



**HAL**  
open science

# Generic analysis of the response of calcifying microalgae to an elevation of pCO<sub>2</sub>: qualitative vs quantitative analysis

Olivier Bernard, Antoine Sciandra

## ► To cite this version:

Olivier Bernard, Antoine Sciandra. Generic analysis of the response of calcifying microalgae to an elevation of pCO<sub>2</sub>: qualitative vs quantitative analysis. *Revue Africaine de Recherche en Informatique et Mathématiques Appliquées*, 2008, Volume 9, 2007 Conference in Honor of Claude Lobry, 2008, pp.57-84. 10.46298/arima.1892 . hal-01277921

**HAL Id: hal-01277921**

**<https://inria.hal.science/hal-01277921v1>**

Submitted on 23 Feb 2016

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## Generic analysis of the response of calcifying microalgae to an elevation of $pCO_2$ : qualitative vs quantitative analysis

Olivier Bernard<sup>\*a</sup> — Antoine Sciandra<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> COMORE, INRIA  
BP93,06 902 Sophia-Antipolis cedex

\* Corresponding author  
olivier.bernard@inria.fr

<sup>b</sup> LOV, UMR 7093  
B.P. 28, 06234, Villefranche-sur-mer FRANCE  
antoine.sciandra@obs-vlfr.fr

**ABSTRACT.** Calcifying microalgae can play a key role in atmospheric  $CO_2$  trapping through large scale precipitation of calcium carbonate in the oceans. However, recent experiments revealed that the associated fluxes may be slow down by an increase in atmospheric  $CO_2$  concentration. In this paper we design models to account for the decrease in calcification and photosynthesis rates observed after an increase of  $pCO_2$  in *Emiliana huxleyi* chemostat cultures. Since the involved mechanisms are still not completely understood, we consider various models, each of them being based on a different hypothesis. These models are kept at a very general level, by maintaining the growth and calcification functions in a generic form, *i.e.* independent on the exact shape of these functions and on parameter values. The analysis is thus performed using these generic functions where the only hypothesis is an increase of these rates with respect to the regulating carbon species. As a result, each model responds differently to a  $pCO_2$  elevation. Surprisingly, the only models whose behaviour are in agreement with the experimental results correspond to carbonate as the regulating species for photosynthesis. Finally we show that the models whose qualitative behaviour are wrong could be considered as acceptable on the basis of a quantitative prediction error criterion.

**RÉSUMÉ.** Les microalgues calcifiantes jouent un rôle clé dans le piégeage du  $CO_2$  atmosphérique d'origine anthropique en précipitant du carbonate de calcium qui sédimente au fond des océans. Toutefois, des expériences en laboratoire ont suggéré que cette activité biologique pourrait être diminuée par l'augmentation de la pression partielle de  $CO_2$  ( $pCO_2$ ) dans les océans qui a tendance à s'équilibrer avec celle de l'atmosphère. Dans ce papier, nous concevons des modèles dynamiques pour essayer de simuler la diminution des taux de calcification et de photosynthèse observés chez *Emiliana huxleyi* après une hausse de la  $pCO_2$  reproduite en chémostat. Comme les mécanismes physiologiques impliqués sont encore loin d'être complètement élucidés, nous considérons différents modèles, chacun d'eux étant basé sur une hypothèse biologique différente. Ces modèles, construits en utilisant des fonctions génériques pour caractériser les processus de croissance et de calcification, peuvent être analysés indépendamment de la forme exacte de ces fonctions et de la valeur des paramètres. L'étude s'appuie donc sur ces fonctions génériques où la seule hypothèse est une régulation de ces taux par une des trois formes qui composent la totalité du carbone inorganique dissous : le  $CO_2$ , les carbonates et les bicarbonates. Il s'en suit que chaque modèle réagit différemment à une élévation de la  $pCO_2$ . Contrairement aux hypothèses classiquement admises, notre étude montre que les seuls modèles dont le comportement est en accord avec les résultats expérimentaux sont

ceux pour lesquels une régulation de la photosynthèse par les carbonates a été supposée, ce qui corrobore les conclusions de travaux récents. Enfin, nous montrons que les modèles dont le comportement qualitatif est mauvais ne seraient pas rejetés sur la base d'un critère quantitatif d'erreur de prédiction.

**KEYWORDS** : coccolithophore, photosynthesis, calcification, multimodel,  $pCO_2$ , greenhouse effect, qualitative approach.

**MOTS-CLÉS** : Coccolithophoridés, photosynthèse, calcification, approche multimodèle,  $pCO_2$ , effet de serre, approche qualitative.


.....

---


## 1. Introduction

Calcifying microalgae play a major role in global biogeochemical cycling of elements (mainly carbon, calcium and sulphur). Among these species, *Emiliana huxleyi* is well known since it forms very large and dense blooms detectable from space by satellites, due to the highly scattering calcareous plates produced during growth.

Photosynthesis and calcification are biological processes which transform dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) into respectively particulate organic and inorganic matter which, being denser than seawater, sink towards the ocean floor. The export of particulate organic carbon (POC) from the surface ocean layers, insured by the biological pump, constitutes a carbon sink on a geological scale [8]:



The DIC precipitation into particulate inorganic carbon (PIC), and more specifically into calcium carbonate, also constitutes a sink of carbon, even if calcification produces  $CO_2$  :



Being responsible for almost 70% of the biogenic carbonate precipitation in the oceans, the Coccolithophorid communities have been studied in the context of the predicted increase of  $CO_2$  in the atmosphere resulting from the anthropogenic activity [10]. Based on the accumulation rate of  $CO_2$  observed in the atmosphere from the beginning of the industrial era, current models roughly predict a doubling of the partial pressure of the atmospheric  $CO_2$  ( $pCO_2$ ) at the end of the 21st century. Since the atmosphere tends to be in equilibrium with the superficial oceanic layers, the change in atmospheric  $CO_2$  will have a direct effect on the  $CO_2$  seawater concentration, and consequently on the carbonate system speciation. For example, [16] have calculated that, if the  $pCO_2$  was doubled in the seawater, the concentration of carbonate should be reduced by 50 % approximately, and the pH by 0.35 units. The consequences are not only on the chemical properties but also on the biological processes. The reductions mentioned above, by diminishing the buffer capacity of sea water, will enhance the production of  $CO_2$  via calcification. Under these conditions, the expected increase of  $pCO_2$  for the next decades would exert a positive feedback on the production of  $CO_2$  by the calcifying communities [9]. Nevertheless, recent studies have shown that cellular calcification could be depressed consequently to a rise of  $pCO_2$  in seawater. For example, by increasing  $pCO_2$  in phytoplankton cultures by the means of strong acid additions, a significant decrease of the calcification rate and of the calcification/photosynthesis ratio was induced in *Gephyrocapsa oceanica* [13, 17], and, with a less extend, in *Emiliana huxleyi*. Therefore, an increase in atmospheric  $pCO_2$  can have antagonistic effects on the production of  $CO_2$  by calcification, so that long term consequences are difficult to predict.

The functional relationships between calcification and photosynthesis continue to cause intense research leading to contradictory results (see [12] for a compilation). The factor influencing calcification are thus still debated, but the only point for which a broad consensus seems to exist is that carbonate  $CO_3^{2-}$  is neither used for photosynthesis nor for calcification.

Face to this complex biochemical system, mechanistic models can complement experiments to elucidate the involved processes and to test different simple functional hypotheses, that is not always feasible by the mean of expensive experiments where the variables are not easy to control routinely. We propose here an integrative modelling approach to theoretically explore the interactions between the species of the carbonate system and the processes of photosynthesis and calcification. We consider that the processes of dissolved inorganic carbon uptake, for photosynthesis and calcification are *a priori* driven by a specific carbon species among  $CO_2$ ,  $HCO_3^-$  or  $CO_3^{2-}$ . Moreover, we have considered that these processes could be either coupled or not. To discuss the validity of the different models, we compare the qualitative features predicted by each model to data published in [14]. The experimental device was designed to control in real time the  $pCO_2$  in  $NO_3^-$ -limited chemostat cultures, and allowed to follow accurately the temporal response of net photosynthesis and net calcification of *E. huxleyi* in response to a step elevation of  $pCO_2$  from 360 to 700 ppm. This paper complements the results presented in [2] in the sense that we also examine the quantitative predictions of models that are wrong on a qualitative basis. We show that a reasoning only based on a simple quantitative criterion (least square between data and predictions) would mislead the biological interpretation.

