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Coupled air-sea interactions
Accounting for ‘biothermal feedback’

(Joliff & Smith 2013)
The details of penetrative radiation can significantly change SST and air temp: Biothermal feedback in Monterey Bay

- Accounting for the chlorophyll (Chl) impact on penetrative radiation resulted in bias in SST, air temperature, relative humidity, wind speeds, and surface Chl
- That’s in Monterey - what does the analogous situation look like in the BoB?
Chl and the marine food chain

- Phytoplankton growth is limited by photon fluxes (i.e., light) from above and nutrient fluxes from below.

- Phytoplankton require visible light, or photosynthetically available radiation (PAR), to photosynthesize.

- In the open ocean, nitrogen (N) typically limits phytoplankton growth.

- Phytoplankton represent the base of the marine food-chain.
Chl and the carbon cycle

• The autotrophic fixation of carbon is driven by PAR and determines the biologically mediated fluxes of carbon between the atmosphere, the long-term storage pools of carbon in slope sediments, and the deep ocean (Simpson & Sharples 2012)
Chl, irradiance, and the heat budget

This subroutine computes the balance of heat in the form

\[
\dot{\Theta} = D_\Theta - \frac{1}{\tau_R} (\Theta - \Theta_{\text{obs}}) + \frac{1}{C_p \rho_0} \frac{\partial I}{\partial z},
\]

where \(\dot{\Theta}\) denotes the material derivative of the mean potential temperature \(\Theta\), and \(D_\Theta\) is the sum of the turbulent and viscous transport terms modelled according to

\[
D_\Theta = \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \left( \left( \nu_t^\Theta + \nu^\Theta \right) \frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial z} - \tilde{G}_\Theta \right).
\]

In this equation, \(\nu_t^\Theta\) and \(\nu^\Theta\) are the turbulent and molecular diffusivities of heat, respectively, and \(\tilde{G}_\Theta\) denotes the non-local flux of heat, see section 4.

(Umlauf et al. 2006)

- Where \(I(z)\) is the subsurface irradiance

- The heat flux profile is usually determined more by wind mixing than by radiation absorption alone (Price et al. 1986)
Bio-physical interactions

**Nutrient supply:** e.g. wind mixing, submesoscale processes, subduction of coastal waters

**Penetrative radiation:** shortwave radiation and light attenuation

**Local phytoplankton growth:** increase in light attenuation and the absorption of solar irradiance in near-surface

**Local surface heating:** warming SST and air temperature? Enhanced stratification? Suppressed mixing? Lateral temperature gradients?
Light-limited phytoplankton growth within the Bay of Bengal during the southwest monsoon (Schlosser et al. in preparation)
Light-limited phytoplankton growth within the Bay of Bengal during the southwest monsoon (Schloesser et al. in preparation)

Impact of time-variable light attenuation on the upper-ocean heat budget in the Bay of Bengal within one-dimensional coupled air-sea models. (Future work)
Background: Subsurface irradiance

\[ I(z) = I(0)[R \exp(-K_1 z) + (1 - R)\exp(-K_2 z)] \]

\( I(0) \): surface irradiance
\( R \): proportion non-visible vs. visible radiation
\( K_1 \): non-visible light attenuation
  (also diffuse attenuation)
\( K_2 \): visible light attenuation

(e.g. Price et al. 1986)

(Lotliker et al. 2016)
Light attenuation

https://flyfishingscience.co.uk/2018/10/19/light-attenuation-in-water/
Jerlov water types

\[ I(z) = I(0)[R \exp(-K_1 z) + (1 - R) \exp(-K_2 z)] \]

\( I(0) \): surface irradiance
\( R \): proportion non-visible vs. visible radiation
\( K_1 \): non-visible light attenuation
\( K_2 \): visible light attenuation

(e.g. Price et al. 1986)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jerlov (1968) water types</th>
<th>( R )</th>
<th>( K_1 ) (m)</th>
<th>( K_2 ) (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 1 – relatively clear</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 1 (upper 50 m)</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 1A</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 1B</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3 – murky</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Time- and depth-variability

\[ I(z) = I(0) [R \exp(-K_1 z) + (1 - R) \exp(-K_2 z)] \]

\[ I(z, t) = I(0, t) [R(t) \exp(-K_1(z, t)z) + (1 - R(t)) \exp(-K_2(z, t)z)] \]

