Parameter sensitivity and identifiability for a biogeochemical model of hypoxia in the northern Gulf of Mexico☆

Marcus W. Beck*

USEPA National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory, Gulf Ecology Division, 1 Sabine Island Drive, Gulf Breeze, FL 32561

John C. Lehrter

Dauphin Island Sea Lab, University of South Alabama, Dauphin Island, AL 36528

Lisa L. Lowe

Lockheed Martin IS & GS - Civil supporting the USEPA, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

Brandon M. Jarvis

USEPA National Health and Environmental Effects Research Laboratory, Gulf Ecology Division, 1 Sabine Island Drive, Gulf Breeze, FL 32561

Abstract

This study addresses quantitative limitations of coupled hydrodynamic-ecological models by evaluating parameter sensitivity and identifability of a zero-dimensional (0-D) unit of a larger spatio-temporal model of hypoxia on the Louisiana continental shelf of Gulf of Mexico. A systematic framework is used to infer larger trends in dissolved oxygen dynamics over time, having implications for understanding factors that contribute to environmental conditions that are detrimental to aquatic resources. In particular, we focus on issues of parameter identifiability using local sensitivity analyses to provide quantitative descriptions of numerical constraints on model precision. The sensitivity of state variables differed considerably with parameter changes, although most variables were responsive to changes in parameters that influenced planktonic growth rates and less sensitive to physical or chemical parameters. Variation in sensitivity had a direct correspondence with identifiability, such that only small subsets of the complete parameter set were characterized as having unique effects on the model output. As a result, we provide a set of parameter selection heuristics that can be used to identify parameters for model calibration that depend on relative sensitivity and ecological categories within the biogeochemical equations. Although these concerns have been expressed in the literature, they are rarely explicitly addressed or included in evaluations of water quality models.

Keywords: Coastal General Ecosystem Model (CGEM), Gulf of Mexico (GOM), Hypoxia, Identifiability, Sensitivity

1. Introduction

Hypoxia formation in bottom waters of coastal oceans occurs primarily from excess nutrient inputs from land-based sources (Justíc et al., 1987; Diaz and Rosenberg, 1995; Howarth et al., 1996). These events are detrimental to aquatic organisms and have significant negative effects on economic resources derived from coastal ecosystems (Lipton and Hicks, 2003; Diaz and Rosenberg, 2011). An understanding of the biological, physical, and chemical processes that contribute to the growth of hypoxic areas is a critical concern for mitigating and preventing these negative impacts. Numerical ecosystem models are important tools that synthesize knowledge of ecosystem processes that contribute to hypoxia formation and for predicting the effects of proposed management activities or future scenarios (Scavia et al., 2004; Hagy and Murrell, 2007; Pauer et al., 2016). Unlike statistical models with more generic structures, simulation and process-based models include explicit descriptions of relevant processes that are constrained by empirical or observational data relevant to the system of interest (e.g. Omlin et al., 2001b; Eldridge and Roelke, 2010). These models are often coupled with hydrodynamic grids to provide spatially-explicit representations of patterns in three dimensions (Warner et al., 2005; Zhao et al., 2010; Ganju et al., 2016). Combined hydrodynamic and bio-geo-chemical models have been developed specifically to describe hypoxic conditions on the Louisiana continental shelf (LCS) in the northern Gulf of Mexico (GOM) (Fennel et al. 2013; Obenour et al. 2015; Pauer et al. 2016, Lehrter et al. in press). This area drains a significant portion of the continental United States through the Mississippi-Atchafalaya River Basin (MARB) and is the second largest hypoxic area in the world (Rabalais et al., 2002). Understanding processes that contribute to the frequency and duration of hypoxic events remains a critical research goal for the region.

The development and application of a model represents a tradeoff between characteristics expected from the output or provided by the structural components. An idealized model is sufficiently generalizable across systems, provides results that are precise given the inputs, and includes components that are realistic descriptions of actual processes (Levins, 1966). Given that these characteristics cannot be simultaneously achieved, models are developed in partial dependence of reality and theoretical constructs, completely separate from both, or dependent on one or the other (Morrison and Morgan, 1999; Ganju et al., 2016). These challenges are analagous to the well-known bias-variance tradeoff in statistical models that balances the competing objectives of over- and under-fitting to an observed dataset. Process-based models are more commonly imbalanced between reality and theory, such that most are over-parameterized in an attempt to completely describe reality (Denman, 2003; Nossent and Bauwens, 2012; Petrucci and Bonhomme, 2014). Quantitative limitations of over-parameterization are analagous to degrees of freedom in standard statistical models as free parameters cannot be numerically estimated when constrained to an observed dataset (Kirchner, 2006). More importantly, over-parameterization can limit use across systems outside of the data domain and impose uncertainty in model predictions as realistic values for every variable may not be known or inaccurately applied from existing studies (Durand et al., 2002; Refsgaard et al., 2007; Wade et al., 2008).

Model precision can be evaluated relative to the effects of initial conditions or the observed data used

for calibration, changes in parameter values, or variation in the structural components (i.e., observational, parameter, or structural uncertainty) (Beck, 1987). Evaluating effects of parameter changes is by far the most common and simplest approach. Although sensitivity analyses should be integrated with model development, parameters are often evaluated post-hoc as a form of 'damage control' for further calibration. This approach is sometimes called inverse modelling where results from sensitivity analyses are used to guide calibration or fit of the developed model to observations (Soetaert and Petzoldt 2010, or confronting models with data, *sensu* Hilborn and Mangel 1997). Parameter sensitivity analysis combined with inverse modelling necessarily involves questions of parameter 'identifiability'. Redundancies in parameter effects lead to unidentifiable models where calibration is empirically impossible (i.e., standard algorithms will not converge) or parameter values may be non-unique leading to the right answer for the wrong reason (Kirchner, 2006). Unidentifiable parameter sets have effects on model output that can be undone or compensated for by alteration of other parameters. Identifiability issues are not foreign to hypoxia or eutrophication models (Omlin et al., 2001a; Estrada and Diaz, 2010; Mateus and Franz, 2015), although there is a clear need for greater integration of these concepts in practice (Fasham et al., 2006).

This study describes a parameter sensitivity and identifiability analysis of a zero-dimensional (0-D) unit of a larger spatial-temporal model of hypoxia dynamics on the LCS. The objectives were to provide a statistical approach that demonstrates numerical limitations of parameter sets for model calibration and provide a framework for selecting parameters within the identifability constraints. The specific goals were to 1) identify the parameters that have the greatest influence on state variables using local sensitivity analysis, 2) quantify the identifiability of subsets of the total parameter space based on sensitivity, 3) and provide a set of heuristics for choosing parameters based on sensitivity, identifiability, and parameter categories. In addition to dissolved oxygen (O_2), other state variables that were evaluated included ammonium, chlorophyll a (chl-a), irradiance, nitrate, particulate organic matter (POM), dissolved organic matter (DOM), and phosphorus. In general, we provide empirical results to support the assumption that models are generally over-parameterized and only a finite and smaller subset of the complete parameter set can be optimized. Although concerns of identifiability constraints have been shown in the literature, rulesets are not readily available that define how parameters should be selected given tradeoffs betwen precision, sensitivity, and identifiability, especially for biogeochemical models of ecosystem processes.

2. Methods

2.1. Model description

Hypoxic events, defined as <2 mg L^{-1} of O_2 (< 64 mmol m^{-3}), occur seasonally in bottom waters in the northern GOM. The hypoxic area averages 15,540 km^2 annually (1993-2015) with minimum concentrations observed from late spring to early fall. Seasonal variation is strongly related to carbon and nutrient export from the MARB (Lohrenz et al., 2008; Bianchi et al., 2010), whereas hydrologic variation, currents, and wind patterns can affect vertical salinity gradients that contribute to the formation of hypoxia (Wiseman et al.,

₇₂ 1997; Paerl et al., 1998; Obenour et al., 2015). The Coastal General Ecosystem Model (CGEM) was developed

₇₃ to describe hypoxia dynamics on the LCS and includes elements from the Navy Coastal Ocean Model

₇₄ (Martin, 2000) for hydrodynamics and a biogeochemical model with multiple plankton groups, water-column

₇₅ metabolism, and sediment diagenesis (Eldridge and Roelke, 2010). The hydrodynamic component of CGEM

₇₆ provides a spatially-explicit description of hypoxia using an orthogonal grid with an approximate horizontal

₇₇ resolution of 1.9 km^2 and twenty equally-spaced vertical sigma layers on the shelf. The biogeochemical

₇₈ component includes equations for 36 state variables including six phytoplankton groups (with nitrogen and

₇₉ phosophorus quotas for each), two zooplankton groups, nitrate, ammonium, phosphate, dissolved inorganic

₈₀ carbon, oxygen, silica, and multiple variables for dissolved and particulate organic matter from different

₈₁ sources.

₈₂ The core unit of CGEM is FishTank, a 0-D model that implements the biogeochemical equations in

₈₃ Eldridge and Roelke (2010) and does not include any advection, mixing, or sediment diagenesis. Although

₈₄ FishTank was developed for specific application in CGEM, it can easily be applied to other hydrodynamic

₈₅ grids. Results are based on time-dependent differential equations that describe energy flow between phy-

₈₆ toplankton and zooplankton groups given nutrient uptake rates, organic matter inputs and losses, inherent

₈₇ optical properties, and temperature (Penta et al. 2008; Eldridge and Roelke 2010, see appendix in Lehrter

₈₈ et al. in press). A total of 108 equations are estimated at each time step to return values for each of the

₈₉ 36 state variables described by the model. In addition to the initial conditions, 251 parameter values for

₉₀ each of the equations are also supplied at model execution. Values for each of the parameters were based on

₉₁ estimates from the literature, field or laboratory-based measurements, or expert knowledge in absence of the

₉₂ former. As such, a sensitivity analysis of parameter values is warranted given that, for example, literature

₉₃ or field-based estimates may not apply under all scenarios or expert knowledge is not completely certain

₉₄ (Refsgaard et al., 2007).

₉₅ The sensitivity of state variables to perturbations of all relevant parameters for the 108 equations was

₉₆ estimated using a five minute timestep from January 1st to December 31st, 2006. Irrelevant parameters

₉₇ were removed for several reasons; parameters were not relevant for the 0-D model (i.e., hydrodynamic

₉₈ parameters), were considered physical constants, or had no effect given initial conditions. Additionally,

₉₉ FishTank includes six phytoplankton and two zooplankton groups to add complexity in community structure

₁₀₀ and foodweb dynamics. To remove obvious redundancies, the sensitivity analyses were conducted using only

₁₀₁ one phytoplankton and one zooplankton group. The final set that was evaluated included 51 parameters that

₁₀₂ were further grouped into one of six categories based on applicable biogeochemical components of the model:

₁₀₃ optics ($n = 4$ parameters), organic matter (12), phytoplankton (22), temperature (2), and zooplankton (11).