---

## 2. Experimental results

The experimental set-up is extensively described in [14, 2]. Two chemostat cultures of the coccolithophore *Emiliana huxleyi* were grown under identical nutrient, temperature, light and  $pCO_2$  conditions. Once the steady state reached in the two cultures, one of them was subjected to an increase in  $pCO_2$  (referred to LH for low to high  $pCO_2$ , equivalent to a shift in the sea from 360  $\mu\text{atm}$  to 700  $\mu\text{atm}$ ), whereas in the other one the  $pCO_2$  conditions remained unchanged (referred to LL for low to low  $pCO_2$ , 360  $\mu\text{atm}$ ). It is worth noting that to reproduce this shift in the chemostat, a higher  $pCO_2$  had to be maintained in order to compensate the high biological activity that consumes much more  $CO_2$  than in the sea since biomass is much higher. Indeed, the objective was to double the dissolved  $CO_2$  concentration from a 0.012  $\text{mmol.L}^{-1}$  to 0.024  $\text{mmol.L}^{-1}$ . This was realised by adjusting pH to the desired value (taking into account the known alkalinity).

During the establishment of the steady state, the two cultures presented identical cell concentrations and diameters, nitrate and nitrite concentrations (near the level of detection), POC and PIC concentrations, pH,  $pCO_2$ , total alkalinity (TA), and also similar rates of photosynthesis and calcification. This was a verification that the two cultures were effectively submitted to indistinguishable growth conditions before the  $pCO_2$  shift up made in the LH culture. Table 1 summarises the main differences that appeared between the LL and LH cultures after doubling the  $pCO_2$  in the latter. The most noticeable is a calcification decrease in the LH culture by about 20%, coherent with the decrease of cell diameter, probably due to the loss of external coccoliths. The diminished calcification in the LH culture is also consistent with the observed increase of TA. More surprising is the concomitant decline of the carbon fixation rate, also consistent with the reduction of the cell carbon content. The decrease of the photosynthetic rate being of the same order as that observed for the calcification, the ratio of these two processes remained unchanged.

---

Quantity	Variation	Unit
POC	-0.023 (-13.5%)	mmolC.L <sup>-1</sup>
PIC	-0.018 (-11.9%)	mmolC.L <sup>-1</sup>
DIC	+0.16 (+8.1%)	mmolC.L <sup>-1</sup>
PON	+0.13 (+0.8 %)	μmolN.L <sup>-1</sup>
PIC/POC	+0.023 (+2.6 %)	μmolN.L <sup>-1</sup>
pH	-0.2	
TA	+0.032 (1.3%)	mmol.L <sup>-1</sup>

**Table 1.** Experimental variation of the chemostat quantities after pCO<sub>2</sub> increase, from [14].

### 3. Model design

#### 3.1. Introduction

Since the functional dependence between the synthesis of organic and inorganic carbon in *E. huxleyi* are still subject to discussion, as are the related involved regulating mechanisms, we adopted a modelling approach allowing to test different combinations of coupling and regulating variables. These models are kept at a qualitative level to ensure that they are generic and therefore that the derived conclusions are independent of parameter values or even of the shape of the functions used to represent the biological processes. Finally they will be discussed in relation to their ability to qualitatively reproduce the experimental observations previously described.

We have considered 2 classes of models, which suppose respectively that photosynthesis and calcification are either coupled (class CI) or uncoupled (class UI). There is a consensus to admit that  $HCO_3^-$  is the substrate of calcification, and that reaction (2) produces  $CO_2$  which can then be used for photosynthesis together with the  $HCO_3^-$  and/or  $CO_2$  directly uptaken by the cell. In the proposed series of models we investigated several possibilities for the regulation of these processes, assuming that the regulation is not necessarily driven by the substrate availability, but that it can result from another species concentration, among  $HCO_3^-$ ,  $CO_2$  and  $CO_3^{2-}$ . Therefore, we examined the possibility that, for each class of models (CI or UI) these species can be regulating photosynthesis or calcification. This unusual way of processing will be justified in the sequel, since the simplest model –where  $HCO_3^-$  drives calcification and photosynthesis – reveals a contradictory behaviour. Thus, 3 CI and 9 UI models were designed.

The 12 models use the same state variables (Table 2), which makes their comparison possible. The algal biomass in the chemostat (X) is represented by the POC concentration. Particulate nitrogen concentration (N) is taken into account to base a Droop approach [5, 6]. The concentration of nitrate ( $NO_3$ ) in the chemostat ( $S_1$ ) is explicitly taken into account since it is the limiting nutrient for growth. Hence the cellular quota of nitrogen (Q) is expressed as the N/X ratio. The dissolved inorganic carbon and calcium ( $Ca^{2+}$ ) concentrations are denoted  $D$  and  $S_2$  respectively. Finally the PIC concentration (C), describes the calcite of both attached and free coccoliths. The concentrations in the chemostat renewal medium are denoted with the subscript “*in*”.

The cultures were completely mixed so that the medium in the chemostat was homogeneous. During the experiments pH evolved in the range 7.8 - 8.1. We developed thus

the model making some (classical) simplifying assumptions valid in the realistic pH range 7.6 - 8.3.

First we will present the (classical) equations describing the seawater chemistry since they are a major component of the model to be developed.

### 3.2. The carbonate system

The ionic balance of the main species in seawater can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} & [HCO_3^-] + 2[CO_3^{2-}] + [B(OH)_4^-] + [OH^-] + [Cl^-] + [Br^-] + [F^-] + 2[SO_4^{2-}] + \dots \quad (3) \\ & = [Na^+] + [K^+] + 2[Mg^{2+}] + 2[Sr^{2+}] + 2[Ca^{2+}] + [H^+] + \dots \end{aligned}$$

The carbonate alkalinity (CA) represents the electric charges carried in the carbonate system:

$$CA = [HCO_3^-] + 2[CO_3^{2-}] \quad (4)$$

The total alkalinity (TA) is defined by:

$$TA = CA + [B(OH)_4^-] + [OH^-] - [H^+] \quad (5)$$

Note that this definition indeed corresponds to the practical alkalinity which is a very good approximation of the total alkalinity [16].

We denote  $\lambda = TA - 2[Ca^{2+}] = TA - 2S_2$ .

In a first approximation, the ions mainly contributing to  $\lambda$  depend on the salinity and remain constant.

In a first step, to keep the model mathematically tractable, we will also assume that  $\lambda_0 = [B(OH)_4^-] + [OH^-] - [H^+]$  remains constant compared to  $CA$ . This hypothesis implies mainly that  $[B(OH)_4^-]$  hardly varies, which is reasonable for the considered pH range since, its associated dissociation constant is  $pK_B = 8.6$ . However, the detailed computation when explicitly taking into account variations of borate is presented in Appendix B.

From the previous considerations carbonate alkalinity is thus only depending on calcium:  $CA = \lambda - \lambda_0 + 2S_2$ . In order to compute the  $[HCO_3^-]$  and  $[CO_3^{2-}]$  concentrations, we will use the dissociation constants of the carbon dioxide ( $K_1$ ) and bicarbonate ( $K_2$ ) (the proton concentration,  $[H^+]$  will be denoted  $h$ ):

$$K_1 = \frac{h[HCO_3^-]}{[CO_2]} \text{ and } K_2 = \frac{h[CO_3^{2-}]}{[HCO_3^-]} \quad (6)$$

The total dissolved inorganic carbon (D) is defined as:

$$D = [HCO_3^-] + [CO_3^{2-}] + [CO_2] \quad (7)$$

Note that, in the considered pH range, we have  $[HCO_3^-] \gg [CO_3^{2-}] \gg [CO_2]$  (see for example [16]). It follows that bicarbonate is the main carbon species in the bicarbonate system:

$$[HCO_3^-] \simeq D \quad (8)$$

We deduced from equations (4) and (7), in the considered pH range:

$$[CO_3^{2-}] \simeq CA - D \quad (9)$$

Although this approximation will be useful for the mathematical analysis, we will compute the exact relationship between the carbonic species and pH.

Let us now compute the following ratio:  $r = \frac{D}{CA}$ , using equations (4), (7) and (6), we get:

$$r = \frac{h + K_2 + h^2/K_1}{h + 2K_2} \quad (10)$$

It follows that  $h$  can be computed as a function of  $r$ :

$$h = u(r) = \left( -1 + r + \sqrt{(1 - 2r)(1 - 4K_2/K_1) + r^2} \right) \frac{K_1}{2} \quad (11)$$

where it can be verified that function  $u$  is an increasing function of  $r$ . Note that pH is directly deduced from (11). Now using equations (6) and (4) we can compute the exact  $CO_2$  concentration:

$$[CO_2] = \frac{CA}{K_1} \frac{h^2}{h + 2K_2} = CA v(r) = \psi(S_2, D) \quad (12)$$

where  $v(r) = \frac{1}{K_1} \frac{u(r)^2}{u(r) + 2K_2}$  is an increasing function of  $u$  and thus an increasing function of  $r$ . As shown on Figure 1,  $CO_2$  is an increasing function of  $D$  and a decreasing function of  $S_2$  and pH is increasing with respect to  $S_2$  and decreasing with respect to  $D$ .

