

Old Dominion University ODU Digital Commons

OEAS Faculty Publications

Ocean, Earth & Atmospheric Sciences

2015

Iron Supply and Demand in Antarctic Shelf Ecosystem

D. J. McGillicuddy Jr.

Peter N. Sedwick

Old Dominion University, Psedwick@odu.edu

Michael S. Dinniman


Old Dominion University, msd@ccpo.odu.edu

K. R. Arrigo

T. S. Bibby

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/oeas_fac_pubs

 Part of the [Biogeochemistry Commons](#), [Marine Biology Commons](#), and the [Oceanography Commons](#)

Repository Citation

McGillicuddy, D. J. Jr.; Sedwick, Peter N.; Dinniman, Michael S.; Arrigo, K. R.; Bibby, T. S.; Greenan, B. J. W.; Hofmann, Eileen E.; Klinck, John M.; Smith, W. O. Jr.; Mack, S. L.; Marsay, C. M.; Sohst, B. M.; and van Dijken, G. L., "Iron Supply and Demand in Antarctic Shelf Ecosystem" (2015). *OEAS Faculty Publications*. 88.

https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/oeas_fac_pubs/88

Original Publication Citation

McGillicuddy, D.J., Sedwick, P.N., Dinniman, M.S., Arrigo, K.R., Bibby, T.S., Greenan, B.J.W., . . . van Dijken, G.L. (2015). Iron supply and demand in an Antarctic shelf ecosystem. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 42(19), 8088-8097. doi: 10.1002/2015gl065727

Authors

D. J. McGillicuddy Jr., Peter N. Sedwick, Michael S. Dinniman, K. R. Arrigo, T. S. Bibby, B. J. W. Greenan, Eileen E. Hofmann, John M. Klinck, W. O. Smith Jr., S. L. Mack, C. M. Marsay, B. M. Sohst, and G. L. van Dijken

RESEARCH LETTER

10.1002/2015GL065727

Key Points:

- Iron supply is estimated using observations and a 3-D model of the Ross Sea
- The largest sources are winter mixing from the benthos and melting sea ice
- Inferred supply is sufficient to balance satellite-based productivity estimates

Supporting Information:

- Supporting Information S1

Correspondence to:

D. J. McGillicuddy,
dmcgillicuddy@whoi.edu

Citation:

McGillicuddy, D. J., Jr., et al. (2015), Iron supply and demand in an Antarctic shelf ecosystem, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *42*, 8088–8097, doi:10.1002/2015GL065727.

Received 14 AUG 2015

Accepted 15 SEP 2015

Accepted article online 22 SEP 2015

Published online 8 OCT 2015

©2015. The Authors.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

Iron supply and demand in an Antarctic shelf ecosystem

D. J. McGillicuddy Jr.¹, P. N. Sedwick², M. S. Dinniman², K. R. Arrigo³, T. S. Bibby⁴, B. J. W. Greenan⁵, E. E. Hofmann², J. M. Klinck², W. O. Smith Jr.⁶, S. L. Mack^{2,7}, C. M. Marsay^{2,7}, B. M. Sohst², and G. L. van Dijken³

¹Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, Woods Hole, Massachusetts, USA, ²Department of Ocean, Earth and Atmospheric Sciences, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia, USA, ³Department of Earth System Science, Stanford University, Stanford, California, USA, ⁴Ocean and Earth Science, National Oceanography Centre Southampton, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK, ⁵Ocean and Ecosystem Sciences Division, Bedford Institute of Oceanography, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, Canada, ⁶Virginia Institute of Marine Science, College of William and Mary, Gloucester Point, Virginia, USA, ⁷Now at Skidaway Institute of Oceanography, University of Georgia, Savannah, Georgia, USA

Abstract The Ross Sea sustains a rich ecosystem and is the most productive sector of the Southern Ocean. Most of this production occurs within a polynya during the November–February period, when the availability of dissolved iron (dFe) is thought to exert the major control on phytoplankton growth. Here we combine new data on the distribution of dFe, high-resolution model simulations of ice melt and regional circulation, and satellite-based estimates of primary production to quantify iron supply and demand over the Ross Sea continental shelf. Our analysis suggests that the largest sources of dFe to the euphotic zone are wintertime mixing and melting sea ice, with a lesser input from intrusions of Circumpolar Deep Water and a small amount from melting glacial ice. Together these sources are in approximate balance with the annual biological dFe demand inferred from satellite-based productivity algorithms, although both the supply and demand estimates have large uncertainties.

1. Introduction

Previous field and modeling studies [Boyd *et al.*, 2012; Fitzwater *et al.*, 2000; Measures *et al.*, 2012; Raiswell *et al.*, 2006; Sedwick *et al.*, 2011] have identified a number of potential sources of dissolved iron to surface waters on Antarctic continental shelves. These include the vertical resupply of iron by winter convective mixing, shallow benthic inputs from banks and shoals, intrusions of Circumpolar Deep Water (CDW), and meltwater from sea ice and glacial ice, all of which are likely to be sensitive to climatic change. Hence, in regions such as the Ross Sea, where iron supply is thought to regulate primary production [Arrigo *et al.*, 2003; Martin *et al.*, 1990; Sedwick *et al.*, 2000], an understanding of the relative importance of these sources is required to predict the ecological and biogeochemical impacts of a varying climate.

