MARINE PHOTOSYNTHESIS & PRIMARY Production in the Ocean Production in the Ocean

Roadmap for this class session:

- 1. Photosynthesis (refresher) & primary production (some terminology)
- 2. PS & PP vs. irradiance relationships (P-I curves)
- 3. PS & PP vs. nutrient concentrations (Michaelis-Menten et al.)
- 4. PS & PP vs. temperature (Eppley curves)
- 5. 4 common approaches for measuring primary productivity
- 6. Some discussion on Martin et al.1994

Refresher slide photosynthesis: light & dark rxns

" 6 H $_2$ 0 + 6 CO $_2$ \rightarrow 6 (CH $_2$ O) + 6 O $_2$ "

http://www.life.uiuc.edu/govindjee/ZSchemeG.html http://www.blc.arizona.edu/courses/181gh/rick/photosynthesis/Calvin.html

Some very basic definitions:

Primary production $-$ an <u>amount</u> of photosynthate produced by photosynthesis (e.g., amt of CH $_2$ 0)

Primary productivity – a rate of this production (e.g., total C fixed by photosynthesis, volume⁻¹ time⁻¹)

Gross & Net primary productivity

Net primary productivity $=$ Gross - autotrophic respiration

(as with photosynthesis: net = gross – respiration)

Can quickly get more complicated….

Table 1. Different meanings associated with general terms. Because these general terms can be interpreted in many different ways, it is essential to be explicit and precise when discussing the factors that might influence primary production or the growth of phytoplankton.

* 1-Smetacek and Passow 1990; 2-Strickland 1965; 3-Dugdale and Goering 1967; 4-Platt et al. 1984; 5-Siegel et al. 1989; 6-Minas et al. 1986; 7-Cullen 1982; 8-Martin and Fitzwater 1988; de Baar et al. 1990; Banse 1990; 9-Lande et al. 1989; 10-Hecky and Kilham 1988; Banse 1991b; 11-Blackman 1905; 12-Thingstad and Sakshaug 1990; 13-Morel et al. 1991; 14-Cullen et al. 1992. † Thingstad and Sakshaug 1990.

Cullen 1991

"…essential to be explicit and precise…"

Phytoplankton (& all plants) in unusual situation, that

energetic & material resources come from different sources (unlike with heterotrophs)

With photosynthesis \rightarrow fn (<u>qty</u> of light + nutrients)

With PP = \rightarrow fn (<u>qty</u> & <u>distributions</u> of light + nutrients)

Spatial and temporal uncoupling of material & energetic resources in the ocean is fundamental issue in primary production & phytoplankton ecology.

Energy: sunlight (E or I)

Strong variability: seasonal, latitude, time of day, clouds, etc.

Organisms with lifespans of O(days) Scales & magnitudes of variability in E

What about light after it enters the water column?

Seawater affects the light field strongly: *In both intensity and spectral composition*

K_{water} = 0.02 m⁻¹, K_{PAR} ALOHA = ?

Red light preferentially absorbed. Blue light preferentially scattered. H₂O minimum abs \approx 460 nm. With depth color shifts bluer. (loses red first, green later) SCUBA diver? Color of blood?

Fig. 3.4. Spectral absorption coefficient of pure water (solid line) and of pure sea water (dotted line) as a function of wavelength. [drawn from data compiled in Hale and Ouerry (1973), Jackson (1975), Smith and Baker (1981), and Zoloratev and Demin (1977)]

Evolutionary selection to absorb $E(\lambda)$ = where photons are

Shouldn't be surprising that chlorophyll *a* absorption max in the blue. Accessory pigments fill the abs gap (carotenoids, phycobiliproteins).

Yet, evolved differences in algal pigment complements

Implications for the so-called "paradox of the plankton"? All species occupying identical, homogenous environments?

Quantifying photosynthesis-light relationships

Photosynthesis-Irradiance curves: "P-I (or P-E) curves"

Many models to describe the linear-saturating phase

$$
P = P_{\text{max}}(1 - e^{-\alpha I/P_{\text{max}}})e^{-\beta I/P_{\text{max}}}
$$

Purely empirical semi-analytical fully mechanistic

Generating P vs. I: photosynthetrons, incubators, *in situ*

P vs. I curves reflect *adaptation* **(evolutionary) to light**

FIGURE 4.2.9: Schematic P-I curves for various major phytoplankton groups. Based on Parsons et al. [1984].

Physiological differences in P-E relationship allow niche partitioning. Paradox?