₁₀₄ A full description of the model parameters is available as an appendix in Lehrter et al. in press.

₁₀₅ *2.2. Local sensitivity analysis*

₁₀₆ A local sensitivity analysis was performed by evaluating the change in state variables following pertur-

₁₀₇ bation of each parameter from its original value (Soetaert and Petzoldt, 2010; RDCT (R Development Core

Team), 2017). Parameters were individually perturbed by 50% of the original values and sensitivity S was estimated for each time step i given a change for parameter j as:

$$S_{ij} = \frac{\partial y_i}{\partial \Theta_j} \cdot \frac{w_{\Theta_j}}{w_{y_i}} \tag{1}$$

where the estimate is based on the change in the predicted value for response variable y divided by the change in the parameter Θ_j multiplied by the quotient of scaling factors w for each. The scaling factors, w_{Θ_j} for the parameter Θ_j and w_{y_i} for response variable y_i, were set as the default value of the unperturbed parameter and the predicted value of y_i after perturbation (Soetaert and Petzoldt, 2010). Scaling makes the estimates unitless to compare model sensitivity to parameters and state variables that differ in relative magnitude. Sensitivity values for all j parameters were summarized as a single value across the time series from $i = 1$ to n as $L1$:

$$L1 = \sum |S_{ij}|/n \tag{2}$$

All parameters for each of the six equation categories (optics, organic matter, phytoplankton, temperature, and zooplankton) that had non-zero $L1$ were retained for identifiability analysis.

2.3. Identifiability and selecting parameter subsets

The collinearity index γ provides a measure of potential redundancies in the response of a state variable to changes in parameter values. The index measures the linear dependence between sensitivity functions (i.e., S_i for j parameters) described above for parameter subsets and was estimated from the minimum eigenvector of the cross-product of a selected sensitivity matrix (Brun et al., 2001; Omlin et al., 2001a):

$$\gamma = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\min \left(\text{EV}[\hat{S}^\top \hat{S}] \right)}} \tag{3}$$

where γ ranges from one to infinity for perfectly identifiable (orthogonal) or unidentifiable (perfectly collinear) parameter sets. The sensitivity functions were supplied as a matrix $\hat{S}$ with rows i and columns j (eq. (1)) that described deviations of predicted O_2 following perturbations of each parameter. Thus, γ can be estimated from results for any subset of parameter combinations. Sensitivity matrices were first normalized by dividing by the square root of the summed residuals (Omlin et al., 2001a; Soetaert and Petzoldt, 2010). Estimates of γ greater than 10-15 suggest parameter sets are poorly identifiable (Brun et al., 2001; Omlin et al., 2001a), meaning parameter values that maximize precision on a calibration dataset are inestimable by conventional optimization algorithms. An intuitive interpretation of γ is provided by Brun et al. (2001), such that a change in a state variable caused by a change in one parameter can be offset by the fraction $1 - 1/\gamma$ by the remaining parameters. That is, $\gamma = 10$ suggests the relative change in O_2 for an arbitrary parameter in the selected set can be compensated for by 90% with changes in the other parameters.

Parameter selection for model calibration must consider the competing objectives of increased precision with parameter inclusion and reduced identifability as it relates to optimization. An additional challenge is a large number of combinations of parameter sets, which complicates selection given sensitivity differences and desired ecological categories of each parameter (e.g., parameters for a group of related structural equations could be of interest). Fig. 1 provides a simple graphic of the unique number of combinations that are possible for different subsets of 'complete' parameter sets of different sizes (i.e., n choose k combinations, $n!/(k!(n-k)!)$). The number of unique combinations increases with the total parameters in the set and is also maximized for moderate selections (e.g., selecting half the total). For example, over 10^{14} combinations are possible by selecting 25 parameters from a set of 50.

A set of heuristics was developed that addresses the tradeoff in model complexity and identifiability given the challenges described above (see also Wagener et al., 2001). These rulesets were developed with the assumption that parameters will be selected with preference for those with high sensitivity and identifability based on $\gamma < 15$ as an acceptable threshold for subsets (e.g., 93% accountability between parameters). Selection heurestics also recognized that parameter categories (i.e., optics, organic matter, phytoplankton, temperature, zooplankton) may have unequal preferences by model users given questions of interest. In all selection scenarios, parameters were selected by decreasing sensitivity starting with the most sensitive until identifiability did not exceed $\gamma = 15$ where selections were 1) blocked within parameter category, 2) independent of parameter category, 3) or considering all categories equally. The selection rules produced seven subsets of parameters that could further be used to optimize model calibration.

2.4. Model calibration and extrapolation

Selected parameter subsets from the seven heuristics were used to calibrate the 0-D model. This analysis demonstrated that different parameter sets can produce model output with differing precision and calibration effort given 1) differences in variable sensitivity to parameters in each subset, 2) differences in the parameters selected from different categories (heuristic difference), and 3) differences in identifiability values. Generally, this analysis was a proof of concept that the selection heuristics can lead to an 'optimal' model by maximizing the balance between sensitivity and identifiability.

A time series of O_2 from Weeks Bay, Alabama was used for model calibration. Daily observations from January 1st, 2006 to January 1st, 2007 at the Weeks Bay station of the Weeks Bay National Estuarine Reserve were used (Wenner et al., 2004). We chose this location because of the availability of data for model calibration compared to bottom waters in the northern GOM and the system exhibits hypoxia from eutrophication. This application also provided a practical example of how the FishTank model could be calibrated using data from alternative locations. Initial conditions for model input were modified to match conditions in Weeks Bay using observed water quality and nutrient data (all data from http://cdmo.baruch.sc.edu/). The O_2 time series was filtered to reduce physical effects of the tidal advection component on the observed data (*sensu* Beck et al. 2015). As such, the filtered data were comparable to a time series with no physical advection to match conditions of the 0-D FishTank model with no hydrodynamic component.

6

¹⁷¹ Each parameter subset was calibrated to most closely match the model output to the observed time
¹⁷² series. Parameter values were searched using the optim function in R that implemented the limited memory
¹⁷³ modification of the BFGS quasi-Newton method (Byrd et al., 1995; Nocedal and Wright, 2006; RDCT
¹⁷⁴ (R Development Core Team), 2017). This opimization scheme searches for values within the user-defined
¹⁷⁵ lower and upper bounds of each parameter. We set the algorithm to search within +/- 50% of the default
¹⁷⁶ parameter values. While we recognize that 'actual' parameter values could possibly be outside of this range,
¹⁷⁷ constraining the values to those tested herein was expected to produce output that was more interpretable
¹⁷⁸ within the context of the sensitivity functions defined above. Moreover, precise limits on each parameter
¹⁷⁹ were less of a concern for the current analysis as our primary goal was to demonstrate differences in precision
¹⁸⁰ as a function of sensitivity and identifiability. The optimal values for each parameter were identified based
¹⁸¹ on convergence of the model results as a minimization of the root-mean squared error between the observed
¹⁸² and modelled data.

¹⁸³ As a final analysis, effects of parameter changes on the larger 3-dimensional model were evaluated to
¹⁸⁴ demonstrate that results from the 0-D FishTank model can be extrapolated. For simplicity, only the most
¹⁸⁵ sensitive parameter in each category was selected. The CGEM model was run for one year using the default
¹⁸⁶ parameter conditions and by increasing each of the selected parameters by 50%. This produced six spatially-
¹⁸⁷ referenced time series from which the changes in the daily hypoxic area (number of cells < 64 mmol O_2)
¹⁸⁸ were estimated in the nothern GOM.

3. Results

3.1. Local sensitivity analysis

¹⁹¹ Local sensitivity analyses showed that O_2 was sensitive to perturbations in 38 of the 51 (75% of total)
¹⁹² parameters that were evaluated in FishTank (Fig. 2, Table 1). Within each parameter category, O_2 was
¹⁹³ sensitive to three parameters for optics (75% of all optic parameters), eight for organic matter (67%), 16
¹⁹⁴ for phytoplankton (73%), one for temperature (50%), and 10 for zooplankton (91%). Although O_2 had the
¹⁹⁵ greatest sensitivity to parameters in the zooplankton category (as percentage of total), the relative effects
¹⁹⁶ varied. Among all parameters, average sensitivity was $L1 = 9.2 \times 10^{-3}$ with values ranging from $L1 =$
¹⁹⁷ 8.34×10^{-8} for $QminP$ (phytoplankton) to 0.05 for $umax$ (phytoplankton). Within categories (excluding
¹⁹⁸ temperature with one sensitive parameter), sensitivity ranged from 4.39×10^{-5} ($astarOMA$) to 7.51×10^{-4}
¹⁹⁹ ($astar490$) for optics, 4.17×10^{-4} ($KNH4$) to 6.15×10^{-3} ($KG1$) for organic matter, 8.34×10^{-8} ($QminP$)
²⁰⁰ to 0.05 ($umax$) for phytoplankton, and 3.69×10^{-5} (ZQp) to 0.05 (ZKa) for zooplankton (Table 1). Average
²⁰¹ sensitivity values in each category were $L1 = 2.81 \times 10^{-4}$ for optics, 2.17×10^{-3} for organic matter, 0.02 for
²⁰² temperature, 0.01 for phytoplankton, and 0.01 for zooplankton.

²⁰³ Local sensitivity analyses for the additional state variables (ammonium, chl-a, irradiance, nitrate, POM,
²⁰⁴ DOM, and phosphorus) had similar results as O_2 with some exceptions (Fig. 2 and Tables S1 to S7).
²⁰⁵ All variables were sensitive to the same parameters as O_2 (38 of 51 evaluated), although average sensitivity

7

₂₀₆ differed between variables. Average $L1$ ranged from 0.02 for irradiance (Table S3) to 0.71 for DOM (Table S6).

₂₀₇ All average sensitivity values for the state variables were higher than the average for O_2 ($L1 = 9.2 \times 10^{-3}$).

