

# Forecasting the Ecology of the Red Sea using a Cluster of Regional 1D Marine Ecosystem Assimilative Models

Denis Dreano<sup>a</sup>, George Triantafyllou<sup>c</sup>, Bani Mallick<sup>b</sup>, Ibrahim Hoteit<sup>a,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Computer, Electrical and Mathematical Sciences and Engineering Division, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology*

<sup>b</sup>*Department of Statistics, Texas A&M University*

<sup>c</sup>*Hellenic Center for Marine Research*

---

## Abstract

Abstract

---

## 1. Introduction

*Marine ecosystem forecasting is needed because....*

- HAB affect public health, desalination and coastal economy
- predicting chlorophyll can help fisheries
- For research: better understand the large-scale ecosystem
- Especially usefull because we lack data about the subsurface phenomena

*Marine ecological models are one way to make such forecasting.*

- marine ecology models represent biogeochemical interactions as differential equations.
- Can be as simple as NPZ or as complex and complete as ERSEM.

---

\*Corresponding author

Email address: [ibrahim.hoteit@kaust.edu.sa](mailto:ibrahim.hoteit@kaust.edu.sa) (Ibrahim Hoteit)

11 *...But are expensive and difficult to tune, and subject to various sources of un-*  
12 *certainties.*

- 13     • (Anderson, 2005) lot of under-determination
- 14     • require coupling physics + biology
- 15     • Circulation models very expensive, because high-resolution grids and num-  
16       ber of involved PDEs.

17 *Data assimilation and parameter estimation techniques are used to improve and*  
18 *tune the models, but 3D models are still expensive to run.*

19 *In this article we investigate ways to simulate and predict 3D ecosystems more*  
20 *cheaply by running many parallel 1D regional models.*

- 21     • Divide the domain into small regions with similar ecology using advanced  
22       clustering techniques
- 23     • Build 1D model for each identified region
- 24     • Ensure parametrization is better for each region
- 25     • apply data assimilation techniques on the 1D models for efficient calcula-  
26       tions.

27 *We are going to test that idea on the Red Sea because....*

- 28     • Red Sea is an interesting environment: extreme temperatures and salinity
- 29     • Very rich and preserved ecosystem
- 30     • Unexplored environment
- 31     • Lack of data: therefore developing models is important

32 *We will use the SEIK data assimilation scheme, because....*

- 33 • Assimilation constrains the model, reduces underdetermination, and im-  
34 proves forecasting
- 35 • Mitigates the fact that initial conditions, parameters and physics are sub-  
36 ject to uncertainties.
- 37 • SEIK is better than SEEK for strongly nonlinear models

38 *We will assimilate Chl data because it is currently the best available data for the*  
39 *Red Sea.*

- 40 • Chl data allows to observe large scale ecological patterns with high spatial  
41 and temporal coverage.
- 42 • Compared with in situ data that are limited in time and space, and ex-  
43 pensive.
- 44 • However chl data suffers from missing values due clouds, aerosols, etc.
- 45 • Also bad values near the coast, case II waters
- 46 • Both problem particularly affect the southern Red Sea, that has nearly no  
47 observation in the summer during some months.

48 *What we are going to do in this paper step by step.*

- 49 • Fill the data with DINEOF
- 50 • Apply clustering to the Red Sea
- 51 • Implement 1D models and assimilation schemes
- 52 • Run models with assimilation
- 53 • Analyze results and compare to findings in previous studies

54 *What is new in this paper and why.*

- 55 • We use CCI data: which is a new dataset, not fully exploited in Red Sea.
- 56 • We do eco-region clustering for the first time in the Red Sea.
- 57 • We have assimilation of ecological model with hybrid-SEIK published for  
58 the first time.
- 59 • We improve our understanding of the Red Sea ecology in its different parts.

60 *Introduce sections.*

## 61 **2. Data**

### 62 *2.1. CCI chlorophyll data*

63 *We use CCI chlorophyll data because it has more coverage..*

- 64 • Single satellite CHL data products have a lot of missing data especially  
65 during summer in the South
- 66 • CCI data, merges three different sensors and uses the POLYMER algo-  
67 rithm.
- 68 • As a result the coverage increases dramatically.
- 69 • This is the first dataset that has significant coverage in the southern Red  
70 Sea, and that is why we will use it.
- 71 • We use 4km resolution L3 CHL product between such and such coordi-  
72 nates.
- 73 • We use weekly data for the clustering and 8days data for the assimilation

74 *With a quick look at the data this is what we see....*

- 75 • plot coverage
- 76 • plot average chlorophyll
- 77 • plot seasonal chlorophyll

78 *2.2. DINEOF*

79 *There are still missing data in CCI, so we use DINEOF for data filling be-*  
80 *cause....*

- 81     • DINEOF is an EOF based non parametric data filling methods
- 82     • introduced originally by *Beckers and Rixen* (2003)
- 83     • Has been applied to geoscience datasets, in particular to chl datasets
- 84     • Shown in *Taylor et al.* (2013) to be more efficient than its competition.

85 *More or less this is the way DINEOF works....*

- 86     • Describe here the algo

87 *This is how we applied DINEOF....*

- 88     • Choices of parameters and cross validation method and why we made  
89         these choices.

90 *Present and discuss the results of DINEOF.*

- 91     • Show minimization of error plot.
- 92     • Show the filling of a region.

93 *2.3. Clustering*

94 *To identify the ecological regions, we cluster the Red Sea using clustering algo-*  
95 *rithms on the CHL data. We chose GMM because....*

- 96     • There are many clustering algorithms on the market: for example...
- 97     • Discuss advantages and inconvenients of some of them (find reference)
- 98     • Finally we tried some of them and found that GMM was given better  
99         results, in comparison to what we expected.