\( I(0) \): surface irradiance

\( R \): proportion non-visible vs. visible radiation

\( K_1 \): non-visible light attenuation

\( K_2 \): visible light attenuation

Clouds

Water clarity
Chl impacts light attenuation

• Observations from southern BoB
• Here $K_2$ is $h_2$ and scales with surface chlorophyll-a (Chl) concentrations
• $K_2$ varies by >20 m across the Bay
• $K_2 \propto \text{Chl}$ is predicted for Class-1 waters
Light attenuation vs. wavelength

• Here $K$ is inverted and shown for clear waters

• In addition to accounting for the time-, spatial- and depth-variability in light attenuation, we can improve estimates by adding wavelength ($\lambda$) resolution to $K$

• Jerlov water types are convenient and are an approximation that may under-state the influence of time-variable water clarity

Visible Light

$K$, DIFFUSE ATTENUATION COEFFICIENT (m$^{-1}$)

$\lambda$, WAVELENGTH [nm]

(Smith & Baker 1981)
Measuring subsurface irradiance

- Measuring irradiance over the upper ~5 m is largely impacted by surface waves via wave scattering of light.

- Observing $R$ and $K_1$ is challenging in wavy conditions.

- We can observe $K_2$ at high fidelity from autonomous vehicles like vertical profilers (e.g. Wirewalker) and gliders.

(Lotliker et al. 2016)
Study Site- July 2019 campaign

- We deployed 3 vertical profilers for ~18 days in July, 2019
Drogued-Buoy Air Sea Interaction System (D-BASIS)

Instrumentation presented here (subsample of all data):

• WHOI metocean buoy including shortwave radiation (SWR)

• Wirewalker profiling upper 100 m including:
  • CTD
  • Chlorophyll-α fluorescence (ChlF), a proxy for the concentration. We did not calibrate in the field so concentrations presented here are not precise.
  • Downward irradiance at wavelengths 380, 412, 490, and 532 nm
  • To estimate photosynthetically available radiation (PAR):
    \[
    PAR(z, t) = \int_{380}^{532} I(z, t) d\lambda \times \frac{700-400}{532-380}
    \]
  • Optical backscatter - turbidity (NTU)
  • Most variables were telemetered to the ship in real time
Study Site - July 2019 campaign
Light Attenuation ($K$)

- Light attenuation varied over depth but here we use a simplified depth-averaged value.
PAR and Chlorophyll fluorescence (ChlF)

←Coastal plume
Diel Cycle

• Previously observed in the Bay (Lucas et al. 2016)

• Chl increases with sunlight – we can make use of the coupling between PAR and Chl to estimate the gross production of Chl and the rate of Chl loss
dielFit - https://github.com/duebi/dielFit

MATLAB routine to estimate rates of gross production and community respiration from diel measurements of concentration of oxygen, particles, or other parameters. This routine is reported in a manuscript by Barone et al. (2019) and builds on the approach used by Nicholson et al. (2015). Estimates of community rates rely on the assumption of constant respiration throughout the day while the assumption on gross production varies based on three models:

1. Linear model, assuming constant production during daytime
2. Sinusoidal model, assuming that production scales linearly with light intensity
3. P vs. E model, including a parameterization for light saturation and photoinhibition

Rates estimates are obtained using linear least squares while rate uncertainties are obtained by bootstrapping the model residuals. Residual autocorrelation is tested using the Durbin-Watson test.
Observed ChlF
Observed ChlF

- ChlF decreased due to loss>GPP, so still observed large diel cycle in Chl even when the daily averaged Chl decreased
Light-limited production

• SWR vs GPP (top) and PAR vs GPP (bottom) both linearly and significantly (p<0.001) related

• PAR better described GPP than SWR, showing time-variable light attenuation (colour) or depth of the SCM is important

• The performance of these fits are surprising given we ignore nutrient limitations
Regional Context

- Southwest monsoon has lower average shortwave radiation but also higher surface Chl.

- Typically light-limited??