To quantify iron supply from these various sources, we conducted a detailed survey of the Ross Sea in austral summer 2011–2012, spanning key geographic locations and water masses (Figure 1). The primary inflows into the Ross Sea consist of Low-Salinity Shelf Water (LSSW) from the east and both CDW and Antarctic Surface Water (AASW) from offshore [Jacobs and Giulivi, 1999]. CDW mixes with ambient shelf water to become Modified Circumpolar Deep Water (MCDW). Brine rejection during sea ice formation leads to production of High-Salinity Shelf Water (HSSW). Ice Shelf Water (ISW) is created by cooling of waters in contact with the underside of the Ross Ice Shelf (RIS) at depth, leading to outflows from beneath the RIS with temperatures below the surface freezing point.

2. Methods

We combine observations and models to estimate iron supply (four distinct sources) and demand. Iron supply due to convective mixing is derived from homogenizing our observed iron profiles down to the maximum mixed layer depths simulated by our hydrodynamic model. Sources from MCDW, sea ice, and glacial ice are quantified with passive tracer simulations using observations to define the end-member concentrations. Iron demand is calculated from a satellite-based productivity algorithm, assuming an f ratio




Figure 1. (a) Sampling locations in the western, central, and shelf edge subregions of the Ross Sea (boundaries for in situ and satellite data analysis depicted by dashed lines), overlaid on a satellite-derived estimate for mean annual production 1997–2013 (color shading coincident with the maximum ice-free area during that period; permanent ice cover is not distinguished from land in the gray mask). Seagoing observations (white dots) were collected in January–February 2012. (b) Observations of dFe (all depths) plotted as a function of temperature and salinity. Gray dots are all prior measurements from the World Ocean Database 2009 CTD data (see <http://www.nodc.noaa.gov/OC5/SELECT/dbsearch/dbsearch.html>), 140–230°E, 65–80°S, bottom depths < 2000 m, similar to the area selected in a recent climatology [Orsi and Wiederwohl, 2009]. Density contours (σ_T) are shown as dotted lines, and the freezing point of seawater at surface pressure and salinity of 35 is depicted as a horizontal solid line. See text for definitions of water masses indicated in bold. (c) Dissolved iron plotted as a function of height above bottom. Values are filled in color for those samples that occur within benthic nepheloid layers (BNLs) identified in transmissometer data for each station (Figure S1 in the supporting information). Blue bars indicate the mean iron concentration for each 50 m depth bin.

based on prior studies. This approach also requires phytoplankton carbon:iron uptake stoichiometry, for which values reported in the literature vary widely. Therefore, we use our data to constrain the drawdown ratio by computing the difference between our summertime observations and estimated wintertime concentrations of iron and nitrate, converting to carbon units with the Redfield ratio.

2.1. Seagoing Observations

Data were collected on voyage NBP1201 of the RVIB *Nathaniel B. Palmer*, 24 December 2011 to 8 February 2012. Hydrography and water samples were obtained using a rosette sampler fitted with 24 10-L Niskin bottles, together with conductivity, temperature, and depth (CTD) sensors and a transmissometer. Nitrate and other macronutrient concentrations were measured at sea using standard autoanalyzer techniques. Seawater samples for trace metal analysis were collected with custom-modified 5-L Teflon-lined external-closure Niskin-X samplers (General Oceanics) on a trace metal clean rosette deployed on a nonmetallic line, and dissolved iron (dFe) was determined postcruise following the methods described by Sedwick *et al.* [2011].

2.2. Tracer Transport Modeling

Ross Sea circulation and tracer transport was simulated with the Regional Ocean Modeling System (ROMS; <http://www.myroms.org>). The model domain extends from north of the shelf break (67.5°S) southward to 85°S and includes almost the entire cavity beneath the RIS. The horizontal grid spacing is 5 km, and there are 24 vertical levels. This model expands upon earlier simulations of the Ross Sea [Dinniman *et al.*, 2011] with the inclusion of tidal forcing as well as a dynamic sea ice component. The simulation covers the time period 15 September 2010 to 27 February 2012, which includes the time period of observations examined here. The model is forced with European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts Interim winds and atmospheric temperatures. Lateral open boundary conditions are provided by climatology.

Three passive tracers were added to the model to estimate dFe fluxes from MCDW, melting sea ice, and meltwater from the base of floating glacial ice (predominantly the RIS). Circulation under the ice is represented, so dFe delivered from those areas to ice-free waters is included in supply estimates. A simple scavenging model is used to account for dFe removal by sinking particles along the transport pathways. Cumulative supply of new dFe is estimated from the simulated concentration in the euphotic zone at the end of the growing season, assuming complete utilization by phytoplankton.

Given the end-member concentrations of dFe and nitrate in each of the three water types, the simulated fluxes can be used to calculate the supply from each source. For MCDW, we use $dFe_{MCDW} = 0.27 \pm 0.05$ nM and $NO3_{MCDW} = 29.9 \pm 1.4$ μ M based on our field measurements, which are consistent with prior observations in that water mass [Sedwick *et al.*, 2011]. Nitrate in sea ice and glacial ice tends to be depleted relative to that in seawater, so nitrate supply from those sources is assumed to be negligible.

The concentration of dFe in Antarctic sea ice varies widely, with reported values ranging from 1 to 20 nM [Lannuzel *et al.*, 2010]. The iron present in sea ice originates from both atmospheric deposition and the surrounding seawater, with the latter thought to predominate [Lannuzel *et al.*, 2010]. Indeed, recent studies in McMurdo Sound concluded that iron in land-fast sea ice is derived primarily from the water column via sediment resuspension rather than aeolian sources [de Jong *et al.*, 2013]; accumulation rates of aeolian iron on sea ice can account for only a small fraction of the new primary production in the southwestern Ross Sea [Winton *et al.*, 2014]. A variety of mechanisms facilitate incorporation of waterborne iron into sea ice, including (1) direct inclusion of dFe through frazil and congelation ice growth, (2) incorporation of particulate and colloidal iron, and (3) colonization by microorganisms [Lannuzel *et al.*, 2010]. In cases (2) and (3), additional processes are required to transform these various particulate forms into dFe. We used a median value of $dFe_{SeaIce} = 10 \pm 5$ nM, with the large uncertainty reflecting the variability in measured dFe concentrations in sea ice.