Finally the coccoliths dissolution rate should be taken into account. However, the dissolution of coccoliths (mainly composed of calcite) is possible if the  $CaCO_3$  saturation state  $\Omega$  of the medium is lower than one:


$$\Omega = \frac{[Ca^{2+}][CO_3^{2-}]}{K_{sp}} \quad (13)$$

where the solubility constant yields  $K_{sp} = 5.1510^{-7} mol^2.L^{-2}$ . The computation of the saturation state shows that  $\Omega$  is always above 2.5 during the experiment. Hence conditions for calcite solubilisation are not met and this phenomenon is not taken into account in the model.


## 4. The coupled models (CI)

### 4.1. General formulation

In the CI class models, photosynthesis and calcification are coupled so that the carbon assimilation for the coccoliths ( $C$ ) and for the biomass ( $X$ ) can be represented as follows:







**Figure 1.**  $CO_2$  and pH as functions of  $D$  and  $Ca^{2+}$ .

where  $\mu(\cdot)$  represents the specific algal growth rate. The coupling between photosynthesis and calcification induces the same expression  $\mu(\cdot)X$  for the kinetics of these two processes. The constant  $\alpha$  represents the proportion of the total up taken DIC which is allocated to photosynthesis.

Following the quota model viewpoint [5, 4, 6], we consider that growth and external  $NO_3$  uptake are uncoupled. The nitrogen mass transfer is thus given by:

$$S_1 \xrightarrow{\rho(\cdot)X} N \tag{15}$$

	Meaning	Unit
D	Dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC)	$mmol.L^{-1}$
N	Particulate nitrogen (PON)	$mmol.L^{-1}$
Q	Internal nitrogen quota	/
X	Particulate organic carbon (POC)	$mmol.L^{-1}$
C	Coccoliths concentration (PIC)	$mmol.L^{-1}$
$S_1$	Nitrate	$mmol.L^{-1}$
$S_2$	Calcium	$mmol.L^{-1}$

**Table 2.** Meaning of the state variables whose evolution is described by each of the 12 proposed models.

where  $N$  is the algal nitrogen and  $\rho(\cdot)$  the external  $NO_3$  uptake rate.

The carbon exchanges between the liquid and gaseous phases are described by Henry's law:

$$qC = K_L a(CO_2 - K_H pCO_2)$$

where  $K_L a$  is the gas transfer rate,  $K_H$  is Henry's constant and  $pCO_2$  represents the partial pressure of carbon dioxide in the gaseous phase.

We can now straightforwardly [1, 3] derive from the mass transfer equations (14) and (15) the mass balance based model:

$$\dot{S}_1 = d(S_{1in} - S_1) - \rho(\cdot)X \quad (16)$$

$$\dot{D} = d(D_{in} - D) - \frac{1}{\alpha}\mu(\cdot)X - qC \quad (17)$$

$$\dot{Q} = \rho(\cdot) - \mu(\cdot)Q \quad (18)$$

$$\dot{X} = -dX + \mu(\cdot)X \quad (19)$$

$$\dot{C} = -dC + \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\mu(\cdot)X \quad (20)$$

$$\dot{S}_2 = d(S_{2in} - S_2) - \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\mu(\cdot)X \quad (21)$$

Note that the equation for  $Q$  is obtained from Equation (17) combined with the equation of  $N$ :

$$\dot{N} = -dN + \rho(\cdot)X$$

It is worth noting that this representation is valid whatever the real substrate used for photosynthesis and calcification and whatever the dissolved inorganic component driving photosynthesis and calcification. Now we need to provide an analytical expression for the growth and uptake rates.

## 4.2. Kinetic modelling

To remain as general as possible in the formalisation of  $\rho(\cdot)$  and  $\mu(\cdot)$ , very simple hypotheses are adopted. We assume that  $\rho(\cdot)$  is an increasing function of the  $NO_3$  concentration ( $S_1$ ), and that  $\mu(\cdot)$  is an increasing function of both the internal nitrogen quota ( $Q$ ) and the DIC species ( $Dp$ ) selected for its role in the regulation of growth and calcification. It must be emphasised, at this level, that the qualitative analysis presented later on to determine the qualitative response to a  $pCO_2$  increase, remains valid for any functions  $\rho(S_1)$  and  $\mu(Q, Dp)$  with the considered properties.

Nevertheless, in order to compute the range of variations and to compare simulations with data, we will use the Michaelis-Menten expression to represent the  $NO_3$  uptake rate [7],  $\rho(S_1) = \rho_m S_1 / (S_1 + k_N)$ , where  $\rho_m$  and  $k_N$  are the maximum uptake rate and the half-saturation constant, respectively. Based on the Droop model [5, 6], the net growth rate may be written as:

$$\mu(Q, Dp) = \bar{\mu} \left(1 - \frac{k_Q}{Q}\right) \frac{Dp}{Dp + k_{Dp}} - R \quad (22)$$

where  $k_Q$ ,  $\bar{\mu}$  and  $k_{Dp}$  are respectively the subsistence internal quota, the maximum hypothetical growth rate and the half-saturation constant for the chosen regulating carbon species, and  $R$  the respiration rate (supposed to be constant).

### 4.3. Model equations

The following differential system synthesises the previous developments for a regulating species  $Dp$ .

$$\dot{S}_1 = d(S_{1in} - S_1) - \rho(S_1)X \quad (23)$$

$$\dot{Q} = \rho(S_1) - \mu(Q, Dp)Q \quad (24)$$

$$\dot{X} = -dX + \mu(Q, Dp)X \quad (25)$$

$$\dot{C} = -dC + \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\mu(Q, Dp)X \quad (26)$$

$$\dot{D} = d(D_{in} - D) - \frac{1}{\alpha}\mu(Q, Dp)X - K_L a(\psi(S_2, D) - K_{Hp}CO_2) \quad (27)$$

$$\dot{S}_2 = d(S_{2in} - S_2) - \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\mu(Q, Dp)X \quad (28)$$

The 3 models of the CI class, named CI- $HCO_3^-$ , CI- $CO_2$ , CI- $CO_3^{2-}$  differ only by the inorganic carbon component  $Dp$  controlling photosynthesis and calcification.

**Remark:** for very high value of the transfer coefficient  $K_L a$ , compared to the terms related to chemostat hydraulics ( $d(D_{in} - D)$ ) and to biological activity ( $\frac{1}{\alpha}\mu(Q, Dp)X$ ), Equation (27) shows that  $D$  will rapidly reach its pseudo steady-state corresponding to  $CO_2^* = K_{Hp}CO_2$ . The carbonate system is then mainly constrained by the applied  $pCO_2$ . The high bubbling flow rate in the chemostat experiments guaranty a high  $K_L a$ : in the sequel we will apply this classical hypothesis for the mathematical analysis of the model.

### 4.4. Carbon assimilation rate

The carbon assimilation rate by photosynthesis [resp. by calcification] will be named  $\Phi_p$  [resp.  $\Phi_c$ ] and called rate of photosynthesis [resp. of calcification] for short. For the CI class models, the coupled uptake and use of DIC for photosynthesis and calcification is expressed by the following equation:

$$\Phi_c = \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha}\mu(Q, Dp)X, \quad \Phi_p = \mu(Q, Dp)X \quad (29)$$

The total carbon assimilation rate is denoted  $\Phi = \Phi_c + \Phi_p = \frac{1}{\alpha}\mu(Q, Dp)X$ .

The total specific carbon assimilation rate ( $\Phi$ ), is thus:

$$\Phi = \frac{1}{\alpha}\mu(Q, Dp) \quad (30)$$

## 5. The uncoupled models

### 5.1. General formulation

This class of models supposes that calcification and photosynthesis are uncoupled, so that incorporation of inorganic carbon follows two different metabolic pathways:



where  $\mu(\cdot)$  and  $\sigma(\cdot)$  are the rate of photosynthesis and calcification, respectively. The process of nitrogen uptake is still assumed to be independent from carbon assimilation and follows thus reaction (15).

### 5.2. Kinetic description

The rate of photosynthesis,  $\mu(Q, Dp)$ , is an increasing function of both the internal nitrogen quota and the regulating species  $Dp$ . Calcification is assumed to be an increasing function  $\sigma(\cdot)$  of the calcification regulating species  $Dc$ .

