

Model for Adaptive Ecosystems in Coastal Seas (MAECS)

Complete Set of Equations for the Physiological (Non-size) Version

Kai W. Wirtz¹ Richard Hofmeister¹
Markus Schartau^{2,1} Carsten Lemmen¹ ?? Onur Kerimoglu¹

¹ *Institute of Coastal Research, Helmholtz Zentrum Geesthacht, Germany*

0.1 Model structure

MAECS resolves major functional groups and their dynamics not unlike simple state-of-the-art ecosystem models. All energy and material fluxes in the ecosystem derive from primary production of phytoplankton, here expressed in terms of biomass carbon (C) concentration. Phytoplankton experiences various local and trait dependent loss rates, from sinking, respiration, exudation, to grazing. MAECS versions differ in the degree of resolution in ecological processes; a full account of grazing interactions in the plankton is only addressed by versions that includes size as a major trait. Grazers convert only a fraction of captured phytoplankton to their own biomass; in size-based variants of MAECS we have implemented different formulations for whether this fraction immediately contributes to the biomass of adult grazers or their egg stage, or how many grazer groups are simulated (see below).

Physiological regulation in unicellular autotrophs makes the very kernel of the MAECS version documented here. The intracellular nutrient quotas, in this model version resolved for nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P), and silicon (Si), change over time when uptake does not match demand due to biomass build-up. Differential uptake regulation then leads to highly variable stoichiometries, that not only reflect ambient nutrient and light

concentration, but also generalized optimality criteria.

For describing the living compartment of plankton ecosystems MAECS employs much more trait variables (e.g., allocation coefficients) compared to bulk variables (e.g., phytoplankton or zooplankton biomass). The adaptive trait dynamics infers the need of calculating (sometimes long) derivative terms, which also challenges this documentation; however, the gradient-derived terms include very few additional process parameters, so that the number of tunable parameters in relation to simulated and testable dynamics is significantly reduced compared to models that share a similar resolution in plankton physiology or ecology. Most importantly, MAECS seeks to express biophysical and evolutionary principles as much as possible; this means to avoid heuristic functions such as Michaelis-Menten, Droop, Geider, or Liebig. Biophysical origins of model formulations further reduces the number of tunable parameters, in particular in the ecological part. Prominent counter-examples, i.e. yet uncertain model formulations or parameters, comprise aggregation dynamics or variations in metabolic interdependency.

0.2 Growth rate components and primary production

Temporal changes of the bulk phytoplankton concentration Phy_C are per construction given in terms of the over all relative growth rate μ_{tot} :

$$\frac{d}{dt}\text{Phy}_C = \mu_{\text{tot}} \cdot \text{Phy}_C \quad (1)$$

The relative growth rate of autotrophic unicells (phytoplankton) collects primary production and a number of loss terms

$$\mu_{\text{tot}} = \underbrace{P - R}_{\mu} - \underbrace{\left(\underbrace{E}_{(69)} + \underbrace{\frac{G \text{Zoo}_C}{\text{Phy}_C}}_{(58)} + \underbrace{S}_{(59)} + \underbrace{AF}_{(64)} + D \right)}_M = \mu - M \quad (2)$$

with sinking loss given in Eq.(59) (relevant only in 0D), aggregate formation in Eq.(64) [TODO: living cells in aggregates], grazing G explained in Sec. 0.14, exudation rate E formulated in Eq.(69), dilution rate D (for running the model in a chemostat mode), and respiration R in Eq.(5).

Gross C assimilation P changes with stoichiometric balance as expressed by the multi-nutrient co-limitation factor LF, maximal photosynthetic capacity P_{\max} (further depending on, e.g. partitioning, Eq.(13), or size in the ecological version, Wirtz (2011, 2013)) and light harvesting success S

$$P = P_{\max} \cdot \text{LF} \cdot \text{LH} \quad (3)$$

(13)
(7)

Light harvesting LH is primarily controlled by ambient light intensity PAR and light adsorption by chloroplasts $\alpha \cdot \theta$ proportional to the chlorophyll concentration θ (cf.Eq.(14)). Its functional form derives from Poisson arrival statistics of photons

$$\text{LH} = 1 - e^{-\alpha \theta \text{PAR} / P_{\max}} \quad (4)$$

0.3 *Respiration and temperature*

Respiratory losses reflect costs of N uptake (Raven, 1984; Pahlow, 2005), while neglecting energetic costs of P- and Si-assimilation

$$R = \zeta V_N \quad (5)$$

Temperature dependency of respiration thus follows from the factor f_T in the uptake coefficients in Eq.(17). In the current MAECS version, all metabolic rates equally increase with rising temperature following the Arrhenius equation,

$$f_T = e^{-E_a(T^{-1} - T_0^{-1})} \quad \text{with} \quad E_a = \frac{T_0^2}{10} \cdot \log(Q_{10}) \quad (6)$$

with a reference temperature T_0 (here 18°C) where f_T equals one.