Unfortunately, we have no direct measurements of dFe in the glacial ice of the RIS. Glacial ice cores from the Talos Dome, about 250 km west of the Ross Sea, contain total iron concentrations ranging from 1.34 to 8.79 ng g⁻¹ during the Holocene and Last Glacial Maximum, respectively [Spolaor *et al.*, 2013]. Using these values, and assuming 32% solubility [Edwards and Sedwick, 2001], we estimate $dFe_{GlacialIce} = 29 \pm 21$ nM. Death *et al.* [2014] have suggested end-member dFe concentrations 2–3 orders of magnitude higher for subglacial meltwaters, but such values would cause the simulated glacial meltwater dFe concentrations to exceed the total dFe observed in waters adjacent to the RIS (Figure S10 in the supporting information). If the Death *et al.* [2014] end-members were applied only to the fraction of freshwater budget of the RIS cavity derived from the supply of subglacial meltwater across the grounding line (approximately 5% [Carter and Fricker, 2012]), our simulations suggest the overall glacial flux would contribute 50–500% of the observed concentrations in ISW. Obviously, the lower bound is possible, with the remaining 50% supplied by mixing from other sources such as MCDW. However, based on the present measurements, it is not possible to distinguish between subglacial and glacial meltwater.

The simulated fluxes associated with MCDW, sea ice, and glacial ice are used for two purposes: (1) to estimate the cumulative dFe and nitrate resupply at the space-time location of each station to facilitate drawdown calculations and (2) to compute annual dFe supply on both a subregional and shelf-wide basis. See supporting information for more details of the tracer transport calculations (including the dFe scavenging formulation), as well as quantitative evaluation of model skill based on available observations.




Figure 2. (a) Dissolved iron concentration in the deepest sample for each cast (colored dots). Bathymetry shaded in gray with contours at 200 m intervals. (b) Maximum mixed layer depth diagnosed from a ROMS hindcast. Note that the station near 177°49'E, 77°45'S is located underneath the Ross Ice Shelf in the model simulation, so its maximum mixed layer depth was taken to be that of the closest model grid point north of the ice shelf. Surface mixed layer (c) dissolved iron and (d) nitrate concentrations computed by homogenizing each profile to the depth of maximum mixing.

2.3. Satellite-Based Estimates of Net Primary Production

Daily maps of net primary production (NPP) for the Ross Sea were produced from satellite-derived chlorophyll *a* (Chl *a*), sea surface temperature, and sea ice cover using an algorithm developed for the Southern Ocean that explicitly includes light limitation [Arrigo *et al.*, 2008]. More details on the methods are provided in the supporting information. Briefly, the algorithm is tuned to match in situ NPP observations [Arrigo *et al.*, 2008], so the NPP estimates are not sensitive to the suspected bias in satellite chlorophyll *a* retrievals in the Southern Ocean. The algorithm assumes a fixed C:Chl *a* ratio in phytoplankton and therefore does not account for variations in this ratio associated with species composition, irradiance, and other environmental variables. In particular, the C:Chl *a* ratio has been shown to increase with iron deficiency [Sunda and Huntsman, 1997], a factor that varies seasonally in this region. However, increasing iron limitation also decreases phytoplankton growth, which would tend to compensate for increasing C:Chl *a* in terms of NPP.

Satellites can only detect Chl *a* in open waters, so phytoplankton within and beneath ice are not included in production estimates. Primary production within the ice itself, although locally important as a food source for zooplankton and krill, is a small fraction of total productivity in such regions [Arrigo *et al.*, 1997]. As for production in the water column beneath ice, prior observations suggest that little chlorophyll is present in those waters. For example, a section through ice-covered waters near Terra Nova Bay [Arrigo *et al.*, 2000] revealed reduced surface salinity (their Plate 2), low Chl *a* (their Plate 4B), and relatively little nitrate drawdown (their Plate 4C). Therefore, neglect of NPP within/beneath ice and its associated iron demand is not likely to constitute a large error in this analysis.

Table 1. Iron Supply and Demand for the Ross Sea and Regional Subdomains Shown in Figure 1a^a

Inventories	All	Western	Central	Shelf Edge
Winter Fe (nM)	0.23 ± 0.10	0.29 ± 0.11	0.18 ± 0.05	0.15 ± 0.02
Winter NO ₃ (μM)	30.0 ± 1.4	30.3 ± 0.7	29.6 ± 1.6	29.8 ± 2.0
NO ₃ :Fe drawdown 10 ⁵ mol N/mol Fe	0.59 ± 0.22	0.54 ± 0.20	0.72 ± 0.22	0.42 ± 0.04
<i>Nov–Feb Mean Mixed Layer Depth (m)</i>				
	24.8	22.2	27.6	24.9
<i>Fe Sources (μmol Fe m⁻² yr⁻¹)</i>				
Drawdown of winter reserve	3.2 ± 2.5	4.2 ± 2.4	2.2 ± 1.4	1.2 ± 0.5
MCDW	1.3 ± 0.2	1.4 ± 0.3	1.9 ± 0.3	1.6 ± 0.3
Sea ice	3.1 ± 1.6	5.8 ± 2.9	1.9 ± 1.0	3.0 ± 1.5
Glacial ice	0.17 ± 0.12	0.33 ± 0.24	0.34 ± 0.25	0.04 ± 0.03
Sum	7.8 ± 4.4	11.8 ± 5.9	6.3 ± 2.9	5.9 ± 2.3
<i>Fe Demand (μmol Fe m⁻² yr⁻¹)</i>				
Satellite-based NP	8.8 ± 6.4	8.5 ± 6.2	9.9 ± 7.1	6.6 ± 4.8
<i>Difference</i>				
	1.0 ± 10.8	−3.2 ± 12.0	3.5 ± 10.1	0.6 ± 7.1