₂₀₈ For each variable, $L1$ ranged from 2.24×10^{-6} ($QminP$) to 8.49 (mA) for ammonium (Table S1), 1.38×10^{-6}

₂₀₉ ($QminP$) to 13.94 (mA) for chl-a (Table S2), 1.92×10^{-7} ($QminP$) to 0.13 (ZKa) for irradiance (Table S3),

₂₁₀ 6.67×10^{-7} ($QminP$) to 8.49 ($umax$) for nitrate (Table S4), 6.41×10^{-5} ($KNH4$) to 7.22 (mA) for POM

₂₁₁ (Table S5), 7.41×10^{-5} ($KNH4$) to 14.25 (mA) for DOM (Table S6), and 8.21×10^{-7} ($QminP$) to 1.47 (ZKa)

₂₁₂ for phosphate (Table S7). For the parameter categories, ammonium was most sensitive to phytoplankton

₂₁₃ parameters (average $L1 = 0.8$ across all parameters in the category), chl-a to phytoplankton ($L1 = 1.14$),

₂₁₄ irradiance to zooplankton ($L1 = 0.03$), nitrate to zooplankton ($L1 = 1.06$), POM to temperature ($L1 = 0.86$),

₂₁₅ DOM to temperature ($L1 = 1.48$), and phosphate to zooplankton ($L1 = 0.31$). Finally, average sensitivity

₂₁₆ between parameter categories independent of the state variables ranged from 8.38×10^{-3} for optics (average

₂₁₇ $L1$ across all variables) to 0.62 for phytoplankton.

3.2. Identifiability of parameter subsets and selection rules

₂₁₉ The identifiability analyses suggested that many parameter subsets exceeded the thresholds of $\gamma = 10, 15$.

₂₂₀ Parameter identifiability for O_2 decreased (increasing γ) at different rates with increasing size of parameter

₂₂₁ subsets depending on the parameter category or the number of top parameters that were selected (Fig. 3).

₂₂₂ By category, identifiability was lowest for all combinations of parameter subsets in the phytoplankton (60%

₂₂₃ of subsets less than $\gamma = 15$, 43% less than $\gamma = 10$) and zooplankton categories (53.1% less than $\gamma = 15$, 40%

₂₂₄ less than $\gamma = 10$), whereas all combinations were identifiable for optics (100% less than $\gamma = 15, 10$) and a

₂₂₅ majority identifiable for organic matter (91.9% less than $\gamma = 15$, 76.5% less than $\gamma = 10$). Identifiability for

₂₂₆ parameters in the temperature category was not evaluated because O_2 was sensitive to only one parameter

₂₂₇ (i.e., $\gamma = 1$). Parameter combinations for choosing from the top, top two, top three, and top four parameters

₂₂₈ in each category together had decreasing identifability with the increasing size of the selection pool (e.g., top

₂₂₉ one versus top four parameters, Fig. 3). The percentage of parameter subsets that were below the acceptable

₂₃₀ thresholds for identifability was 100% less than $\gamma = 15, 10$ for the top parameter in each category, 90.6% and

₂₃₁ 80.7% for the top two, 80.7% and 70.9% for the top three, and 55.8% and 45.7% for the top four. Results for

₂₃₂ the remaining state variables had similar patterns in identifiability with increasing size of parameter subsets

₂₃₃ and selection categories, although differences in identifiabiltiy between state variables was observed (Fig. 4).

₂₃₄ Most notably, nitrate was consistently the least identifiable variable (highest overall γ), whereas O_2 was

₂₃₅ most identifiable.

₂₃₆ An alternative view of the results in Fig. 3 can be used to demonstrate the effects of parameter selection

₂₃₇ criteria and number of parameters in the selection pool on identifiability. Fig. 5 shows the percentage of

₂₃₈ identifiable parameter sets for O_2 using the same selection criteria in Fig. 3, i.e., selection of parameters only

₂₃₉ within parameter categories and selection of the top sensitive parameters regardless of category. Fig. 5 is

₂₄₀ similar to Fig. 3, with the added effect of a chosen γ threshold on identifability. Previous studies have provided

₂₄₁ only general rules for γ thresholds (Brun et al., 2001; Omlin et al., 2001a), such that exact values for which

parameter sets are inestimable likely vary between models and optimization methods. As such, multiple values are shown in Fig. 5 given that actual thresholds could vary in practice. In general, identifiability decreased with the addition of parameters, although the rate of decrease depended on the selected threshold for γ. More conservative values for γ (e.g., $\gamma = 5$) were more sensitive to the number of parameters in a subset, that is, identifiability decreased more quickly with the addition of parameters at lower γ thresholds as compared to higher γ. Notable differences in identifiability were also observed by parameter selection criteria (within categories or top parameters only), which further supports results in Figs. 3 and 4.

An evaluation of the effects of individual parameters on γ suggested that some parameters had dispro-portionate effects on identifiability. Based on $\gamma = 15$, Fig. 3 suggests that most parameter sets for organic matter were identifiable, regardless of how many parameters were selected (i.e., two through eight). However, some subsets were not identifiable such that identification of one or more redundant parameters that are inflating γ values could provide useful information. Fig. 6 shows an alternative view of identifiability of O_2 with exclusion and inclusion of individual parameters in different sets for the organic matter category. As before, collinearity increases with more parameters in a subset, although the increase varies depending on which parameter was included or excluded from the set. For example, inclusion of *KNO3* in a parameter set almost always inflated γ. All parameter subsets that did not include *KNO3* were well below $\gamma = 15$, suggesting that exclusion of this parameter improves identifiability. Interestingly, the inclusion of some pa-rameters caused a reduction in γ, which contradicts the general rule that more parameters caused reduced identifiablity. For example, parameter sets that included *KGcdom* generally had lower γ values relative to those that excluded the parameter.

Results for each of the three selection heuristics (blocked by parameter category, independent of category, all categories equally) applied to each state variable differed in the number of selected parameters and dis-tribution of parameters within each category (Tables 2 to 4). In general, a corresponendence was observed between the number of parameters that were selected given the threlhod of $\gamma = 15$ and relative identifiability between the state variables. As noted above, nitrate was the least identifiable variable (Fig. 4), whereas other variables (e.g., O_2, irradiance) were more identifiable. The constraints on identifiability between variables were demonstrated with the selection heuristics. For example, heuristics for nitrate typically selected only one or two parameters that met the criteria as compared to more identifiable variables that included several parameters. Overall, the first selection heuristic demonstrated that the number of parameters chosen by pa-rameter category differed independently of the state variables (Table 2). The number of selected parameters averaged across state variables in decreasing order was 4.25 parameters from the phytoplankton category, 3.5 from organic matter, 2.75 from optics, and 2.38 from zooplankton. The second and third selection heuristics (Tables 3 and 4) were similar, although more parameters were generally selected for the third heuristic given equal importance between categories.

3.3. Model calibration and extrapolation

Calibration of parameter values for each of the seven selection heuristics produced model output that varied in precision and computational effort to identify optimal values. The seven evaluated subsets were those for O_2 in each of the four categories of parameters in Table 2, including the single parameter for temperature. The subsets in Tables 3 and 4 for the parameters selected independent of category and equally within each category were also evaluated. NULL

Fig. 7

4. Discussion

4.1. Implications of sensitivity and identifiability analyses

Common goals in the application of biogeochemical models of ecosystem processes are to 1) accurately describe the system by matching predictions with observed data (Reckhow et al., 1990), and 2) provide a means of forecasting ecosystem condition with hypothesized management or environmental scenarios (Clark et al., 2001). Although these objectives are the focus of most applications, the structural components of process-based models should secondarily provide inference into which ecosystem processes and functions are driving observed changes. This latter objective represents a more generic scientific purpose of biogeochemical models that extends beyond the applied benefits of describing and predicting change in a particular system. Modelers often hope to identify universal principles that govern dynamics across systems and the constraint of model parameters to observations provides a means of supporting or refuting hypotheses (Kirchner, 2006). Extension of these principles to test the effects of structural changes and observation uncertainty on model predictions provides further information to support validation of model components. This study provided a simple approach to use the effects of parameter perturbations on model state variables to characterize identifiable parameter subsets that vary by parameter selection criteria. By doing so, we demonstrated that small parameter subsets relative to all sensitive parameters were within the identifiability thresholds described in the literature. The identifiable parameter subsets varied considerably between state variables and the method for parameter selection. In general, these results provide justification for the use of explicit parameter selection heuristics that practitioners should adopt to facilitate model calibration.

State variables were most sensitive to parameters in the phytoplankton and zooplankton categories, particularly the maximum growth rates (*umax* for phytoplankton, *Zumax* for zooplankton), mortality coefficient for phytoplankton (*mA*), and the zooplankton half saturation coefficent for grazing (*ZKa*). An increase in the growth rate of primary producers has the potential to increase oxygen concentration through photosynthetic processes, although increased production of organic matter is balanced with respiration and bacterial decomposition that reduce O_2 in the water column. Similarly, increases in zooplankton abundance with increased growth rates causes a reduction in phytoplankton biomass through grazing, which is expected to further deplete pools of organic matter. Most variables were also sensitive to variation in the half-saturation grazing coefficient which moderates the concentration of nutrients that support half the maximum grazing

rate. Although the tradeoff between abundance, grazing, and decomposition is complex, the sensitivity of model state variables to parameters that directly control the abundance of primary producers is in agreement with empirical observations of factors that influence hypoxia dynamics on the LCS (Fahnenstiel et al., 1995; Roelke, 2000; Eldridge and Roelke, 2010). The sensitivity of the model output to variation in other parameters that relate to physical and chemical properties of the system was of secondary importance to biological relationships. That is, state variables were sensitive to changes in light and temperature parameters, although to a lesser extent than phytoplankton and zooplankton parameters. As such, the differing sensitivities of state variables to parameters in each of the categories was not unexpected given general ecological relationships that are well understood and described by the model.

A general conclusion from the identifiability analyses is that only limited subsets of parameters were identifiable within the constraints of local sensitivity analyses. These results support previous studies that have suggested similarly small subsets of parameters can be identified using traditional calibration schemes (e.g., Wheater et al., 1986; Ye et al., 1997; Omlin et al., 2001a). In addition to CGEM, these conclusions have relevance for many biogeochemical models that include numerous parameters and structural equations to characterize processes in the model domain. A general conclusion is that perhaps a trend towards less complex models could be beneficial given that only a small subset of parameters is identifiable and that ecosystem processes may in fact be sufficiently characterized with few parameters (Ye et al., 1997). Conversely, others have argued that model complexity is not in itself a disadvantage when parsimony is not the sole arbitrator of model structure (Reichert and Omlin, 1997). Over-parameterization can be useful if processes have importance that were not evaluated during model identification. Single objective functions that maximize model precision with identifiable parameters may also provide an incomplete characterization of model worth, which has prompted the development of probability-based models of hypoxia that explicitly include uncertainty in model components (e.g. Obenour et al., 2015). Our results demonstrated that approximately 75% of the evaluated parameters had an effect on the eight state variables, whereas CGEM includes a total of 36 variables and multiple plankton groups, not all of which have immediate concern for understanding hypoxia. The redundancies identified with the sensitivity analyses are only problematic if the primary interest is, for example, O_2 dynamics. Moreover, the proposed selection heuristics provide flexibility for choosing different parameters with the assumption that those chosen depend on the research or management question.