0.4 Multi-nutrient co-limitation

The co-limitation factor LF is constructed within a metabolic network view of cellular physiology. There, LF reflects not only the availability of singular resources (nutrients) but also how dependent the sub-networks (protein turnover) associated to those nutrients can evolve. In this view, LF quantifies the turnover of the first sub-process (here intracellular nitrogen turnover) times the queuing function that gives the intermittency between the first and the other sub-processes (associated to elements X):

$$\text{LF} = q_N \cdot \underset{(9)}{g_h(q'_X/q_N)} \cdot c_{hq} \quad \text{with} \quad c_{hq} = 1 + \underset{(10)}{c_h} + h \cdot q_N \underset{(11)}{q'_X} \quad (7)$$

The relative quota q_X expresses the availability of nutrient X above a subsistence threshold Q_X^0 normalized by a reference pool size $Q_X^* - Q_X^0$. In contrast to most other structured models, Q_X^* does not impose an upper boundary of the cell quota Q_X .

$$q_X = \frac{Q_X - Q_X^0}{\Delta Q_X} \quad \text{with} \quad \Delta Q_X = Q_X^* - Q_X^0 \quad \text{and} \quad X = \text{N, P, Si, } \dots \quad (8)$$

In Eq.(7), the product $h q_N q'_X$ describes the non-linear metabolic interdependency between intracellular turnover of element N and X that is not covered by the simple queuing function. g_h expresses a "stop and go" dependency while neglecting possible amplification and inhibition effects as explained by Wirtz&Kerimoglu (in prep.). The product term leads to a quadratic influence of the first element (q_N) and can be considered as most simple account of non-linear metabolic interdependency. It also ensures symmetry of LF with respect to exchanging the order of nutrients as $q_1 g_h(q'_2/q_1) c_{hq12} \approx q_2 g_h(q'_1/q_2) c_{hq21}$.

The queuing function g_h can be derived from assuming Poisson statistics in phase-locking of sub-networks:

$$g_h(x) = \frac{x - x_h}{1 - x_h} \quad \text{with} \quad x_h = x^{1+h^{-1}} \quad (9)$$

The function g_h introduces as new control parameter the metabolic interdependency h . h resembles the processing intermittency introduced by Wirtz (2012), which describes the probability of phase-locking in independent sub-steps in a process chain.

The correction coefficient c_h in Eq.(7) follows from imposing convergence of LF to the product and Liebig rules. Compliance to the Liebig rule leads to $c_0 = 0$ since g_0 describes

a stepwise linear function. For the product rule, we use the identity $g_h(1) = 1/(1+h)$ and assume that $q_X = q_Y = 1/2$, to obtain $1/4 = 1/2 \cdot (1 + h/4 + c_h)/(1+h)$, or $c_h = -1/2 + h/4$. However, the offset in this linear relation conflicts with the condition $c_0 = 0$. Both conditions can be approximately reconciled by a logarithmic function

$$c_h = \log(1/4^h + h/2) \quad (10)$$

It is mandatory in MAECS to resolve nitrogen. If optionally one, two, or more further nutrients are considered (e.g., P *or* Si, P *and* Si, or a micro-nutrient), a recursive scheme is applied. The limiting effect of element $X+1$ on the processing of element X (q'_X) is then formally equivalent to the LF of the first element (N) limited by the remainder metabolism (LF = q'_N) as given in Eq.(7):

$$q'_X = q_X \cdot g_h(q'_{X+1}/q_X) \cdot c_{hq} \quad X = \text{P, Si}, \dots \quad (11)$$

For the final element we have $q'_X = q_X$. From the (subjective) ordering of elements in the recursive scheme only a small asymmetry arises.

0.5 Uptake system allocation and PI-coefficients

It is assumed that the fraction of free proteins or allocatable resources does not change. Structural compounds such as cell wall, nucleus, or other non directly functional components are thus kept at a fixed ratio. The pool of free organics (in terms of cellular carbon) is partitioned between photosynthetic machinery and nutrient uptake. Photosynthetic machinery is further sub-divided into light harvesting and processing. The relative pool size of free resource (here in units C!) invested into light-independent reactions, primarily those in Rubisco and the Calvin cycle (Friend, 1991) is denoted as f_R , the one for the light harvesting complex (LHC) f_θ . This way, the coefficient f_V for C-allocation to nutrient uptake becomes a linear function of the C-allocation to LHC f_θ and to Rubisco f_R :

$$f_V = 1 - f_R - f_\theta \quad (12)$$

Maximum photosynthesis rate P_{\max} is controlled by the pool fraction f_R invested into

Rubisco/processing and a temperature dependency f_T given in Eq.(6), while the effect of nutrient limitation (namely N) is already included in Eq.(3)

$$P_{\max} = f_R \cdot \underset{(6)}{f_T} \cdot P_{\max}^* \quad (13)$$

The fraction of light harvesting carbon depends on the C-fraction partitioned to photosystem processing (electron chain) and the chloroplast chlorophyll concentration θ (relative to a reference value θ_C):

$$f_\theta = f_R q_N^\sigma \theta / \theta_C \quad \text{or} \quad \theta = f_\theta / f_R q_N^{-\sigma} \theta_C \quad (14)$$

where C stoichiometry of pigment complexes is denoted by θ_C . The exponent σ describes an additional linkage of LHC synthesis on the N-status of the cell. Wirtz and Pahlow (2010) proposed that $\sigma = 1$ for diatoms, while $\sigma = 0$ for other autotrophs.