As it will be discussed in the sequel, the qualitative response to a  $pCO_2$  increase is, as for the CI class models, independent of the mathematical form chosen for  $\sigma(Dc)$  and  $\mu(Q, Dp)$ , and of the parameter values (except in particular cases, mentioned below).

In order to quantify the variation range, we will consider that photosynthesis is expressed, as in the CI class models, by expression (22), and that the calcification rate is an increasing function of the variable  $Dc$ :

$$\sigma(Dc) = \sigma_m \frac{Dc}{Dc + k_{Dc}}$$

### 5.3. Model equations

The following equations give the structure adopted for the UI class models :

$$\dot{S}_1 = d(S_{1in} - S_1) - \rho(S_1)X \quad (32)$$

$$\dot{Q} = \rho(S_1) - \mu(Q, Dp)Q \quad (33)$$

$$\dot{X} = -dX + \mu(Q, Dp)X \quad (34)$$

$$\dot{C} = -dC + \sigma(Dc)X \quad (35)$$

$$\dot{D} = d(D_{in} - D) - \mu(Q, Dp)X - \sigma(Dc)X - K_L a(\psi(S_2, D) - K_{HP}CO_2) \quad (36)$$

$$\dot{S}_2 = d(S_{2in} - S_2) - \sigma(Dc)X \quad (37)$$

There are 9 possible combinations for  $Dp$  and  $Dc$  for this equation system, depending on the regulating carbon species for calcification and photosynthesis among  $CO_2$ ,  $HCO_3^-$  and  $CO_3^{2-}$ . For example, in the model denoted UI- $HCO_3^-$ - $CO_2$ .  $Dp = HCO_3^-$  and  $Dc = CO_2$

**Remark:** as for the CI models, for very high values of the transfer coefficient  $K_L a$ , the terms related to chemostat hydraulics and to biological activity can be neglected in Equation (36) therefore leading to  $CO_2^* = K_H pCO_2$ . The carbonate system is then mainly constrained by the applied  $pCO_2$ .

#### 5.4. carbon assimilation

In this model, total carbon assimilation is different for photosynthesis and calcification:

$$\Phi_p = \mu(Q, Dp)X \text{ and } \Phi_c = \sigma(Dc)X \quad (38)$$

And the total rate of carbon assimilation per biomass unit is thus:

$$\Phi = \mu(Q, Dp) + \sigma(Dc) \quad (39)$$

## 6. Study of the qualitative response of the set of models

### 6.1. Introduction

In order to determine which regulation mechanism is the most appropriate, we will assess the qualitative model consistency with respect to experimental observations. Hence we will study the qualitative behaviour for both classes of models (coupled or uncoupled) and for all the considered potential regulating species. This analysis is to be performed in the framework of general (increasing) functions  $\mu(\cdot)$ ,  $\rho(\cdot)$  and  $\sigma(\cdot)$ , and it is therefore independent of the parameter values (except in particular cases that will be mentioned) and will provide a diagnosis on the model adequacy. This analysis will be performed at steady-state. It will mainly consist in determining the evolution of the equilibrium of the model when the  $CO_2$  partial pressure is increased. In other terms, if  $x_i^*$  is a state variable of a given model at equilibrium (steady-state will be marked with \*), we will investigate the sign of  $\frac{\partial x_i^*}{\partial pCO_2}$ .

At steady-state, the state variables of any model in the considered set verify:

$$\dot{S}_1 = \dot{D} = \dot{X} = \dot{C} = \dot{Q} = \dot{S}_2 = 0 \quad (40)$$

In the sequel, we will use these equations to determine the effect of an increase in  $pCO_2$  on the system. We will first derive some general properties that are valid for any of the 12 considered models. Then we will separately consider the CI and the UI models.

### 6.2. Qualitative properties of $S_1$ , $X$ and $Q$ for the UI and CI models

It is worth noting that the equations for  $S_1$ ,  $X$  and  $Q$  are the same for the two sets of models. This remark leads to the following property:

**Property 1** For any UI or CI model where photosynthesis is controlled by  $Dp$ , we have:

$$\bullet \frac{\partial Q^*}{\partial Dp^*} < 0 \quad (41)$$

$$\bullet \frac{\partial X^*}{\partial Dp^*} > 0 \quad (42)$$

$$\bullet \frac{\partial S_1^*}{\partial Dp^*} < 0 \quad (43)$$

**Proof:** With the biomass equations (25) or (34) we get :

$$\mu(Q^*, Dp^*) = d \quad (44)$$

By differentiating this equation with respect to  $Dp$ , we obtain:

$$\frac{\partial \mu}{\partial Q^*} \frac{\partial Q^*}{\partial Dp^*} + \frac{\partial \mu}{\partial Dp^*} = 0 \quad (45)$$

Since  $\mu$  is an increasing function of both  $Q$  and  $Dp$ , we end up with Equation (41).

Combining equations (32) to (34), we have:

$$S_1^* + Q^* X^* = S_{1in} \quad (46)$$

Since in standard chemostat experiments  $NO_3$  is limiting, we have  $S_1^* \ll S_{1in}$ , it follows that  $X^* \simeq \frac{S_{1in}}{Q^*}$ , leading thus to (42).

Finally from equation (23) or (32), we get

$$\frac{\partial S_1^*}{\partial Dp^*} \left( \frac{d\rho}{dS_1} X^* + d \right) = -\rho(S_1) \frac{\partial X^*}{\partial Dp^*} < 0 \quad (47)$$

and then we obtain (43). ■

### 6.3. Qualitative properties of the CI models for $C$ , $S_2$ and $D$

**Property 2** For any CI model where photosynthesis and calcification are controlled by  $Dp$ , we have:

$$\bullet \frac{\partial C^*}{\partial Dp^*} > 0 \quad (48)$$

$$\bullet \frac{\partial (C^*/X^*)}{\partial Dp^*} = 0 \quad (49)$$

$$\bullet \frac{\partial S_2^*}{\partial Dp^*} < 0 \quad (50)$$

Finally, for  $Dp \neq CO_3^{2-}$ , we have  $\frac{\partial D^*}{\partial Dp^*} > 0$  and  $\frac{\partial CO_2^*}{\partial Dp^*} > 0$ . For  $Dp = CO_3^{2-}$ , we have  $\frac{\partial D^*}{\partial Dp^*} < 0$  and  $\frac{\partial CO_2^*}{\partial Dp^*} < 0$ .

Moreover, in all the cases  $\frac{\partial D^*}{\partial CO_2^*} > 0$ .

**Proof:** Note first, that from equations (25) and (26), biomass and coccoliths are correlated:

$$C^* = \frac{1 - \alpha}{\alpha} X^* \quad (51)$$

Moreover, from equation (28), we have

$$S_{2in} - S_2^* = \frac{1 - \alpha}{\alpha} X^* \quad (52)$$

These two equations combined with (42) lead to (49) and (50).

Now let us compute now the sign of  $\frac{\partial CO_2^*}{\partial Dp^*}$  and  $\frac{\partial CO_2^*}{\partial D^*}$ . Note first that when the biological activity is negligible, the standard and well-known properties of sea water [16] straightforwardly lead to:  $\frac{\partial CO_2}{\partial HCO_3^-} > 0$ ,  $\frac{\partial CO_2}{\partial CO_3^{2-}} < 0$  and  $\frac{\partial CO_2}{\partial D} > 0$ . However due to biological activity these relationships are not straightforward anymore for high biomass concentrations.

The computation of  $\frac{\partial CO_2^*}{\partial Dp^*}$  is trivial for  $Dp = CO_2$ . For  $Dp = HCO_3^-$ , figure 2 illustrates the fact that  $CO_2$ , computed from equation (12) is an increasing function of  $HCO_3^-$  and a decreasing function of  $S_2$ :  $CO_2 = \psi_{CO_2-HCO_3^-}(HCO_3^-, S_2)$ .

Note that this is valid for the simplified computation or for the one integrating borate effects developed in Appendix A. As a consequence

$$\frac{\partial CO_2^*}{\partial Dp^*} = \frac{\partial \psi_{CO_2-HCO_3^-}}{\partial Dp^*} + \frac{\partial \psi_{CO_2-HCO_3^-}}{\partial S_2} \frac{\partial S_2^*}{\partial Dp^*}$$

is positive since  $\frac{\partial S_2^*}{\partial Dp^*} < 0$ .

Now for  $Dp = CO_3^{2-}$ , it can be checked (Figure 2) that, in the considered pH range,  $CO_2$  is a decreasing function of  $CO_3^{2-}$  and an increasing function of  $S_2$ :  $CO_2 = \psi_{CO_2-CO_3^{2-}}(CO_3^{2-}, S_2)$ .

