Arctic sea ice algae differ markedly from phytoplankton in their ecophysiological characteristics
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Abstract

Photophysiological and biochemical characteristics were investigated in natural communities of sympagic (ice-associated) and pelagic algae, in order to understand their respective responses towards variable irradiance and nutrient regimes. This study revealed large differences in photosynthetic efficiency and capacity between the two algal assemblages. Successful photoacclimation in sympagic algal assemblages was restricted to very low irradiance ranges, and as irradiances increased, photochemical damage and oxidative stress appeared to outweigh cellular defenses, causing a decline in photosynthetic performance under the highest irradiance levels (> 8 μmol photons m\(^{-1}\) s\(^{-1}\)). On the contrary, pelagic algae assemblages were strongly light limited within the same irradiance ranges. Furthermore, the pelagic algal assemblages exhibited more efficient carbon assimilation rates in the low irradiance range compared to the sympagic algae, possibly explaining the ability of phytoplankton to generate substantial blooms beneath sea ice. The Arctic is warming more rapidly than any other oceanic region on the planet, and as a consequence, irradiance levels in surface waters are expected to increase due to faster sea ice melt and enhanced stratification. The results of this study suggest that sea ice algae will struggle more with adapting to the expected environmental changes compared to phytoplankton. We therefore anticipate a change in sea ice-based vs. pelagic primary production with respect to timing and quantity in a future Arctic. The clearly distinct responses of sea ice algae vs. phytoplankton also need to be incorporated into model scenarios of future Arctic algae blooms and considered when predicting implications for the entire ecosystem.
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Introduction

In the ice-covered seas of the Arctic, two major functionally distinct types of primary producers are found: sympagic (i.e. ice-associated), and pelagic algae (Leu et al. 2015). Sympagic algae colonize the underside of sea ice and are a key component of the Arctic food web, contributing up to 57% of total primary production in the central Arctic Ocean and between 3 and 25% in Arctic shelf regions (Legendre et al. 1992, Gosselin et al. 1997, Arrigo et al. 2010, Loose et al. 2011). Sympagic algae production typically peaks in early spring when pelagic production is classically thought to be minimal, extending the period of primary production in spring (Cota et al. 1991, Legendre et al. 1992). Furthermore, many Arctic marine organisms have adapted their life cycles to take advantage of this high-quality food source prior to the phytoplankton bloom (Runge et al. 1991, Søreide et al. 2006, Søreide et al. 2010, Daase et al. 2013). Growth and succession in both sympagic and pelagic communities are controlled by several environmental variables: most importantly, irradiance and nutrient availability (Tremblay & Gagnon 2009, Arrigo et al. 2014, Lewis et al. 2018), but also other drivers such as temperature and salinity (Coello-Camba et al. 2015, Torstensson et al. 2015). These physical factors vary greatly over time and space and strongly influence physiology, abundance, biomass and taxonomic composition of differentially adapted species (Sakshaug 2004, Litchman & Klausmeier 2008).

Due to the contrasting physico-chemical environments in sea ice and open water, sympagic and pelagic algae exhibit specific adaptations to their respective habitats (Poulin et al. 2011, Kvernvik et al. under revision). Irradiance reaching the bottom of sea ice is principally regulated by ice thickness and overlaying snow cover, where the latter is usually most important due to its high light attenuation properties (Gosselin et al. 1990, Mundy et al. 2005, Marks & King 2014, Hancke et al. 2018). As a result, reported transmittance through ice and snow layers in the Arctic is often very low (between 0.023 – 9% of incident irradiance, Leu et al. 2010, Leu et al. 2015, Campbell et al. 2016, Assmy et al. 2017, Hancke et al. 2018). Since sympagic algae live in a spatially restricted environment that is normally not undergoing rapid changes, they usually experience gradually changing irradiances on low amplitudes (i.e. gradual changes in the sun’s elevation and snow cover overlaid by diurnal fluctuation). Furthermore, sympagic communities are facing quite challenging growth conditions, such as sub-zero temperatures, high salinities, and rapidly depleted nutrient and dissolved organic carbon (DIC) levels due to limited resupply (Weeks & Ackley 1986, McMinn et al. 2014, Hill et al. 2018). In comparison, vertical mixing of phytoplankton cells within deeply mixed surface layers implies strong and rapid fluctuations
in light and sometimes nutrient regimes (MacIntyre et al. 2000), while salinity remains comparably stable. Phytoplankton species occurring in this environment can therefore be expected to cope better with dynamic light conditions.

Microalgae have evolved several mechanisms that allow them to acclimate to changes in irradiance, described as photoprotection and photoacclimation. The most important short term photoprotective mechanisms involve increased non-photochemical quenching (NPQ) of excitation energy, mainly driven by the de-epoxidation of expressed xanthophylls (e.g. diadinoxanthin and diatoxanthin). On longer time scales, microalgae can alter cellular pigment composition, e.g., by increasing antioxidant carotenes and xanthophylls as well as decreasing the light harvesting pigments (Brunet et al. 2011). Despite the ability of microalgae to acclimate to increasing irradiances, high levels at potentially species-specific thresholds can still have negative physiological effects resulting in high light stress and photoinhibition (Barlow et al. 1988, Galindo et al. 2017). This can be a result of the fact that cells will mostly acclimate to their average experienced growth environment, which is substantially lower than the experienced peak values (Behrenfeld et al. 2008). Furthermore, sufficient acclimation will take some time to adjust pigmentation, hence, rapid increases in irradiance will remain a challenge (Kvernvik et al. under revision, Leu et al. 2006).

Seasonally ice-covered seas at high latitudes are characterized by very pronounced algal spring blooms, usually starting with a sympagic bloom followed by a pelagic one. During the early phase when nutrients are plentiful, microalgal growth is often primarily limited by light (Leu et al. 2015). Later, because of intense algal growth during bloom events, initially available inorganic nutrients become gradually depleted, and become a limiting factor for further biomass accumulation (Hansell et al. 1993, Varela et al. 2013, Danielson et al. 2017). In coastal Arctic regions, nitrogen is the main limiting nutrient, (Strom et al. 2006, van De Poll et al. 2016), which is often reflected in high carbon to nitrogen (C:N) ratios in microalgae (Niemi & Michel 2015). Nitrogen starvation may have considerable effects on phytoplankton photophysiology, because proteins (such as D1 and Rubisco) and pigments required for photoacclimation and photo-repair also consume large amounts of nutrients (Geider et al. 1993, Eberhard et al. 2008). Moreover, nutrient limitation affects photochemical energy conversion as energy derived from light reactions may be used for nutrient uptake rather than carbon fixation (Kulk et al. 2018). Hence, NO₃ limitation can impede photoacclimation responses and increase the susceptibility to photoinhibition, which is critical, since during the period of nutrient depletion, algal
communities might also be exposed to high levels of irradiance as snow and ice melt (Nicolaus et al. 2012). Over the course of the bloom, microalgal populations can thus shift from a phase characterized by light limited growth and accumulation to that of one or a combination of light limitation, nutrient limitation, photoinhibition and in the case of sympagic algae, ice melt (Lavoie et al. 2005, Galindo et al. 2017, Mortenson et al. 2017).