0.6 Nutrient uptake

Nutrient uptake rate of the cell varies with a number of internal, physiological factors, such as the partitioning coefficient f_V (see above) and the (enzymatic) activity $a_{V,X}$ ($X = N, P, Si, \dots$), and is furthermore determined by the potential uptake V_X^*

$$V_X = \underset{(12)}{f_V} \cdot \underset{(38)}{a_{V,X}} \cdot V_X^* \quad (15)$$

Potential uptake V_X^* reflects ambient nutrient concentration, but also affinity and transport capacities denoted by A_X and $V_{\max,X}$. Nutrient uptake is a sequential 2-stage process (membrane uptake and intracellular transport) as described by the nutrient affinity A_X and maximal uptake rate $V_{\max,X}$ such that the effective uptake time equals the sum of turnover times in each stage:

$$V_X^{*-1} = V_{\max,X}^{-1} + (A_X \text{ DIX})^{-1} \quad \text{with} \quad \text{DIX} = \text{DIN}, \text{DIP}, \text{DSi}, \dots \quad (16)$$

Nutrient uptake characteristics are temperature sensitive and assumed to depend on a sub-partitioning of allocatable proteins expressed by the coefficient $f_{A,X}$

$$V_{\max,X} = (1 - f_{A,X}) \cdot Q_0 \cdot \underset{(6)}{f_T} \cdot V_{\max,X}^0 \quad (17)$$

$$A_X = f_{A,X} \cdot Q_0 \cdot f_T \cdot A_X^0 \quad (18)$$

[TODO: differential temperature sensitivity; see Smith 2013]

Protein sub-partitioning of overall uptake machinery (f_V) into affinity and transport capabilities is instantaneously optimized

$$\frac{\partial V_X^*}{\partial f_{A,X}} = 0 \quad (19)$$

and the resulting optimal sub-partitioning depends on nutrient availability (Pahlow, 2005; Smith et al., 2009)

$$f_{A,X} = \left(1 + \sqrt{A_X^0 \cdot \text{DIX} / V_{\max,X}^0}\right)^{-1} \quad (20)$$

In terms of the autotroph nutrient quota Q_X (X=N, P, Si) imbalance between nutrient uptake and growth demand leads to

$$\frac{d}{dt}Q_X = V_X - \mu \cdot Q_X \quad (21)$$

or, in the MAECS notation where traits/characteristics are transported as bulk biomasses Phy_X parallel to the basic phytoplankton concentration Phy_C

$$\frac{d}{dt}\text{Phy}_X = V_X \cdot \text{Phy}_C - \underset{(2)}{M} \cdot \text{Phy}_X \quad \text{with} \quad Q_X = \frac{\text{Phy}_X}{\text{Phy}_C} \quad (22)$$

[TODO: exudation]

0.7 Adaptive trait regulation and differential trade-off

Adaptive trait dynamics in its general form has been proposed as an optimality-seeking principle guiding transient adaptive regulation phenomena on very different levels of description, from organ physiology to population ecology (Wirtz, 2000, 2003; Smith et al., 2011). This principle/equation is applied to all physiological traits in MAECS, in particular to those that primarily control nutrient uptake (f_R and θ through f_V , and activity $a_{V,X}$.

C-growth as goal function needs to be extended by "hidden" or indirect effects through a differential link between nutrient uptake V_X and quota Q_X for all macro-nutrients:

$$\frac{df_{m,X}}{dt} = \delta_m \left(\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial f_{m,X}} + \sum_x \underbrace{\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial Q_X}}_{(33)} \underbrace{\frac{dQ_X}{dV_X}}_{(34)} \bigg|_{\text{tot}} \frac{\partial V_X}{\partial f_{m,X}} \right) \quad \text{with} \quad f_{m,X} = f_R, \theta, a_{V,X} \quad X = N, P, Si, \dots \quad (23)$$

[TODO: reduce text or spread to individual euqations]

Diverging from most standard ecosystem models, however, MAECS assumes intricate interdependencies between independent C, N, or P assimilation functions while avoiding prescribed stoichiometric control settings such as maximal N:C or P:C ratios. For doing so, it implies optimality criteria already in the description of basic uptake formulations (lower part of Table ??). These criteria control shifts between high affinity and fast transport nutrient uptake (see above Eq.(20)) and in the enzymatic down-regulation of all nutrient uptake activities. Adaptive control in activity secures phytoplankton cells from non-beneficial intracellular accumulation of nutrients, but in the model also requires to formulate an extended optimality principle by which C costs of nutrient uptake have to be balanced with corresponding C benefits arising fro associated quota changes (Eq.(??)). For both regulations (uptake site/transport partitioning, activity), steady-state solutions or approximations are calculated since physiological uptake regulations proceed at very high speed.