P-E can also indicate *acclimation* **to changes in light**

FIG. 30. Three types of P vs. *I* curves. (1) and (2) shade type algae showing similar I_k values but with higher photosynthetic efficiency in (2) than (1). Sun-type community (3) showing lower photosynthetic efficiency than (1) or (2) at lower intensity.

Reflecting different investment/structuring of photosynthetic components

Acclimation strategies

Broad taxonomic groups exhibit different photoacclimation strategies.

"acclimation" \rightarrow an organism's individual response to a change in the environment.

"*Photoacclimation*": adjustments to

- Light harvesting capacity
- "Turnover" of photons into useful energy

$$
P = P_{\max}(1 - e^{-\alpha I/P_{\max}})
$$

Miller Ch3

Effect of nutrients on the P-I relationship

As with light, different processes in the ocean control availability of nutrients to phytoplankton:

Michaelis-Menten kinetics for effect of [nuts] on PS, PP,

FIGURE 4.2.6: Rate of nitrate uptake versus nitrate concentration. Taken from Dring [1982]; original reference is MacIsaac and Dugdale [1969]. V_{max} is $V_p(T)$ and $\gamma_p(I) = 1$.

Relates phytoplankton growth rates to the availability of a specific nutrient (or multiple).

Derived from simple enzyme kinetic model.

Not appropriate for all nutrients (any?). Not how it actually "works" in cells (with active transporter sites, multiple limiting steps in uptake, etc).

Still, the most widely used parameterization.

Effect of nutrient concentration on P-I

Fig. 1. Representative curves of cell-specific (A) and Chl a-specific (B) photosynthesis vs. irradiance for Fereplete and Fe-deficient cultures of Phaeodactylum tricornutum.

Here $\mathsf{P}_{\mathsf{max}}$ increases with increasing [Fe]. Any change in initial slope?

Specific effect depends on nutrient studied, species, & experimental treatment.

Are these good fits? Why lower P at high E & [Fe]?

When might increases in a nutrient decrease P_{max} ?

Open-ocean Fe enrichment & primary production

FIG. 3 Vertical profiles, for the 3 days following fertilization, of primary production, PP, (A) chlorophyll a concentrations. Chl a , (B) as a function of time inside and outside the patch. Outside values are depicted for YD 299. Primary production was measured using $H^{14}CO_2^-$ uptake determined at various light levels, in incubations on board the ship. Chlorophyll was determined from filtered and extracted samples as in Fig. 1D. The errors associated with the chlorophyll analyses are generally $<$ 0.02 µg C I^{-1} . The depth to which the water column was enriched was \sim 35 m up to YD 301 (just before subduction). It is in the upper 35 m that the differences are most pronounced. Productivity and chlorophyll both converge by 75 m.

FIG. 4 Comparison of vertical profiles of primary production (A) and chlorophyll a concentrations (B) for stations inside and outside the fertilized patch, and stations upstream (westward) of the Galapagos Islands and downstream (eastward) of the Galapagos Islands.

Does P or N limit overall production in the ocean?

Fig. 3.13 A scatter plot from a series of global sampling sections (GEOSECS) of nitrate (NO₃) vs. phosphate (PO $^{3-}_{4}$). Some phosphate is usually left when nitrate is depleted below levels detected by standard techniques. (After Tyrrell 1999.)

What forms of P, N are available to phytoplankton in the ocean?

What might be misleading about this plot?

Lacustrine systems \rightarrow high P inputs. What algae thrive in lakes & why?

 \leftarrow What is the N:P ratio?

Response to temperature

Dark reactions are primary chemical (enzymatic) and T dependent.

Increasing T leads to greater P_{max} , up to a point.

$$
Q_{10} = \left(\frac{R_2}{R_1}\right)^{10/(T_2 - T_1)}
$$

What is the Q₁₀ of *Gigartina*?

A change in $\mathsf{P}_{\mathsf{max}}$ or $\alpha?$

The "Eppley curve" of temperature-dependent growth

Fig. 3.14 Temperature effect on phytoplankton growth rate for several species: (a) diatoms, and (b) flagellates. The dashed line in (b) is the "Eppley curve", μ (doublings day⁻¹) = 0.85 $e^{0.0637}$, (After Smayda 1976.)

Miller Ch3

3+ methods for "measuring" primary productivity (-tion)

- •• \circ O₂ evolution
- • 14C (radiocarbon) incorporation
- •Ocean color remote sensing
- •Others (18O, C, 15N, 32P, etc.)

No one "best" method – different suitability for examining primary production on different scales, in different oceanographic contexts, etc.