The Arctic is warming more rapidly than any other oceanic region on the planet, leading to a reduction in sea ice extent and thickness (Kwok et al. 2009, Screen et al. 2011), earlier melt onset (Nicolaus et al. 2012), declining snow cover (Screen & Simmonds 2012), in addition to amplified river discharge due to increasing precipitation and terrestrial ice melt (Peterson et al. 2002). Since the underwater light climate in the Arctic is principally regulated by snow and ice cover (Mundy et al. 2005, Aumack & Juhl 2015), the Arctic Ocean is expected to shift from a predominantly light-controlled (ice-covered) to a more nutrient-controlled (open water) system (Carmack & Wassmann 2006). This may not only affect the physiological performance, but also competitiveness and biochemical characteristics of microalgae. Therefore, we expect major changes in microalgal community structure, succession and bloom phenology in the Arctic (Rat'kova & Wassmann 2002, Hegseth & Sundfjord 2008), with potentially cascading effects in higher trophic levels. Sea ice algae and phytoplankton blooms do not only differ with respect to timing, but are also utilized by different groups of grazers – which will likely result in clearly distinct effects on higher trophic levels, when their relative contribution to Arctic primary production alters. For developing realistic future scenarios, a proper mechanistic understanding of the physiological and biochemical responses of sea ice algae and phytoplankton towards their changing environment is essential. Of particular importance in this context is to understand how the balance between sea ice-based vs. pelagic primary production will change with respect to timing and quantity.

The aim of this study was to compare photophysiological and biochemical characteristics of natural sea ice algal vs. phytoplankton communities and identify their response to changes in the environment. To this end, we collected time series data of phytoplankton and sea ice algae from a high Arctic fjord, taking advantage of the (rare) co-occurrence of their respective spring blooms to conduct field experiments. We hypothesized that sea ice algae and phytoplankton will exhibit distinct differences in their responses towards changes in their abiotic environment, and expected sea ice algae communities to be less resistant towards high light stress compared
to the pelagic community - probably resulting from their adaptation to two very different habitat types.

Materials and methods

Study area

This study was conducted in Van Mijenfjorden, an approximately 10 km wide and 50 km long fjord located on the west coast of Spitsbergen, Norway (Fig. 1). The mouth of the fjord is largely closed off by the island Akseløya, which together with a shallow sill limits the exchange of fjord water with the warm Atlantic water from the West Spitsbergen current. Furthermore, the rather closed nature of the fjord leaves it less exposed to winds and waves, which offers favorable conditions for a stable sea ice cover. The fjord can be divided into an outer basin, which is ~10 km wide and 100 m deep, and inner basin, which is 5 km wide and has an average depth of ~30 m (Kangas 2000). Time for freeze-up usually covers a wide time span ranging from November to January, while the ice normally breaks up between June and July depending on ice coverage and thickness (Høyland 2009). Because of the strongly increased winter temperatures in Svalbard, however, the period of ice coverage in Van Mijenfjorden has become shorter during the latest years (Osuch & Wawrzyniak 2017). In 2017, when the current study was conducted, ice started to settle in the inner and outer basin end of January/early February. The ice break-up started in end of May, and the inner and outer basins were more or less ice free from mid-June onwards (retrieved from http://polarview.met.no/).

Sample collection

Samples of sea ice algae and pelagic algae were collected from ice cores and in open water from a total of eight stations in Van Mijenfjorden between March and August 2017 (Fig. 1). Detailed information on station coordinates, depth distribution, snow and ice thickness are shown in Table 1. Sea ice samples for community composition, elemental analysis and photosynthetic pigments were collected from bottom 3 cm of sea-ice cores using a Kovacs Mark2 core barrel (9 cm diameter; Kovacs Enterprise, Roseburg, USA). On each sampling day, three sets of six cores each were taken approximately one meter apart. To compare the effect of the different snow depths on sympagic algae, on the 23rd and 26th of April and on the 2nd of May samples were taken from areas with low (0-5 cm) and high (20+ cm) snow cover. Snow depth and ice thickness for each core were recorded and averaged. All samples were left for melting in darkness over 24 h (5-10°C), after adding 100 mL of GF/F filtrated sea water to every cm of core to minimize osmotic stress (Bates & Cota 1986, Garrison & Buck 1986). After
thawing, the volume of the samples was measured and sets of six samples were pooled in order to obtain three pools per station and per treatment in the case of low vs. high snow. For each pool, two additional ice cores were taken; one was left to thaw without the addition of filtered seawater, to be used for nutrient analysis, the second was measured for temperature, sectioned for salinity measurements and left to thaw without addition of filtered sea water. Pelagic sampling was performed using a 10 L Niskin bottle (Ocean Test Equipment Inc., Fort Lauderdale, Fla., USA) at different depths; 0 m (ice-based sampling only) 5 m, 15 m, 25 m, 50 m and bottom. From each water depth (pelagic) and core section (sympagic), water was filtered for pigment analysis (HPLC), particulate organic carbon and nitrogen (POC, PON), and Chl a (see detailed description below).

**Environmental parameters**

Nutrient samples were filtered using an acid washed syringe (10% HCl, 48 hours) and GF/F filters. Samples were stored at -20 °C in 15ml acid washed Falcon tubes. After thawing, the samples were analyzed colourimetrically on a QuaAtro autoanalyzer (Seal Analytical, Mequon, USA) using internal calibrations and CRMs (KANSO, Osaka, Japan) for quality control. The bulk salinity was measured using a Symphony SP90M5 conductivity meter (VWR, Radnor, USA). Brine salinities were calculated from ice temperature (Cox & Weeks 1986, Leppäranta & Manninen 1988).

Incoming and ice-transmitted planar down-welling spectral irradiance was measured simultaneously at every sampling site and date between 11:00 and 13:00 h, using two cosine-corrected 2π photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) sensors coupled to a data logger (LI-1400). For the measurements at the ice-water interface, the sensor was placed ~1.5 m south from the core hole using a folding L-shaped hinging arm, in order to minimize the shading effect of the equipment and observer. Measurements were repeated after measuring the snow depth and the subsequent removal of approximately 5m² of snow around the measuring point, in order to measure the light attenuation of the ice only. Similar measurements using the two cosine-corrected 2π PAR sensors and data logger were performed at different depths for assessment of the pelagic light climate, both under the ice as in open water. The pelagic light measurements in open water were done from a small tender away from the larger main vessel, to reduce the shading effect of the vessel. The incoming and transmitted planar down-welling spectral irradiance was used to calculate % transmitted irradiance through ice and different
snow depths at each station and date. The water column diffuse attenuation coefficient \( K_d \) was determined based on the Beer-Lambert law (Swinehart 1962).