For nitrogen (N), the differential effect of increasing nutrient uptake rate on the quota derives from functional variation applied to the quota uptake equation Eq.(21):

$$\delta V_X + \frac{\partial V_X}{\partial Q_X} \delta Q_X - \mu \cdot \delta Q_X - Q_X \cdot \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial Q_X} \delta Q_X - Q_X \cdot \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial V_X} \delta V_X = 0 \quad (24)$$

or

$$\frac{dQ_X}{dV_X} = (1 + \zeta_X Q_X) \cdot \left(\mu + Q_X \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial Q_X} - \frac{\partial V_X}{\partial Q_X} \right)^{-1} \quad (25)$$

where the derivative of uptake rate on quota may only become non-zero (1) for nitrogen (N) and (2) if C-partitioning to chlorophyll (f_θ in Eq.(14)) is hardwired to the N-quota:

$$\frac{\partial V_N}{\partial Q_N} = \frac{V_N}{f_V} \frac{\partial f_V}{\partial Q_N} = -\frac{\sigma f_R \theta}{f_V \theta_C \Delta Q_N} V_N = -\sigma' V_N \quad (26)$$

0.8 Growth derivatives under co-limitation

For the N-turnover and regulation, the differential dependency of V_N on Q_N also enters the marginal increase in primary production when raising intracellular quota; an analytical derivation of the photosynthesis rate P in Eq.(3) with respect to each co-limiting quota Q_X reads

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial Q_X} &= \frac{P}{LF} \frac{\partial LF}{\partial q_X} \frac{\partial q_X}{\partial Q_X} - \zeta \frac{\partial V_N}{\partial Q_X} \\
&= d_X \frac{\mu + \zeta V_N}{\Delta Q_X} + \sigma' \zeta V_N \quad \text{with } d_X = LF^{-1} \frac{\partial LF}{\partial q_X} \\
&= \left(d_X \frac{1 + \zeta Q_N}{\Delta Q_X} + \sigma' \zeta Q_N \right) \cdot \mu \\
&= d_{QX} \cdot \mu
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where we assumed a balanced growth relation between growth and uptake ($\mu Q_N = V_N$), used the relation $P = \mu + \zeta V_N$. In light of Eq.(36) we have $\sigma'_N = \sigma'$ and $\sigma'_X = 0$ for other elements that lack direct influence on N-uptake rate.

The derivation result d_X of the (recursive) co-limitation factor $LF \equiv q'_1$ may contain a number of product terms, depending on where in the scheme the limiting effect of Q_X is calculated. Consider the series of limitation factors $q_1, q_2, \dots, q_{\text{No}^{\text{nut}}}$ (e.g., for q_N, q_P, q_{Si}) we start from the first element where the recursive scheme Eq.(11) has been invoked only once. For example, if MAECS just resolves its basic element N,

$$d_N = \frac{1}{q'_N} \quad \text{for } \text{No}^{\text{nut}} = 1 \tag{28}$$

or N and P,

$$d_N = \frac{1}{q'_N} \frac{\partial q'_N}{\partial q_N} \quad d_P = \frac{1}{q'_N} \frac{\partial q'_N}{\partial q'_P} \frac{\partial q'_P}{\partial q_P} \quad \text{for } \text{No}^{\text{nut}} = 2 \tag{29}$$

Note that $\partial q'_P / \partial q_P$ is one because P makes the last element in the list, so that the metabolic effect of Q_P as quantified by q'_P exclusively depends on the availability of Q_P

as quantified by q_P . The general form for an arbitrary No^{nut} continues the sequential differentiation from the first element (here usually N) to the element X under consideration. So starting from q'_1 we calculate the use efficiency of element X again using the chain-rule:

$$d_X = \frac{1}{q'_1} \frac{\partial q'_1}{\partial q'_2} \frac{\partial q'_2}{\partial q'_3} \dots \frac{\partial q'_X}{\partial q_X} \quad (30)$$

Note that the last term in the product of differentials ($\partial q'_X / \partial q_X$) is either one if X is the last element in the sequence, and otherwise given by Eq.(31). The differentials in Eqs.(28)–(30) characterize the recursive effect of metabolic efficiencies of q'_X formulated in Eq.(11)

$$\frac{\partial q'_X}{\partial q_X} = q'_X \cdot \left(q_X^{-1} - \frac{\partial g_h}{\partial x} \frac{q'_{X+1}}{g_h q_X^2} + \frac{h q'_{X+1}}{c_{hq}} \right) \quad (31)$$

or, if we differentiate with respect to the second efficiency:

$$\frac{\partial q'_X}{\partial q'_{X+1}} = q'_X \cdot \left(\frac{\partial g_h}{\partial x} \frac{1}{g_h q_X} + \frac{h q_X}{c_{hq}} \right) \quad (32)$$

where the coefficient c_{hq} given in Eq.(7) is written without nutrient specific indices. Step-wise derivation of the queuing function $(x - x_h)/(1 - x_h)$ with $x_h = x^{1+h^{-1}}$ in Eq.(9) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial g_h}{\partial x} &= \frac{(1 - (1 + h^{-1})x_h/x) \cdot (1 - x_h) + (x - x_h) \cdot (1 + h^{-1})x_h/x}{(1 - x_h)^2} \\ &= \frac{(x h - (h + 1)x_h) \cdot (1 - x_h) + (x - x_h) \cdot (h + 1)x_h}{x h \cdot (1 - x_h)^2} \\ &= \frac{x h - (h + 1)x_h - \cancel{x h x_h} + \cancel{(h + 1)x_h^2} + x \cdot (h + 1)x_h - \cancel{(h + 1)x_h^2}}{x h \cdot (1 - x_h)^2} \\ &= \frac{x h + (x - 1 - h) \cdot x_h}{x h \cdot (1 - x_h)^2} \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