100 *This is more or less the way GMM works....*

- 101 • Describe how GMM algo works

102 *This is how we used it....*

- 103 • We wanted 3 broad regions in the northern, central and southern Red Sea.
- 104 • We ran GMM with k varying from 3 to 7.
- 105 • We looked at some of this tests to see if the clusters where good.
- 106 • At the end we settled with k=? because it was good for our purposes and
- 107 the regions where closed to to what *Raitsos et al.* (2013) found.

108 *This is what we got....*

- 109 • Show plot of clusters
- 110 • Comment on clusters, and what was found by *Raitsos et al.* (2013).

### 111 **3. Clustered 1D Modeling and Assimilation**

#### 112 *3.1. 1D-ERSEM model*

113 *Description of ERSEM.*

- 114 • ERSEM develop originally for the northern Sea
- 115 • Complete ecology modeling
- 116 • Been applied in many ecosystem
- 117 • in particular used for the Red Sea simulation *Triantafyllou et al.* (2013)
- 118 • Very complex: many parameters and variables

119 *Initialization/Parameters/Forcing.*

- 120 • We initialize with the values found by *Triantafyllou et al.* (2013)
- 121 • The nutrients are initialized using the values of WOA
- 122 • Parameters are chosen like this
- 123 • Forcing come from the simulation by *Yao et al.* (2014a,b)

124 *3.2. Data Assimilation*

125 *We chose SEIK DA scheme because....*

- 126 • Data assimilation is necessary to improve the forecasting skill of complex  
127 geophysical models
- 128 • It constrains models that are imperfect and whose parametrization is dif-  
129 ficult to do.
- 130 • SEEK has a long history in assimilation into ecological models.
- 131 • Its ensemble variant SEIK, has been shown to behave better for very  
132 nonlinear systems

133 *Brief description of the SEIK algorithm.*

- 134 • Show the steps of the SEIK scheme

135 *Implementations.*

- 136 • How we implemented the filter.

## 137 **4. Results**

138 *4.1. Output evaluation*

139 Here, we compare the results of the free-run with the assimilated-run. We  
140 show that we have a good prediction skill, and that the assimilation improves  
141 the model.

142 *Plot some models output vs the data and qualitative comments.*

143 *Discuss different metrics to evaluate model and DA schemes.*

144 *Show a couple metrics on our results.*

145 *Impact of assimilation on the subsurface variables.*

#### 146 *4.2. Analysis*

147 Here we look at the results and interpret them biologically. Do we find  
148 comparable results as Acker, Raitsos, Weiker, etc. What can we say about the  
149 hypothesis that they made about the process that drive primary productivity in  
150 the Red Sea.

151 *Discuss differences between climatology and 2003-2004.*

152 *Comment on the role of overturning and stratification.*

*What is the limiting nutrient?*

$$\frac{N3N + N4N}{N1P}$$

153 vs Redfield ratio

154 *Compute production at different time of years and compare with Weikert1987/Acker2008/Koblentz.*

155 *Study the DCM.*

#### 156 **5. Conclusion**

157 Summary of the proposed approach

158 Are several 1D parallel 1D models a good alternative to 3D simulations?

159 What did we learn about the Red Sea ecology?

160 Future works?



## 161 **Acknowledgment**

162 The research reported in this publication was supported by King Abdullah  
163 University of Science and Technology (KAUST).

## 164 **6. Bibliography**

165 Anderson, T. R. (2005), Plankton functional type modelling: running be-  
166 fore we can walk?, *Journal of Plankton Research*, 27(11), 1073–1081, doi:  
167 10.1093/plankt/fbi076.

168 Beckers, J. M., and M. Rixen (2003), EOF calculations and data  
169 filling from incomplete oceanographic datasets, *Journal of Atmo-*  
170 *spheric and Oceanic Technology*, 20(12), 1839–1856, doi:10.1175/1520-  
171 0426(2003)020<1839:Ecadff>2.0.Co;2.

172 Raitso, D. E., Y. Pradhan, R. J. W. Brewin, G. Stenchikov, and I. Hoteit  
173 (2013), Remote sensing the phytoplankton seasonal succession of the Red  
174 Sea, *PLoS One*, 8(6), e64909, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0064909.

175 Taylor, M. H., M. Losch, M. Wenzel, and J. Schröter (2013), On the sensitivity  
176 of field reconstruction and prediction using empirical orthogonal functions  
177 derived from gappy data, *Journal of Climate*, 26, 9194–9205, doi:10.1175/Jcli-  
178 D-13-00089.1.

179 Triantafyllou, G., I. Hoteit, X. Luo, K. Tsiaras, and G. Petihakis (2013), As-  
180 sessing a robust ensemble-based Kalman filter for efficient ecosystem data  
181 assimilation of the Cretan Sea, *Journal of Marine Systems*, 125, 90–100, doi:  
182 10.1016/J.Jmarsys.2012.12.006.

183 Yao, F., I. Hoteit, L. J. Pratt, A. S. Bower, P. Zhai, A. Köhl, and G. Gopalakr-  
184 ishnan (2014a), Seasonal overturning circulation in the Red Sea: 1. model  
185 validation and summer circulation, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Oceans*,  
186 119, 2238–2262, doi:10.1002/2013jc009004.

187 Yao, F., I. Hoteit, L. J. Pratt, A. S. Bower, A. Köhl, G. Gopalakrishnan, and  
188 D. Rivas (2014b), Seasonal overturning circulation in the Red Sea: 2. winter  
189 circulation, *Journal of Geophysical Research-Oceans*, *119*, 2263–2289, doi:  
190 10.1002/2013jc009331.