Results from the identifiability analyses provided additional insight into the interactions of parameters in large biogeochemical models. First, identifiability of parameter subsets was not related to the sensitivity of individual variables. As noted above, an identifiable parameter is one that has a unique effect on model predictions that cannot be compensated for or undone by changing other parameters. The magnitude of the effect of a parameter has no bearing on identifiability, which further complicates the selection of parameters for calibration. Although identifiability is the primary limiting factor in choosing a set, the relative sensitivities are more important for the decision to include or exclude individual parameters. Our

11

analysis addressed this challenge by presenting multiple selection criteria for identifiable parameter sets that prioritized the most sensitive parameters during the selection process. Similarly, identifability was not always related to the number of parameters in a set. Although the overwhelming trend was decreasing identifiability with more parameters, the unique effects of including an individual parameter with an existing set often reduced the γ estimate. For example, Fig. 6 shows that including *KGcdom*, *KO2*, or *nitmax* in parameter sets more often reduced γ relative to sets that excluded the parameters. These examples demonstrate the complex interactions of parameter changes on variable response, highlighting the need to consider the combined and individual effects of parameters on identifiability. The selection criteria proposed in our above analyses can facilitate parameter selection and also provide diagnostic tools to identify parameters with disproportionate effects on γ.

4.2. Recommendations and conclusions

An evaluation of sensitivity and identifiability of relevant parameter sets is a preliminary and simplistic approach to improving model predictions. In general, uncertainty analyses that lead to improved models are ultimately expected to increase our understanding of properties defining ecological relationships. The extension of simple parameter sensitivity analyses to the generalization of ecosystem properties requires additional analysis and potential model refinement, at the core of which is the balance between generality and precision. The utility of a specific model depends on the question and objective for application to a specific system. For the above analysis, the FishTank model, as part of the larger CGEM application, was evaluated in the context of hypoxia effects on ecosystem condition and function. At the core of the simple model is a set of biogeochemical equations that characterize the system in relation to planktonic groups, nutrient requirements, and water-column metabolism. Our results have shown that relatively small subsets of parameters are identifiable given the complexity of the model, and as a result, we have provided a general approach to select parameter subsets depending on the ecological context (i.e., selection by parameter category, selection for specific state variables). Thus, the results described above have relevance for further model refinement with the specific goal of better understanding ecological dynamics that moderate hypoxia on the northern GOM. However, the general principles of sensitivity and parameter identifiability have broad applicability beyond this context and we argue that such methods should be more universally applied as an initial approach to quantify numerical constraints of biogeochemical models.

Specific approaches can be used to improve and build on the results presented herein, in addition to the more general considerations above. An evaluation of model precision following calibration with relevant parameter subsets could provide additional information that supports results from the sensitivity analyses. For simplicity, our analysis did not calibrate model parameters and an explicit assumption was that parameter subsets with γ below 10 or 15 were identifiable. To our knowledge, this threshold has not been rigorously evaluated and it is likely to vary between parameter subsets and the chosen calibration method. Variation in parameter estimates given the calibration method and different identifiability thresholds could affect the interpration of model output. Further, how results for the 0-D model extrapolate to the larger

three-dimensional model should be evaluated. Although the above analyses were facilitated using the 0-D model (i.e, quick execution times, ease of changing model parameters), lack of physical transport or spatial components potentially limits extrapolation of the results. Variation in parameter estimates at lower dimensions could be magnified as errors propagate to larger scales or site-specific observations for model calibration are not appropriate across a hydrodynamic grid (Harvey, 2000; Lehrter and Cebrian, 2010). The effects of structural or observational uncertainty should also be evaluated in the context of the larger model. Our simple approach to examine changes in the initial conditions and switches used in the model showed that sensitivity estimates of individual parameters differed relative to the original model configuration, having further implications for characterizing identifiability.

Beck, M. B., 1987. Water quality modeling: A review of the analysis of uncertainty. Water Resources Research 23 (8), 1393–1442.

Beck, M. W., Hagy III, J. D., Murrell, M. C., 2015. Improving estimates of ecosystem metabolism by reducing effects of tidal advection on dissolved oxygen time series. Limnology and Oceanography: Methods 13 (12), 731–745.

Bianchi, T. S., DiMarco, S. F., Jr, J. H. C., Hetland, R. D., Chapman, P., Day, J. W., Allison, M. A., 2010. The science of hypoxia in the Northern Gulf of Mexico: a review. Science of the Total Environment 408 (7), 1471–1484.

Brun, R., Reichert, P., Künsch, H. R., 2001. Practical identifiability analysis of large environmental simulation models. Water Resources Research 37 (4), 1015–1030.

Byrd, R. H., Lu, P., Nocedal, J., Zhu, C., 1995. A limited memory algorithm for bound constrained optimization. SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing 16 (5), 1190–1208.

Clark, J. S., Carpenter, S. R., Barber, M., Collins, S., Dobson, A., Foley, J. A., Lodge, D. M., Pascual, M., Pielke, R., Pizer, W., Pringle, C., Reid, W. V., Rose, K. A., Sala, O., Schlesinger, W. H., Wall, D. H., Wear, D., 2001. Ecological forecasts: an emerging imperative. Science 293 (5530), 657–660.

Denman, K. L., 2003. Modelling planktonic ecosystems: parameterizing complexity. Progress in Oceanography 57 (3-4), 429–452.

Diaz, R. J., Rosenberg, R., 1995. Marine benthic hypoxia: A review of its ecological effects and the behavioural responses of benthic macrofauna. Oceanography and Marine Biology 33, 245–303.

Diaz, R. J., Rosenberg, R., 2011. Introduction to environmental and economic consequences of hypoxia. International Journal of Water Resources Development 27 (1), 71–82.

Durand, P., Gascuel-Odoux, C., Cordier, M. O., 2002. Parameterisation of hydrological models: a review and lessons learned from studies of an agricultural catchment (Naisin, France. Agronomie 22 (2), 217–228.

Eldridge, P. M., Roelke, D. L., 2010. Origins and scales of hypoxia on the Louisiana shelf: importance of seasonal plankton dynamics and river nutrients and discharge. Ecological Modelling 221 (7), 1028–1042.

Estrada, V., Diaz, M., 2010. Global sensitivity analysis in the development of first principle-based eutrophication models. Environmental Modelling and Software 25, 1539–1551.

Fahnenstiel, G. L., McCormick, M. J., Lang, G. A., Redalje, D. G., Lohrenz, S. E., Markowitz, M., Wagoner, B., Carrick, H. J., 1995. Taxon-specific growth and loss rates for dominant phytoplankton populations from the northern Gulf of Mexico. Marine Ecology Progress Series 117 (1-3), 229–239.

Fasham, M. J. R., Flynn, K. J., Pondaven, P., Anderson, T. R., Boyd, P. W., 2006. Development of a robust marine ecosystem model to predict the role of iron in biogeochemical cycles: A comparison of results for iron-replete and iron-limited areas, and the SOIREE iron-enrichment experiment. Deep-Sea Research I 53, 333–366.

Fennel, K., Hu, J., Laurent, A., Marta-Almeida, M., Hetland, R., 2013. Sensitivity of hypoxia predictions for the northern Gulf of Mexico to sediment oxygen consumption and model nesting. Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans 118 (2), 990–1002.

Ganju, N. K., Brush, M. J., Rashleigh, B., Aretxabaleta, A. L., del Barrio, P., Grear, J. S., Harris, L. A., Lake, S. J., McCardell, G., O'Donnell, J., Ralston, D. K., Signell, R. P., Testa, J. M., Vaudrey, J. M. P., 2016. Progress and challenges in coupled hydrodynamic-ecological estuarine modeling. Estuaries and Coasts 39 (2), 311–332.

Hagy, J. D., Murrell, M. C., 2007. Susceptibility of a northern Gulf of Mexico estuary to hypoxia: An analysis using box models. Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science 74, 239–253.

Harvey, L. D. D., 2000. Upscaling in global change research. Climatic Change 44 (3), 225–263.

Hilborn, R., Mangel, M., 1997. The Ecological Detective: Confronting Models with Data. Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Howarth, R. W., Billen, G., Swaney, D., Townsend, A., Jaworski, N., Lajtha, K., Downing, J. A., Elmgren, R., Caraco, N., Jordan, T., Berendse, F., Freney, J., Kudeyarov, V., Murdoch, P., Zhao-Liang, Z., 1996. Regional nitrogen budgets and riverine N & P fluxes for the drainages to the North Atlantic Ocean: natural and human influences. Biogeochemistry 35 (1), 75–139.

Justić, D., Legović, T., Rottini-Sandrini, L., 1987. Trends in oxygen content 1911–1984 and occurrence of benthic mortality in the northern Adriatic Sea. Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science 25 (4), 435–445.

Kirchner, J. W., 2006. Getting the right answers for the right reasons: Linking measurements, analyses, and models to advance the science of hydrology. Water Resources Research 42 (3), W03S04.

Lehrter, J. C., Cebrian, J., 2010. Uncertainty propagation in an ecosystem nutrient budget. Ecological Applications 20 (2), 508–524.

Lehrter, J. C., Ko, D. S., Lowe, L., Penta, B., In press. Predicted effects of climate change on the severity of northern Gulf of Mexico hypoxia. In: Justic et al. (Ed.), Modeling Coastal Hypoxia: Numerical Simulations of Patterns, Controls, and Effect of Dissolved Oxygen Dynamics. Springer, New York.

Levins, R., 1966. The strategy of model building in population biology. American Scientist 54 (4), 421–431.

Lipton, D., Hicks, R., 2003. The cost of stress: low dissolved oxygen and eocncmic benefits of recreational striped bass (*Morone saxatilis* fishing in the Patuxent River. Estuaries 26 (2A), 310–315.

Lohrenz, S. E., Redalje, D. G., Cai, W. J., Acker, J., Dagg, M., 2008. A retrospective analysis of nutrients and phytoplankton productivity in the Mississippi River plume. Continental Shelf Research 28 (12), 1466–1475.

Martin, P. J., 2000. Description of the navy coastal ocean model version 1.0. Tech. Rep. NRL/FR/7322-00-9962, Naval Research Lab, Stennis Space Center, Mississippi.

Mateus, M. D., Franz, G., 2015. Sensitivity analysis in a complex marine ecological model. Water 7, 2060–2081.