[TODO: numerical approximation to avoid problems at $x = 1$]

0.9 Quota-uptake feed-back

Eq.(25) provides a first estimate for the differential trade-off required for a fully coherent application of the optimality principle to physiological regulation. However, a marginal change in quota after a differential change in uptake rate may propagate back to the uptake rate, if the latter directly depends on Q_N . This direct, differential feed-back between changes in Q_N and V_N reads

$$\left. \frac{dQ_N}{dV_N} \right|_{\text{tot}} = \frac{dQ_N}{dV_N} \cdot \left(1 + \underbrace{\frac{dQ_N}{dV_N} \frac{\partial V_N}{\partial Q_N}}_{(35)} \right) \quad (34)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dQ_N}{dV_N} \frac{\partial V_N}{\partial Q_N} &= -(1 + \zeta Q_N) \cdot \left(\mu + Q_N \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial Q_N} - \frac{\partial V_N}{\partial Q_N} \right)^{-1} \sigma' V_N \\ &= -(1 + \zeta Q_N) \cdot \left(1 + Q_N \left[d_N \frac{1 + \zeta Q_N}{Q_N - Q_{N0}} + \sigma' \zeta Q_N \right] + \sigma' Q_N \right)^{-1} \sigma' Q_N \\ &= -(1 + \zeta Q_N) \cdot \left((Q_N)^{-1} + d_N \frac{1 + \zeta Q_N}{Q_N - Q_{N0}} + \sigma' \cdot (1 + \zeta Q_N) \right)^{-1} \sigma' \\ &= -\sigma' \cdot \left(\underbrace{(Q_N (1 + \zeta Q_N))^{-1} + d_N (Q_N - Q_{N0})^{-1}}_{e_N} + \sigma' \right)^{-1} \\ &= -\frac{\sigma'}{e_N + \sigma'} \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

In all other cases apart of nitrogen, the uptake dependency on the quota vanishes:

$$\frac{\partial V_X}{\partial Q_X} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \left. \frac{dQ_X}{dV_X} \right|_{\text{tot}} = \frac{dQ_X}{dV_X} \quad \text{with} \quad X = P, Si \quad (36)$$

The product of the quota-uptake differential (without feed-back) and the growth-quota differential in Eq.(23) combines Eq.(25) and Eq.(27) and again assumes $V_X = Q_X \mu$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dQ_X}{dV_X} \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial Q_X} &= (1 + \zeta_X Q_X) \cdot \left(\mu + Q_X \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial Q_X} - \frac{\partial V_X}{\partial Q_X} \right)^{-1} \cdot d_{QX} \cdot \mu \\ &= (1 + \zeta_X Q_X) \cdot \left(1 + Q_X d_{QX} + \sigma'_X V_X \mu^{-1} \right)^{-1} \cdot \underbrace{d_{QX}}_{(27)} \\ &= \frac{(1 + \zeta_X Q_X) \cdot d_{QX}}{1 + Q_X \cdot (d_{QX} + \sigma'_X)} \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

0.10 Uptake activity regulation

In the current version of MAECS, regulation of all uptake activity traits a_X is supposed to be very fast compared to the simulated dynamics and therefore not integrated in time according to Eq.(23), but assumed to be in steady-state. If the marginal benefit of uptake $d\mu/da_X$ is negative, activity is ceased; at positive benefit, a_X approaches one, while at neutral growth effect $d\mu/da_X \approx 0$, the activity smoothly varies at 1/2. This behavior is emulated by the non-linear function

$$a_X = \left(1 + e^{-\Delta t_v d\mu/da_X}\right)^{-1} \quad (38)$$

For optimization in N-uptake activity a_N based on its the marginal C gain the extended optimality principle integrates Eq.(23) and Eqs.(27)–(37):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mu}{da_X} &= \frac{\partial\mu}{\partial a_X} + \frac{\partial\mu}{\partial Q_X} \frac{dQ_X}{dV_X} \Big|_{\text{tot}} \frac{\partial V_X}{\partial a_X} \\ &= -\zeta_X \frac{V_X}{a_X} + \frac{\partial\mu}{\partial Q_X} \frac{dQ_X}{dV_X} \frac{e_N}{e_N + \sigma'_X} \frac{V_X}{a_X} \\ &= \left(-\underset{(41)}{\zeta_X} + \frac{(1 + \zeta_X Q_X) \cdot d_{QX}}{1 + Q_X \cdot (d_{QX} + \sigma'_X)} \frac{e_N}{e_N + \sigma'_X} \right) \cdot \frac{V_X}{a_X} \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where, again, $\sigma'_N = \sigma'$ and $\sigma'_X = 0$ for other elements that lack direct influence on uptake.