As a consequence,  $\frac{\partial \psi_{CO_2-CO_3^{2-}}}{\partial CO_3^{2-*}} + \frac{\partial \psi_{CO_2-CO_3^{2-}}}{\partial S_2} \frac{\partial S_2^*}{\partial CO_3^{2-*}} < 0$ .

Now let us examine the sign of  $\frac{\partial D^*}{\partial Dp^*}$ . When  $Dp = CO_2$  we consider the increasing function  $\psi_{D-CO_2}$  such that  $D = \psi_{D-CO_2}(CO_2, S_2)$ . We have then

$$\frac{\partial D^*}{\partial CO_2^*} = \frac{\partial \psi_{D-CO_2}}{\partial CO_2} + \frac{\partial \psi_{D-CO_2}}{\partial S_2} \frac{\partial S_2}{\partial Dp^*} \frac{\partial Dp^*}{\partial CO_2^*}$$


Since  $\frac{\partial S_2}{\partial Dp^*} < 0$  and  $\frac{\partial Dp^*}{\partial CO_2^*} < 0$  it shows that  $\frac{\partial D^*}{\partial CO_2^*} > 0$ .

When  $Dp = CO_3^{2-}$  we consider function  $D = \psi_4(CO_2, S_2)$ . We have thus:

$$\frac{\partial D^*}{\partial CO_2^*} = \frac{\partial \psi_4}{\partial CO_2} + \frac{\partial \psi_4}{\partial S_2} \frac{\partial S_2}{\partial CO_2^*}$$

In this case, a numerical evaluation is necessary.  $\frac{\partial D^*}{\partial CO_2^*}$  has been computed using the analytical expression of  $\frac{\partial S_2}{\partial CO_2^*}$  and the numerical values of  $\frac{\partial \psi_4}{\partial CO_2}$  and  $\frac{\partial \psi_4}{\partial S_2}$ . These calculations have been done 200 times for different combinations of parameter values, considering possible variations of  $\pm 10\%$  of the parameter nominal values (as presented in Tables 5 and 6). The range of variations for a  $\pm 10\%$  variation of the parameters leads to  $\frac{\partial D^*}{\partial CO_2^*} \in [7.7 \ 17.1]$  which is thus positive.

The same method is applied when  $Dp = HCO_3^-$  using  $D = \psi_{D-HCO_3^-}(HCO_3^-, S_2)$ , and shows that  $\frac{\partial D^*}{\partial HCO_3^-} \in [0.61 \ 1.57]$  which is thus positive ■



**Figure 2.** Evolution of functions  $\psi_{CO_2-CO_3^{2-}}(CO_3^{2-}, S_2)$  and  $\psi_{CO_2-HCO_3^-}(HCO_3^-, S_2)$ .

#### 6.4. Response of the carbon assimilation rate for the CI models

**Property 3** The photosynthesis ( $\Phi_p$ ) and calcification ( $\Phi_c$ ) rates are increasing functions of  $pCO_2$  for models CI- $HCO_3^-$  and CI- $CO_2$ . They are decreasing for CI- $CO_3^{2-}$ . The total carbon incorporation rate per biomass unit remains constant despite the change in  $pCO_2$ .

**Proof:** The total carbon incorporation at equilibrium can be computed for all the CI models from (30):

$$\Phi^* = \frac{1}{\alpha} dX^* = \frac{1}{\alpha} \Phi_p^* = \frac{1}{1 - \alpha} \Phi_c^* \quad (53)$$

Therefore, the evolutions of  $\Phi^*$ ,  $\Phi_p^*$  and  $\Phi_c^*$  follow the evolution of  $X^*$ . ■



## 6.5. Study of the qualitative properties of the UI models for $C$ , $S_2$ and $D$

**Property 4** For any UI model where photosynthesis and calcification are controlled respectively by  $Dp$  and  $Dc$ , we have:

$$\bullet \frac{\partial C^*}{\partial Dc^*} = -\frac{\partial S_2^*}{\partial Dc^*} \quad (54)$$

$$\bullet \frac{\partial(C^*/X^*)}{\partial Dc^*} > 0 \quad (55)$$

• For models  $UI-HCO_3^- -CO_3^{2-}$ ,  $UI-CO_2 -CO_3^{2-}$ ,  $UI-CO_3^{2-} -HCO_3^-$  and  $UI-CO_3^{2-} -CO_3^{2-}$  we have  $\frac{\partial S_2^*}{\partial CO_2} > 0$  otherwise  $\frac{\partial S_2^*}{\partial CO_2} < 0$ . Finally, in all the cases  $\frac{\partial D^*}{\partial CO_2} > 0$ .

Note that the last point of this property is straightforward for low biomass concentrations [16].

**Proof:** Let us first remark that from (37) and (35) we get

$$C^* + S_2^* = S_{2in}^*$$

this provides equation (54). From equation (35), it follows:

$$C = \frac{X}{d}\sigma(Dc) \quad (56)$$

This leads to (55).

To demonstrate the last point we use equation (44). At steady state  $S_1^* \ll S_{1in}$ , we can thus rewrite this equation as:

$$\mu_a\left(\frac{S_{1in}}{X^*}\right)\mu_b(Dp^*) = d \quad (57)$$

This equation can be used to derive the expression of  $X^*$  from  $Dp^*$ :  $X^* = \omega(Dp^*)$ , where  $\omega(Dp^*)$  is obviously an increasing function.

Note that for the numerical computations, the function  $\omega$  associated to the Droop model can be computed as follows:

$$\omega(Dp) = \frac{S_{1in}}{k_Q} \left[ 1 - \frac{d+R}{\bar{\mu}} \left( 1 + \frac{k_{Dp}}{Dp} \right) \right] \quad (58)$$

$S_2$  can be related to  $Dp^*$  and  $Dc^*$  using  $S_{2in}^* - S_2^* = \frac{X^*}{d}\sigma(Dc^*)$  it yields:

$$S_2^* = S_{2in}^* - \frac{1}{d}\omega(Dp^*)\sigma(Dc^*) \quad (59)$$

The proof of the last statement of Property 4, is detailed in Appendix B, considering successively 2 main cases. The proof is based on a semi-quantitative study of the signs of  $\frac{\partial S_2^*}{\partial Dp^*}$  and  $\frac{\partial Dc^*}{\partial Dp^*}$  (see Table 3). ■

Model	$A_1$	$A_2$	$B_1$	$B_2$	$\frac{\partial S_2}{\partial Dp^*}$	$\frac{\partial Dc^*}{\partial Dp^*}$	$\frac{\partial S_2}{\partial CO_3^{2-}}$
UI- $CO_2$ - $CO_3^{2-}$	+	-	[-38.2 -2.72]	+	+	-	+
UI- $HCO_3^-$ - $CO_3^{2-}$	+	-	[-13.0 -5.3]	+	+	-	+
UI- $CO_3^{2-}$ - $CO_2$	+	-	[-4.6 -1.35]	+	+	-	-
UI- $CO_3^{2-}$ - $HCO_3^-$	+	-	[-0.22 -0.092]	+	-	-	+
UI- $CO_2$ - $HCO_3^-$	+	+	+	[-0.38 -0.042]	-	+	-
UI- $HCO_3^-$ - $CO_2$	[-4.2 -1.81]. $10^{-3}$	+	+	+	-	+	-

**Table 3.** Qualitative or semi-quantitative study of the signs of  $\frac{\partial Dc^*}{\partial Dp^*}$  and  $\frac{\partial S_2}{\partial CO_3^{2-}}$

## 6.6. Response of the carbon incorporation rate for the UI models

**Property 5** The total carbon incorporation rate ( $\Phi$ ), the photosynthesis ( $\Phi_p$ ) and calcification ( $\Phi_c$ ) rates are increasing functions of  $pCO_2$  for all the models where  $CO_3^{2-}$  does not intervene as a regulating species. For models where  $CO_3^{2-}$  is a regulating species,  $\Phi$  decreases. These results are generic except for models UI- $HCO_3^-$ - $CO_3^{2-}$ , UI- $CO_2$ - $CO_3^{2-}$  and UI- $CO_3^{2-}$ - $CO_2$  where parameter values have been used for the  $\Phi$  predictions.

The specific photosynthesis rate is constant whereas the calcification rate decreases for  $Dc = CO_3^{2-}$  and increases in the other cases.

**Proof:** The carbon incorporation rates at equilibrium can be computed from (38):

$$\Phi_p^* = dX^*, \quad \Phi_c^* = dC^* \quad (60)$$

They have the same trend as  $X^*$  and  $C^*$  respectively.