Morrison, M., Morgan, M. S., 1999. Models as mediating agents. In: Morgan, M. S., Morrison, M. (Eds.), Models as Mediators. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, p. 401.

Nocedal, J., Wright, S. J., 2006. Numerical Optimization, 2nd Edition. Springer-Verlag, New York, New York.

Nossent, J., Bauwens, W., 2012. Multi-variable sensitivity and identifiability analysis for a complex environmental model in view of integrated water quantity and water quality modeling. Water Science & Technology 65 (3), 539–549.

Obenour, D. R., Michalak, A. M., Scavia, D., 2015. Assessing biophysical controls on Gulf of Mexico hypoxia through probabilistic modeling. Ecological Applications 25 (2), 492–505.

Omlin, M., Brun, R., Reichert, P., 2001a. Biogeochemical model of Lake Zürich: sensitivity, identifiability and uncertainty analysis. Ecological Modelling 141 (1-3), 105–123.

Omlin, M., Reichert, P., Forster, R., 2001b. Biogeochemical model of Lake Zürich: model equations and results. Ecological Modelling 141 (1-3), 77–103.

Paerl, H. W., Pinckney, J. L., Fear, J. M., Peierls, B. L., 1998. Ecosystem responses to internal and watershed organic matter loading: consequences for hypoxia in the eutrophying Neuse River Estuary, North Carolina, USA. Marine Ecology Progress Series 166, 17–25.

Pauer, J. J., Feist, T. J., Anstead, A. M., DePetro, P. A., Melendez, W., Lehrter, J. C., Murrell, M. C., Zhang, X., Ko, D. S., 2016. A modeling study examining the impact of nutrient boundaries on primary production on the Louisiana continental shelf. Ecological Modelling 328, 136–147.

Penta, B., Lee, Z., Kudela, R. M., Palacios, S. L., Gray, D. J., Jolliff, J. K., Shulman, I. G., 2008. An underwater light attenuation scheme for marine ecosystem models. Optical Express 16 (21), 16581–16591.

Petrucci, G., Bonhomme, C., 2014. The dilemma of spatial representation for urban hydrology semi-distributed modelling: trade-offs among complexity, calibration and geographical data. Journal of Hydrology 517, 997–1007.

Rabalais, N. N., Turner, R. E., Scavia, D., 2002. Beyond science into policy: Gulf of Mexico hypoxia and the Mississippi river. BioScience 52 (2), 129–142.

RDCT (R Development Core Team), 2017. R: A language and environment for statistical computing, v3.3.2. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. http://www.R-project.org.

Reckhow, K. H., Clements, J. T., Dodd, R. C., 1990. Statistical evaluation of mechanistic water-quality models. Journal of Environmental Engineering 116 (2), 250–268.

Refsgaard, J. C., van der Sluijs, J. P., Højberg, A. L., Vanrolleghem, P. A., 2007. Uncertainty in the environmental modelling process - a framework and guidance. Environmental Modelling & Software 22 (11), 1543–1556.

Reichert, P., Omlin, M., 1997. On the usefulness of over parameterized ecological models. Ecological Modelling 95 (2), 289–299.

Roelke, D. L., 2000. Copepod food-quality threshold as a mechanism influencing phytoplankton succession and accumulation of biomass, and secondary productivity: a modeling study with management implications. Ecological Modelling 134, 245–274.

Scavia, D., Justic, D., Bierman, V. J., 2004. Reducing hypoxia in the Gulf of Mexico: Advice from three models. Estuaries 27 (3), 419–425.

Soetaert, K., Petzoldt, T., 2010. Inverse modelling, sensitivity, and Monte Carlo analysis in R using package FME. Journal of Statistical Software 33 (3), 1–28.

Wade, A. J., Jackson, B. M., Butterfield, D., 2008. Over-parameterised, uncertain 'mathematical marionettes' - how can we best use catchment water quality models? An example of an 80-year catchment-scale nutrient balance. Science of the Total Environment 400 (1-3), 52–74.

Wagener, T., Boyle, D. P., Lees, M. J., Wheater, H. S., Gupta, H. V., Sorooshian, S., 2001. A framework for development and application of hydrological models. Hydrology and Earth System Sciences 5 (1), 13–26.

Warner, J. C., Geyer, W. R., Lerczak, J. A., 2005. Numerical modeling of an estuary: a comprehensive skill assessment. Journal of Geophysical Research: Oceans 110 (C5), 13.

Wenner, E., Sanger, D., Arendt, M., Holland, A. F., Chen, Y., 2004. Variability in dissolved oxygen and other water-quality variables within the National Estuarine Research Reserve System. Journal of Coastal Research 45 (SI), 17–38.

Wheater, H. S., Bishop, K. H., Beck, M. B., 1986. The identification of conceptual hydrological models for surface water acidification. Hydrological Processes 1 (1), 89–109.

[514] Wiseman, W. J., Rabalais, N. N., Turner, R. E., Dinnel, S. P., MacNaughton, A., 1997. Seasonal and
[515]   interannual variability within the Louisiana coastal current: stratification and hypoxia. Journal of Marine
[516]   Systems 12 (1-4), 237–248.

[517] Ye, W., Bates, B. C., Viney, N. R., Sivapalan, M., Jakeman, A. J., 1997. Performance of conceptual rainfall-
[518]   runoff models in low yielding ephemeral catchments. Water Resources Research 33 (1), 153–166.

[519] Zhao, L., Chen, C., Vallino, J., Hopkinson, C., Beardsley, R. C., Lin, H., Lerczak, J., 2010. Wetland-
[520]   estuarine-shelf interactions on the Plum Island Sound and Merrimack River in the Massachusetts coast.
[521]   Journal of Geophysical Research 115 (C10), 13.

Table 1: Sensitivity of O$_2$ to perturbations of individual parameters. Sensitivities are based on a 50% increase from the initial parameter value, where $L1$ summarizes differences in model output from the default (see eq. (2)). Parameters that did not affect O$_2$ are not shown. Parameters are grouped by categories as optics, temperature, phytoplankton, zooplankton, and organic matter.

Description	Parameter	L1
Optics		
Chla specific absorption at 490 nm	$astar490$	7.51×10^{-4}
OMZ specific absorption at 490 nm	$astarOMZ$	4.92×10^{-5}
OMA specific absorption at 490 nm	$astarOMA$	4.39×10^{-5}
Temperature		
Optimum temperature for growth(C)	$Tref(nospA+nospZ)_{p1}$	0.02
Phytoplankton		
maximum growth rate	$umax$	0.05
mortality coefficient	mA	0.02
initial slope of the photosynthesis-irradiance relationship	$alpha$	0.02
edibility vector for Z1	$ediblevector(Z1)$	0.02
phytoplankton carbon/cell	Qc	0.01
phytoplankton growth respiration coefficient	$respg$	8.36×10^{-3}
N-uptake rate measured at umax	$vmaxN$	8.12×10^{-3}
phytoplankton basal respiration coefficient	$respb$	6.94×10^{-3}
Phytoplankton threshold for grazing, is multiplied by VOLcell	$Athresh$	4.57×10^{-3}
minimum N cell-quota	$QminN$	4.32×10^{-3}
P-uptake rate measured at umax	$vmaxP$	4.27×10^{-3}
coefficient for non-limiting nutrient	aN	4.23×10^{-3}
phytoplankton volume/cell	$volcell$	4.13×10^{-3}
half-saturation constant for P	Kp	2.9×10^{-3}
half-saturation constant for N	Kn	2.77×10^{-4}
minimum P cell-quota	$QminP$	8.34×10^{-8}
Zooplankton		
half saturation coefficient for grazing	ZKa	0.05
zooplankton nitrogen/individual	ZQn	0.02
Zooplankton mortality constant for quadratic mortality	Zm	0.02
maximum growth rate of zooplankton	$Zumax$	0.02
assimilation efficiency as a fraction of ingestion	$Zeffic$	0.01
proportion of grazed phytoplankton lost to sloppy feeding	$Zslop$	7.78×10^{-3}
Zooplankton growth-dependent respiration factor	$Zrespg$	5.32×10^{-3}
Zooplankton biomass-dependent respiration factor	$Zrespb$	2.96×10^{-3}
zooplankton carbon/individual	ZQc	9.38×10^{-5}
zooplankton phosphorus/individual	ZQp	3.69×10^{-5}
Organic Matter		
turnover rate for OM1A and OM1Z	$KG1$	6.15×10^{-3}
turnover rate for OM2A and OM2Z	$KG2$	3.14×10^{-3}
O2 concentration that inhibits denitrification	$KstarO2$	3.04×10^{-3}
decay rate of CDOM, 1/day	$KGcdom$	2.98×10^{-3}
half-saturation concentration for O2 utilization	$KO2$	5.85×10^{-4}
half-saturation concentration for NO3 used in denitrification	$KNO3$	5.8×10^{-4}
maximum rate of nitrification per day	$nitmax$	4.99×10^{-4}
NH4 rate constant for nitrification	$KNH4$	4.17×10^{-4}

*Temperature parameters apply separately to phytoplankton ($p1$, one group) or zooplankton ($z1$, one group), denoted by subscripts

Table 2: Parameter identifiability (as γ, eq. (3)) by category for relevant state variables. Selections followed the first heuristic where parameters were selected within categories from most to least sensitive until $\gamma > 15$. Rank describes the relative parameter sensitivity in each category for each state variable. Duplicate parameters and ranks in the first two columns apply only to γ values in the same row (i.e., parameter ranks vary for each variable).