0.11 Costs in P and Si uptake

For a first estimation of the C-costs of P- and Si-uptake (with units mol-C/mol-X) we link the latter to N-assimilation. This means that energetic costs of P- and Si-assimilation are not accounted for as additional terms but assumed to be already included in protein synthesis that are chararized by $\zeta \equiv \zeta_N$ (with units mol-C/mol-N). For the P-link, we use

the N-stoichiometry in RNA (N:P \approx 3.8:1) and phospholipids (N:P \approx 0.8:1 mol-N/mol-P)

$$\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial V_X} = \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial V_N} \frac{\partial V_N}{\partial V_X} = -\zeta_N \cdot \frac{Q_N^{0*}}{Q_X^{0*}} = -\zeta_X \quad (40)$$

with Eq.(7) Eq.(11)

$$\zeta_P = \left[(1 - f_{\text{Lip}}) 3.8 + f_{\text{Lip}} 0.8 \right] \cdot \zeta_N \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta_{\text{Si}} = 0 \quad (41)$$

[TODO: check and simplify]

[TODO: include proteins/membranes (N:P \gg 16:1) under low growth conditions]

0.12 Photoacclimation and transport

MAECS resolves transient photoacclimation as adaptive dynamics in allocation traits (Eq.(23)). The optimality principle extended by the differential quota-based trade-off Eq.(37) seeks to find an allocation key between nutrient uptake, LHC and light-independent processes (Rubisco) that maximizes relative C-uptake rate μ . The optimality condition includes marginal growth benefits of all nutrients (see Eq.(23)):

$$\frac{d}{dt} f_R = \delta_R \left(\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial f_R} + \sum_x \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial Q_X} \frac{dQ_X}{dV_X} \Big|_{\text{tot}} \frac{\partial V_X}{\partial f_R} \right) \quad (42)$$

(33)
(34)
(45)

and similar for the chloroplast CHL:C ratio θ :

$$\frac{d}{dt} \theta = \delta_R \left(\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \theta} + \sum_x \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial Q_X} \frac{dQ_X}{dV_X} \Big|_{\text{tot}} \frac{\partial V_X}{\partial \theta} \right) \quad (43)$$

(27)
(34)
(46)

The differential growth loss by increasing allocation to photosynthesis apparati down-sizes the nutrient uptake machinery. All uptake and indirect derivatives of the photoacclimation traits that induce these differential costs had been already introduced above.

Flexibilities in chloroplast CHL:C ratio and in C-allocation to Rubisco are given following Wirtz (2000)

$$\delta_\theta = \delta_\theta^* \cdot \theta \cdot (\theta_C - \theta) \quad \delta_R = \delta_R^* \cdot f_R \cdot (1 - f_R) \quad (44)$$

Partial derivatives of photosynthesis rates with respect to θ and f_R (see Eq.(13) and Eq.(15)):

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial f_R} &= \frac{P}{f_R} - \zeta \frac{\partial V_N}{\partial f_R} \\ &= \frac{P}{f_R} + \zeta \cdot \left(1 + \frac{q_N^\sigma \theta}{\theta_C}\right) \cdot a_{V,N} V_X^* \quad (45)\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial \theta} &= \frac{P}{LH} \frac{\partial LH}{\partial \theta} - \zeta \frac{\partial V_N}{\partial \theta} \\ &= \frac{P}{LH} \frac{\alpha \text{PAR}}{P_{\max}} (1 - LH) - \zeta \frac{q_N^\sigma f_R}{\theta_C} \cdot a_{V,N} V_X^* \quad (46)\end{aligned}$$

For transporting photoacclimation traits in 1D-3D, MAECS integrates them as bulk variables by employing a "carrier" biomass variable (usually Phy_C). With Eq.(14) we have for the bulk chlorophylla concentration

$$\text{Chl} = f_\theta \theta_C \text{Phy}_C = f_R q_N^\sigma \theta \text{Phy}_C \quad (47)$$

and bulk Rubisco concentrations

$$\text{Rub} = f_R \text{Phy}_C \quad (48)$$

[TODO: write down full equations]

0.13 Mass equations

Basic mass equations common to the two MAECS variants (size and physiology). All coefficients and their meanings are listed in Table ??.

