td>
<td>09/01/19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.1 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.3 ± 0.1</td>
<td>24.7 ± 0.5</td>
<td>3.2 ± 2.5</td>
<td>1.4 ± 1.5</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.4 ± 1.4</td>
<td>38.4 ± 12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCIS Average</td>
<td>LCIS</td>
<td>14 ± 6</td>
<td>29 ± 9</td>
<td>0.7 ± 0.4</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>16.4 ± 4.7</td>
<td>8.2 ± 4.9</td>
<td>8.1 ± 4.9</td>
<td>0.6 ± 0.3</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.2</td>
<td>16.7 ± 2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen C</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>22/01/19</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.3 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.1</td>
<td>21.8 ± 0.1</td>
<td>2.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>2.3 ± 0.3</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>11.2 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen C</td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>20/04/19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.3</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.2</td>
<td>13.7 ± 5.0</td>
<td>8.6 ± 4.8</td>
<td>7.8 ± 4.7</td>
<td>0.6 ± 0.4</td>
<td>0.9 ± 0.8</td>
<td>15.2 ± 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen C</td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>14/01/19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.9 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>23.1 ± 0.2</td>
<td>2.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.3 ± 0.8</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.6 ± 0.6</td>
<td>17.7 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen C</td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>14/01/19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.5</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>12.1 ± 2.5</td>
<td>12.0 ± 2.1</td>
<td>10.9 ± 2.2</td>
<td>0.9 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.9 ± 0.3</td>
<td>13.9 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen C</td>
<td>L5</td>
<td>15/01/19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.2</td>
<td>12.0 ± 1.9</td>
<td>10.9 ± 2.3</td>
<td>9.6 ± 1.7</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.9 ± 0.3</td>
<td>13.7 ± 0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen C</td>
<td>L6</td>
<td>13/01/19</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.7 ± 0.5</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>15.1 ± 2.1</td>
<td>8.9 ± 1.9</td>
<td>8.0 ± 1.9</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.3</td>
<td>20.4 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen C</td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>22/01/19</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.0 ± 1.1</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.2</td>
<td>14.7 ± 4.1</td>
<td>11.1 ± 3.8</td>
<td>13.5 ± 3.4</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.2</td>
<td>1.2 ± 0.3</td>
<td>14.8 ± 0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen C</td>
<td>L8</td>
<td>23/01/19</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.3 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.0</td>
<td>12.2 ± 2.2</td>
<td>12.9 ± 4.5</td>
<td>12.0 ± 3.2</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.3</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.4</td>
<td>16.0 ± 0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen C</td>
<td>L9</td>
<td>19/01/19</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.4</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>20.3 ± 4.3</td>
<td>5.8 ± 3.3</td>
<td>6.6 ± 5.1</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.3</td>
<td>1.1 ± 1.0</td>
<td>11.0 ± 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen C</td>
<td>L10</td>
<td>24/01/19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.7 ± 0.3</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>18.2 ± 5.4</td>
<td>8.7 ± 3.7</td>
<td>10.6 ± 4.9</td>
<td>0.7 ± 0.3</td>
<td>1.2 ± 0.6</td>
<td>13.0 ± 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG Average</td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>20 ± 9</td>
<td>99 ± 14</td>
<td>0.7 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>28.8 ± 3.4</td>
<td>4.0 ± 0.3</td>
<td>2.0 ± 0.9</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.0</td>
<td>5.6 ± 0.7</td>
<td>4.1 ± 0.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weddell Gyre</td>
<td>WG1</td>
<td>14/02/19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>26.7 ± 0.5</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.3</td>
<td>2.3 ± 0.8</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.0</td>
<td>5.1 ± 0.7</td>
<td>45.0 ± 0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weddell Gyre</td>
<td>WG2</td>
<td>15/02/19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>30.2 ± 0.8</td>
<td>0.3 ± 0.4</td>
<td>2.0 ± 1.0</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>6.1 ± 1.3</td>
<td>3.7 ± 1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Euphotic zone-integrated rates and averages at each station occupied in the Weddell Sea in summer 2018/2019. Values shown are averages ± 1 SD (n ≥ 2). “...” indicates no available data and the values shown in italics (i.e., ρurea) were estimated rather than measured (see text for details).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station position</th>
<th>Station</th>
<th>[PON] (μM)</th>
<th>C:N ratio</th>
<th>NPP (μmol m⁻² d⁻¹)</th>
<th>ρNO₃⁻ (μmol m⁻² d⁻¹)</th>
<th>ρNH₄⁺ (μmol m⁻² d⁻¹)</th>
<th>ρurea (μmol m⁻² d⁻¹)</th>
<th>VNO₂⁻ (μmol m⁻² d⁻¹)</th>
<th>f-ratio (excluding zeroes)</th>
<th>f-ratio (including zeroes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIS Average</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>0.3 ± 0.2</td>
<td>21.6 ± 3.7</td>
<td>4.9 ± 0.0</td>
<td>3.8 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.3 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.3 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.80 ± 0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.0</td>
<td>26.3 ± 12.6</td>
<td>20.8 ± 0.2</td>
<td>2.4 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.07 ± 0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.75 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F3</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.2</td>
<td>8.8 ± 3.0</td>
<td>56.9 ± 0.6</td>
<td>4.8 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.2 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.80 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F4</td>
<td>2.1 ± 0.6</td>
<td>9.4 ± 0.5</td>
<td>28.3 ± 0.4</td>
<td>3.9 ± 0.0</td>
<td>1.9 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.9 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.68 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP Average</td>
<td>AP</td>
<td>1.1 ± 0.3</td>
<td>8.3 ± 2.5</td>
<td>26.6 ± 33.5</td>
<td>3.4 ± 1.4</td>
<td>3.8 ± 2.0</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.52 ± 0.17</td>
<td>0.48 ± 0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antarctic Peninsula</td>
<td>AP1</td>
<td>1.3 ± 0.1</td>
<td>6.1 ± 1.4</td>
<td>3.1 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.8 ± 0.1</td>
<td>2.6 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.0 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.41 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AP2</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.3</td>
<td>7.8 ± 2.7</td>
<td>11.8 ± 0.2</td>
<td>4.0 ± 0.2</td>
<td>2.1 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.72 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antarctic Peninsula</td>
<td>AP3</td>
<td>1.3 ± 0.2</td>
<td>11.8 ± 2.1</td>
<td>65.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>4.4 ± 0.0</td>
<td>5.8 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.43 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCIS Average</td>
<td>LCIS</td>
<td>2.4 ± 0.8</td>
<td>7.4 ± 1.9</td>
<td>28.6 ± 21.3</td>
<td>2.2 ± 1.1</td>
<td>2.6 ± 1.3</td>
<td>0.6 ± 0.3</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.8</td>
<td>0.50 ± 0.09</td>
<td>0.47 ± 0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larsen C</td>
<td>L1</td>
<td>1.5 ± 0.3</td>
<td>10.0 ± 3.4</td>
<td>2.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.5 ± 0.0</td>
<td>1.4 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.7 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.52 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L2</td>
<td>3.1 ± 0.5</td>
<td>6.3 ± 1.7</td>
<td>47.8 ± 0.5</td>
<td>1.5 ± 0.1</td>
<td>3.3 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.8 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.3 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.54 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L3</td>
<td>2.6 ± 0.8</td>
<td>5.8 ± 1.4</td>
<td>32.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>2.5 ± 0.0</td>
<td>3.3 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.3 ± 0.0</td>
<td>2.9 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.42 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L4</td>
<td>1.0 ± 0.2</td>
<td>8.0 ± 0.5</td>
<td>32.2 ± 1.0</td>
<td>1.9 ± 0.1</td>
<td>2.1 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.49 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L5</td>
<td>3.1 ± 0.6</td>
<td>7.4 ± 1.9</td>
<td>61.0 ± 0.7</td>
<td>4.7 ± 0.0</td>
<td>3.1 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.9 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.60 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L6</td>
<td>2.4 ± 0.5</td>
<td>9.2 ± 5.3</td>
<td>25.9 ± 1.5</td>
<td>2.4 ± 0.1</td>
<td>2.2 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.7 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.53 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L7</td>
<td>1.5 ± 0.7</td>
<td>8.2 ± 1.1</td>
<td>55.9 ± 1.0</td>
<td>3.1 ± 0.0</td>
<td>3.8 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.1 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.0 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.45 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L8</td>
<td>3.3 ± 0.3</td>
<td>8.2 ± 1.3</td>
<td>17.3 ± 0.4</td>
<td>2.3 ± 0.0</td>
<td>4.8 ± 0.1</td>
<td>0.9 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.32 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L9</td>
<td>2.9 ± 0.2</td>
<td>3.4 ± 4.1</td>
<td>9.7 ± 1.3</td>
<td>2.0 ± 0.1</td>
<td>1.2 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.6 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.63 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L10</td>
<td>2.7 ± 1.1</td>
<td>7.1 ± 0.4</td>
<td>1.8 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.2 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.1 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.46 ± 0.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WG Average</td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>0.7 ± 0.3</td>
<td>12.3 ± 1.8</td>
<td>31.6 ± 31.3</td>
<td>3.2 ± 1.1</td>
<td>2.0 ± 0.2</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.1</td>
<td>9.0 ± 6.8</td>
<td>0.54 ± 0.10</td>
<td>0.48 ± 0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weddell Gyre</td>
<td>WG1</td>
<td>0.5 ± 0.2</td>
<td>13.6 ± 7.7</td>
<td>53.7 ± 0.2</td>
<td>3.3 ± 0.0</td>
<td>2.1 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.6 ± 0.0</td>
<td>13.8 ± 2.2</td>
<td>0.47 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WG2</td>
<td>0.9 ± 0.3</td>
<td>11.8 ± 7.5</td>
<td>9.5 ± 0.4</td>
<td>3.1 ± 0.0</td>
<td>1.8 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.4 ± 0.9</td>
<td>4.2 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.61 ± 0.0</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Discussion