Parameter	Rank	Ammonium	Chl-a	O_2	Irradiance	Nitrate	POM	DOM	Phosphate
Optics									
astar490	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
astarOMA	2	7.33	5.42	-	5.36	-	7.78	7.87	-
astarOMZ	2	-	-	1.39	-	-	-	-	4.73
astarOMA	3	-	-	3.87	-	-	-	-	10.04
astarOMZ	3	7.58	5.51	-	6.02	-	7.91	7.87	-
Organic Matter									
KG1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	1
KG2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
KGcdom	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-
KstarO2	1	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
nitmax	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KG1	2	-	1.12	-	1.93	-	-	-	-
KG2	2	-	-	6	-	-	-	-	13.43
KGcdom	2	-	-	-	-	-	1.47	1.39	-
KNH4	2	4.03	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KG1	3	4.09	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
KG2	3	-	-	-	8.19	-	-	-	-
KGcdom	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13.75
KO2	3	-	-	-	-	-	14.07	11.96	-
KstarO2	3	-	-	6.04	-	-	-	-	-
KGcdom	4	4.19	-	6.12	-	-	-	-	-
KO2	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.68
KstarO2	4	-	-	-	10.65	-	14.08	-	-
KO2	5	9.47	-	8.61	-	-	-	-	-
Phytoplankton									
mA	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-
umax	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	1
ediblevector(Z1)	2	1.13	1.17	-	-	-	1.15	-	-
mA	2	-	-	1.19	1.29	-	-	-	-
Qc	2	-	-	-	-	11.57	-	-	-
umax	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.21	-
vmaxP	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.45
alpha	3	-	-	1.44	1.98	-	-	-	-
ediblevector(Z1)	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.9	-
umax	3	2.73	2.11	-	-	-	3.26	-	-
alpha	4	3.55	4.57	-	-	-	-	-	-
ediblevector(Z1)	4	-	-	2.09	4.09	-	-	-	-
Qc	4	-	-	-	-	-	4.98	-	-
vmaxN	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.9	-
alpha	5	-	-	-	-	-	10.11	-	-
Qc	5	-	-	2.9	-	-	-	-	-
vmaxN	5	8.14	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Athresh	6	11.27	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
respg	6	-	-	3.41	-	-	-	-	-
vmaxN	7	-	-	3.97	-	-	-	-	-
Zooplankton									
ZKa	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	-	1
Zumax	1	1	1	-	-	-	1	1	-
ZKa	2	-	4.31	-	-	-	7.3	5.43	-
ZQn	2	-	-	3.18	6.32	9.76	-	-	8.54
Zm	3	-	-	4.57	-	-	-	-	-
Zumax	3	-	-	-	6.93	-	-	-	-
Zm	4	-	-	-	11.86	-	-	-	-
Zumax	4	-	-	5.2	-	-	-	-	-

Table 3: Parameter identifiability (as γ, eq. (3)) for relevant state variables. Selections followed the second heuristic where parameters were selected independent of category from most to least sensitive (L1, eq. (2)), until $\gamma > 15$. Rank describes the relative parameter sensitivity in each category for each state variable (O: optics, OM: organic matter, P: phytoplankton, T: temperature, Z: zooplankton).

Selections by state variable	Parameter	L1	Rank	γ
Ammonium				
1	mA	8.49	1_P	1
2	$nitmax$	1.54	1_{OM}	1.16
3	$Zumax$	1.42	1_Z	2.9
Chlorophyll				
1	mA	13.94	1_P	1
2	$Zumax$	1.02	1_Z	1.18
Dissolved Oxygen				
1	$umax$	0.05	1_P	1
2	ZKa	0.05	1_Z	2.17
3	mA	0.02	2_P	2.31
4	$Tref(nospA+nospZ)_{p1}$	0.02	1_T	2.37
5	ZQn	0.02	2_Z	4.69
6	$alpha$	0.02	3_P	4.91
7	Zm	0.02	3_Z	6.73
8	$Zumax$	0.02	4_Z	6.81
DOM				
1	mA	14.25	1_P	1
2	$Tref(nospA+nospZ)_{p1}$	1.48	1_T	1.05
3	$umax$	1.11	2_P	2.46
4	$Zumax$	1.01	1_Z	2.91
Irradiance				
1	ZKa	0.13	1_Z	1
2	$umax$	0.09	1_P	4.41
3	ZQn	0.06	2_Z	7.54
4	mA	0.05	2_P	8.17
5	$KGcdom$	0.05	1_{OM}	9.44
6	$alpha$	0.04	3_P	9.66
7	$Zumax$	0.04	3_Z	10.79
Nitrate				
1	$umax$	8.49	1_P	1
Phosphate				
1	ZKa	1.47	1_Z	1
2	$umax$	0.78	1_P	11.45
3	$vmaxP$	0.59	2_P	11.48
4	ZQn	0.5	2_Z	13.74
POM				
1	mA	7.22	1_P	1
2	$Zumax$	0.96	1_Z	1.15
3	$KG1$	0.92	1_{OM}	3.87

Table 4: Parameter identifiability (as γ, eq. (3)) for relevant state variables. Selections followed the third heuristic where parameters were selected equally within each category from most to least sensitive (L1, eq. (2)), until $\gamma > 15$. Rank describes the relative parameter sensitivity in each category for each state variable (O: optics, OM: organic matter, P: phytoplankton, T: temperature, Z: zooplankton).

Selections by state variable	Parameter	L1	Rank	γ
Ammonium				
1	mA	8.49	1_P	1
2	$nitmax$	1.54	1_{OM}	1.16
3	$Zumax$	1.42	1_Z	2.9
4	$Tref(nospA{+}nospZ)_{p1}$	0.79	1_T	3.46
5	$astar490$	0.03	1_O	4.25
Chlorophyll				
1	mA	13.94	1_P	1
2	$Zumax$	1.02	1_Z	1.18
3	$Tref(nospA{+}nospZ)_{p1}$	0.6	1_T	2.62
4	$KGcdom$	0.07	1_{OM}	3.24
5	$astar490$	0.02	1_O	5.98
Dissolved Oxygen				
1	$umax$	0.05	1_P	1
2	ZKa	0.05	1_Z	2.17
3	$Tref(nospA{+}nospZ)_{p1}$	0.02	1_T	2.29
4	$KG1$	6.15×10^{-3}	1_{OM}	3.85
5	$astar490$	7.51×10^{-4}	1_O	3.89
6	mA	0.02	2_P	4.42
7	ZQn	0.02	2_Z	5.22
DOM				
1	mA	14.25	1_P	1
2	$Tref(nospA{+}nospZ)_{p1}$	1.48	1_T	1.05
3	$Zumax$	1.01	1_Z	2.61
4	$KG2$	0.94	1_{OM}	3.39
5	$astar490$	0.04	1_O	4.46
6	$umax$	1.11	2_P	6.02
7	ZKa	0.88	2_Z	9.21
Irradiance				
1	ZKa	0.13	1_Z	1
2	$umax$	0.09	1_P	4.41
3	$KGcdom$	0.05	1_{OM}	4.5
4	$Tref(nospA{+}nospZ)_{p1}$	0.03	1_T	4.5
5	$astar490$	0.02	1_O	6.9
6	ZQn	0.06	2_Z	10.63
7	mA	0.05	2_P	11.21
8	$KG1$	3.96×10^{-3}	2_{OM}	14.65
9	$astarOMA$	1.47×10^{-3}	2_O	14.72
Nitrate				
1	$umax$	8.49	1_P	1
Phosphate				
1	ZKa	1.47	1_Z	1
2	$umax$	0.78	1_P	11.45
3	$Tref(nospA{+}nospZ)_{p1}$	0.16	1_T	13.71
4	$KG1$	0.14	1_{OM}	14.64
POM				
1	mA	7.22	1_P	1
2	$Zumax$	0.96	1_Z	1.15
3	$KG1$	0.92	1_{OM}	3.87
4	$Tref(nospA{+}nospZ)_{p1}$	0.86	1_T	3.93
5	$astar490$	0.03	1_O	5.81

Table 5: Results of model calibration to observed O_2 for each of seven parameter subsets selected by sensitivity within each parameter category (first), independent of category (second), and equally within each category (third). The collinearity values (γ) and parameters of each subset are from Tables 2 to 4. Mean L1 is the average of sensitivity values (eq. (2)) for the subset. $RMSE$ shows the final error comparing observed and model output after the specified number of iterations for optimization.

| Selection heuristic	γ	n parameters	mean L1	Iterations	$RMSE$
1					
Optics	3.87	3	2.81×10^{-4}	14	72.14
Organic Matter	8.61	5	3.18×10^{-3}	154	68.7
Phytoplankton	3.97	7	0.02	270	68.72
Temperature	1	1	0.02	6	71.76
Zooplankton	5.2	4	0.03	99	71.22
2					
Independent of category	6.81	8	0.03	850	67.05
3					
Equally within category	5.22	7	0.03	690	67.67

Fig. 1: Examples of unique parameter combinations from different parameter sets and number of selected parameters. The number of combinations are shown for increasing numbers of selected parameters from the total in the set, where 50 parameter sets are shown each with one through 50 total parameters. Note that the number of unique combinations is shown as the natural-log.

Fig. 2: Sensitivity values (L1, eq. (2)) of all state variables to changes in a 50% increase in parameter values. Parameters are grouped by category: optics, organic matter, phytoplankton, zooplankton, temperature, and zoplankton. See Table 1 for L1 values for O_2 and Tables S1 to S7 for the other state variables.

Fig. 3: Collinearity (γ as a measure of identifiability, eq. (3)) of parameter subsets for O_2. Plots in (a) show collinearity by parameter categories and (b) shows collinearity by selecting the top 1 through 4 parameters in all categories. Lines represent collinearity ranges for the possible combinations given the number of parameters in the set. The temperature category is not shown because O_2 was sensitive to only one parameter (i.e., $\gamma = 1$).

Fig. 4: Average collinearity (γ as a measure of identifiability, eq. (3)) of parameter subsets for all state variables. Plots in (a) show collinearity by parameter categories and (b) shows collinearity by selecting the top 1 through 4 parameters in all categories. Collinearity was averaged for all combinations in a parameter set to evaluate relative differenes between state variables. The temperature category is not shown because all state variables were sensitive to only one parameter (i.e., $\gamma = 1$).

Fig. 5: Percent of identifiable parameter sets for O_2 at different γ thresholds, selection criteria, and total number of parameters in the set. Thresholds varied from $\gamma = 2$ to 20 such that sets with γ below a threshold were considered identifiable relative to the value. Plots in (a) show percent of identifiable sets by selecting parameters within categories and (b) shows percent identifiable by selecting from the top 1 through 4 parameters in all categories. Percent identifiable was based on all sets in Fig. 3.

Fig. 6: Collinearity (γ as a measure of identifiability, eq. (3)) for O_2 of organic matter parameters for subset combinations in Fig. 3. Collinearity is evaluated for subsets that excluded and included the parameters at the top of each plot. Collinearity of including all eight parameters is in Fig. 3. Grey lines indicate potential thresholds at $\gamma = 10, 15$ for maximum acceptable collinearity.

Fig. 7: Estimated hypoxic area and monthly averages ($km^2 \times 1000$) using the default parameter settings (a, b) and the differences using a 50% increase in each parameter (c, d). The selected parameters were the top sensitive in each parameter category for O_2 in Fig. 2 and Table 1. Error bars are 95% confidence intervals for the monthly averages in (b) and the difference in monthly averages (d) from the perturbed and default results. Areal extent of estimated hypoxia on August 29th using the defaulat parameters (grey) and estimated changes with parameter perturbations is shown in (e).