Net change in autotroph C, N, P, Si (cf. Eq.(1) and Eq.(22)) ...

$$\frac{d}{dt} \text{Phy}_C = \mu_{\text{tot}} \cdot \text{Phy}_C \quad (49)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \text{Phy}_X = V_X \cdot \text{Phy}_C - M \cdot \text{Phy}_X \quad \text{with } X = \text{N, P, Si} \quad (50)$$

... in dissolved inorganic nutrients (X=N, P), optionally including silicate

$$\frac{d}{dt} \text{DIX} = -V_X \text{Phy}_C + \omega_{\text{DOM}}^{(55)} \text{DOX} \quad (51)$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \text{DSi} = -V_{\text{Si}} \text{Phy}_C + \omega_{\text{Det}}^{(55)} \text{Det}_{\text{Si}} \quad (52)$$

[TODO: include DIC into code]

... in dissolved organic nutrients (X=C, N, P),

$$\frac{d}{dt} \text{DOX} = E \text{Phy}_X + \omega_{\text{Det}} \text{Det}_X - \omega_{\text{DOM}} \text{DOX} \quad (53)$$

... and in the detrital pool (X=C, N, P, Si).

$$\frac{d}{dt} \text{Det}_X = M' \text{Phy}_X + M_Z \text{Zoo}_X - \omega_{\text{Det}} \text{Det}_X \quad (54)$$

where the phytoplankton mortality M' collects contributions from sloppy grazing $((1 - y)G)$ and, in 0D setups, and from sinking (S in Eq.(59)). Remineralization of DOM ω_{DOM} and hydrolysis of detritus ω_{Det} both change with ambient temperature and substrate quality

$$\omega_{\text{DOM}} = f_T \frac{\text{DON}}{\text{DOC}} \omega_{\text{DOM}}^* \quad \omega_{\text{Det}} = f_T \frac{\text{Det}_N}{\text{Det}_C} \omega_{\text{Det}}^* \quad (55)$$

Because of the quality dependency in degradation rates, element cycles in the water column are easily decoupled within MAECS.

Note that in a chemostat mode, to the dynamics of *all* concentration variables a dilution (D) loss is added, which only for dissolved nutrients also contains reservoir inflow $(-D \cdot (\text{DIX} - \text{DIX}^0))$.

0.14 Grazing

Before merging with the ecological MAECS version, we use primitive (non-biophysical) standards for describing heterotrophic activities:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \text{Zoo}_C = (y \cdot G - \tau_C - M_Z) \cdot \text{Zoo}_C \quad (56)$$

with quadratic and temperature sensitive mortality to represent top-down pressure

$$M_Z = f_T \cdot M_Z^0 \cdot Z_{\text{OOC}} \quad (57)$$

and a Holling-III response function for functional grazing response:

$$G = g_{\text{max}} f_T \cdot \frac{\text{Phy}_C^2}{K_G^2 + \text{Phy}_C^2} \quad (58)$$

[TODO: more complicated loss/leakage terms τ_X to ensure homeostasis and mass conservation]

0.15 *Sinking loss*

Vertical losses account for enhanced settling due to aggregate formation which occurs under high concentrations of particles and exopolymers. As a coastal model, already the basic version of MAECS resolves a benthic compartment independently from the coupled diagenesis model (see below).

The relative loss rate S is, in an idealized picture, the ratio between v_s and the mixed layer depth (MLD)

$$S = (1 + f_{\text{agg}}) \cdot \frac{v_s}{\text{MLD}} \quad (59)$$

(64)

[TODO: add size as trait or explicit parameter; the following part comes from the size-based model version]

The velocity v_s of a sinking particle is described by Stokes' law, which for a spherical cell with diameter $\text{ESD} = e^\ell$ reads

$$v_s = \frac{g \rho'(\ell) e^{2\ell}}{18\nu(T)} \quad (60)$$

The unitless excess density ρ' , the density difference between water and the suspended body, divided by water density, is known to be a function of the physiology and size of the suspended cells (Waite et al., 1997; Kiørboe et al., 1998; Miklasz and Denny, 2010). Dead cells are relatively heavy-weighted ($\rho' = \rho^\dagger$, $\rho^\dagger > 0$), but ρ^\dagger decreases in

large (siliceous) phytoplankton due to an increasing fraction of vacuoles. The allometric relation of vacuolation and excess density reduction is

$$\rho^\dagger = \rho_0^\dagger e^{-\alpha_\rho \ell} \quad (61)$$

As vacuoles usually contain a higher concentration of inorganic compounds than the surrounding cytoplasm, the exponent α_ρ should be close to the size scaling slope reported for carbon density by Menden-Deuer and Lessard (2000).

Linear dependency between excess density and relative production

$$\rho' = (1 - f_{\text{vac}} \cdot p) \cdot \rho^\dagger \quad (62)$$

f_{vac} is the relative volumetric fraction that can be filled with material of reduced density (e.g., gases, lipids, or solutes, the latter listed in Boyd and Gradmann (2002)). This quantity relates to the vacuole structure (Raven and Waite, 2004) and can therefore be formulated as the relative density difference with respect to cells without vacuolation (ρ_0^\dagger in Eq.(61))

$$f_{\text{vac}} = \frac{\rho_0^\dagger - \rho^\dagger}{\rho_0^\dagger} = 1 - e^{-\alpha_\rho \ell} \quad (63)$$

0.16 Particle aggregation

[check with Richard; re-introduce into code]

Aggregation depends on stickiness and particle surface

$$f_{\text{agg}} = f_{\text{agg}}^* \text{EP} \cdot \text{Phy}_C \cdot \text{ESD}^n \quad (64)$$