To estimate the incoming irradiance for each sampling date, we calculated daily integrated \( \text{PAR}_{24h} \) retrieved from light sensors monitoring PAR every 10 minutes in Adventdalen. Meteorological data comparing cloud coverage in Van Mijenfjorden and Adventdalen, in addition to incoming irradiance around noon were used to choose the most similar days. To calculate irradiance at the ice–water interface (sympagic algae), we estimated downward irradiance at the ice–water interface by multiplying the daily integrated \( \text{PAR}_{24h} \) by the calculated PAR transmittance. To calculate irradiance at each depth \( (E_z; \text{pelagic algae}) \), we used the calculated \( K_d \), daily integrated \( \text{PAR}_{24h} \), and surface irradiance \( (E_0) \) using the equation:

\[
E_z = E_0 \times \text{Exp}(-K_d \times z)
\]

In addition to the discrete light measurements during the sampling campaigns, we also collected continuous integrated PAR data by loggers that were a) part of an ocean observatory close to the position of station VMF1, and b) mounted underneath the sea ice as part of a sea ice observatory that was deployed from early March to early May 2017 close to the position of the MS station. The ocean observatory was deployed in late August 2016, and retrieved one year later. At 12 m depth, an upward looking cosine-corrected PAR sensor (Satlantic, Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada) was placed, and measured incoming irradiance every second hour.

At the sea ice observatory, a Licor LI-192 Underwater Quantum Sensor (Licor, Lincoln, Nebraska, USA) was mounted 20 cm beneath the ice-water interface, measuring integrated PAR once per hour between March 7th and May 2nd 2017. At the time of retrieval, the sea ice thickness above the sensor was appx. 30 cm, covered by 27 cm of snow.

**Biochemical composition of algae**

Samples for Chl \( a \) determination were filtered onto GF/F filters (Whatman, Maidstone, UK) using a gentle vacuum, shock frozen in liquid nitrogen, and stored at -80 °C until further analysis. Upon analysis, Chl \( a \) filters were extracted in 10 mL methanol for 24 hours at +4°C in the dark (Holm-Hansen & Riemann 1978) and measured on a 10-AU-005-CE Fluorometer (Turner Designs, San Jose, USA). POC/N samples were filtered onto pre-combusted (8 hours, 450°C) GF/F filters and stored at -20 °C in precombusted (12 hours, 500°C) glass petri dishes. Prior to analysis, samples were acidified (0.2ml of 0.2M HCl) and dried for 24 hours. The
samples were subsequently packed into tin capsules. Most samples were analyzed on a Euro EA 3000 elemental analyzer (Hekatech, Wegberg, Germany). Approximately one quarter of the samples were analyzed on a Flash EA 1112 elemental analyzer (Thermo Scientific, Milan, Italy) coupled to a Delta V Advantage IRMS (Thermo Scientific, Bremen, Germany), since stable isotope ratios needed to be determined for them in addition. For calibration of the different elemental analyzers, an acetonilide standard was used. C:N ratios were corrected based on the difference in atomic rate in carbon and nitrogen. Samples for pigment composition from sympagic and pelagic algae were collected on GF/F filters (Whatman, England), flash-frozen in liquid nitrogen and stored at -80 °C until analysis. Frozen filters from algal cultures were extracted in a Teflon-lined screw-capped tube with 1.6 ml 95 % methanol for 24 h, and then re-filtered through Millipore 0.45 μm filters (Millipore, Billerica, MA, USA), before the final extract was injected in the HPLC system. HPLC pigment analyses were performed as described in Rodriguez et al. (2006) using a Hewlett Packard 1100 HPLC system (Hewlett-Packard, Ramsey, MN, USA) with a quaternary pump and auto sampler. The identification of pigments was based on retention time and the optical density (OD) spectra of the pigment obtained with diode array OD detector using pigments standards (Rodriguez et al. 2006).

Photo-physiology by fast repetition rate fluorometry
Chl a variable fluorescence was measured using a Fast Ocean FRR fluorometer (Chelsea Technologies Group, Ltd., West Molesey, UK) in combination with an Act2 system. For sympagic algae, the bottommost 1 cm were quickly scraped off and kept dark until sufficient brine drainage was achieved (after ~5 min). Pelagic algae were sampled with Niskin bottles at different depths and put directly inside the Act2 chamber after sampling. Once placed inside the FRRf, cells were dark acclimated for > 5 min, and thus exposed to a weak measuring light to record initial fluorescence (F₀). Thereafter 120 single turnover (ST) saturation flashlets (blue LED color; 450 nm) with a duration of 2 μs were applied, to saturate PSII and determine maximal fluorescence (Fₘ) and the absorption cross section of PSII (σ_{PSII}; nm² PSII⁻¹). ST saturation flashlets were followed by 60 relaxation flashlets, each with 40-60 μs duration, separated by 2.4 ms intervals, to record the relaxation kinetics (Oxborough 2012). The maximum quantum yield of PSII charge separation (Fᵥ/Fₘ) was then calculated as (Fₘ-F₀)/Fₘ (Krause & Weis 1991). To record photosynthesis versus irradiance (PE) curves, the FastAct provided 10 x 3 min levels of white PAR ranging from 0 to 1500 μmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹. Following actinic light periods, minimum (F₀') and maximum (Fₘ') fluorescence in light exposed cells were determined.
Electron transfer rates (ETR [mol e\(^{-}\) (mol RCII\(^{-1}\) s\(^{-1}\)]) through PSII were calculated as:

\[
ETR = \frac{F_{m}' - F_0'}{F_m'} \cdot E_{PAR}
\]

The calculated ETRs were plotted against actinic irradiance to generate PE curves in Microsoft Excel 2010 (Microsoft corporation, Redmond, WA, USA), from which the light utilization coefficient (\(\alpha [\text{mol e}^{-}\ \text{m}^{2} (\text{mol RCII})^{-1} (\text{mol photons})^{-1}]\)) and the maximum photosynthetic rate (ETR\(_{\text{max}} [\text{mol e}^{-}\ (\text{mol RCII})^{-1} \text{s}^{-1}]\)) were derived using the model fit of Eilers & Peeters (1988). The light saturation index (E\(_{k} [\text{\mu mol photons m}^{-2} \text{s}^{-1}]\)) was then calculated as ETR\(_{\text{max}}/\alpha\).