For the total incorporation rate  $\Phi^* = d(X^* + C^*)$ , we can directly conclude when  $X^*$  and  $C^*$  have the same trend, *i.e.* when  $\frac{\partial Dp^*}{\partial Dc^*} > 0$ . For the three cases UI- $HCO_3^-$ - $CO_3^{2-}$ , UI- $CO_2$ - $CO_3^{2-}$  and UI- $CO_3^{2-}$ - $CO_2$  this result was obtained from a numerical computation.

**Remark:** The photosynthesis to calcification ratio  $\frac{\Phi_p^*}{\Phi_c^*}$  has the same response to  $pCO_2$  as  $\frac{X^*}{C^*}$ .

## 6.7. Synthesis

It is now possible to summarise the qualitative behaviour for each state variable in response to increased  $pCO_2$ . Table 4 presents this evolution for the 12 considered models, depending on the carbon compounds driving the process. We lay emphasise on the fact that these results have been deduced mainly from qualitative arguments that do not depend on parameter values, and as such they are very insensitive to modelling options. Parameter ranges were considered to deal with high biomass concentrations where intuition for the prediction of the carbonate system could be contradicted. However it is shown that in the considered experimental conditions the “classical” evolution of the carbonate system is still valid (*i.e.*  $\frac{\partial CO_2}{\partial HCO_3^-} > 0$ ,  $\frac{\partial CO_2}{\partial CO_3^{2-}} < 0$  and  $\frac{\partial CO_2}{\partial D} > 0$ ).

The first outcome of this qualitative study is that the models where  $HCO_3^-$  would straightforwardly drive photosynthesis and calcification (model CI- $HCO_3^-$  or UI- $HCO_3^-$ - $HCO_3^-$ ) predict increase of  $POC$  and  $PIC$  as well as calcification and photosynthesis

	CI			UI									
	HCO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>3</sub> <sup>2-</sup>	HCO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	HCO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	HCO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>2</sub>	CO <sub>3</sub> <sup>2-</sup>	CO <sub>3</sub> <sup>2-</sup>	CO <sub>3</sub> <sup>2-</sup>
D*	↗	↗*	↘	↗	↗*	↗*	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗*	↗*	↘
Dp*	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗*	↗*	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗*	↗*	↘
Dc*	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗*	↗*	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗*	↗*	↘
X*	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗	↘	↗*	↗	↗	↗	↗*	↗	↘
Q*	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↘
S <sub>1</sub> *	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘
C*	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘
S <sub>2</sub> *	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘*	↘*	↘	↘	↘	↘*	↘*	↘	↘
C/X*	→	→	→	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗	↘	↘	↗	↗	↘
pH*	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘
CA	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘
TA	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘	↘
Φ*	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↘
Φ <sub>p</sub> *	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↘
Φ <sub>c</sub> *	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗	↘	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↗	↘
Φ <sub>p</sub> */Φ <sub>c</sub> *	→	→	→	↘	↘	↗	↘	↘	↗	↘	↘	↘	↗

**Table 4.** Qualitative variations of the state variables at steady-state after an elevation of pCO<sub>2</sub> for the 12 considered models. Symbol \* means that interval based numerical estimations were performed to conclude.

rates; this is contradicted by the experiment. In the same way, model UI-CO<sub>2</sub>-HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> predicts a contradictory response. Indeed, all the models where only species CO<sub>2</sub> and/or HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> are involved have predictions that are contrary to experimental evidence. It is noteworthy that these 6 models have exactly the same qualitative behaviour. The only difference between the two groups is their C/X predictions (constant for the CI models and increasing for the UI models), and their photosynthesis over calcification ratio (constant for the CI models and decreasing for the UI models). It therefore follows that CO<sub>3</sub><sup>2-</sup> is required in the model to explain the experimental observations.

Among the considered models, only the models where CO<sub>3</sub><sup>2-</sup> regulates photosynthesis are compatible with the experimental decrease of POC and PIC. The 3 remaining models only differ by their predictions of the PIC over POC ratio and photosynthesis over calcification ratio: C/X and Φ<sub>c</sub>\*/Φ<sub>p</sub>\* increase for model UI-CO<sub>3</sub><sup>2-</sup>-HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, they are constant for model CI-CO<sub>3</sub><sup>2-</sup> while they decrease for UI-CO<sub>3</sub><sup>2-</sup>-CO<sub>3</sub><sup>2-</sup>. The slight observed experimental increase of the PIC over POC ratio (see Table 1) is not significant and cannot be used to select one of these 3 models. Note however that if another experiment could validate a significant increase of this ratio, the most appropriate model would be UI-CO<sub>3</sub><sup>2-</sup>-HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, where photosynthesis is regulated by CO<sub>3</sub><sup>2-</sup> and calcification by HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>.

It is important to note that the considered experimental results differ from those of [13, 17] which were obtained in unlimited growth conditions (a decrease of C/X was observed).

## 7. Quantitative approach through numerical simulations

Note first that from the previous qualitative analysis it is possible to discuss which model can explain the observed response with respect to pCO<sub>2</sub> increase. However, here we discuss the ability of all the models to quantitatively lie in a reasonable range of the data.

We first briefly describe how the parameter values have been obtained. The objective was to find a parameter set that minimise a least square error criterion *i.e.* such that

numerical simulation are close to the experimental data. Parameter  $K_H$  has been taken from the literature [16]. Parameters  $\bar{\mu}$ ,  $k_Q$ ,  $\rho_m$  and  $k_N$  were estimated from batch experiments where nitrate uptake and biomass were simultaneously measured. Parameter  $\alpha$  was computed from the fraction of biomass and coccoliths at steady state (see Equation (51)), and parameter  $\sigma_m$  was derived from Equation (56). The respiration rate has been neglected ( $R = 0$ ). Finally, parameters  $k_{Dp}$ ,  $k_{Dc}$  and  $K_{La}$  were obtained using a least square approach, where distance between simulations and measured data were minimised using the Matlab *fmins* function.

Finally, the parameter values and units are presented in Table 5 for the 12 considered models.

Parameters	Values	Units
$d$	0 to 0.5	$d^{-1}$
$S_{1in}$	12.5	$\mu mol N.L^{-1}$
$D_{in}$	2.29	$mmol C.L^{-1}$
$K_{La}$	1.75	$d^{-1}$
$\rho_m$	100.19	$\mu mol N.mmol C^{-1}.d^{-1}$
$k_{S_1}$	0.038	$\mu mol N.L^{-1}$
$K_1$	$1.392 \cdot 10^{-6}$	$mmol.L^{-1}$
$K_2$	$1.189 \cdot 10^{-9}$	$mmol.L^{-1}$
$K_H$	36.7	$mmol CO_2.L^{-1}.\mu atm$
$\lambda$	$-17.31^3$	$mmol.L^{-1}$
$\lambda_0$	$0.086^3$	$mmol.L^{-1}$


**Table 5.** Estimates of the model parameters for model  $UI-CO_3^{2-}-HCO_3^-$ .

Parameters	$HCO_3^-$	$CO_3^{2-}$	$CO_2$	pH	Units
$k_{Dp}$	1.65	0.16	0.015	$1.5 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$\mu mol C.L^{-1}$
$k_{Dc}$	1.65	0.12	0.015	$1.5 \cdot 10^{-8}$	$\mu mol C.L^{-1}$
$k_Q$	34.4	28.2	61.03	34.4	$\mu mol N.mmol C^{-1}$
$\bar{\mu}$	2.22	1.61	5.62	1.78	$d^{-1}$
$\sigma_m$	0.83	0.83	0.8	0.8	$d^{-1}$

**Table 6.** Parameters used to fit the model to the data.

The computations were performed over 42 simulated days. The first 18 days were necessary to ensure that a steady-state had been reached for each variable. The partial pressure of carbon dioxide ( $pCO_2$ ) was then instantly doubled ( $360 \mu atm$  to  $700 \mu atm$ ), with increase of bubbling (corresponding to a strong increase in  $K_{La}$ ) during 30 minutes, and the numerical behaviour of the system was observed for a further 16 days. In Figures 3, 4 and 5 model simulations are compared to experimental data.

The model-computed evolution of nitrate fits the data very well for any of the considered models. In each case the predicted model values and the experimental data (Figure 3) show a rapid decrease in nitrate concentrations over the first 3 days. For the remaining simulation period, the nitrate concentrations stay at a very low level (below the detection threshold). No change is detectable after the doubling of  $pCO_2$ .




**Figure 3.** Comparison between models  $CI-CO_3^{2-}$  (—),  $UI-CO_3^{2-}-HCO_3^-$  (- - -) and data for POC ( $X$ ), PIC ( $C$ ) Nitrate ( $S_1$ ) and TA. Organic carbon is simultaneously estimated by biovolume (light grey points).