Across the Weddell Sea in summer 2019, the euphotic zone-integrated rates of NPP and N uptake were generally lower at the OOZ stations than the CCSZ stations, with the highest depth-specific uptake rates observed in surface waters at LCIS (Figure 6a-d; Table 2). The few studies that have previously measured summertime rates of NPP and N uptake in the Weddell Sea reported similar results, with rates in the marginal ice zone (MIZ) and CCSZ that were up to five-times higher than in the OOZ (El-Sayed and Taguchi 1981; Smith and Nelson 1990; Park et al. 1999). The summertime CCSZ of the Weddell Sea can thus be broadly characterised as a highly productive region with elevated biomass accumulation driven by increased water-column stratification and iron-replete conditions, both the result of sea-ice melt (Semeneh et al. 1998; Lannuzel et al. 2008; Klunder et al. 2011).

However, we observed considerable variability in the biogeochemical rates measured within each region of the Weddell Sea, particularly at LCIS; we examine the possible drivers of the inter- and intraregional differences below.

4.1. Drivers of NPP and N uptake in the Weddell Sea

Light and water column stability: Surface waters throughout the study region were generally well stratified, with MLDS ranging from 7 to 30 m, except at the early-summer FIS stations where the MLD ranged from 63 to 135 m (Table 1). These deep MLDS coincided with elevated concentrations of sea-ice, while the shallowest MLDS observed at LCIS occurred in relatively ice-free surface waters. Average euphotic zone rates of NPP and pNO$_3^-$ generally varied with the depth of the mixed layer and $Z_m$, all stations – they were highest (lowest) at the stations where $Z_m$ was shallowest (deepest) (Figure 10a-b), implicating light as a major control on NPP and pNO$_3^-$. At LCIS, however, the euphotic zone was shallow at all stations (<50 m, average $Z_m$ of 28.5 ± 9 m), yet NPP and pNO$_3^-$ varied by over an order of magnitude (Table 2). We observed a positive relationship between the LCIS rates and SST, with NPP and pNO$_3^-$ increasing at higher SSTs, the latter indicative of increased water column stratification (Figure 10d; see below).

Throughout the region, the average euphotic zone rates of pNH$_4^+$ and purea also varied with $Z_m$ (Figure 10c), suggesting that these processes were light dependent too. This is unexpected, as the energy requirement associated with NH$_4^+$ and urea assimilation is low (El-Sayed and Taguchi 1981; Dortch 1990; Jacques 1991; Goeyens et al. 1995; Priddle et al. 1998). The stations with the deepest $Z_m$ were also characterized by low concentrations of regenerated N (Figures 3a-b and 10c), leading us to conclude that pNH$_4^+$ and purea were predominantly constrained by the availability of regenerated N rather than by light. This conclusion is supported by the observed increase in pNH$_4^+$ and purea towards the base of the euphotic zone at stations with elevated regenerated N concentrations (e.g., station L8; Figures 6c-d, g-h, and k-l, and 10c).