^aWinter iron and nitrate concentrations estimated from cruise data and ROMS hindcast mixed layer depths. Drawdown ratios are computed assuming cumulative inputs of iron and nitrate from MCDW, sea ice, and glacial ice simulated for the space-time location of each station. Iron sources for the mixed layer are calculated from drawdown of the winter reserve and cumulative seasonal inputs simulated for each domain. Mixed layer depths for the growing season (November–February) calculated from the climatology available at <http://www7320.nrlssc.navy.mil/nmld/nmld.html>. Iron demand estimated from a satellite-based algorithm for new production assuming an *f* ratio of 0.5 ± 0.1 and a C:Fe ratio inferred from the estimated NO₃:Fe drawdown and Redfield stoichiometry. The reported uncertainties also reflect interannual variability in NPP (Figure S4 in the supporting information).

2.4. Conceptual Framework for Interpreting Iron Supply and Demand

A mechanistic link between iron supply and demand stems from the fact that iron limits phytoplankton production in the Ross Sea [Sedwick *et al.*, 2011; Tagliabue and Arrigo, 2005]. If the estimated demand were larger than supply, that would suggest that either demand was overestimated or that one or more of the sources was underestimated. On the other hand, if demand were less than supply, then either iron would have accumulated in the surface layer, been transported off the shelf [Tagliabue *et al.*, 2009], or supply (demand) was overestimated (underestimated). Agreement of the two independent estimates to within their associated uncertainties suggests that a steady state model of iron supply and demand is appropriate. However, an important caveat stems from the multiple time scales involved in this analysis: whereas our in situ observations come from a single year, our estimates of iron supply involve multiyear processes such as transport of MCDW and glacial melt from within the RIS cavity. As such, we compare with a multiyear mean (1997–2013) of satellite-based productivity. Interannual variability in the balance between iron supply and demand remains an important issue that will require long-term in situ time series observations.

3. Results

Our observations show that dFe concentrations were generally low enough to limit phytoplankton growth (~0.1 nM) in surface waters of the polynya, whereas CDW and ISW end-members had higher concentrations of ~0.3 nM (Figure 1b). The highest dFe concentrations were observed near the seafloor, often in association with benthic nepheloid layers (Figures 1c, 2a, and S1) in waters deeper than 400 m [Marsay *et al.*, 2014]. Nearly 40% of the total water column dFe inventory was contained within 100 m of the seafloor (Figure S2a in the supporting information), suggesting that benthic sources play a major role in iron cycling on the Ross Sea shelf. This benthic dFe is likely a mixture of remineralized biogenic material exported from the euphotic zone and exogenous inputs of lithogenic iron from the seafloor and terrigenous sediments. Enrichment of dFe near the seafloor was observed in all three subregions examined during our cruise (Figure S2b; the rationale for western, central, and shelf edge domains is provided in the supporting information).

An important mechanism for supply of benthic dFe to the euphotic zone is regional-scale convective mixing in winter, which can extend to the seafloor in some areas of the Ross Sea shelf [Gordon *et al.*, 2000]. This




Figure 3. Model-derived estimates of dFe supplied to the upper mixed layer during the growing season due to intrusions of (left) CDW, (middle) melting sea ice, and (right) glacial meltwater. White lines show the boundaries between the three regional subdomains depicted in Figure 1: western, central, and shelf edge. Note that the offshore limit of the shelf edge domain is defined by the 1200 m isobath because the source of CDW in the tracer simulation was assumed to be seaward of that boundary. Note that the color scales are different in each panel.

mixing sets a “winter reserve” of dFe in surface waters at the start of the growing season. To quantify this, we extracted the depth of maximum mixing from the circulation model hindcast (Figure 2b). These mixing depths are sufficient to ventilate most of the water column over much of the area sampled during our cruise, with the exception of deeper areas near the shelf edge and some of the deeper troughs. Based on our summertime observations of dFe and nitrate profiles in the water column, and the hindcast maximum mixed layer depth for each station (MLD_i), winter concentrations for iron and nitrate are estimated as

$$\widehat{dFe}_i = \frac{1}{MLD_i} \int_{MLD_i}^0 dFe(z)_i dz$$

$$\widehat{NO3}_i = \frac{1}{MLD_i} \int_{MLD_i}^0 NO3(z)_i dz$$

with the coordinate z defined to be positive upward. Values of \widehat{dFe}_i range from 0.10 to 0.56 nM, whereas values of $\widehat{NO3}_i$ range from 25.9 to 33.4 μ M (Figures 2c and 2d). Wintertime observations with which to compare these predictions are scarce, but these ranges are not inconsistent with data from early spring [Coale *et al.*, 2005; Sedwick *et al.*, 2000], although the capacity for rapid utilization of the winter reserve of iron [Sedwick *et al.*, 2011] complicates this comparison. Interestingly, \widehat{dFe}_i in the western Ross Sea is significantly higher than in the other two regions considered, yet $\widehat{NO3}_i$ does not differ significantly among the three subregions (Table 1 and Figure S3 in the supporting information). Note that these estimates do not account for dynamics in seasonal variability. For example, the dFe winter concentrations are conservative minimum values, because there may be continued flux of dFe from the seabed during the period of convective mixing.