- Previous studies have shown transition from nutrient- to light-limited growth during the southwest monsoon (Prasanna Kumar et al., 2010)
Regional Context

- We additionally consider BGC-Argo observations in the BoB
Finding light-limited growth from BGC-Argo

- Surface PAR and ChIF significantly correlated during the southwest monsoon for one profile.
- Subsurface irradiance was dependent on cloudiness, a characteristic of the monsoon, and water clarity, which reduced within a coastal plume and a Chl bloom.
- Chl concentrations are tightly connected to, and well predicted by, optical observations of subsurface irradiance.
- As a result of the monsoon-influenced PAR, there is an intra-seasonal signal in subsurface ChlF.

Schlosser et al. (in preparation)
Light-limited phytoplankton growth within the Bay of Bengal during the southwest monsoon (Schlosser et al. in preparation)

Impact of time-variable light attenuation on the upper-ocean heat budget in the Bay of Bengal within one-dimensional coupled air-sea models. (Future work)

**Nutrient supply:** e.g. wind mixing, submesoscale processes, subduction of coastal waters

**Penetrative radiation:** shortwave radiation and light attenuation

**Local phytoplankton growth:** increase in light attenuation and the absorption of solar irradiance in near-surface

**Local surface heating:** warming SST and air temperature? Enhanced stratification? Suppressed mixing? Lateral temperature gradients?
Does $K_2(x, y, z, t)$ impact SST in the BoB?

(Giddings et al. 2021)
Sensitivity to $K_2$ in 1D KPP models

- During the southwest monsoon, Jerlov water type 1B is appropriate ($h_2=17$ m)
- When $\Delta$MLD is larger, $\Delta$SST also increases
Significance of ΔSST

- The intra-seasonal SST anomalies during July 1-15 were 0.6°C

- Higher surface Chl (and lower $h_2$) could generate ~60% of this intra-seasonal variability in SST (Giddings et al. 2021)

- Indicative of potential uncertainty when using a single Jerlov water type for entire BoB (Giddings et al. 2021)
GOTM idealised 1D modeling

• Collaborating with Leah Johnson

• We test the effect of running GOTM with different light attenuation coefficients and using the KPP-CVmix turbulence scheme:
  • obsK: Observed $K_2(t)$ [10.7 m to 18.1 m], $K_1 = 0.9$, $R = 0.4$ (from Lotliker et al. 2016)
  • meanK: Observed average $K_2$ [15.7 m], $K_1 = 0.9$, $R = 0.4$
  • mink: Observed minimum $K_2$, $K_1 = 0.9$, $R = 0.4$
  • maxK: Observed maximum $K_2$, $K_1 = 0.9$, $R = 0.4$

• Jerlov water types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jerlov (1968) water types</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$K_1$ (m)</th>
<th>$K_2$ (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type 1 – relatively clear</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 1 (upper 50 m)</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 1A</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 1B</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type 3 – murky</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observed range
Preliminary results

- ΔSST progressively increase over break period then rapidly converge after the transition to active conditions

\[ \dot{\Theta} = D_\Theta \left( \frac{1}{\tau_R} (\Theta - \Theta_{\text{obs}}) + \frac{1}{C_p \rho_0} \frac{\partial I}{\partial z} \right), \]

- Changing $K_2$ within observed range resulted in ΔSST of up to 0.2°C

- Changing $R$ and $K_1$ resulted in ΔSST of up to 0.6°C (obsK vs jerlov-1b)
Preliminary results

• ΔMLD of ~15 m at night during break conditions

• ΔMLD progressively decreases over active period

• Diel SST differences increase over break period before sharply converging during active conditions
Lateral variability in optics

- We frequently observed variable Chl and/or turbidity around sub-mesoscale features

- In low wind conditions, does $K_2$ influence lateral gradients in SST?
Conclusions

• The physics and biology are inter-linked, even in the relatively low Chl BoB

• Chl, turbidity, as well as other constituents that impact the water optics, are more likely to influence estimates of SST and MLD during the calm break conditions

• The 3-dimensionality, including the influence of submesoscale processes, needs further investigation

Nutrient supply: e.g. wind mixing, submesoscale processes, subduction of coastal waters

Penetrative radiation: shortwave radiation and light attenuation

Local phytoplankton growth: increase in light attenuation and the absorption of solar irradiance in near-surface

Local surface heating: warming SST and air temperature? Enhanced stratification? Suppressed mixing? Lateral temperature gradients?
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