The lowest regenerated N concentrations occurred at the stations with the lowest rates of NPP and pNO$_3^-$, and the highest NO$_3^-$ concentrations (e.g., station F1). This is probably because NH$_4^+$ and urea tend to accumulate only when biomass (and productivity) is sufficiently high to support elevated rates of heterotrophic activity (Semeneh et al. 1998). At the stations with low POC and PON concentrations, remineralisation rates were likely also low, limiting the flux of NH$_4^+$ and urea and driving low rates of pNH$_4^+$ and purea. At the stations where NH$_4^+$ and urea concentrations were elevated, rates of pNH$_4^+$ and purea increased with depth, along with a decrease in NPP and
ρNO$_3^-$ (e.g., station L8). These observations further demonstrate the control of light on NPP and ρNO$_3^-$, and substrate availability on ρNH$_4^+$ and urea. That said, it is unlikely that the variability in NPP and N uptake among the stations was driven by light and nutrient availability alone, and we hypothesize that hydrography, iron availability, and phytoplankton community composition also played a role.

Figure 10. Euphotic zone-averaged rates of (a) NPP, (b) ρNO$_3^-$ and (c) ρNH$_4^+$ versus $Z_{eu}$, and (d) NPP versus SST at each station. The symbols in panels (b) and (c) are coloured by nutrient concentration and in panel (d), by ρNO$_3^-$. At LCIS, the stations closest to the ice shelf were characterised by low SSTs and low rates of NPP and N uptake (stations L1 and L3; Figures 1 and 11a; Table 2). The low SSTs can be attributed either to the formation of sea-ice or to the upwelling of WW along the ice shelf. Sea-ice formation, in addition to decreasing SST, also increases the salinity of ASW due to brine rejection (Brennecke 1921; Mosby 1934; Gill 1973). While the salinity of ASW at the low-SST stations was indeed elevated, the oxygen concentrations were relatively low ($\leq$ 300 µM, which is below saturation; Figure 11c and d). In surface waters and sea-ice, oxygen is typically saturated as it rapidly equilibrates with the atmosphere (Gleitz et al. 1995). Sea-ice formation should not, therefore, drive a notable change in the oxygen content of ASW. The low oxygen concentrations at stations L1 and L3 were contiguous with those in the underlying WW (Figure 11d), leading us to conclude that the cool, saline waters along the ice shelf front indicate recent upwelling of WW. Such upwelling could temporarily inhibit productivity by decreasing the stability of the water column, thereby mixing phytoplankton below the euphotic zone. This mechanism can explain the low uptake rates and weak nutrient depletions observed at the low-SST stations.

Relatively cold, saline surface waters have previously been observed at the ice-edge off Larsen A and B Ice Shelves and shown to hinder NPP (Cape et al. 2014). Here, the dense surface waters were surmised to result either from offshore wind stress at the inshore region that induced localised mixing, or from the advection of surface waters offshore by coastal upwelling. Both mechanisms would decrease water column stability, and by extension, productivity. Cape et al. (2014) observed an increase in NPP with distance from the coast at Larsen A and B, a
trend that we did not observe, likely because of the proximity of our LCIS stations to the ice shelf (within 75 km for all stations). Instead, our rates of NPP and N uptake were positively coupled with SST at the ice-edge (Figure 10d). We propose that surface SST at LCIS can be used as an indicator of water-mass age, with cooler SSTs indicating newly-upwelled WW and warmer SSTs designating older surface waters that have had time to absorb heat from the atmosphere. The higher rates of NPP and N uptake in the warm surface waters occur because phytoplankton have experienced favourable growing conditions for an extended period, resulting in the accumulation of biomass. By contrast, persistent localised upwelling along LCIS inhibits productivity in the adjacent surface waters, with implications for the spatial distribution of biomass and organic carbon export.

**Figure 11.** Maps of (a) SST, (b) sea surface salinity, and (c) surface oxygen concentrations, and (d) depth profiles of oxygen concentrations in the region of LCIS at the time of sampling. SST and salinity data were acquired from the underway (~7 m inflow) ferrybox, while the oxygen concentrations were measured via the oxygen sensor on the CTD profiler, calibrated against discrete seawater samples measured for dissolved oxygen by Winkler titration (Carpenter 1965; Grasshoff et al. 1983; Hutchinson et al. 2020). The symbols in panel (d) are coloured by potential density (σθ), with the circles indicating the non-upwelling stations and the triangles the upwelling stations. The grey box in panel (d) indicates the average mixed layer depth (MLD) across the stations at LCIS. The bathymetry data in panels (a-c) were taken fromETOPO1 (NOAA National Geophysical Data Center 2009).
Nutrient and iron conditions in Weddell Sea surface waters: Across our sampling region, ASW was depleted in NO$_3^-$, Si(OH)$_4^-$ and PO$_4^{3-}$ relative to the underlying WW, with the greatest nutrient depletion occurring at LCIS and at FIS in late summer (Figure 4a-c). Under iron-replete conditions, diatoms consume Si:N:P in an approximate ratio of 1:1:0.07 (Ragueneau et al. 2000; Hutchins and Bruland 1998; Takeda 1998; Mosseri et al. 2008), while under iron-limitation, they increase their uptake of Si and decrease that of P relative to N, consuming nutrients in a ratio of ≥2:1:0.09 (Arrigo et al. 1999; Finkel et al. 2006; Green and Sambrotto 2006; Weber and Deutsch 2010; Martiny et al. 2013; Mosseri et al. 2008), with Si:N uptake ratios as high as 8:1 occurring when iron is very low (Franck et al. 2000; Brzezinski et al. 2003). The Si:N:P depletion ratios (more correctly, Si(OH)$_4$:NO$_3$:PO$_4^{3-}$ depletion ratios) estimated in our study suggest that the AP and LCIS stations were characterised by iron-replete conditions (ratio of 0.9:1:0.06) while the phytoplankton community at the FIS and WG stations experienced iron limitation (ratios of 3.6:1:0.15; Figures 4d and 4e; Table 1).