Non-photochemical quenching of Chl \(a\) fluorescence (NPQ) at irradiance of 300 μmol photons m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) was calculated using the normalized Stern-Volmer coefficient, which treats the sum of non-photochemical processes as described in Oxborough (2012):

\[
NPQ = \frac{F_{q}'}{F_{v}'} - 1 = \frac{F_0'}{F_{v}'}
\]

**In situ photosynthesis vs. irradiance incubation**

*In situ* \(^{14}\)C net primary production (NPP) measurements were carried out between 1\(^{\text{st}}\) of May – 2\(^{\text{nd}}\) of May 2017 on samples of natural pelagic and sympagic algal assemblages moored for 24 h underneath the sea ice at the main station (MS) in Van Mijenfjorden, Svalbard (Fig. 1). Sea ice samples were collected from bottom 1 cm of three pooled sea ice cores, whereas pelagic samples were collected underneath the sea ice using two 20 μm phytoplankton net hauls between 0-2 m depth (KC, Denmark, 24 cm diameter). The pooled samples were diluted with GF/F filtered seawater and amended with 250 mL of 50x concentrated f/2 medium (Sigma-Aldrich; Gaillard and Ryther 1962) to prevent nutrient limitation during the incubation period. Final Chl \(a\) concentrations were 71.1 ± 6.9 and 71.8 ± 7.7 μg L\(^{-1}\) for pelagic and sympagic communities, respectively. Triplicate samples of pelagic and sympagic communities were collected for Chl \(a\) variable fluorescence measurements (FRRf) before the remaining samples were split into twelve 20 ml subsamples and transferred to experimental bottles (50 mL capacity) with optical coating (transmission rates: 0 – 100 %, Hydro-bios, Kiel, Germany). For all NPP measurements, samples were amended with NaH\(^{14}\)CO\(_3\) (PerkinElmer, 53.1 mCi · mmol\(^{-1}\) stock) giving a final \(^{14}\)C specific activity of 1 μCi · ml\(^{-1}\). To determine the total activity
in the incubations, 100 μl of radioactive sample were taken out in duplicates and directly transferred to a clean scintillation vial containing 250 μl ethanolamine. Experimental bottles were then placed randomly on an incubation frame equipped with a PAR logger (DEFI 2-L sensor) measuring every 5th min and moored for 24 h underneath the sea ice (after snow was removed from the area). After incubation, samples were fixed with two drops of formalin before they were filtered onto GF/F-filters, acidified with 500 μl 1M HCl and left to degas overnight. Filters were then transferred into scintillation vials, and six hours prior to analysis, 10 mL of scintillation cocktail (Ultima Gold AB, PerkinElmer, Connecticut, USA) were added to the samples and total count vials. Subsequently, they were analyzed by means of a TriCarb 2900TR scintillation counter (PerkinElmer, Connecticut, USA). $^{14}$C fixation rates ($\mu$g C ($\mu$g Chl a)$^{-1}$ d$^{-1}$) were calculated according to Hoppe et al. (2015). Calculated $^{14}$C fixation rates were plotted against actinic irradiances to generate PE curves, from which the light utilization coefficient ($\alpha$ [μg C ($\mu$g Chl a)$^{-1}$ d$^{-1}$ (μmol photons m$^{-2}$s$^{-1}$)$^{-1}$]) and the maximum photosynthetic rate ($P_{max}$ [μg C ($\mu$g Chl a)$^{-1}$ d$^{-1}$]) were derived using the model fit of Eilers & Peeters (1988). The light saturation index ($E_k$ [μmol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$]) was then calculated as $P_{max}/\alpha$.

**Statistical analysis**

Students’ t-test with data following a normal distribution (Shapiro-Wilk test) were performed to evaluate significant differences between sympagic and pelagic algae of the photophysiological and biochemical parameters from field observations and the *in situ* incubation experiment (i.e. parameters shown in Table 2) using the program Sigmaplot (SysStat Software, San Jose, CA, USA). Modeling of parameters as a function of irradiance and NO$_3$ levels was performed with generalized additive mixed modeling (GAMM), using the gamm() function in the R package mgcv (Wood 2017, R Core Team 2017). Replicates for the pelagic samples were modeled as being correlated if they were taken at the same station on the same day. For the sea ice samples replicates were taken to be correlated if they were observed at the same station on the same day and with the same snow cover, either low or high. All relationships were modeled as log-log ones, implying that the size effect is a percentage change in the response for a given percentage change in the predictor. In many cases the GAMM model diagnosed a linear relationship where the effect size was constant, but in a case where the relationship was nonlinear the effect size changed depending on the predictor’s value. Relationships were plotted along with 95% confidence error curves and when parameters were found to be significantly related to both irradiance and NO$_3$ contour plots were
Results

Environmental conditions
This study followed the development of sympagic algae from 9th of March to 2nd of May 2017, and pelagic algae from 13th of March to 23rd of August 2017. In Van Mijenfjorden in 2017, sea ice started to settle in the inner basin end of January/early February and covered the fjord out to station Vmf 4 by early May (Fig. 1). Ice thickness remained relative stable between stations and sampling dates, ranging from 30 to 50 cm, while snow cover on sea ice was rather variable due to wind drift as well as melting processes later in the season, and ranged between 0 and 27 cm (Table 1). Temporal development of ice and snow thickness from early March to early May at station MS is shown in Fig 2a. These dynamics resulted in highly variable transmitted PAR through ice and snow, with 0.5 % transmittance of incoming irradiance under the highest snow covers (27 cm) and 26 % transmittance in areas without snow. The resulting under-ice irradiances ranged between 2 and 74 μmol photons m^{-2}s^{-1}. Air temperature in Van Mijenfjorden remained under 0 °C (ranging between 0 and -29 °C) between 3rd of March and 28th of April, before it approached ~ 4 °C on the 4th of May. After 31st of May, air temperature stayed above 0 °C (Fig. 2b), initiating ice melt and break-up. The inner and outer basins were ice free from mid-June onwards (retrieved from http://polarview.met.no/). During June and August, open water stations (Vmf 1 and 4) were influenced by meltwater and sediment loading, inducing variable surface PAR between stations (1 – 62 μmol photons m^{-2}s^{-1}), with very low irradiance levels at depths below 15 m (< 1 μmol photons m^{-2}s^{-1}).