30

Table S1: Sensitivity of ammonium to perturbations of individual parameters. Sensitivities are based on a 50% increase from the initial parameter value, where $L1$ summarizes differences in model output from the default (see eq. (2)). Parameters that did not affect ammonium are not shown. Parameters are grouped by categories as optics, temperature, phytoplankton, zooplankton, and organic matter.

Description	Parameter	L1
Optics		
Chla specific absorption at 490 nm	$astar490$	0.03
OMA specific absorption at 490 nm	$astarOMA$	1.63×10^{-3}
OMZ specific absorption at 490 nm	$astarOMZ$	1.5×10^{-3}
Temperature		
Optimum temperature for growth(C)	$Tref(nospA{+}nospZ)_{p1}$	0.79
Phytoplankton		
mortality coefficient	mA	8.49
edibility vector for Z1	$ediblevector(Z1)$	1.32
maximum growth rate	$umax$	0.65
initial slope of the photosynthesis-irradiance relationship	$alpha$	0.6
N-uptake rate measured at umax	$vmaxN$	0.46
Phytoplankton threshold for grazing, is multiplied by VOLcell	$Athresh$	0.29
coefficient for non-limiting nutrient	aN	0.17
phytoplankton growth respiration coefficient	$respg$	0.16
phytoplankton basal respiration coefficient	$respb$	0.15
half-saturation constant for P	Kp	0.14
phytoplankton volume/cell	$volcell$	0.14
minimum N cell-quota	$QminN$	0.1
P-uptake rate measured at umax	$vmaxP$	0.1
phytoplankton carbon/cell	Qc	0.03
half-saturation constant for N	Kn	0.01
minimum P cell-quota	$QminP$	2.24×10^{-6}
Zooplankton		
maximum growth rate of zooplankton	$Zumax$	1.42
assimilation efficiency as a fraction of ingestion	$Zeffic$	0.76
half saturation coefficient for grazing	ZKa	0.74
zooplankton nitrogen/individual	ZQn	0.62
Zooplankton mortality constant for quadratic mortality	Zm	0.5
proportion of grazed phytoplankton lost to sloppy feeding	$Zslop$	0.3
Zooplankton growth-dependent respiration factor	$Zrespg$	0.22
Zooplankton biomass-dependent respiration factor	$Zrespb$	0.16
zooplankton phosphorus/individual	ZQp	1.07×10^{-3}
zooplankton carbon/individual	ZQc	1.44×10^{-4}
Organic Matter		
maximum rate of nitrification per day	$nitmax$	1.54
NH4 rate constant for nitrification	$KNH4$	0.66
turnover rate for OM1A and OM1Z	$KG1$	0.07
decay rate of CDOM, 1/day	$KGcdom$	0.07
half-saturation concentration for O2 utilization	$KO2$	0.06
O2 concentration that inhibits denitrification	$KstarO2$	0.05
turnover rate for OM2A and OM2Z	$KG2$	0.03
half-saturation concentration for NO3 used in denitrification	$KNO3$	7.55×10^{-3}

Table S2: Sensitivity of chl-a to perturbations of individual parameters. Sensitivities are based on a 50% increase from the initial parameter value, where $L1$ summarizes differences in model output from the default (see eq. (2)). Parameters that did not affect chl-a are not shown. Parameters are grouped by categories as optics, temperature, phytoplankton, zooplankton, and organic matter.

Description	Parameter	L1
Optics		
Chla specific absorption at 490 nm	$astar490$	0.02
OMA specific absorption at 490 nm	$astarOMA$	1.45×10^{-3}
OMZ specific absorption at 490 nm	$astarOMZ$	1.13×10^{-3}
Temperature		
Optimum temperature for growth(C)	$Tref(nospA+nospZ)_{p1}$	0.6
Phytoplankton		
mortality coefficient	mA	13.94
edibility vector for Z1	$ediblevector(Z1)$	0.95
maximum growth rate	$umax$	0.85
initial slope of the photosynthesis-irradiance relationship	$alpha$	0.62
N-uptake rate measured at umax	$vmaxN$	0.53
phytoplankton growth respiration coefficient	$respg$	0.26
Phytoplankton threshold for grazing, is multiplied by VOLcell	$Athresh$	0.25
phytoplankton basal respiration coefficient	$respb$	0.24
coefficient for non-limiting nutrient	aN	0.17
half-saturation constant for P	Kp	0.14
P-uptake rate measured at umax	$vmaxP$	0.12
phytoplankton volume/cell	$volcell$	0.1
minimum N cell-quota	$QminN$	0.07
phytoplankton carbon/cell	Qc	0.02
half-saturation constant for N	Kn	0.01
minimum P cell-quota	$QminP$	1.38×10^{-6}
Zooplankton		
maximum growth rate of zooplankton	$Zumax$	1.02
half saturation coefficient for grazing	ZKa	0.85
assimilation efficiency as a fraction of ingestion	$Zeffic$	0.57
zooplankton nitrogen/individual	ZQn	0.52
Zooplankton mortality constant for quadratic mortality	Zm	0.41
proportion of grazed phytoplankton lost to sloppy feeding	$Zslop$	0.23
Zooplankton growth-dependent respiration factor	$Zrespg$	0.17
Zooplankton biomass-dependent respiration factor	$Zrespb$	0.14
zooplankton phosphorus/individual	ZQp	1.29×10^{-3}
zooplankton carbon/individual	ZQc	7.55×10^{-5}
Organic Matter		
decay rate of CDOM, 1/day	$KGcdom$	0.07
turnover rate for OM1A and OM1Z	$KG1$	0.03
turnover rate for OM2A and OM2Z	$KG2$	0.01
O2 concentration that inhibits denitrification	$KstarO2$	0.01
half-saturation concentration for O2 utilization	$KO2$	3.35×10^{-3}
half-saturation concentration for NO3 used in denitrification	$KNO3$	1.19×10^{-3}
maximum rate of nitrification per day	$nitmax$	3.4×10^{-5}
NH4 rate constant for nitrification	$KNH4$	2.97×10^{-5}

Table S3: Sensitivity of irradiance to perturbations of individual parameters. Sensitivities are based on a 50% increase from the initial parameter value, where $L1$ summarizes differences in model output from the default (see eq. (2)). Parameters that did not affect irradiance are not shown. Parameters are grouped by categories as optics, temperature, phytoplankton, zooplankton, and organic matter.

Description	Parameter	L1
Optics		
Chla specific absorption at 490 nm	*astar490*	0.02
OMA specific absorption at 490 nm	*astarOMA*	1.47×10^{-3}
OMZ specific absorption at 490 nm	*astarOMZ*	1.34×10^{-3}
Temperature		
Optimum temperature for growth(C)	$Tref(nospA+nospZ)_{p1}$	0.03
Phytoplankton		
maximum growth rate	*umax*	0.09
mortality coefficient	*mA*	0.05
initial slope of the photosynthesis-irradiance relationship	*alpha*	0.04
edibility vector for Z1	*ediblevector(Z1)*	0.04
N-uptake rate measured at umax	*vmaxN*	0.03
Phytoplankton threshold for grazing, is multiplied by VOLcell	*Athresh*	0.02
coefficient for non-limiting nutrient	*aN*	0.01
phytoplankton growth respiration coefficient	*respg*	0.01
half-saturation constant for P	*Kp*	0.01
P-uptake rate measured at umax	*vmaxP*	9.48×10^{-3}
phytoplankton basal respiration coefficient	*respb*	9.38×10^{-3}
phytoplankton volume/cell	*volcell*	8.1×10^{-3}
minimum N cell-quota	*QminN*	5.75×10^{-3}
phytoplankton carbon/cell	*Qc*	3.78×10^{-3}
half-saturation constant for N	*Kn*	9.81×10^{-4}
minimum P cell-quota	*QminP*	1.92×10^{-7}
Zooplankton		
half saturation coefficient for grazing	*ZKa*	0.13
zooplankton nitrogen/individual	*ZQn*	0.06
maximum growth rate of zooplankton	*Zumax*	0.04
Zooplankton mortality constant for quadratic mortality	*Zm*	0.04
assimilation efficiency as a fraction of ingestion	*Zeffic*	0.03
proportion of grazed phytoplankton lost to sloppy feeding	*Zslop*	0.02
Zooplankton growth-dependent respiration factor	*Zrespg*	0.01
Zooplankton biomass-dependent respiration factor	*Zrespb*	9.67×10^{-3}
zooplankton phosphorus/individual	*ZQp*	9.34×10^{-5}
zooplankton carbon/individual	*ZQc*	1.99×10^{-5}
Organic Matter		
decay rate of CDOM, 1/day	*KGcdom*	0.05
turnover rate for OM1A and OM1Z	*KG1*	3.96×10^{-3}
turnover rate for OM2A and OM2Z	*KG2*	9.88×10^{-4}
O2 concentration that inhibits denitrification	*KstarO2*	7.2×10^{-4}
half-saturation concentration for O2 utilization	*KO2*	3.54×10^{-4}
half-saturation concentration for NO3 used in denitrification	*KNO3*	6.18×10^{-5}
maximum rate of nitrification per day	*nitmax*	1.72×10^{-6}
NH4 rate constant for nitrification	*KNH4*	1.48×10^{-6}

Table S4: Sensitivity of nitrate to perturbations of individual parameters. Sensitivities are based on a 50% increase from the initial parameter value, where $L1$ summarizes differences in model output from the default (see eq. (2)). Parameters that did not affect nitrate are not shown. Parameters are grouped by categories as optics, temperature, phytoplankton, zooplankton, and organic matter.