High iron concentrations have previously been measured in surface waters in the CCSZ and northern Weddell Sea (7 nM; Lannuzel et al. 2008; De Jong et al. 2012). Iron is supplied to the mixed layer in these regions via sea-ice melt, ice shelf melt, continental runoff, vertical and lateral advection, and resuspension of continental shelf sediments (Lannuzel et al. 2008; De Jong et al. 2012; Klunder et al. 2014). In contrast, the central WG is iron limited as iron is supplied to surface waters mainly by wind-induced vertical mixing (Hoppema et al. 2015). During our sampling, sea-ice concentrations were high at the WG stations, which would have dampened the effect of wind stress on surface waters and thus hindered vertical mixing. At FIS in early summer, iron is expected to be replete as phytoplankton will not have had sufficient time to exhaust the surface reservoir. Here, the sea-ice concentrations were elevated, and the mixed layers were deep such that light, rather than iron, likely limited phytoplankton growth. Light-limited diatoms have been observed to consume Si:N:P in a ratio similar to that reported under conditions of iron depletion (Brzezinski 1985). By late summer at FIS, the sea-ice had completely melted, which should have further alleviated iron limitation, yet the Si(OH)$_4$:NO$_3^-$ depletion ratios were characteristic of iron-deplete diatoms (average of 2.3 ± 0.5). These apparently high Si:N depletion ratios may be due to our not accounting for regenerated N uptake. At FIS in late summer, NH$_4^+$ supported 32% of N uptake; accounting for this N source decreases the Si:N depletion ratio to 1.4:1, which is closer to that expected for iron-replete diatoms. While some diatom growth was likely also supported by urea, which would further decrease the Si:N depletion ratio, it is nonetheless plausible that the diatoms at F4 were beginning to experience iron-limitation as the station was sampled late in the season.

Accounting for regenerated N uptake greatly alters the Si:N depletion ratios, particularly at LCIS, and provides insights into the dominant phytoplankton groups that were active in the mixed layer, both prior to and at the time of sampling. From the Si:NO$_3^-$ depletion ratio at LCIS, we infer that *P. antarctica* predominantly consumed regenerated sources of N. Our reasoning relies on that fact that under favourable nutrient and light conditions, diatoms will rely near-exclusively on NO$_3^-$ (Lomas and Glibert 1999), such that the average Si:NO$_3^-$ depletion ratio at LCIS of 1.0 ± 0.2 can be attributed entirely to this phytoplankton group. When total N uptake is considered, the Si:N depletion ratios decrease to 0.3 ± 0.1, indicating the consumption of three-times more N than Si(OH)$_4$- which we attribute to regenerated N uptake by *P. antarctica*. Indeed, this phytoplankton group is known to preferentially consume NH$_4^+$ when it is available due to the lower energy (El-Sayed and Taguchi 1981; Dortch...
1990; Jacques 1991; Goeyens et al. 1995; Priddle et al. 1998) and iron requirements (Stefels and Van Leeuwe 1998) associated with NH₄⁺ assimilation. By contrast, diatoms are NO₃⁻ specialists that can outcompete other phytoplankton for this N source (Malone 1980; Fawcett and Ward 2011). They have even been observed to consume NO₃⁻ under iron-deplete conditions, which is possible because of their low requirement relative to that of other phytoplankton groups (Marchetti and Maldonado 2016; Marchetti and Cassar 2009).

We can also use the NO₃⁻:PO₄³⁻ depletion ratios to better understand the iron conditions and the relative importance of *P. antarctica* versus diatoms in generating the observed nutrient depletion ratios. *P. antarctica* are known to consume NO₃⁻ and PO₄³⁻ in a ratio of ~20:1, while for iron-replete diatoms, this ratio is <14:1 (Arrigo et al. 1999; Smith and Asper 2001; Garcia et al. 2018). At LCIS, the NO₃⁻:PO₄³⁻ depletion ratio averaged $14.7 ± 2.9$, consistent with a dominant role for iron-replete diatoms. However, variability in the NO₃⁻:PO₄³⁻ depletion ratios was observed among the LCIS stations (with ratios ranging from 11 to 20), which we attribute to local variations in phytoplankton community composition. At stations where large diatoms were dominant (e.g., L10, where diatoms contributed 6.47 pg C L⁻¹ to biomass while *P. antarctica* only contributed 0.07 pg C L⁻¹; Leblanc et al. 2012; Mathot et al. 2000), the NO₃⁻:PO₄³⁻ depletion ratios were low ($13.0 ± 0.6$). In contrast, at the stations where *P. antarctica* were numerically dominant (e.g., L6; where *P. antarctica* constituted 90% of the phytoplankton population) and contributed more to biomass (0.17 pg C L⁻¹), elevated NO₃⁻:PO₄³⁻ depletion ratios were measured ($20.4 ± 0.3$; Figure 9d-f; Table 1). Furthermore, high rates of NH₄⁺ uptake were measured at LCIS, equivalent to and at times greater than the coincident NO₃⁻ uptake rates. *P. antarctica* has been observed to preferentially consume NH₄⁺, while diatoms will consume NO₃⁻ if iron is available (Probyn and Painting 1985; Lomas and Glibert 1999; Glibert et al. 2016). The relative contribution of diatoms versus *P. antarctica* to biomass thus appears to control the nutrient depletion ratios on a variety of scales across the Weddell Sea.

**Drivers of phytoplankton community composition**: Phytoplankton community composition and the variations therein have implications for the biological pump, both directly (diatoms sink more rapidly than smaller and/or non-ballasted phytoplankton; Treguer and Jacques 1992; De Baar et al. 2005; Boyd et al. 2007) and indirectly (NO₃⁻ consumption is quantitatively related to carbon export; Dugdale and Goering 1967; Eppley and Peterson 1979). Above, we have discussed the biogeochemical evidence for the dominance of one phytoplankton group over another in driving productivity and nutrient consumption. Below, we discuss the processes that may have resulted in the dominance of *P. antarctica* over diatoms at LCIS, and vice versa at the other Weddell Sea stations.