In addition to the winter reserves, there are also sources of dFe and nitrate derived from MCDW, sea ice, and glacial ice. Each of these inputs was quantified using tracer experiments in the model hindcast (Figure 3). These sources are taken into account in calculating the apparent biological drawdown by adding the simulated dFe and nitrate concentrations from the closest model grid point j at the time of each observation i :

$$\widehat{dFe}_i = \int_{EZ}^0 \text{pos} \left(\widehat{dFe}_i + dFe_{MCDW_j} + dFe_{SeaIce_j} + dFe_{GlacialIce_j} - dFe(z)_i \right) dz$$

$$\widehat{NO3}_i = \int_{EZ}^0 \text{pos} \left(\widehat{NO3}_i + NO3_{MCDW_j} + NO3_{SeaIce_j} + NO3_{GlacialIce_j} - NO3(z)_i \right) dz$$

where EZ is the depth of the euphotic zone and pos indicates that only positive drawdowns are included in the integral. We do not have sufficient information to constrain spatial and temporal variations in the depth of the euphotic zone, so we utilized the mean mixed layer depth for the growing season (Table 1). This is justified on the basis that waters below the mixed layer account for only a small fraction of the vertically integrated primary production in this region [Arrigo *et al.*, 2008].




Figure 4. Dissolved (a) iron and (b) nitrate drawdown computed from the difference between cruise observations and the estimated winter reserve values plus cumulative inputs of dFe and nitrate from MCDW, sea ice, and glacial ice simulated for the space-time location of each station. Bathymetry shaded in gray with contours at 200 m intervals. (c, d) Nitrate:iron drawdown ratios. The histogram in Figure 4d displays regional estimates with bin sizes of $0.2 \cdot 10^5 \text{ mol N} / (\text{mol dFe})^{-1}$. Note that the three easternmost shelf stations (white crosses in Figures 4a and 4c) are excluded in Figure 4d because summer surface dFe either exceeds or is nearly the same as the estimated winter reserve dFe, thereby making the drawdown ratios meaningless.

The drawdown ratio $\overline{\text{NO}_3} / \overline{\text{dFe}}$ provides a means to evaluate phytoplankton uptake stoichiometry. Although there are hints of pan-regional patterns, systematic differences in the drawdown ratios are not statistically significant at the 95% confidence level (Figure 4), so we relied on the cruise-mean ratio (Table 1). Converting the NO₃:Fe drawdown ratio of $0.59 \pm 0.22 \times 10^5 \text{ mol N} / (\text{mol Fe})^{-1}$ to carbon units yields a C:Fe molar ratio of $390,000 \pm 150,000$ (standard deviation) or equivalently $2.6 \pm 0.99 \mu\text{mol Fe} / \text{mol C}$. This value falls within the range of prior estimates for phytoplankton C:Fe assimilation ratios, which vary from 5000 to 450,000 [Boyd *et al.*, 2012; Fung *et al.*, 2000; Twining *et al.*, 2004], with some recent estimates as high as 2,500,000 [Strzepek *et al.*, 2011].

Using the phytoplankton C:Fe assimilation ratio inferred from our observations, we estimated seasonal biological iron demand with a satellite-based primary productivity algorithm applied to the Ross Sea shelf [Arrigo *et al.*, 2008] (Figure 1a). This bio-optical model of productivity is based on satellite retrievals of open water area and chlorophyll (Chl), together with estimates of irradiance and the phytoplankton C:Chl ratio. As such, it reflects net primary production, which consists of both new and recycled components. A synthesis of published values of the *f* ratio for the Ross Sea [Asper and Smith, 1999; Cochlan and Bronk, 2001; Nelson and Smith, 1986] (Table S1 in the supporting information) suggests $f = 0.5 \pm 0.1$. The demand for new carbon is scaled accordingly and converted to nitrogen units using the Redfield ratio. The corresponding iron demand is then computed using our empirical estimate of the drawdown ratio $\overline{\text{NO}_3} / \overline{\text{dFe}}$, described above.

4. Discussion

Our observations and model results facilitate a quantitative comparison of annual dFe supply and demand in surface waters of the Ross Sea (Table 1). In aggregate, the mean supply and demand are approximately equal, and the difference between them is less than 10% of the estimated uncertainty. The two largest sources of dFe are the winter reserve (heavily influenced by benthic sources) and sea ice melt, providing roughly equal contributions that comprise more than 80% of the total. MCDW supplies most of the remainder, with the contribution from glacial ice almost an order of magnitude less.

Iron supply and demand estimates for the three subregions are also in approximate balance, with the magnitudes of the mean residuals ranging between 8% and 35% of the uncertainties. Curiously, regional differences in supply do not appear to be reflected in demand. Specifically, a higher winter reserve and larger input of sea ice melt in the western Ross Sea drive an iron supply approximately double that in the other subregions—whereas satellite-based estimates indicate highest iron demand in the central Ross Sea (although the uncertainties in the regional estimates overlap).