The evolution of the carbonate system (Figure 4) is accurately predicted by the models for all the considered models. The increase in the simulated DIC in response to the  $pCO_2$  elevation is well reproduced. Note that the carbonate system and the pH are also well reproduced by models which are *a priori*, as previously demonstrated, not adapted (see Figure 7).

As expected, in the simulations where the photosynthesis controlling species are  $HCO_3^-$  or  $CO_2$ , we observe an increase in biomass in response to the shift in  $pCO_2$  (Figure 6). In contrast when  $CO_3^{2-}$  is the limiting species we notice a depletion of the biomass. This evolution of the biomass and calcium carbonate (Figure 3) is quantitatively consistent with the data. This could justify to test only the four corresponding models. However, in the spirit of a more general reflection on model validation and result presentation, we have also calibrated the models whose qualitative behaviour was demonstrated to be wrong. It is worth noting that these models can predict values that stay in the range of the actual measurements despite a very small increase (instead of the observed decrease), see Figures 6, so that the simulation does not appear to be quantitatively aberrant.

## 8. Discussion

From the generic qualitative analysis we have shown that  $CO_3^{2-}$  is required in the model to explain the experimental observations. This result can be straightforwardly ex-




**Figure 4.** Comparison between models  $CI-CO_3^{2-}$  (—),  $UI-CO_3^{2-}-HCO_3^-$  (- - -) and data for the DIC species.

plained by a simple argument based on the growth rate. We base this reasoning on the assumption that the growth rate (or photosynthesis rate) is an increasing function of both the internal quota and a controlling inorganic carbon compound. The experimentally observed biomass decrease induced by the shift of  $pCO_2$  leads to an increase in the internal quota (since particulate nitrogen stays constant). Now if we keep in mind that, under chemostat steady state, the growth rate is constant (and equals the dilution rate  $d$ ), this implies that the increase in internal quota must be compensated by a decrease of the controlling variable in order to maintain a constant growth rate. The only variable to decrease in response to the shift in the bicarbonate system is  $CO_3^{2-}$ . It therefore explains why only this model can provide an adequation with the experiments.

The multimodel analysis therefore leads to the conclusion that, in the model,  $CO_3^{2-}$  must be implicated in the photosynthesis regulation. This conclusion is surprising and is not clearly supported by any experimental evidence. In fact, these unexpected conclusions have already been obtained in a previous study implying a simpler Monod based growth model depending directly from external nitrate and from an inorganic carbon species. Since such models did not lead to the expected consistency between observation and process knowledge, we progressively complexified the model to make it closer to biology, but the changes did not affect the conclusion. This was also why the expressions have been considered generic, so as to make sure that the conclusions were not dependent on a specific form chosen for the photosynthesis or calcification rates.

The main conclusion of our study is that  $CO_3^{2-}$  may play a key role for coccolithophores. This hypothesis has been also raised in a recent paper [11], where the authors



**Figure 5.**  $p\text{CO}_2$  evolution in the chemostat and comparison between models  $\text{CI-CO}_3^{2-}$  (—),  $\text{UI-CO}_3^{2-} - \text{HCO}_3^-$  (- · -) and data for pH.

state that the condition of high  $\text{CO}_3^{2-}$  can be considered a crucial ecological factor for the success of *E. huxleyi*.


We have shown that a quantitative approach would have been misleading. If we had developed a single model on the basis of the classical hypotheses (model  $\text{UI-CO}_2 - \text{HCO}_3^-$ ), we would have ended up with a calibration procedure minimising the prediction error. Figure 6 would have inexorably led to a sentence like "the graph demonstrates a good adequation between model and data" which would have justified the use of model  $\text{UI-CO}_2 - \text{HCO}_3^-$ . Developing a theory on the basis of the model allows to draw conclusions that are independent of parameter values and even on the precise functions used in the model. As a consequence we end-up with a more objective and fruitful information to test the model. We have also shown that this approach can drive the experimentalist toward experiments that can critically distinguish models and eliminate inappropriate models (see also [15]). Here a better measurement of  $C/X$  would be decisive to identify the more appropriate model.

Finally, our qualitative approach has stimulated a multi model development. We strongly recommend this point of view where the model designer is not the "owner" of a specific model. Considering models in parallel provides more freedom to criticise a model and finally reject it. This is often difficult when the model under study was the result of several years of investments.

---

## 9. Conclusion

We have developed a multimodel generic approach to investigate the coupled effect of a nitrogen limitation and of a  $p\text{CO}_2$  increase. We have proposed 12 models of the production and calcification rates of *E. huxleyi* based on several possible regulation mechanisms. These models are generic since they only rely on qualitative hypotheses. The only possible set of models that can explain both a decrease of calcification and of photosynthesis are those where photosynthesis is regulated by  $\text{CO}_3^{2-}$ . This is not supported by classical hypotheses, even if they were stated on the basis of nitrogen unlimited cultures. However this conclusion is consistent with [11] who state that the condition of high  $\text{CO}_3^{2-}$  can be considered a crucial ecological factor for the success of *E. huxleyi*.



**Figure 6.** Comparison between models  $Cl-HCO_3^-$  (—),  $Ul-CO_2-HCO_3^-$  (- · -) and data for POC ( $X$ ), PIC ( $C$ ) Nitrate ( $S_1$ ) and TA. Organic carbon is simultaneously estimated by biovolume (light grey points)

Finally we show that our conclusions could not have been obtained with a "classical" quantitative approach. In such a study we would probably have developed a model based on standard assumptions that would have produced (on our experimental data set) a "good adequation with experimental data".

**Acknowledgements:** Funding was provided by the BOOM project (Biodiversity of Open Ocean Microcalcifiers) supported by the French National Research Agency (ANR).

**APPENDIX A: pH computation considering borate effect**


Let us denote by  $B_T$  the total Bohr concentration, the contribution of borate to alkalinity is therefore:

$$\lambda_0 = \frac{K_B}{K_B + h} B_T$$

We can thus compute the fraction  $r = \frac{D}{CA} = \frac{h+K_2+h^2/K_1}{h+2K_2}$ , and we get:

$$\frac{h + K_2 + h^2/K_1}{h + 2K_2} - \frac{D}{\lambda + 2S_2 - \frac{K_B}{K_B+h} B_T + h - K_{H_2O}/h} = 0$$





**Figure 7.** Comparison between models  $CI-HCO_3^-$  (—),  $UI-CO_2-HCO_3^-$  (- - -) and data for the DIC species.

Knowing  $S_2$ ,  $D$  and  $\lambda$  this provides the 4th order polynomial equation for  $h$  that must be solved. In practice this equation is solved as a minimisation problem initialised with the solution provided by equation (11).

This more accurate computation provides however results very close to one obtained with equation (11).

## APPENDIX B: proof of Property 4


1- let us first assume that  $Dp = Dc$ . Equation (59) where  $\omega$  and  $\sigma$  are both increasing, straightforwardly demonstrates that  $\frac{\partial S_2^*}{\partial Dc^*} < 0$ .

If  $Dc = CO_2$  it directly gives  $\frac{\partial S_2^*}{\partial CO_2} < 0$ .

If  $Dc = CO_3^{2-}$ , since  $CO_2$  is an increasing function of  $S_2$  and a decreasing function of  $CO_3^{2-}$ :  $CO_2 = \psi_{CO_2-CO_3^{2-}}(CO_3^{2-}, S_2)$ , we have

$$\frac{\partial CO_2^*}{\partial S_2^*} = \frac{\partial \psi_{CO_2-CO_3^{2-}}}{\partial Dc} \frac{\partial Dc}{\partial S_2} + \frac{\partial \psi_{CO_2-CO_3^{2-}}}{\partial S_2^*} > 0$$

Finally when  $Dc = HCO_3^-$ , since  $\psi_{CO_2-HCO_3^-}$  is an increasing function of  $HCO_3^-$  and a decreasing function of  $S_2$ , it gives  $\frac{\partial CO_2^*}{\partial S_2^*} < 0$ .



**Figure 8.** Applied  $p\text{CO}_2$  and comparison between models  $\text{Cl-HCO}_3^-$  (—),  $\text{UI-CO}_2 - \text{HCO}_3^-$  (- · -) and data for pH.

To conclude the proof,  $D$  can be expressed as an increasing function of  $S_2$  and  $\text{CO}_2$ , which leads to:

$$\frac{\partial D}{\partial \text{CO}_2} = \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \text{CO}_2} + \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial S_2} \frac{\partial S_2}{\partial \text{CO}_2}$$

For the cases where  $\frac{\partial S_2}{\partial \text{CO}_2} > 0$ , we get directly  $\frac{\partial D}{\partial \text{CO}_2} > 0$ , in the other cases a numerical computation shows that this result is always true.