At LCIS, a coastal sensible heat polynya persisted throughout the sampling period. The opening of such polynyas along the eastern AP is linked to the occurrence of warm, föhn winds that originate over the continent and blow over the AP, influencing the coastal north-western Weddell Sea (Cape et al. 2014). Föhn winds drive the offshore movement of sea-ice, which initiates the opening of polynyas that persist because the winds are warm, thus hindering the formation of new sea-ice (Cape et al. 2014). The development of coastal sensible heat polynyas results in relatively deep mixed layers and a weakly stratified water column. The polynya at LCIS opened in late November, approximately two months prior to our sampling. At this time (i.e., the beginning of the growing season), motile *P. antarctica* cells likely dominated the phytoplankton community as *P. antarctica* are low-light specialists compared to other Antarctic phytoplankton (Goffart et al. 2000; Delmont et al. 2014). This notion is
supported by the low phytoplankton cell counts (for both flow cytometry and net samples) and high relative abundance of *P. antarctica* compared to diatoms at the stations along the ice shelf where WW had recently upwelled (e.g., L3; Figure 9a, d and e). As the mixed layer shoaled and light limitation was alleviated, a diatom bloom would have been initiated and *P. antarctica* colony formation would have occurred (Schoemann et al. 2005). Indeed, the presence of *P. antarctica* (as colonies) and diatoms (as chains) at the time of our sampling in January is evidence that the water column was well stratified (Goffart et al. 2000). As the season progressed, diatoms would have outcompeted *P. antarctica* and come to dominate the phytoplankton community. At the stations sampled later in the season (e.g., L10; Figure 9e), the relative abundance of diatoms versus *P. antarctica* was greater than at the stations sampled two weeks earlier (e.g., L5; Figure 9e). Diatoms have a lower iron and higher light requirement than *P. antarctica* and thus tend to thrive once the *P. antarctica* bloom is over, when the water column has stratified and they can utilize the lower concentrations of residual iron (Strzpek et al. 2011). That said, iron is likely perennially high at LCIS as it is near-continuously supplied to surface waters in summer by sea-ice melt and upwelling of WW along the ice shelf (Klunder et al. 2014). The elevated iron concentrations would allow the diatoms to grow rapidly on the available NO$_3$ once the mixed layer had shoaled enough to alleviate light limitation.

Throughout the rest of the Weddell Sea, diatoms dominated the phytoplankton community. Here, we hypothesize that at the beginning of the growing season, melting sea-ice alleviated light- and, to a lesser extent, iron limitation, providing favourable conditions for diatom growth. At the same time, the generally lower iron concentrations characteristic of open Weddell Sea waters may have selected against *P. antarctica*. Previous studies conducted in the Ross Sea observed large diatom blooms associated with the receding ice-edge and concluded that bloom formation was favoured by the rapid stabilization of the water column from meltwater inputs (Goffart et al. 2000; Sedwick et al. 2000). Regions of the Weddell Sea that undergo rapid stratification due to sea-ice melt will likely also experience large diatom blooms. We thus conclude that the dominance of diatoms over *P. antarctica* at the non-LCIS stations was influenced by local hydrodynamic processes that induce water column stability and allow access to sufficient light (e.g., in areas of recent sea-ice melt). By contrast, *P. antarctica* dominates under conditions of low light, such as the deep mixed layers that initially characterize coastal polynyas. Eventually, diatoms will succeed *P. antarctica* in these polynyas once conditions become favourable for their growth.

### 4.2. Carbon export potential across the Weddell Sea

Previous f-ratio estimates for the summertime Weddell Sea range from 0.18 to 0.83 (Koike et al. 1986; Rönnor et al. 1983; Nelson et al. 1987; Smith and Nelson 1990; Goeyens 1991; Goeyens et al. 1995). Using equations 4a and 4b, we calculate euphotic zone-integrated f-ratios that range from 0.32 to 0.91 (excluding urea uptake) and 0.30 to 0.84 (including urea uptake). The lowest f-ratios were observed at LCIS (f-ratio$_{excluding~urea}$ = 0.50 ± 0.09 and f-ratio$_{including~urea}$ = 0.47 ± 0.08) and the highest at FIS (f-ratio$_{excluding~urea}$ = 0.78 ± 0.1 and f-ratio$_{including~urea}$ = 0.73 ± 0.09) (Figure 8; Table 2). We note that urea uptake may have been stimulated at the stations where it was measured given the quantity of $^{15}$N-urea added (0.1 μM) relative to the ambient urea concentrations (average of 0.2 ± 0.1 μM; Figure S2; section S3 in the Supplemental Information); if so, regenerated production could be overestimated at all stations since we applied the average measured contribution of urea-to-total-N uptake (8 ± 6%) to the stations at which purea was not measured (equation 7). The f-ratio estimates excluding and including
urea uptake thus represent an upper and lower bound on the fraction of potentially exportable carbon. That said, accounting for urea uptake decreased the average f-ratio from 0.57 ± 0.15 to 0.52 ± 0.14 which is minor (Figure 8; Table 2).

Estimates of the f-ratio and carbon export potential can be further complicated by eutrophic zone nitrification, which supplies regenerated rather than new NO$_3^-$ to the euphotic zone. Failing to account for this regenerated N flux leads to an overestimation of carbon export potential (Yool et al. 2007; Mdutyana et al. 2020). At all the stations sampled, the eutrophic zone rates of V$_{NO_2^-}$ were low (undetectable to 9.5 nM d$^{-1}$; Figure 7b) and correcting the f-ratio for eutrophic zone nitrification (equation 4) had a minimal effect on our estimates (average decrease of 2 ± 6%). The largest decrease was observed at WG1 where the highest eutrophic zone-integrated rates of V$_{NO_2^-}$ were measured (f-ratio$_{excluding\text{ urea}}$ decreased from 0.6 to 0.47 and f-ratio$_{including\text{ urea}}$ decreased from 0.49 to 0.39; Table 2).

The low rates of eutrophic zone nitrification are consistent with the previous (limited) data available for the summertime OOZ and CCSZ of the Southern Ocean. For example, Mdutyana et al. (2020) measured eutrophic zone rates of V$_{NO_2^-}$ and NH$_3^+$ oxidation in summer at FIS and in the Antarctic Zone just north of the WG (56°S 0°E) that were below detection. Summertime studies of eutrophic zone NH$_3^+$ oxidation in the Ross and Scotia Seas reported similarly low rates of 6.8-9.9 nM d$^{-1}$ and 0.4-5.8 nM d$^{-1}$, respectively (Olson 1981). We conclude that, as expected, the high-light and generally low-NH$_3^+$ conditions of the summertime Weddell Sea inhibited eutrophic zone nitrification (Horrigan 1981; Olson 1981; Guerrero and Jones 1996; Merbt et al. 2012; Qin et al. 2014), and that the slow growing nitrifiers were likely also outcompeted by phytoplankton for any available NH$_3^+$ (Ward 1985; 2005; Smith et al. 2014; Zakem et al. 2018). Classifying NO$_3^-$ uptake as new production and equating it to carbon export potential thus seems reasonable for the summertime Weddell Sea.