It is tempting to consider whether this lack of covariation in iron supply and demand could be a result of regional differences in phytoplankton composition that are not included in our estimates of demand. Blooms in the western Ross Sea tend to be dominated by diatoms, whereas those in the central subregion are more commonly dominated by the colonial prymnesiophyte *Phaeocystis antarctica* [DiTullio and Smith, 1996]. Cellular iron requirements of these two taxa certainly differ, but the literature does not offer consensus on a systematic relative difference in C:Fe ratios [Strzepek *et al.*, 2011; Tagliabue and Arrigo, 2005]. Laboratory culture studies suggest lower Chl:C ratios in *P. antarctica* relative to a typical Antarctic diatom (*Fragilariopsis cylindrus*) [Arrigo *et al.*, 2010], but these photophysiological differences run counter to the observed trend: all else being equal, if the bio-optical model were to include these variations in Chl:C, the relative difference in satellite-based productivity estimates in the west and central regions would be accentuated—with a commensurate impact on apparent iron demand. Thus, it does not appear that variations in phytoplankton composition can reconcile the regional trends in iron supply and demand. It is possible that these apparent discrepancies reflect undersampling of spatial and temporal variations in this complex and dynamic physical-biological-chemical environment, which is complicated by the fact that the western Ross Sea is ice covered longer than the other two subregions (Figure S7 in the supporting information). Alternatively, factors other than iron may be limiting or colimiting [Boyd, 2002]. However, the low concentrations of dFe observed in surface waters (Figure 1b) are consistent with iron limitation. In any case, the domain-wide average iron demand appears to be in balance with the supply processes quantified here, albeit with substantial uncertainty.

In light of these uncertainties, it is useful to quantify the error budget. On the demand side, the fractional error of 0.73 is dominated by uncertainty in the C:Fe ratio (0.37), which is approximately twice that ascribed to the *f* ratio (0.2). Uncertainty in the satellite retrieval of primary production itself is estimated to be 15% [Arrigo *et al.*, 2008]. On the supply side, the fractional error is somewhat lower: 0.56. The two largest contributors are uncertainties in the winter reserve and sea ice sources. The former reflects purely observational uncertainty, as we have insufficient data to assess the accuracy of the wintertime mixed layer depths simulated by the model. The latter reflects uncertainty in the end-member concentration of dFe in sea ice (see section 2), as the modeled sea ice cover is consistent with observations (Figures S6, S7, and Table S2 in the supporting information). Absolute uncertainties in the contributions from MCDW and glacial ice are more than an order of magnitude lower and again reflect uncertainty in the end-member concentrations, as the hydrodynamic aspects of MCDW intrusions and glacial melt simulated by the model compare favorably with available observations (Figures S8 and S9 in the supporting information).

Additional uncertainties pertain to mechanisms of iron supply that we have not considered. Atmospheric deposition is thought to be very small in the Southern Ocean [Mahowald *et al.*, 2005]. Analyses of snow from the Ross Sea [Edwards and Sedwick, 2001] suggest an aeolian flux of water-soluble iron on the order of $0.1 \mu\text{mol Fe m}^{-2} \text{ yr}^{-1}$, with locally higher deposition confined to the McMurdo Sound area [Winton *et al.*, 2014]. Postconvective vertical mixing by turbulent diffusion and/or episodic upwelling by mesoscale and submesoscale fronts and eddies may supply additional dFe during the growing season. However, the vertical gradient on which these mechanisms operate is generally weak at the base of the euphotic zone (Figure S11 in the supporting information). The biological availability of suspended particulate iron [Lam *et al.*, 2012], which we have not considered, is perhaps the most significant outstanding unknown in terms of dFe supply.

5. Conclusions

Despite the large uncertainties, this attempt to quantify proximate iron sources in the Ross Sea has revealed several important findings relative to estimated iron demand on an annual time scale. Direct measurement of the near-bottom dFe profile and its significance in terms of the vertically integrated inventory confirm the importance of benthic iron supply, which has been proposed in the Ross Sea [Gerringa *et al.*, 2015; Marsay *et al.*, 2014], elsewhere in the Southern Ocean [Blain *et al.*, 2007; de Jong *et al.*, 2012; Tagliabue *et al.*, 2009; Wadley *et al.*, 2014], as well as in other locations [Johnson *et al.*, 1999]. In contrast to other areas on the Antarctic margin, where melting glacial ice is a major source of iron [Gerringa *et al.*, 2012], the proportion of dFe supplied from glacial ice appears to be negligible in the Ross Sea: input from sea ice is an order of magnitude larger on a regional basis. Our findings illustrate the complexities of iron cycling in the Southern Ocean, highlighting the heterogeneity of the underlying processes along the Antarctic continental margin. Explicit representation of these complexities, and the temporal variability in both proximate and ultimate sources of iron, will be necessary to understand how a changing climate will affect this important ecosystem and its influence on biogeochemical cycles. Reduction of the present uncertainties in iron supply and demand will require coupled observational and modeling systems capable of resolving the wide range of physical, biological, and chemical processes involved.

Acknowledgments

The data used in this paper are archived at the Biological and Chemical Oceanography Data Management Office: <http://www.bco-dmo.org/project/2155>. Support of this research by the National Science Foundation's United States Antarctic Program is gratefully acknowledged. We thank the officers, crew, and technical personnel on board the R/V *Nathaniel B. Palmer* for their outstanding support during our seagoing operations. S. Howard and S. Springer assisted in adding tidal forcing to the circulation model. O. Kosnyrev, V. Kosnyrev, and L. Anderson provided technical support in data analysis and figure preparation. We thank two anonymous referees for their thorough reviews that helped improve the manuscript.

The Editor thanks two anonymous reviewers for their assistance in evaluating this paper.