**2-** In order to simplify the notations let us denote by  $\psi_{cp}$  the function relating  $Dc^*$  to  $S_2^*$  and  $Dp^*$ :  $Dc^* = \psi_{cp}(Dp^*, S_2^*)$

Now we can differentiate this expression with respect to  $Dp^*$ :

$$\frac{\partial Dc^*}{\partial Dp^*} = \frac{\partial \psi_{cp}}{\partial Dp^*} + \frac{\partial \psi_{cp}}{\partial S_2^*} \frac{\partial S_2^*}{\partial Dp^*} \quad (61)$$

The term  $\frac{\partial S_2^*}{\partial Dp^*}$  can be computed using expression (59):


$$\frac{\partial S_2^*}{\partial Dp^*} = -\frac{1}{d} \omega'(Dp^*) \sigma(Dc^*) - \frac{1}{d} X^* \sigma'(Dc^*) \frac{\partial Dc^*}{\partial Dp^*} \quad (62)$$

Combining this expression with equation (61) it gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial S_2^*}{\partial Dp^*} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{d} X^* \sigma'(Dc^*) \frac{\partial \psi_{cp}}{\partial S_2^*} \right] = \\ -\frac{1}{d} \omega'(Dp^*) \sigma(Dc^*) - \frac{\sigma'(Dc^*) X^*}{d} \frac{\partial \psi_{cp}}{\partial Dp^*} \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial Dc^*}{\partial Dp^*} \left[ 1 + \frac{\sigma'(Dc^*) X^*}{d} \frac{\partial \psi_{cp}}{\partial S_2^*} \right] = -\frac{\partial \psi_{cp}}{\partial S_2^*} \frac{\sigma(Dc^*) \omega'(Dp^*)}{d} + \frac{\partial \psi_{cp}}{\partial Dp^*} \quad (64)$$



**Figure 9.** Comparison between model CI-pH (—), and data for POC ( $X$ ), PIC ( $C$ ) Nitrate ( $S_1$ ) and TA. Organic carbon is simultaneously estimated by biovolume (light grey points)

To conclude we need to study the signs of the quantities defined as follows:

$$A_1 = \frac{\partial \psi_{cp}}{\partial S_2} \frac{\sigma'(Dc)X^*}{d}, \quad A_2 = X^* \sigma'(Dc^*) \frac{\partial \psi_{cp}}{\partial Dp}, \quad B_1 = A_2 / (\sigma(Dc^*) \omega'(Dp^*))$$

$$\text{and } B_2 = -\frac{\partial \psi_{cp}}{\partial S_2} / \frac{\partial \psi_{cp}}{\partial Dp} \frac{\sigma(Dc^*) \omega'(Dp^*)}{d}.$$


Note that the signs of  $A_1$ ,  $A_2$ ,  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  are directly related to the partial derivatives of  $\psi_{cp}$ .

Table 3 summarises the signs of  $A_1$ ,  $A_2$  and  $B_1$  associated to each model. In the cases where it is not possible to conclude directly from generic arguments, quantities  $A_1$ ,  $A_2$  or  $B_1$  are computed assuming a  $\pm 10\%$  variation of the parameters (200 different combinations of parameter values are considered) and the ranges of variations are provided.

For example, in the case when  $Dc$  or  $Dp$  is  $CO_3^{2-}$ ,  $Dc = \psi_{cp}(Dp, S_2)$  is an increasing function of  $S_2$  and a decreasing function of  $Dp$ . As a consequence (63) shows that  $A_1$  is positive and that the sign of  $\frac{\partial S_2}{\partial Dp^*}$  is determined by the term  $-A_2(1 + 1/B_1)$ , whose sign is *a priori* unknown.

A numerical study of the ratio  $B_1$ , considering various parameter values allows to determine which term dominates in the sum.

In this case it is worth noting that  $CO_2 = \frac{K_1}{K_2} \frac{(HCO_3^-)^2}{CO_3^{2-}}$  is an increasing function of  $HCO_3^-$  and a decreasing function of  $CO_3^{2-}$ , which proves that  $\frac{\partial CO_2^*}{\partial CO_3^{2-*}} < 0$




**Figure 10.** Comparison between model CI-pH and data for the DIC species.

Now in the remaining cases where  $Dc$  or  $Dp$  is  $CO_2$ ,  $\psi_{cp}$  is an increasing function of  $HCO_3^-$ , so that the right hand side of equation (63) is positive. When  $Dc$  is  $CO_2$  a numerical computation is required since  $A_1 < 0$ . When  $Dp$  is  $CO_2$ ,  $A_1 > 0$  and  $B_1 > 0$  such that  $R_2$  must be numerically evaluated (see Table 3) to determine the sign of  $\frac{\partial Dc^*}{\partial Dp^*}$ .

## 10. References

- [1] G. BASTIN and D. DOCHAIN. *On-line estimation and adaptive control of bioreactors*. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1990.
- [2] O. BERNARD, A.SCIANDRA, and S. MADANI. Multimodel analysis of the response of the coccolithophore *Emiliania huxleyi* to an elevation of  $pCO_2$  under nitrate limitation. *Ecol. Model.*, 211:324–338, 2008.
- [3] O. BERNARD and G.BASTIN. On the estimation of the pseudo-stoichiometric matrix for mass balance modeling of biotechnological processes. *Math. Biosciences*, 193:51–77, 2005.
- [4] D. E. BURMASTER. The unsteady continuous culture of phosphate-limited *Monochrysis lutheri* Droop: experimental and theoretical analysis. *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.*, 39(2):167–186, 1979.
- [5] M. R. DROOP. Vitamin B12 and marine ecology. IV. the kinetics of uptake growth and inhibition in *Monochrysis lutheri*. *J. Mar. Biol. Assoc.*, 48(3):689–733, 1968.
- [6] M. R. DROOP. 25 years of algal growth kinetics, a personal view. *Botanica marina*, 16:99–112, 1983.



**Figure 11.** Applied  $p\text{CO}_2$  and comparison between model CI-pH and data for pH.

- [7] R. C. DUGDALE. Nutrient limitation in the sea: dynamics, identification and significance. *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 12:685–695, 1967.
- [8] P. G. FALKOWSKI. Evolution of the nitrogen cycle and its influence on the biological sequestration of  $\text{CO}_2$  in the ocean. *Nature*, 327:242–244, 1997.
- [9] M. FRANKIGNOULLE, C. CANON, and J. P. GATTUSO. Marine calcification as a source of carbon dioxide: positive feedback of increasing atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$ . *Limnol Oceanogr.*, 39:458–462, 1994.
- [10] J. T. HOUGHTON, JENKINS G. J., and EPHTRAIMS J. J. *Climate Change 1995, The Science of Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [11] A. MERICO, T. TYRRELL, and T. COKACAR. Is there any relationship between phytoplankton seasonal dynamics and the carbonate system? *J. Mar. Syst.*, 59:120–142, 2006.
- [12] E. PAASCHE. A review of the coccolithophorid *emiliana huxleyi* (prymnesiophyceae), with particular reference to growth, coccolith formation, and calcification-photosynthesis interaction. *Phycologia*, 40:503–529, 2002.
- [13] U. RIEBESELL, I. ZONDERVAN, B. ROST, P.D. TORTELL, R. E. ZEEBE, and F. M. M. MOREL. Reduced calcification of marine plankton in response to increased atmospheric  $\text{CO}_2$ . *Nature*, 407:364–367, 2000.
- [14] A. SCIANDRA, J. HARLAY, D. LEFÈVRE, R. LEMÉE, P. RIMMELIN, M. DENIS, and J.-P. GATTUSO. Response of coccolithophorid *emiliana huxleyi* to elevated partial pressure of  $\text{CO}_2$  under nitrogen limitation. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, 261:111–122, 2003.
- [15] I. VATCHEVA, H. DEJONG, O. BERNARD, and N.J.L. MARS. Experiment selection for the discrimination of semi-quantitative models of dynamical systems. *Artif. Intel.*, 170, 2006.
- [16] R. E. ZEEBE and D. WOLF-GLADROW.  *$\text{CO}_2$  in seawater: equilibrium, kinetics, isotopes*. Elsevier, 2003.
- [17] I. ZONDERVAN, B. ROST, and U. RIEBESELL. Effect of  $\text{CO}_2$  concentration on the pic/poc ratio in the coccolithophore *emiliana huxleyi* grown under light-limiting conditions and different daylengths. *J Exp Mar Biol Ecol*, 272:55–70, 2002.