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# Physical Dynamics

Methodology mostly follows Kooi 2017. Biofouling causes particles to “yoyo” sort of related to euphotic depth.
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­Her model relates the number of attached algae particles (*A*) which affect the density/size of the plastic particle, and thus the vertical hydrodynamics (settling velocity).

*A* is changed in time by 4 factors (eq 11):

1. Collision of algae with plastic particles
2. Light and temperature limited growth
3. Grazing mortality
4. Respiration

## 1: Collision of algae with plastic particles

Collision frequency depend on some dynamics, specifically Brownian motion, settling velocity, and shear. No external datasets needed.

Notably, collision frequency also depends on concentration of algae in the water column, for which there are no data. This gets tricky. We want an accurate idea of the concentration of algae at any grid point. Kooi uses chlorophyll A concentration as a proxy, and relates the two by some constant ratios. We will do the same.

### Vertical Profiles of Chlorophyll A

Getting chlorophyll A concentration vertical profiles is challenging. Kooi references Uitz 2006, which really goes hard into extrapolating vertical profiles from surface concentrations. Keys: distinguishes between “mixed” (mixed layer > euphotic depth) and “stratified” areas (mixed layer < euphotic depth), different parameterization for each. For both, multiple fits are done for different levels of surface concentration, so there’s a fat table of hard-coded parameters. The following figure shows concentration depth profiles for stratified (S) waters, in 9 categories of surface concentration. Euphotic depth is also shown.
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Compare the above profiles to the profiles for mixed waters:
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So there is a significant difference between these two profiles. To distinguish, we compare euphotic depth (calculated from surface chlorophyll concentration) with mixed layer depth. We can calculate mixed layer depth by looking for maxima in vertical gradient of seawater density, but this could be computationally expensive, as well as a complex process. However, we will likely want an estimate of the mixed layer depth anyways, for the sake of computing turbulent mixing of plastic particles, which should vary seasonally with the variation of the mixed layer (quite a strong seasonal variation).

I suggest adapting the approach above as such:

Case 1: stratified waters. Use same method as Kooi.

Case 2: well mixed waters: constant concentration from surface to euphotic depth. Then, linear decrease to mixed layer depth. This takes into account the mixing in euphotic zone, and the role of mixing as the main mechanism which brings chlorophyll a below euphotic zone.

Case 1 ensures that we accurately capture the interesting concentration profile in calm waters. Case 2 ensures that we take into account conditions where case 1 breaks down, which could be a lot of the time (euphotic depth is less than 100m, but mixed layer depths can be much lower, especially in subtropical winters).
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We should also remember that HYCOM has been demonstrated to overestimate the mixed layer depth, should this depth determine the plastic dynamics we observe.

## 2: Light and Temperature Limited Growth

Algae growth is well modeled as a function of light and temperature. Kooi cites Bernard 2012, which is pretty bang on, really accurate. Ultimately the data needed is, obviously, temperature, which we can have from HYCOM, and light. Light is a bit more complicated; to get light intensity at an arbitrary z, you need light intensity at the surface and the average concentration of algae in the euphotic zone. Below euphotic depth, light is just zero, so model only has to work above euphotic depth.

## 3: Mortality

This is modeled as constant, 39% population dieoff per day, due to grazing. Pretty basic. Comes from oceanic grazing mortality in Calbet 2004. This paper, table 1, offers other values based on region: Oceanic (.39), Coastal (.40), Estuarine (.53), Tropical (.50), Temperate (.41), and Polar (.16). We might want to use all these, as our model, unlike Kooi’s, should take regional variation into account. We’ll need to look into Calbet’s regional definitions.

## 4: Respiration

Somewhat difficult to find an explanation for this term and its sign! Perhaps it is very “common knowledge.” Here, from Béchet 2013:

Endogenous respiration: Photosynthesis generates chemical energy in the form of ATP, NADPH, and organic material. Endogenous respiration includes the consumption of chemical energy at day time and the consumption of organic material at night time.

Algal productivity: Rate of net biomass production expressed as the difference of the rate of photosynthesis minus the rate of endogenous respiration.

So, essentially, it’s metabolic activity, which consumes organic material and thus decreases the number of algae over time. As long as they’re alive, they’re consuming themselves, so below euphotic zone, this will lead to a die-off in addition to grazing mortality.

Kooi models respiration using a constant respiration rate, and a dependence on temperature which appears to be an “industry standard” relation between metabolic activity and temperature, dating way back to seminal papers in the 70s. Good enough for me, though I never found the justification for Kooi’s parameter value in the citation trail.

# Computational Considerations

## Data Product Tree

## Complexity