Regarding the temporal development of algal biomass, bottom ice Chl a concentrations peaked (~300 mg L^{-1}) between 7th of April and 2nd of May. This was, surprisingly, at the same time as the peak in pelagic Chl a concentrations which approached ~16 mg L^{-1} between 23rd of April and 2nd of May (Fig. 2c). The accumulation of algal biomass resulted in a rapid drawdown of open water NO3 (from 9.9 ± 0.3 to 1.1 ± 0.6 μmol L^{-1}) and SiOH4 (from 4.4 ± 0.3 to 0.3 ± 0.2 μmol L^{-1}) levels by end of April. Phosphate levels remained comparable stable ranging from averagely 0.46 ± 0.05 μmol L^{-1} in early March to 0.19 ± 0.09 μmol L^{-1} in August. In sea ice, NO3 levels varied to a great extent between dates and stations, but averagely dropped from 6.6 ± 5.3 in early March to 1.0 ± 0.9 μmol L^{-1} in early May. Silicate and phosphate levels did not...
change significantly over time in sea ice, ranging between $1.09 \pm 0.17 \, \mu mol \, L^{-1}$ and $2.28 \pm 0.21 \, \mu mol \, L^{-1}$, respectively. On the 23rd (at station MS) and 26th of April (at station Vmf 2) and on the 2nd of May (station MS), samples were taken from areas with low (0-5 cm) and high (20+ cm) snow cover. NO$_3$ levels were significantly lower under low compared to high snow cover at station MS on the 23rd of April (students’ t-test, $t_4 = 5.7, p = 0.004$), Vmf 2 26th of April (students’ t-test, $t_4 = 14.3, p = 0.0001$) and on the 2nd of April (students’ t-test, $t_4 = 4.8, p = 0.008$). SiOH$_4$ and PO$_4$ remained statistically similar between low and high snow sites. Brine temperature in the bottom 3 cm of the sea ice remained relatively stable (increasing temporally from -2.0 to -1.6 °C), while salinity varied more, i.e. ranging from 28.7 to 35.6. In open water, the temperature increased from approximately -1.7 in April to 5.4°C in August, while the salinity remained comparably stable (between 31.2 and 34.6).

**Community composition**

The sympagic and pelagic community composition analyzed in this study provide important information on what kind of communities were used for the ecophysiological measurements. Sea ice algal assemblages were mainly dominated by pennate diatoms (between 37 – 99 % of total cell abundances) across all stations and throughout the sampling period (Fig 3a). Particularly abundant taxa were *Nitzschia* sp., *Navicula* sp. and *Fragilariopsis* sp. No coherent trends were observed when comparing low and high snow depth sites. The pelagic community was much more heterogeneous and variable compared to the sympagic. In April and May, three major groups were found to dominate: diatoms (between 30-40 % of total abundance), dinoflagellates (0-40 %) and prymnesiophyceae (0-68 %, Fig. 3b). Particularly abundant taxa were the centric diatoms *Chaetoceros* sp. and *Thalassiosira* sp., the pennate diatom *Fragilariopsis* sp. and the colony-forming haptophyte *Phaeocystis pouchetii*. In June at station Vmf 4, surface layers (5m) were largely dominated by one known brackish and mixotrophic genus, namely *Olisthodiscus* sp. (Raphidophyceae, 48 % of total abundance), while the deeper depths (25 and 50 m) were dominated by > 80 % *Phaeocystis pouchetii*. In August, the pelagic protist assemblage was dominated by heterotrophic and mixotrophic cryptophytes (particularly Cryptophyceae and *Teleaulax* sp.) and dinoflagellates (*Gymnodinium* sp.), in addition to other unidentified flagellates.

**Photophysiological and biochemical responses from field observations.**

In order to assess ecophysiological responses of natural sympagic and pelagic algae assemblages we followed variable fluorescence characteristics, stoichiometry and pigment
composition of the two communities, under naturally variable environmental conditions. Some similar responses were observed in sympagic and pelagic algal assemblages, such as a positive relationship between the amount of the photoprotective pigments diadinoxanthin and diatoxanthin per Chl a ((DD+DT):Chl a ratios) and irradiance. However, the results also revealed large differences in photosynthetic efficiency and capacity between the two algal assemblages, especially when daily average irradiance levels were > 8 μmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹, and NO₃ levels were depleted (< 0.5 μmol L⁻¹).

$F_{v}/F_{m}$, the maximum dark-acclimated PSII quantum yield, of the sympagic assemblages ranged between 0.05 and 0.48, and was significantly correlated with both irradiance ($p = 0.0006$) and NO₃ ($p = 0.0008$; Fig. 4a). The relation between $F_{v}/F_{m}$ and irradiance was, however, not linear. After log-transforming the different variables, we can deduce that for a 10 % increase in irradiance, sympagic $F_{v}/F_{m}$ increased by 3.3 % up to ~6 μmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹. When irradiance levels increased > 8 μmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹, sympagic $F_{v}/F_{m}$ started to decrease by 3.4 % for every 10 % increase in irradiance (Fig. 4b). The relation between $F_{v}/F_{m}$ and NO₃ levels was linearly increasing (by 2.9 % for every 10 % increase in NO₃) in sympagic algae (Fig. 4c). Hence, the lowest sympagic $F_{v}/F_{m}$ (< 0.1) was observed under high irradiance (> 50 μmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹) and low NO₃ (< 0.5 μmol L⁻¹) levels. $F_{v}/F_{m}$ of pelagic phytoplankton ranged between 0.06 and 0.55, where the highest values were observed between mid-March and early May (0.32 – 0.55), when communities were dominated by diatoms, dinoflagellates and prymnesiophyceae (Supplementary material, Fig. S1). Pelagic $F_{v}/F_{m}$ was lowest in June and August, when mixotrophic and heterotrophic microalgal groups dominated the assemblages (e.g. Raphidophyceae and dinoflagellates). By then, nutrient levels were low (< 1 μmol L⁻¹) and irradiances highly variable due to high sediment loading, i.e. either < 1 μmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹ or > 50 μmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹. Due to the highly variable values under both low and high irradiances (Fig. 4d), pelagic $F_{v}/F_{m}$ was not significantly correlated with irradiance (Fig. 4e). A slight, but insignificant positive relationship was observed between $F_{v}/F_{m}$ and NO₃ levels (Fig. 4f). Further analysis revealed that in pelagic communities dominated primarily by photosynthetic organisms (i.e. being more similar to the sympagic algae assemblages), $F_{v}/F_{m}$ increased slightly with increasing irradiance ($p < 0.003$; data not shown). The absorption cross-section of PSII ($\sigma_{PSII}$) did not show any specific trends with irradiance and NO₃ levels in either sympagic or pelagic algae (data not shown), and the averaged values were statistically insignificant between the two communities (Table 2). Similarly, no apparent trends in $\tau_{ES}$, indicating the kinetics of electron transport on the acceptor side of PSII, were observed in neither sympagic nor pelagic
algae, however, the averaged $\tau_{ES}$ was almost twice as high in the former (students’ t-test, $t_{52} = 3.2, p = 0.003$; Table 2).