Although the highest f-ratios were estimated for the FIS stations, the highest rates of pNO$_3^-$ were observed at LCIS and along the AP (Figure 8; Table 2). FIS was thus characterised by the highest carbon export potential relative to NPP, while the N cycle data imply that the absolute carbon export flux was highest at LCIS and the AP. The maximum extent of nutrient depletion was also observed at LCIS (NO$_3^-$ depletion of 57-428 mmol m$^{-2}$ and PO$_4^{3-}$ depletion of 5.8-18.7 mmol m$^{-2}$). Assuming Redfield C:N and C:P stoichiometry of 6.63:1 and 106:1, respectively, the seasonal NO$_3^-$ depletion equates to a carbon export flux of 0.4-2.8 mol C m$^{-2}$ and the PO$_4^{3-}$ depletion to 0.6-2.0 mol C m$^{-2}$. Alternately, multiplying pNO$_3^-$ by the length of time that the coastal polynya had been open (30 November until the date of sampling; Table 1) yields an estimate for net seasonal NO$_3^-$ uptake of 59-428 mmol m$^{-2}$ and carbon export flux of 0.4-2.8 mol C m$^{-2}$ at LCIS, remarkably similar to the estimates derived from seasonal NO$_3^-$ depletion. Our estimates are, however, lower than those previously measured in the CCSZ and MIZ of the Weddell Sea (e.g., estimates for January/February range from 2.4-4.9 mol C m$^{-2}$; Rönnner et al. 1983; Hoppema et al. 2000; 2007). Given the high-light and nutrient- and iron-replete conditions at LCIS, one might thus have expected higher f-ratios and carbon export potential (i.e., NO$_3^-$ depletion), raising the question of the possible limitations thereon.
Throughout the Weddell Sea, NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} and urea uptake were coupled with substrate availability, while NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-} uptake was not. Instead, NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-} uptake appeared to vary as a function of the ambient NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} concentration (Figure 12a). At LCIS where NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} was elevated throughout the mixed layer at all stations, NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-} depletion, and therefore NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-} uptake, decreased with increasing NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} (Figure 12b), which we attribute to NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} inhibition of NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-} uptake (Goeyens et al. 1995). By contrast, at the other stations, NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-} depletion and ambient NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} concentration showed a positive relationship, consistent with NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-}-fuelled phytoplankton growth being followed by intense remineralization and grazing, both of which can yield elevated NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} (Rönner et al. 1983; El-Sayed 1984; Semeneh et al. 1998).
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**Figure 12.** (a) NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-} uptake normalised to NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} uptake versus NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} concentration and b) NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-} depletion versus NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} concentration. The symbols in panel (a) are coloured by NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} uptake rate and in panel (b) by PON concentration. The symbol size in panel (b) represents the light level at which the samples were incubated. In panel (b), NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-} depletion at LCIS corresponds with the primary y-axis and NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-} depletion at all other stations corresponds with the secondary y-axis.

Previous studies conducted in MIZ and CCSZ of the Weddell Sea have shown that NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} concentrations ≥0.5 µM can inhibit NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-} uptake, particularly by diatoms, resulting in phytoplankton preferentially consuming NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} over NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-}. Goeyens et al. (1995) observed a Weddell Sea phytoplankton community dominated by diatoms prior to NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} accumulation, but once surface waters became enriched in NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+}, diatom dominance ceased. The authors concluded that diatom blooms were unable to develop despite the elevated NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-} because of the inhibitory effect of NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+}, while non-siliceous phytoplankton species flourished because their preferred N source is NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+}. In our study, although NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} inhibition of ρNO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-} apparently occurred at LCIS, the rates of ρNO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-} were on average as high as ρNH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} and were never zero (Table 2) – in other words, the high ambient NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} did not prevent NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-} uptake even though it appears to have slowed it. We propose that the mixed community of diatoms and *P. antarctica* present at the time of our sampling meant that diatoms were able to consume NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-} while *P. antarctica* consumed the NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+}, preventing this reduced N form from accumulating to fully inhibitory concentrations. While the reliance of *P. antarctica* on NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} over NO\textsubscript{3}\textsuperscript{-} represents a missed opportunity for carbon export given that *P. antarctica* are known to fix up to 50% more carbon than diatoms per mole of PO\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{3-} consumed (Arrigo et al. 1999), that the diatoms were able to proliferate in the face of elevated NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} may have partly compensated for this. Earlier in the season when NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} concentrations were negligible, it is likely that the f-ratios at LCIS were >0.5 and comparable to those at FIS, as observed at Larsen A and B in early summer (Goeyens et al. 1995; Cape et al. 2014). We conclude that elevated NH\textsubscript{4}\textsuperscript{+} may have weakened carbon export potential at LCIS in January/February 2019.
through its effect on whole-community NO$_3$$_4$ uptake. Carbon export may have been further inhibited later in the season as NH$_4$$_4$ concentrations continued to increase following remineralisation of the phytoplankton bloom, coupled with the seasonal decrease in daylight that is expected to shift the phytoplankton community to proportionally higher NH$_4$$_4$ dependence (Glibert et al. 2016).