I. Measuring the O_2 "out"

(Winkler titration. "light" & "dark" bottles to estimate gross PS)

How deep should we bother measuring P vs. I?

Euphotic zone: "well-lit" \rightarrow near ocean surface Where net photosynthesis occurs

Assumed to be depth of 1% light level (or 10% light level). Just say all production happens above that, roughly proportional to $E_{PAR}(z)$ except in very near-surface (why?)

Compute 1% (or 10%) from $E_{PAR}(z)$ with Beer's Law:

$$
I_z = I_0 e^{-kz}
$$
 k = extinction coefficient (k_{PAR})

Continuing source of controversy

SHOULD WE CONTINUE TO USE THE 1% LIGHT DEPTH CONVENTION FOR ESTIMATING THE COMPENSATION DEPTH OF PHYTOPLANKTON FOR **ANOTHER 70 YEARS?**

Karl Banse, School of Oceanography, Box 357940, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, 98195-7940 USA; banse@ocean.washington.edu

Figure 1. Seasonal change of phytoplankton compensation depth in Danish waters (56°N) for dark (open circles), average (crosses), and bright (filled circles) days on righthand ordinate and percent of incident PAR on left-hand ordinate. (Figure 7 in Steemann Nielsen and Hansen. 1961, with permission.)

II. Measuring the CO $_2$ "in" Can use the same light-dark bottle approach

" 6 H₂0 + 6 ¹⁴CO₂ \rightarrow 6 (¹⁴CH₂O) + 6 O₂ "

- 1- Collect samples, filter out grazers (you try…)
- 2- Incubate in situ after spiking with 14C labeled bicarbonate
- 3- After time T, filter out phytoplankton & acidify
- 4- Calculate specific radioactivity by scintillation counting

Approximates: Net primary productivity (sum of dissolved and particulate organic matter plus 14C labeled organic carbon that is respired)

Classic paper: Steemann-Nielsen (1952) 50th year conference proceedings, Wales (2002)

http://hahana.soest.hawaii.edu/hot/

Problems with (but not unique to) 14C method:

- "Bottle effect": phytoplankton photosynthesize differently in a bottle (e.g. no turbulence)

- Micro- herbivores! (same size classes as phytoplankton)
- Bacterial uptake might differ b/w light and dark bottles
- Assumption that only new photosynthate (with 14C) is respired during the incubation
- Isotope uptake might differ between species
- Errors in measuring total carbonate
- Trace metal contamination (accidental spikes in Fe, e.g.)
- Cell breakage on filters
- others…

Continuing source of controversy

SHOULD WE CONTINUE TO MEASURE ¹⁴C-UPTAKE **BY PHYTOPLANKTON FOR ANOTHER 50 YEARS?**

L&O Bull. 2002Karl Banse, School of Oceanography, Box 357940, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195-7940 USA; banse@ocean.washington.edu

Remember:

Photosynthesis is a complex process, & so is primary production

All methods have associated problems

No economy is easy to quantify (especially physiological ones)

Make sure the method is appropriate to the question of interest

More green \rightarrow more chl

Convert chl \rightarrow PriProd

III. Satellite methods ("ocean color")

- **CZCS** (1978): Coastal Zone Color Scanner
- **SeaWiFS** (1997-2011): Sea-viewing Wide Field of view Sensor
- • **MODIS** (1999, 2002): Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (instrument aboard Terra and Aqua satellites)

Algorithms for chl biomass

Choose some wavelengths, do a fit. "greener" = more chl

"Ocean Chlorophyll 4" (i.e., OC4) [Chl] = 10^(a0 + a1*R + a2*R² + a3*R³) +a4 R = Log((Rrs443>Rrs490>Rrs510)/Rrs555)

e.g., O'Reilly et al. 1998

Use chl, PAR, daylength, SST to calc primary production \rightarrow

$$
P=0.66P_{opt}^B(\frac{E_0}{E_0+4.1})Z_{eu}C_{opt}D
$$

$$
P_{opt}^B=f(T)
$$

What's this $P_{\text{opt}}^{\text{B}}$?

A 7th order polynomial function of temperature (a fit).

Idea: Use remote sensing SST to help constrain quantum yields.

Theory: Enzymatic rates, e.g. carbon fixation, should scale with temperature.

Problem: Not a clear relationship between SST and Φ_{p} even in surface waters alone.

Produces surprisingly realistic patterns in global PP.

January

May

Behrenfeld, http://marine.rutgers.edu/opp/