Description	Parameter	L1
Optics		
Chla specific absorption at 490 nm	*astar490*	0.02
OMZ specific absorption at 490 nm	*astarOMZ*	1.27×10^{-3}
OMA specific absorption at 490 nm	*astarOMA*	1.19×10^{-3}
Temperature		
Optimum temperature for growth(C)	*Tref(nospA+nospZ)$_{p1}$*	0.3
Phytoplankton		
maximum growth rate	*umax*	8.49
phytoplankton carbon/cell	*Qc*	0.89
initial slope of the photosynthesis-irradiance relationship	*alpha*	0.7
edibility vector for Z1	*ediblevector(Z1)*	0.33
mortality coefficient	*mA*	0.27
Phytoplankton threshold for grazing, is multiplied by VOLcell	*Athresh*	0.2
N-uptake rate measured at umax	*vmaxN*	0.19
coefficient for non-limiting nutrient	*aN*	0.13
phytoplankton growth respiration coefficient	*respg*	0.11
phytoplankton volume/cell	*volcell*	0.1
P-uptake rate measured at umax	*vmaxP*	0.1
half-saturation constant for P	*Kp*	0.09
minimum N cell-quota	*QminN*	0.09
phytoplankton basal respiration coefficient	*respb*	0.07
half-saturation constant for N	*Kn*	7.06×10^{-3}
minimum P cell-quota	*QminP*	6.67×10^{-7}
Zooplankton		
half saturation coefficient for grazing	*ZKa*	7.59
zooplankton nitrogen/individual	*ZQn*	1.17
Zooplankton mortality constant for quadratic mortality	*Zm*	0.7
maximum growth rate of zooplankton	*Zumax*	0.34
proportion of grazed phytoplankton lost to sloppy feeding	*Zslop*	0.26
assimilation efficiency as a fraction of ingestion	*Zeffic*	0.25
Zooplankton growth-dependent respiration factor	*Zrespg*	0.17
Zooplankton biomass-dependent respiration factor	*Zrespb*	0.1
zooplankton carbon/individual	*ZQc*	3.8×10^{-3}
zooplankton phosphorus/individual	*ZQp*	8.59×10^{-4}
Organic Matter		
O2 concentration that inhibits denitrification	*KstarO2*	0.78
half-saturation concentration for NO3 used in denitrification	*KNO3*	0.07
decay rate of CDOM, 1/day	*KGcdom*	0.04
half-saturation concentration for O2 utilization	*KO2*	0.03
turnover rate for OM1A and OM1Z	*KG1*	0.02
turnover rate for OM2A and OM2Z	*KG2*	0.01
maximum rate of nitrification per day	*nitmax*	9.96×10^{-3}
NH4 rate constant for nitrification	*KNH4*	9.87×10^{-3}

Table S5: Sensitivity of POM to perturbations of individual parameters. Sensitivities are based on a 50% increase from the initial parameter value, where $L1$ summarizes differences in model output from the default (see eq. (2)). Parameters that did not affect POM are not shown. Parameters are grouped by categories as optics, temperature, phytoplankton, zooplankton, and organic matter.

Description	Parameter	L1
Optics		
Chla specific absorption at 490 nm	*astar490*	0.03
OMA specific absorption at 490 nm	*astarOMA*	1.73×10^{-3}
OMZ specific absorption at 490 nm	*astarOMZ*	1.49×10^{-3}
Temperature		
Optimum temperature for growth(C)	$Tref(nospA+nospZ)_{p1}$	0.86
Phytoplankton		
mortality coefficient	*mA*	7.22
edibility vector for Z1	*ediblevector(Z1)*	0.9
maximum growth rate	*umax*	0.89
phytoplankton carbon/cell	*Qc*	0.67
initial slope of the photosynthesis-irradiance relationship	*alpha*	0.67
N-uptake rate measured at umax	*vmaxN*	0.45
phytoplankton growth respiration coefficient	*respg*	0.29
phytoplankton basal respiration coefficient	*respb*	0.24
Phytoplankton threshold for grazing, is multiplied by VOLcell	*Athresh*	0.22
minimum N cell-quota	*QminN*	0.21
coefficient for non-limiting nutrient	*aN*	0.14
half-saturation constant for P	*Kp*	0.11
phytoplankton volume/cell	*volcell*	0.1
P-uptake rate measured at umax	*vmaxP*	0.09
half-saturation constant for N	*Kn*	0.01
minimum P cell-quota	*QminP*	7.35×10^{-4}
Zooplankton		
maximum growth rate of zooplankton	*Zumax*	0.96
half saturation coefficient for grazing	*ZKa*	0.79
assimilation efficiency as a fraction of ingestion	*Zeffic*	0.54
zooplankton nitrogen/individual	*ZQn*	0.49
Zooplankton mortality constant for quadratic mortality	*Zm*	0.39
proportion of grazed phytoplankton lost to sloppy feeding	*Zslop*	0.27
Zooplankton growth-dependent respiration factor	*Zrespg*	0.16
Zooplankton biomass-dependent respiration factor	*Zrespb*	0.12
zooplankton carbon/individual	*ZQc*	9.64×10^{-3}
zooplankton phosphorus/individual	*ZQp*	1.06×10^{-3}
Organic Matter		
turnover rate for OM1A and OM1Z	*KG1*	0.92
decay rate of CDOM, 1/day	*KGcdom*	0.07
half-saturation concentration for O2 utilization	*KO2*	0.04
O2 concentration that inhibits denitrification	*KstarO2*	0.02
turnover rate for OM2A and OM2Z	*KG2*	0.01
half-saturation concentration for NO3 used in denitrification	*KNO3*	3.72×10^{-3}
maximum rate of nitrification per day	*nitmax*	6.98×10^{-5}
NH4 rate constant for nitrification	*KNH4*	6.41×10^{-5}

Table S6: Sensitivity of dissolved organic matter to perturbations of individual parameters. Sensitivities are based on a 50% increase from the initial parameter value, where $L1$ summarizes differences in model output from the default (see eq. (2)). Parameters that did not affect dissolved organic matter are not shown. Parameters are grouped by categories as optics, temperature, phytoplankton, zooplankton, and organic matter.

Description	Parameter	L1
Optics		
Chla specific absorption at 490 nm	$astar490$	0.04
OMA specific absorption at 490 nm	$astarOMA$	2.48×10^{-3}
OMZ specific absorption at 490 nm	$astarOMZ$	2.04×10^{-3}
Temperature		
Optimum temperature for growth(C)	$Tref(nospA+nospZ)_{p1}$	1.48
Phytoplankton		
mortality coefficient	mA	14.25
maximum growth rate	$umax$	1.11
edibility vector for Z1	$ediblevector(Z1)$	0.94
N-uptake rate measured at umax	$vmaxN$	0.86
initial slope of the photosynthesis-irradiance relationship	$alpha$	0.85
phytoplankton carbon/cell	Qc	0.67
phytoplankton growth respiration coefficient	$respg$	0.36
phytoplankton basal respiration coefficient	$respb$	0.29
coefficient for non-limiting nutrient	aN	0.25
minimum N cell-quota	$QminN$	0.24
Phytoplankton threshold for grazing, is multiplied by VOLcell	$Athresh$	0.22
half-saturation constant for P	Kp	0.2
P-uptake rate measured at umax	$vmaxP$	0.14
phytoplankton volume/cell	$volcell$	0.1
half-saturation constant for N	Kn	0.02
minimum P cell-quota	$QminP$	4.37×10^{-3}
Zooplankton		
maximum growth rate of zooplankton	$Zumax$	1.01
half saturation coefficient for grazing	ZKa	0.88
assimilation efficiency as a fraction of ingestion	$Zeffic$	0.58
zooplankton nitrogen/individual	ZQn	0.54
Zooplankton mortality constant for quadratic mortality	Zm	0.41
Zooplankton growth-dependent respiration factor	$Zrespg$	0.17
Zooplankton biomass-dependent respiration factor	$Zrespb$	0.13
proportion of grazed phytoplankton lost to sloppy feeding	$Zslop$	0.12
zooplankton carbon/individual	ZQc	0.04
zooplankton phosphorus/individual	ZQp	1.69×10^{-3}
Organic Matter		
turnover rate for OM2A and OM2Z	$KG2$	0.94
decay rate of CDOM, 1/day	$KGcdom$	0.1
half-saturation concentration for O2 utilization	$KO2$	0.04
turnover rate for OM1A and OM1Z	$KG1$	0.04
O2 concentration that inhibits denitrification	$KstarO2$	0.03
half-saturation concentration for NO3 used in denitrification	$KNO3$	3.16×10^{-3}
maximum rate of nitrification per day	$nitmax$	8.44×10^{-5}
NH4 rate constant for nitrification	$KNH4$	7.41×10^{-5}

Table S7: Sensitivity of phosphate to perturbations of individual parameters. Sensitivities are based on a 50% increase from the initial parameter value, where $L1$ summarizes differences in model output from the default (see eq. (2)). Parameters that did not affect phosphate are not shown. Parameters are grouped by categories as optics, temperature, phytoplankton, zooplankton, and organic matter.

Description	Parameter	L1
Optics		
Chla specific absorption at 490 nm	$astar490$	9.01×10^{-3}
OMZ specific absorption at 490 nm	$astarOMZ$	5.21×10^{-4}
OMA specific absorption at 490 nm	$astarOMA$	5.13×10^{-4}
Temperature		
Optimum temperature for growth(C)	$Tref(nospA+nospZ)_{p1}$	0.16
Phytoplankton		
maximum growth rate	$umax$	0.78
P-uptake rate measured at umax	$vmaxP$	0.59
edibility vector for Z1	$ediblevector(Z1)$	0.25
initial slope of the photosynthesis-irradiance relationship	$alpha$	0.23
mortality coefficient	mA	0.2
N-uptake rate measured at umax	$vmaxN$	0.18
Phytoplankton threshold for grazing, is multiplied by VOLcell	$Athresh$	0.13
coefficient for non-limiting nutrient	aN	0.11
phytoplankton growth respiration coefficient	$respg$	0.09
phytoplankton volume/cell	$volcell$	0.06
phytoplankton basal respiration coefficient	$respb$	0.06
minimum N cell-quota	$QminN$	0.04
half-saturation constant for P	Kp	0.03
half-saturation constant for N	Kn	6.97×10^{-3}
phytoplankton carbon/cell	Qc	6.68×10^{-3}
minimum P cell-quota	$QminP$	8.21×10^{-7}
Zooplankton		
half saturation coefficient for grazing	ZKa	1.47
zooplankton nitrogen/individual	ZQn	0.5
Zooplankton mortality constant for quadratic mortality	Zm	0.35
maximum growth rate of zooplankton	$Zumax$	0.26
assimilation efficiency as a fraction of ingestion	$Zeffic$	0.19
proportion of grazed phytoplankton lost to sloppy feeding	$Zslop$	0.15
Zooplankton growth-dependent respiration factor	$Zrespg$	0.1
Zooplankton biomass-dependent respiration factor	$Zrespb$	0.06
zooplankton phosphorus/individual	ZQp	6.43×10^{-3}
zooplankton carbon/individual	ZQc	3.38×10^{-5}
Organic Matter		
turnover rate for OM1A and OM1Z	$KG1$	0.14
turnover rate for OM2A and OM2Z	$KG2$	0.06
decay rate of CDOM, 1/day	$KGcdom$	0.02
half-saturation concentration for O2 utilization	$KO2$	0.01
O2 concentration that inhibits denitrification	$KstarO2$	7.29×10^{-3}
half-saturation concentration for NO3 used in denitrification	$KNO3$	1.19×10^{-3}
maximum rate of nitrification per day	$nitmax$	2.7×10^{-5}
NH4 rate constant for nitrification	$KNH4$	2.64×10^{-5}