### 4.3. Broader biogeochemical implications at LCIS

LCIS is a region of deep-water formation, such that the biogeochemical properties of ASW influence those of MWDW and the bottom waters. Over the summer growing season, there was significant net depletion of nutrients from ASW. These nutrients were converted to organic matter (OM), which was then either consumed by zooplankton or exported out of the euphotic zone and decomposed by heterotrophic bacteria on the shelf and in the overlying waters. The on-shelf remineralisation of OM acts to increase the CO$_2$ and nutrient reservoir of WW and shelf waters (ISW and HSSW; both precursors of CDW). Some portion of this CO$_2$ is effluxed to the atmosphere when WW upwells along the ice shelf front, while the rest will be mixed into MWDW and eventually transferred to the bottom waters where it will be stored for hundreds of years (Ito et al. 2010). Biological activity and nutrient drawdown at LCIS, and the limitations thereon, thus affect the CO$_2$ and nutrient content of the bottom waters. The Si(OH)$_4$:NO$_3$$_3$:$PO_4$$_3$ ratio at depth at LCIS (average of 2:1:4 below 150 m) implicates diatoms as the main biological driver of the nutrient conditions in MWDW, and by extension the bottom waters, throughout the Weddell Sea. Although the dominance of *P. antarctica* in early and mid-summer does not appear to affect the nutrient properties of MWDW, it likely influences its CO$_2$ content. *P. antarctica* consume approximately twice as much carbon per PO$_4$$_3$ as diatoms, and the colonial forms have been observed to rapidly sink out of the water column, thereby transporting large quantities of carbon to depth (Arrigo et al. 2000; Ditullio et al. 2000). The dominance of *P. antarctica* at LCIS may thus be important for carbon storage in MWDW and the bottom waters.

As SSTs rise and sea-ice melts, a shift from *P. antarctica* to diatom-dominated phytoplankton blooms is expected because diatoms flourish under conditions of high light and water column stratification (i.e., in areas of recent sea-ice melt) (Boyd and Doney 2002; Arrigo and van Dijken 2003; Petrou et al. 2016; Ferreira et al. 2020). Given the anomalously high carbon-to-nutrient content of *P. antarctica*, such a shift may negatively affect the export and storage of carbon in MWDW and the bottom waters. However, rising SSTs will also lead to increased glacial and ice shelf melt, further stratifying the adjacent water column and increasing the iron supply (Petrou et al. 2016). It is projected that these conditions will yield blooms of heavily-silicified diatom species (Deppeler and Davidson 2017) that are known to sink rapidly out of the mixed layer or, if consumed, their frustules are expected to survive the gut passages of copepods, resulting in increased carbon export (Assmy et al. 2013). However, this increase is unlikely to be two-fold that presently contributed by diatoms, and therefore not as high as the carbon export potential associated with colonial *P. antarctica*. In net, the expected floristic shift may lead to decreased carbon export at the ice shelves, in turn decreasing the carbon content of the MWDW formed at LCIS. Further investigation of the drivers of phytoplankton community composition is required to validate this notion, particularly with regards to the response of Antarctic phytoplankton to warming, as well as how changes in the surface ecosystem are transferred to and reflected in the biogeochemistry of bottom waters.
5. Conclusions

In this study, we investigated the summertime productivity of understudied regions of the Weddell Sea, including LCIS, and the potential importance of different phytoplankton groups for biomass production, nutrient consumption, and carbon export. Our data show that mixed-layer nutrient depletion ratios were determined by the dominant phytoplankton group. The lowest Si:N and highest N:P depletion ratios were observed at LCIS (consistent with *P. antarctica* dominance), while the highest Si:N and lowest N:P depletion ratios were estimated at FIS and in the WG (consistent with diatom dominance). The variability in phytoplankton community composition appears to have been largely driven by mechanisms controlling water column stratification. *P. antarctica* are low-light specialists and proliferated at LCIS due to the deep mixed layers that occurred early in the season, while diatoms dominated at stations where the upper water column was more stratified and the mixed layer was shallow, induced by sea-ice melt. Not only does the observed relationship between phytoplankton community composition and the nutrient depletion ratios have implications for the stoichiometry of the deep-water nutrient reservoir, but it likely also has consequences for carbon export and storage.

Although the waters adjacent to LCIS were characterized by the highest NO$_3^-$ uptake rates, the lowest f-ratios were also observed here. We attribute these low f-ratios to some degree of NH$_4^+$ inhibition of NO$_3^-$ uptake, which translates to a missed opportunity for carbon export (Cochlan and Bronk 2003) and potentially, long-term storage in bottom waters, particularly since neither NO$_3^-$ nor iron appeared to be limiting at the time of our sampling. Additional investigation is required to ascertain the persistence of NH$_4^+$ inhibition in the Antarctic CCSZ, particularly in regions of deep-water formation (e.g., at Filchner-Ronne Ice Shelf). Furthermore, given the prediction that the Weddell Sea’s upper water column will become more stratified with climate change (Pörtner et al. 2014; Sallée et al. 2013; Stammerjohn et al. 2012), it is essential that we improve our understanding of the physical and chemical drivers of phytoplankton community composition and functioning if we are to better predict changes to carbon drawdown via the biological pump.

6. Figure and table captions

**Figure 1.** Maps of the Weddell Sea, Larsen C Ice Shelf (LCIS; insert a) and Filmbul Ice Shelf (FIS; insert b) showing the position of the stations where rate experiments were conducted during the Weddell Sea Expedition in January/February 2019. The symbols represent the different regions of the Weddell Sea sampled during the expedition (circle – Antarctic Peninsula (AP); cross – FIS; triangle – LCIS; plus sign – Weddell Gyre (WG)). The general cyclonic circulation of the Weddell Gyre (dashed blue arrow) is illustrated on the central map, and the dashed black arrows indicate the input of modified water masses from Filchner-Ronne Ice shelf (FRIC) and LCIS (Gordon et al. 1993; Schröder et al. 2002; Schodlok et al. 2002). The hypothesized circulation at LCIS (Nicholls et al. 2004; Hutchinson et al. 2020) is shown by the dashed blue arrow in insert (a). The 3.125 km sea-ice concentration data shown in the central panel were taken from ftp://ftp-projects.cen.uni-hamburg.de/seacie/AMSR2/3.125km and the bathymetry data (inserts a and b) were taken from ETOPO1 (NOAA National Geophysical Data Center 2009).

**Figure 2.** Depth profiles (0-100 m) of (a) potential density ($\theta$), (b) potential temperature, (c) absolute salinity, and (d) photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) at all stations. The inserts in panels (a), (b) and (c) show the
profiles down to 1500 m, with the various water masses present at each station identified from their temperature and salinity ranges (WSBW – Weddell Sea Bottom Water, WSDW – Weddell Sea Deep Water, WDW – Warm Deep Water, MWDW – Modified Warm Deep Water, ISW – Ice Shelf Water, HSSW – High Salinity Shelf Water, WW – Winter Water, ASW – Antarctic Surface Water). The station positions are indicated by the different colours: red – Antarctic Peninsula, green – Larsen C Ice Shelf, blue –Weddell Gyre, light purple – early summer Fimbul Ice Shelf, and dark purple – late summer Fimbul Ice Shelf.