Results from FRRf-based PE curves and biochemical analysis revealed substantial differences in the acclimation capacity of sympagic and pelagic communities. Regarding the light utilization coefficient, sympagic algae showed consistently decreasing $\alpha$, by 3.6 % for every 10 % increase in irradiance ($p = 0.003$, Fig. 5a). Moreover, in correspondence with $\alpha$, we observed a significant increase of POC:Chl $a$ content in the sympagic community with increasing irradiance levels ($p < 0.0001$, Fig. 5b), where POC:Chl $a$ ratios increased by 3.5 % for every 10 % increase in irradiance. Contrarily, $\alpha$ and POC:Chl $a$ varied to a great extent in the pelagic communities, ranging from 0.14 to 0.51 mol e$^-$/m$^2$/mol RCII$^{-1}$ (mol photons)$^{-1}$ and from 11.9 to 1027.6 μg μg$^{-1}$, respectively, and the resulting relationship with irradiance was deemed insignificant for both parameters (Fig. 5a,b). The amount of the photoprotective pigments ((DD+DT):Chl $a$) showed an increasing trend with irradiance in both sympagic and pelagic algae assemblages (Fig. 5c). In sympagic algae, (DD+DT):Chl $a$ increased by 1.3 % for every 10 % increase in irradiance in the low irradiance range between 2 and 10 μmol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, and thereafter the ratio increased by 7.6 % ($p < 0.0001$). In pelagic algae, (DD+DT):Chl $a$ ratios increased by 2.7 % for every 10 % increase in irradiance, however, potentially due to the low sample size, the relationship was insignificant. Regarding non-photochemical quenching at 300 μmol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ (NPQ$300$), the sympagic algae showed an increasing trend in NPQ$300$ with irradiance (by 4 % for every 10 % increase in irradiance), but due to the high variability between samples, the relationship was not significant (Fig. 5d). Surprisingly, in the pelagic algae communities, NPQ$300$ decreased significantly with increasing irradiances ($p = 0.02$, Fig. 5d). Due to these two distinct responses between the algal assemblages, the average NPQ$300$ was significantly higher in sympagic (13 ± 7.2) compared to pelagic (4.9 ± 3.2) algae (students’ t-test, $t_{52} = 5.3, p < 0.0001$, Table 2). Maximum electron transport rates (ETR$\text{max}$) were significantly correlated with irradiance in sympagic algae ($p = 0.04$), however this relationship was not linear: At irradiance levels up to approximately 8 μmol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, sympagic ETR$\text{max}$ increased on average by 17.2 % per 10 % increase in light. Thereafter, sympagic ETR$\text{max}$ decreased by 15.3 % for every 10 % increase in irradiance (Fig. 5e). In comparison, the pelagic communities increased their ETR$\text{max}$ with increasing irradiances at all levels > 2 μmol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ ($p < 0.004$), with values increasing on average by 4.0 % for every 10 % increase in irradiance (Fig. 5e). Hence, the differences in ETR$\text{max}$ between the two communities were substantial when irradiances increased > 8 μmol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$, resulting in averagely higher
ETR_{max} in pelagic (80 ± 27 mol e\(^-\) (mol RCII\(^-\))\(^{-1}\) s\(^{-1}\)) compared to sympagic (31 ± 23 mol e\(^-\) (mol RCII\(^-\))\(^{-1}\) s\(^{-1}\)) algae (students’ t-test, t\(_{52}\) = 5.4, \(p < 0.0001\), Table 2). The relation between ETR_{max} and NO\(_3\) levels was insignificant in both algal assemblages. Similarly, to POC:Chl \(a\), C:N ratios also showed stronger environmentally driven patterns in sympagic compared to pelagic algae assemblages. In sympagic algae, C:N ratios increased by 2.2 % with a 10 % increase in irradiance \((p < 0.0001\), Fig. 6b), while decreasing by 0.80 % for every 10 % increase in NO\(_3\) \((p = 0.009\), Fig. 6c). Hence, the responses were strongly negatively correlated between irradiance and NO\(_3\) levels (correlation = -0.79, Fig. 6a), which could also be due to the strong autocorrelation between environmental factors (i.e. under high irradiances, NO\(_3\) levels were low). In pelagic algae assemblages, C:N ratios were highly variable under all irradiance and NO\(_3\) levels, and thus no trends were apparent (Fig. 6d, e, f).

In situ incubation experiment

By measuring variable fluorescence characteristics and \(^14\)C-based carbon fixation in situ under a range of different irradiances, we were able to assess differences in both the functionality of the photosynthetic apparatus regarding the light-dependent reactions, as well as the ability of in pelagic and sympagic algae to fix carbon. Results from the in situ \(^14\)C-based carbon fixation incubation experiment showed similar ecophysiological responses in sympagic vs. pelagic algae as the field observations. Before incubation under the sea ice, \(F_{v}/F_{m}\) was within the same range for sympagic and pelagic algae, with values of 0.37 ± 0.06 vs. 0.38 ± 0.05, respectively (Table 2). Similarly, no noticeable differences were observed with respect to the rate of reopening of PSII reaction centers (\(t_{ES}\)). The absorption cross section of PSII (\(\sigma_{PSII}\)) was slightly higher in pelagic compared to sympagic communities (students’ t-test, \(t_3 = -3.6\), \(p = 0.04\)), while NPQ_{300} was significantly lower in the former (students’ t-test, \(t_3 = 4.6\), \(p = 0.02\), Table 2). Results from the FRRf-based PE curves showed that the ETR_{max} were higher in pelagic compared to sympagic algae (students’ t-test, \(t_3 = -24.5\), \(p < 0.001\)), while \(\alpha\) remained similar, resulting in significantly higher FRRf-derived \(E_k\) in pelagic compared to sympagic algae (students’ t-test, \(t_3 = -4.7\), \(p = 0.02\), Table 2). After 24 h incubation underneath the sea ice, pelagic algae showed higher carbon fixation rates at all irradiances compared to the sympagic algae (Fig. 7a), resulting in a higher \(^14\)C-derived \(\alpha\) in pelagic (0.009 \(\mu\)g C (\(\mu\)g Chl \(a\))\(^{-1}\) d\(^{-1}\) [\(\mu\)mol quanta m\(^{-2}\)s\(^{-1}\)]\(^{-1}\)) compared to sympagic algae (0.004 \(\mu\)g C (\(\mu\)g Chl \(a\))\(^{-1}\) d\(^{-1}\) [\(\mu\)mol quanta m\(^{-2}\)s\(^{-1}\)]\(^{-1}\)). Due to lack of light saturation in the pelagic assemblage, \(^14\)C-based \(P_{max}\) and \(E_k\) could not be derived from the curve fits. In the sympagic assemblage however, light saturation was characterized by a \(^14\)C-based \(E_k\) of 43 \(\mu\)mol photons m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\) and a resulting \(P_{max}\) of 0.18 \(\mu\)g C.
(μg Chl a⁻¹ d⁻¹ (Table 2). Overall, the pelagic community showed higher mean carbon fixation rates (0.25 ± 0.17 μg C μg Chl a⁻¹ d⁻¹) compared to the sympagic one (0.10 ± 0.07 μg C μg Chl a⁻¹ d⁻¹, students’ t-test, t22 = -2.8, p = 0.01).