References

- Arrigo, K. R., D. L. Worthen, M. P. Lizotte, P. Dixon, and G. Dieckmann (1997), Primary production in Antarctic sea ice, *Science*, 276(5311), 394–397.
- Arrigo, K. R., G. R. DiTullio, R. B. Dunbar, D. H. Robinson, M. Van Woert, D. L. Worthen, and M. P. Lizotte (2000), Phytoplankton taxonomic variability in nutrient utilization and primary production in the Ross Sea, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 105(C4), 8827–8846, doi:10.1029/1998JC000289.
- Arrigo, K. R., D. L. Worthen, and D. H. Robinson (2003), A coupled ocean–ecosystem model of the Ross Sea. Part 2: Iron regulation of phytoplankton taxonomic variability and primary production, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 108(C7), 3231, doi:10.1029/2001JC000856.
- Arrigo, K. R., G. L. van Dijken, and S. Bushinsky (2008), Primary production in the Southern Ocean, 1997–2006, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 113, C08004, doi:10.1029/2007JC004551.
- Arrigo, K. R., M. M. Mills, L. R. Kropuenske, G. L. van Dijken, A.-C. Alderkamp, and D. H. Robinson (2010), Photophysiology in two major Southern Ocean phytoplankton taxa: photosynthesis and growth of *Phaeocystis antarctica* and *Fragilariopsis cylindrus* under different irradiance levels, *Integr. Comp. Biol.*, 50(6), 950–966.
- Asper, V. L., and W. O. Smith Jr. (1999), Particle fluxes during austral spring and summer in the southern Ross Sea, Antarctica, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 104(C3), 5345–5359, doi:10.1029/1998JC900067.
- Blain, S., et al. (2007), Effect of natural iron fertilization on carbon sequestration in the Southern Ocean, *Nature*, 446(7139), 1070–1074.
- Boyd, P. W. (2002), Environmental factors controlling phytoplankton processes in the Southern Ocean, *J. Phycol.*, 38(5), 844–861.
- Boyd, P. W., K. R. Arrigo, R. Strzepek, and G. L. van Dijken (2012), Mapping phytoplankton iron utilization: Insights into Southern Ocean supply mechanisms, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, C06009, doi:10.1029/2011JC007726.
- Carter, S. P., and H. A. Fricker (2012), The supply of subglacial meltwater to the grounding line of the Siple Coast, West Antarctica, *Ann. Glaciol.*, 53(60), 267–280.
- Coale, K. H., R. M. Gordon, and X. Wang (2005), The distribution and behavior of dissolved and particulate iron and zinc in the Ross Sea and Antarctic circumpolar current along 170°W, *Deep Sea Res., Part I*, 52, 295–318.
- Cochlan, W. P., and D. A. Bronk (2001), Nitrogen uptake kinetics in the Ross Sea, Antarctica, *Deep Sea Res., Part II*, 48(19–20), 4127–4153.
- de Jong, J., V. Schoemann, D. Lannuzel, P. Croot, H. de Baar, and J.-L. Tison (2012), Natural iron fertilization of the Atlantic sector of the Southern Ocean by continental shelf sources of the Antarctic Peninsula, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 117, G01029, doi:10.1029/2011JG001679.
- de Jong, J., V. Schoemann, N. Maricic, N. Mattielli, P. Langhorne, T. Haskell, and J.-L. Tison (2013), Iron in land-fast sea ice of McMurdo Sound derived from sediment resuspension and wind-blown dust attributes to primary productivity in the Ross Sea, Antarctica, *Mar. Chem.*, 157, 24–40.
- Death, R., J. L. Wadham, F. Monteiro, A. M. L. Brocq, M. Tranter, A. Ridgwell, S. Dutkiewicz, and R. Raiswell (2014), Antarctic ice sheet fertilises the Southern Ocean, *Biogeosciences*, 11, 2635–2643.
- Dinniman, M. S., J. M. Klinck, and W. O. Smith Jr. (2011), A model study of Circumpolar Deep Water on the West Antarctic Peninsula and Ross Sea continental shelves, *Deep Sea Res., Part II*, 58(13–16), 1508–1523.
- DiTullio, G. R., and W. O. Smith Jr. (1996), Spatial patterns in phytoplankton biomass and pigment distributions in the Ross Sea, *J. Geophys. Res.*, 101(C8), 18,467–18,477, doi:10.1029/96JC00034.
- Edwards, R., and P. Sedwick (2001), Iron in East Antarctic snow: Implications for atmospheric iron deposition and algal production in Antarctic waters, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 28(20), 3907–3910, doi:10.1029/2001GL012867.
- Fitzwater, S. E., K. S. Johnson, R. M. Gordon, K. H. Coale, and W. O. Smith Jr. (2000), Trace metal concentrations in the Ross Sea and their relationship with nutrients and phytoplankton growth, *Deep Sea Res., Part II*, 47, 3159–3179.
- Fung, I. Y., S. K. Meyn, I. Tegen, S. C. Doney, J. G. John, and J. K. B. Bishop (2000), Iron supply and demand in the upper ocean, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, 14(1), 281–295, doi:10.1029/1999GB900059.
- Gerringa, L. J. A., A.-C. Alderkamp, P. Laan, C.-E. Thuróczy, H. J. W. De Baar, M. M. Mills, G. L. van Dijken, H. V. Haren, and K. R. Arrigo (2012), Iron from melting glaciers fuels the phytoplankton blooms in Amundsen Sea (Southern Ocean): Iron biogeochemistry, *Deep Sea Res., Part II*, 71–76, 16–31.
- Gerringa, L. J. A., P. Laan, G. L. van Dijken, H. van Haren, H. J. W. De Baar, K. R. Arrigo, and A. C. Alderkamp (2015), Sources of iron in the Ross Sea polynya in early summer, *Mar. Chem.*, doi:10.1016/j.marchem.2015.06.002, in press.
- Gordon, L. I., L. A. Codispoti, J. C. Jennings Jr., F. J. Millero, J. M. Morrison, and C. Sweeney (2000), Seasonal evolution of hydrographic properties in the Ross Sea, Antarctica, 1996–1997, *Deep Sea Res., Part II*, 47(15–16), 3095–3117.