**Figure 3.** Depth profiles (0-500 m) of the concentrations of (a) NH₄⁺, (b) urea-N, (c) NO₂⁻, (d) NO₃⁻, (e) Si(OH)₄ and (f) PO₄³⁻. For all panels, the error bars represent ± 1 SD replicate samples (n = 2-3). Where applicable, the error has been propagated according to standard statistical practices.

**Figure 4.** Depth profiles (0-150 m) of (a) NO₃⁻ depletion, (b) Si(OH)₄ depletion and (c) PO₄³⁻ depletion at each station. Also shown are scatterplots of (d) Si(OH)₄ depletion versus NO₃⁻ depletion at each depth over the euphotic zone at all stations (grey symbols) and the theoretical euphotic zone-averaged Si(OH)₄ versus total N depletion (coloured symbols; see text for details) and (e) PO₄³⁻ depletion versus NO₃⁻ depletion at each depth over the euphotic zone at all stations (grey symbols) and the theoretical euphotic zone-averaged PO₄³⁻ versus total N depletion (coloured symbols). The dashed line in panel (d) represents the 1:1 Si:N depletion ratio, expected for iron-replete diatoms (Ragueneau et al. 2000; Hutchins and Bruland 1998; Takeda 1998; Mosseri et al. 2008), while the dotted lines represent the 1:2 Si:N ratio, indicative of enhanced activity of non-siliceous phytoplankton, and the 2:1 Si:N ratio, expected for iron-limited diatoms (Arrigo et al. 1999; Franck et al. 2000; Brzezinski et al. 2003; Green and Sambrotto 2006; Mosseri et al. 2008; Weber and Deutsch 2010; Martiny et al. 2013). The dashed line in panel (e) represents the 16:1 N:P depletion ratio (the Redfield ratio), while the dotted lines represent the 20:1 N:P ratio, expected for *P. antarctica*, and 14:1 N:P ratio, expected for iron-replete diatoms (Hutchins and Bruland 1998; Takeda 1998; Arrigo et al. 1999; Ragueneau et al. 2000; Mosseri et al. 2008).

**Figure 5.** Bar plots of (a, c, e) PON concentrations and (b, d, f) biomass C:N ratios measured at the 55% (a-b), 10% (c-d) and 1% light levels (e-f). The dotted black line in panels (b), (d), and (f) indicates the Redfield C:N ratio of 6.63. The error bars represent ± 1 SD of replicate samples (n = 2-6). Where applicable, the error has been propagated according to standard statistical practices.

**Figure 6.** Daily rates of (a, e, i) NPP, (b, f, j) ρNO₃⁻, (c, g, k) ρNH₄⁺ and (d, h, l) ρurea for the 55% (a-d), 10% (e-h) and 1% light level (i-l). Where there are no bars in panels (d), (h) and (l), no data are available. The error bars represent ± 1 SD of replicate samples (n = 2).

**Figure 7.** Depth profiles of the NO₃⁻ oxidation rates measured at each station (a) between the surface and 500 m, and (b) within the euphotic zone only.

**Figure 8.** Euphotic zone-integrated f-ratios at each station. The hashed and white bars show the difference between the f-ratio(excluding urea) (higher value) and the f-ratio(including urea) (lower value), with the hashed bars...
representing the stations where urea uptake was measured and the white bars where it was estimated (see text for details).

Figure 9. The (a, d) cell counts, (b, e) relative cell abundance, (c) log-transformed biovolume and (f) carbon biomass of all phytoplankton groups identified from the (a-c) surface flow cytometry samples and (d-f) phytoplankton net samples. Where there are no bars in panels (d), (e), and (f), no data are available. Carbon biomass estimates in panel (f) are only available for prymnesiophyte, *P. antarctica*, and the diatom species.

Figure 10. Euphotic zone-averaged rates of (a) NPP, (b) ρNO$_3^-$ and (c) ρNH$_4^+$ versus $Z_{eu}$ and (d) NPP versus SST at each station. The symbols in panels (b) and (c) are coloured by nutrient concentration and in panel (d), by ρNO$_3^-$. 

Figure 11. Maps of (a) SST, (b) sea surface salinity, and (c) surface oxygen concentrations, and (d) depth profiles of oxygen concentrations in the region of LCIS at the time of sampling. SST and salinity data were acquired from the underway (~7 m inflow) ferrybox, while the oxygen concentrations were measured via the oxygen sensor on the CTD profiler, calibrated against discrete seawater samples measured for dissolved oxygen by Winkler titration (Carpenter 1965; Grasshoff et al. 1983; Hutchinson et al. 2020)(Carpenter 1965; Grasshoff, Kremling, and Ehrhard 1983)(Carpenter 1965; Grasshoff, Kremling, and Ehrhard 1983)(Carpenter 1965; Grasshoff, Kremling, and Ehrhard 1983). The symbols in panel (d) are coloured by potential density ($\sigma_\theta$), with the circles indicating the non-upwelling stations and the triangles the upwelling stations. The grey box in panel (d) indicates the average mixed layer depth (MLD) across the stations at LCIS. The bathymetry data in panels (a-c) were taken from ETOPO1 (NOAA National Geophysical Data Center 2009).

Figure 12. (a) NO$_3^-$ uptake normalised to NH$_4^+$ uptake versus NH$_4^+$ concentration and b) NO$_3^-$ depletion versus NH$_4^+$ concentration. The symbols in panel (a) are coloured by NH$_4^+$ uptake rate and in panel (b) by PON concentration. The symbol size in panel (b) represents the light level at which the samples were incubated. In panel (b), NO$_3^-$ depletion at LCIS corresponds with the primary y-axis and NO$_3^-$ depletion at all other stations corresponds with the secondary y-axis.

Table 1. Euphotic zone-averaged nutrient concentrations, nutrient depletions, and nutrient depletion ratios at each station occupied in the Weddell Sea in summer 2018/2019. Values shown are averages ± 1 SD (n ≥ 2). “-“ indicates no available data.

Table 2. Euphotic zone-integrated rates and averages at each station occupied in the Weddell Sea in summer 2018/2019. Values shown are averages ± 1 SD (n ≥ 2). “-“ indicates no available data and the values shown in italics (i.e., ρurea) were estimated rather than measured (see text for details).
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