The relative fraction of exopolymers within the DOM pool is inversely related to DOM quality, which is expressed in terms of the N:C stoichiometry. Stickiness associated with exopolymers (EP) correlates with DOM quantity and inverse quality

$$\text{EP} = \frac{\text{DOC}}{\text{DON}} \text{DOC} \quad (65)$$

Stickiness not only enhances coagulation efficiency in particle aggregation, it also increases the critical bottom shear stress for sediment resuspension ("biostabilization"). Resuspension of benthic material occurs when bottom shear stress exceeds that "sticky" threshold.

$$RS = RS^* \max \left\{ V_{\text{bshear}} - V_{\text{EP}}^* EP, 0 \right\} \quad (66)$$

so we have for material fluxes due to resuspension

$$\frac{d}{dt} C_X^{\text{z=H}} = \dots + RSC_X^{\text{ben}} \quad \text{with} \quad C_X = \text{Phy}_X, \text{Det}_X \quad (67)$$

0.17 Other stuff

Photoinhibition by depletion of D1-protein

$$u = \frac{q_N}{q_N + u^* \text{Chl:C}^2} \quad (68)$$

Exudation reflects imbalance between C uptake and assimilation

$$E = e^* P_{\text{max}}^* f_T \text{ LH} \quad (69)$$

0.18 Acknowledgements

We thank The work was supported by the Helmholtz society via the program PACES.

References

- Armstrong, R. A., 2006. Optimality-based modeling of nitrogen allocation and photoacclimation in photosynthesis. *Deep Sea Res. II* 53 (5-7), 513–531.
- Boyd, C., Gradmann, D., 2002. Impact of osmolytes on buoyancy of marine phytoplankton. *Mar. Biol.* 141 (4), 605–618.

- Friend, A. D., 1991. Use of a model of photosynthesis and leaf microenvironment to predict optimal stomatal conductance and leaf nitrogen partitioning. *Plant Cell Environ.* 14, 895–905.
- Kjørboe, T., Tiselius, P., Mitchell-Innes, B., Hansen, J., Visser, A., Mari, X., 1998. Intensive aggregate formation with low vertical flux during an upwelling-induced diatom bloom. *Lim. Ocean.* 43, 104–116.
- Menden-Deuer, S., Lessard, E. J., 2000. Carbon to volume relationships for dinoflagellates, diatoms, and other protist plankton. *Lim. Ocean.* 45 (3), 569–579.
- Miklasz, K., Denny, M., 2010. Diatom sinking speeds: improved predictions and insight from a modified Stokes' law. *Lim. Ocean.* 55 (6), 2513–2525.
- Morel, F. M. M., 1987. Kinetics of nutrient uptake and growth in phytoplankton. *J. Phycol.* 23 (2), 137–150.
- Pahlow, M., 2005. Linking chlorophyll-nutrient dynamics to the Redfield N: C ratio with a model of optimal phytoplankton growth. *Mar. Ecol. Progr. Ser.* 287, 33–43.
- Raven, J., 1984. Dark respiration. In: *Energetics and transport in aquatic plants*. Vol. 4 of MBL Lectures. Alan R. Liss; Inc., New York, pp. 253–317.
- Raven, J. A., Waite, A. M., 2004. The evolution of silicification in diatoms: inescapable sinking and sinking as escape? *New Phytol.* 162, 45–61.
- Smith, S. L., Pahlow, M., Merico, A., Wirtz, K. W., 2011. Optimality as a unifying concept for planktonic organisms and their ecology. *Lim. Ocean.* 56, 2080–2094.
- Smith, S. L., Yamanaka, Y., Pahlow, M., Oschlies, A., 2009. Optimal uptake kinetics: physiological acclimation explains the pattern of nitrate uptake by phytoplankton in the ocean. *Mar. Ecol. Progr. Ser.* 384, 1–12.
- Waite, A., Fisher, A., Thompson, P., Harrison, P., 1997. Sinking rate verses cell volume relationships illuminate sinking rate control mechanisms in marine diatoms. *Mar. Ecol. Progr. Ser.* 157, 97–108.
- Wirtz, K. W., 2000. Simulating the dynamics of leaf physiology and morphology with an extended optimality approach. *Ann. Bot.* 86, 753–764.
- Wirtz, K. W., 2003. Adaptive significance of C partitioning and SLA regulation in *Betula pendula*. *Tree Physiol.* 23 (3), 181–190.
- Wirtz, K. W., 2011. Non-uniform scaling in phytoplankton growth rate due to intracellular light and CO₂ decline. *J. Plankton Res.* 33, 1325–1341.
- Wirtz, K. W., 2012. Intermittency in processing explains the diversity and shape of functional

grazing responses. *Oecologia* 169, 879–894.

Wirtz, K. W., 2013. Mechanistic origins of variability in phytoplankton dynamics. Part I: Niche formation revealed by a size-based model. *Mar. Biol.* DOI 10.1007/s00227-012-2163-7.

Wirtz, K. W., Pahlow, M., 2010. Dynamic CHL and N–C regulation in algae optimizes instantaneous growth rate. *Mar. Ecol. Progr. Ser.* 402, 81–96.