Discussion
In this study, we compared photophysiological and biochemical characteristics of pelagic and sympagic (ice-associated) algae communities in order to evaluate strategies used by the two functionally distinct types of microalgal communities to acclimate to variations in light and nutrients. According to the traditional perception, sympagic algal production peaks earlier in spring, whereas pelagic production occurs primarily in open waters subsequent to sea ice retreat (Hill & Cota 2005, Perrette et al. 2011). Increasing evidence during the recent years suggests, however, a more common occurrence of pelagic algal blooms underneath sea ice, which can originate from advected algal blooms in ice-free areas (Johnsen et al. 2018) but have also been found to developed locally (Arrigo et al. 2012, Mundy et al. 2014, Assmy et al. 2017). In the current study, we found that the sympagic and the pelagic algal blooms in Van Mijenfjorden 2017 developed almost in parallel, with recorded peaks in Chl a concentrations only a few days apart (Fig. 2c). Even though irradiance levels in the water column underneath the sea ice are lower (both due to absorption by sympagic algae and water) than in sea ice, the photophysiological measurements conducted on pelagic algae sampled underneath the sea ice revealed healthy cells. These were effectively acclimated to very low light availability, and able to use this light for carbon fixation, and furthermore able to quickly exploit increasing irradiances. Sympagic algae have been recently shown to have extreme low light requirements (Hancke et al. 2018). The results from our study (e.g. Fig. 7), however, indicate that pelagic algae were equally, or even more, able to take advantage of low irradiance ranges for biomass accumulation, possibly explaining the ability of phytoplankton to generate substantial blooms beneath sea ice.

Successful photoacclimation in sympagic algae was restricted to low irradiances
Beneath the sea ice in spring when irradiance levels were low, and nutrients were plentiful, sympagic algae displayed clear signs of photoacclimation to low light. The observed high FRRf-derived α and low POC:Chl a ratios (Fig. 5a, b) probably reflected high content of light-harvesting pigments and thus efficient light utilization. This is in line with various studies that have suggested specific adaptions of polar microalgae that enable them to grow under very low irradiances, such as high growth rates, very high cellular Chl a quota and a low light saturation
of photosynthesis (Cota 1985, Kirst & Wiencke 1995, Lacour et al. 2017, Hancke et al. 2018). As daily average irradiances increased towards ~8 μmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹, sympagic algae responded by rapidly balancing light harvesting and photoprotection to avoid photodamage. Significantly decreasing FRRF-derived α and increasing POC:Chl a ratios support that light absorption was efficiently lessened by reducing the quota of photosynthetic pigments in this low irradiance range (Fig 5a, b). In line with previous work, the significant positive relationships between (DD+DT):Chl a ratios and irradiance in sympagic algae (Fig. 5c) confirms that light transmittance exerts a strong control on carotenoids synthesis even under such low irradiance levels (Alou-Font et al. 2013, Galindo et al. 2017). Hence, a rapid decline in light harvesting coupled with increased capacity for photoprotection seems to be the preferred method of regulating energy flow to PSII in sympagic algae and is a typical diatom response to higher irradiances (Brunet et al. 2011). Given the strong dominance of diatoms in the sympagic algal assemblage, which are known to efficiently employ such photoprotective mechanisms, the observed responses were not surprising (Fig. 3a, von Quillfeldt et al. 2003, Alou-Font et al. 2013). These light-driven adjustments to the photosynthetic machinery were effective in the low average irradiance range between 0 and 8 μmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹, and ensured a high level of plasticity in their light-acclimation capabilities: This resulted in increasingly healthy cells (Fᵥ/Fₘ) that were also able to increase their maximum electron transport rates through PSII (ETRₘₐₓ) towards average irradiance levels of ~8 μmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹ (Fig. 4a, b and 5e).

When average irradiance levels increased > 8 μmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹, sympagic algae assemblages started to exhibit signs of high light stress: (DD+DT):Chl a increased more rapidly with increasing irradiance, and NPQ₃₀₀ approached values of > 20 (Fig. 5c,d), indicating substantial photoprotective efforts. However, photochemical damage and oxidative stress appeared to outweigh cellular defenses, causing Fᵥ/Fₘ to decrease (Fig. 4b). This is in line with previous findings on slow acclimation to high light in a dominant Arctic sympagic diatom (Kvernvik et al. under revision). The decrease in ETRₘₐₓ with increasingly higher irradiances may indicate substantial photoinactivation of PSIIIs, or that the turnover of proteins associated with photoprotection (such as D1) was not sufficient to sustain high rates of electron transport through PSII (Fig. 5e). Under the highest average light (~ 75 μmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹), Fᵥ/Fₘ reached extremely low values (0.11 ± 0.09), indicating a strong decline in photosynthetic performance. Hence, sympagic algae did not benefit from the increased light availability at average daily irradiances > 8 μmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹. This is in line with previous findings of a
The sympagic algae assemblages ability to efficiently utilize increasing irradiances in the low irradiance range, and the apparent sensitivity towards higher light, was further corroborated by the in situ incubation experiment conducted underneath the sea ice (Fig. 7a,b, Table 2). The FRRf-derived $\alpha$ was within the range of the highest $\alpha$ observed from other ice algal communities, ranging between 0.29–0.44 (Manes & Gradinger 2009, Yallop et al. 2012), and higher than the FRRf-derived $\alpha$ from the field observations during this study (Table 2). This indicates that the ice algal assemblage was able to rapidly increase the electron transport through PSII with increasing irradiances during the 24 h incubation underneath the sea ice. The light saturation parameter for photosynthesis ($E_k$) is an indicator of the incubation irradiance at which photosynthesis saturates (Sakshaug et al. 1997). During the experiment, the FRRf-derived $E_k$ for electron transport ($120 \pm 2 \mu\text{mol photons m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$) was about three times higher than the $^{14}$C-derived $E_k$ for carbon fixation ($43 \mu\text{mol photons m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$) in sympagic algae, indicating a decoupling of electron transport through PSII from carbon fixation (Fig. 7a, b, Table 2). This suggests that a substantial fraction of the photosynthetic energy was used for alternative electron sinks, possibly an adaption of sympagic algae to deal with the extreme environmental conditions within sea-ice. These alternative electron sinks could include nutrient assimilation (Laws 1991), carbon concentrating mechanisms (Giordano et al. 2005), photorespiration (Foyer et al. 2009), and cyclic electron flow through PSI (Miyake & Asada 2003). Thus, our results strongly suggest that the ability of natural sympagic algal assemblages to take advantage of increases in irradiance is restricted to rather low irradiance ranges, or that sympagic algae require longer acclimation periods.