- Jacobs, S. S., and C. F. Giulivi (1999), Thermohaline data and ocean circulation on the Ross Sea continental shelf, in *Oceanography of the Ross Sea Antarctica*, edited by G. Spezie and G. M. R. Manzella, pp. 3–16, Springer, Milan.
- Johnson, K. S., F. P. Chavez, and G. E. Friederich (1999), Continental-shelf sediment as a primary source of iron for coastal phytoplankton, *Nature*, *398*(6729), 697–700.
- Lam, P. J., D. C. Ohnemus, and M. A. Marcus (2012), The speciation of marine particulate iron adjacent to active and passive continental margins, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, *80*, 108–124.
- Lannuzel, D., V. Schoemann, J. de Jong, B. Pasquer, P. van der Merwe, F. Masson, J.-L. Tison, and A. Bowie (2010), Distribution of dissolved iron in Antarctic sea ice: Spatial, seasonal, and inter-annual variability, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *115*, G03022, doi:10.1029/2009JG001031.
- Mahowald, N. M., A. R. Baker, G. Bergametti, N. Brooks, R. A. Duce, T. D. Jickells, N. Kubilay, J. M. Prospero, and I. Tegen (2005), Atmospheric global dust cycle and iron inputs to the ocean, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, *19*, GB4025, doi:10.1029/2004GB002402.
- Marsay, C. M., P. N. Sedwick, M. S. Dinniman, P. M. Barrett, S. L. Mack, and D. J. McGillicuddy (2014), Estimating the benthic efflux of dissolved iron on the Ross Sea continental shelf, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *41*, 7576–7583, doi:10.1002/2014GL061684.
- Martin, J. H., R. M. Gordon, and S. E. Fitzwater (1990), Iron in Antarctic waters, *Nature*, *345*, 156–158.
- Measures, C. I., M. Hatta, and M. M. Grand (2012), Bioactive trace metal distributions and biogeochemical controls in the Southern Ocean, *Oceanography*, *25*(3), 122–133.
- Nelson, D. M., and W. O. Smith Jr. (1986), Phytoplankton bloom dynamics of the western Ross Sea ice edge—II. Mesoscale cycling of nitrogen and silicon, *Deep Sea Res.*, *33*(10), 1389–1412.
- Orsi, A. H., and C. L. Wiederwohl (2009), A recount of Ross Sea waters, *Deep Sea Res., Part II*, *56*, 778–795.
- Raiswell, R., M. Tranter, L. G. Benning, M. Siegert, R. De'ath, P. Huybrechts, and T. Payne (2006), Contributions from glacially derived sediment to the global iron (oxyhydr)oxide cycle: Implications for iron delivery to the oceans, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta*, *70*(11), 2765–2780.
- Sedwick, P. N., G. R. DiTullio, and D. J. Mackey (2000), Iron and manganese in the Ross Sea, Antarctica: Seasonal iron limitation in Antarctic shelf waters, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *105*(C5), 11,321–11,336, doi:10.1029/2000JC000256.
- Sedwick, P. N., et al. (2011), Early season depletion of dissolved iron in the Ross Sea polynya: Implications for iron dynamics on the Antarctic continental shelf, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *116*, C12019, doi:10.1029/2010JC006553.
- Spolaor, A., P. Vallelonga, G. Cozzi, J. Gabrieli, C. Varin, N. Kehrwald, P. Zennaro, C. Boutron, and C. Barbante (2013), Iron speciation in aerosol dust influences iron bioavailability over glacial-interglacial timescales, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *40*, 1618–1623, doi:10.1002/grl.50296.
- Strzepek, R. F., M. T. Maldonado, K. A. Hunter, R. D. Frew, and P. W. Boyd (2011), Adaptive strategies by Southern Ocean phytoplankton to lessen iron limitation: Uptake of organically complexed iron and reduced cellular iron requirements, *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, *56*, 1983–2002.
- Sunda, W. G., and S. A. Huntsman (1997), Interrelated influence of iron, light and cell size on marine phytoplankton growth, *Nature*, *390*(6658), 389–392.
- Tagliabue, A., and K. R. Arrigo (2005), Iron in the Ross Sea: 1. Impact on CO₂ fluxes via variation in phytoplankton functional group and non-Redfield stoichiometry, *J. Geophys. Res.*, *110*, C03009, doi:10.1029/2004JC002531.
- Tagliabue, A., L. Bopp, and O. Aumont (2009), Evaluating the importance of atmospheric and sedimentary iron sources to Southern Ocean biogeochemistry, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, *36*, L13601, doi:10.1029/2009GL038914.
- Twining, B. S., S. B. Baines, N. S. Fisher, and M. R. Landry (2004), Cellular iron contents of plankton during the Southern Ocean Iron Experiment (SOFeX), *Deep Sea Res., Part I*, *51*(12), 1827–1850.
- Wadley, M. R., T. D. Jickells, and K. J. Heywood (2014), The role of iron sources and transport for Southern Ocean productivity, *Deep Sea Res., Part I*, *87*, 82–94.
- Winton, V. H. L., G. B. Dunbar, N. A. N. Bertler, M. A. Millet, B. Delmonte, C. B. Atkins, J. M. Chewings, and P. Andersson (2014), The contribution of aeolian sand and dust to iron fertilization of phytoplankton blooms in southwestern Ross Sea, Antarctica, *Global Biogeochem. Cycles*, *28*, 423–436, doi:10.1002/2013GB004574.