It is known that NO$_3$ limitation can impede photoacclimation responses by restricting growth, quantum yield and photochemical efficiency of photosystem II (Geider et al. 1993, Van De Poll et al. 2005) and increases the susceptibility to photoinhibition (Kiefer 1973, Litchman et al. 2002). This is due to the facts that nutrient limitation may reduce the capacity of cells to sink excess light energy into biomass build-up, as well as that the synthesis of proteins and pigments required for photoacclimation and photo-repair also consumes large amounts of nutrients (Eberhard et al. 2008). Congruently, the highest photosynthetic efficiency of sympagic algae in this study was observed when light was low (i.e. $\sim5 \mu\text{mol photons m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$) and NO$_3$ concentrations were high ($> 10 \mu\text{mol L}^{-1}$). The abundant NO$_3$ supplies probably supported
biosynthesis of photosynthetic pigments (Eberhard et al. 2008, Lewis et al. 2018), and thus ensured maximized absorption of the limited light available beneath the sea ice. Changing environmental conditions can cause alterations in cellular C:N ratios of microalgae (Sterner & Elser 2002, Frigstad et al. 2014, Niemi & Michel 2015). Both irradiance and NO₃ are known to exert strong control on C:N ratios, where values may increase as a result of acclimation to high irradiances (i.e. a relative increase in cellular C quota because excess light energy is drained in C fixation) or nutrient limitation (i.e. a relative decrease in cellular N quota; Demers et al. 1989, Gosselin et al. 1990). In the sympagic assemblages characterized here, C:N ratios were strongly negative correlated with irradiances and NO₃ levels, i.e. the highest C:N ratios were observed under high light and low NO₃ concentrations (Fig. 6a, b, c). However, since the observations from field data and in situ experiment strongly suggests that sympagic algae were increasingly light stressed at average irradiances > 8 μmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹ and thus did not benefit from higher light availability, we suspect that the high C:N ratios were primarily resulting from increasing nutrient limitation. Indications of high light stress in sympagic algae assemblages were particularly pronounced when nutrient levels were low, as Fv/Fm decreased to ~ 0.1 under high light (> 50 μmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹) and low nitrate levels (< 0.5 μmol L⁻¹, Fig. 4a). Hence, nutrient limitation probably impeded photoacclimation to these higher irradiances during the later stages of the sampling period and contributed to the strongly reduced photosynthetic efficiency in sympagic assemblages, hinting towards an interactive effect between irradiance and nutrient levels (Lewis et al. 2018).

Pelagic algae exhibited a high plasticity towards variable irradiances

Compared to the sympagic assemblages, detectable responses towards irradiance fluctuations in pelagic algae were rather subtle, e.g. in ETR_max, photoprotective pigment content ((DD+DT):Chl a), and NPQ300, and even absent in several measured parameters, e.g. in Fv/Fm, α, POC:Chl a and C:N ratios. The averaged FRRf-derived α was significantly higher in pelagic compared to sympagic algae (Table 2), pointing towards higher light utilization in the former. In addition, the FRRf-derived α of the pelagic algae remained statistically similar within the full tested range of irradiance levels. This was in strong contrast to the sympagic algae, which efficiently lessened the light harvesting capacity in response to increasing irradiances (Fig. 5a). Hence, as the sympagic algae got increasingly light stressed and subsequently reduced the energy flow through PSII, the pelagic algae did not have to rely on this type of photoprotection within the same irradiance range, while conducting healthy photosynthesis (as visible in Fv/Fm). Similarly, to the sympagic algae, (DD+DT):Chl a ratios increased with irradiance in pelagic
algae, however, did not translate into increased NPQ\textsubscript{300}. Consequently, the averaged NPQ\textsubscript{300} was twice as high in sympagic compared to pelagic algae (Table 2), confirming that within the same irradiance range, pelagic algae were much less light stressed and relied less on photoprotection compared to sympagic algae despite having expressed the necessary machinery. The $\sigma_{\text{PSII}}$ (nm$^2$ PSII$^{-1}$), which designates the absorption cross-section of PSII light harvesting antenna (i.e. energy delivery to PSII), observed in our field samples remained in a similar range between sympagic and pelagic algae. The rate of reopening of PSII reaction centers, and $\tau_{\text{ES}}$ (ms), however was significantly lower in the latter (Table 2), indicating that pelagic algae exhibited higher capacity to shuttle the energy away from PSII (Sakshaug et al. 1997). A substantially more efficient electron drainage in a pelagic compared to sympagic Arctic diatom under high light has been seen before (Kvernvik et al. under revision). This efficient energy drainage into carbon fixation in pelagic algae (which is also seen in the high $^{14}$C-derived $\alpha$; Fig 7a), may help to prevent high-light stress of the photosynthetic apparatus by draining energy in the Calvin Cycle, and possibly explains the lower NPQ values observed in pelagic compared to sympagic algae. We speculate that, while the light levels tested in this study were within the scope of healthy pelagic algae, the synthesized photoprotective pigments serve to allow them to deal with further increases in irradiances.

The results outlined above clearly indicate that pelagic algae possessed a high photoacclimative capacity towards increasing irradiances and generally did not exhibit signs of light stress. This efficient photoacclimation towards different irradiance levels outlined above thus makes one wonder why we see highly variable $F_v/F_m$ at both high and low irradiances (Fig. 4b). If we look at the data in more detail, though, certain patterns emerge: $F_v/F_m$ remained in the range between 0.32 – 0.55 in communities dominated by diatom species, between 0.24 – 0.41 in communities dominated by Phaeocystis pouchetii, while the lowest values (between 0.06 – 0.35) were measured in communities dominated by mixotrophic and heterotrophic species (Supplementary material, Fig. S1). Physiological parameters related to the PSII antenna structure, specifically the functional absorption cross-section ($\sigma_{\text{PSII}}$) and photosynthetic yield ($F_v/F_m$) have been found to vary principally as a result from taxonomic differences (Moore et al. 2006, Suggett et al. 2009), and were also clearly seen in this study (Supplementary material, Fig. S1). Hence, we assume that the low $F_v/F_m$ values observed at the lowest and highest light (Fig. 4e), were driven by community changes rather than light stress.
The field observations prove that pelagic algae exhibited higher plasticity towards increasing irradiances compared to sympagic algae, which was further corroborated by the in situ incubation experiment. In pelagic algae, the FRRf-derived $E_k$ were higher ($274 \pm 44 \mu\text{mol photons m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$) than in sympagic algae, and higher than peak irradiances during the incubation period, making them more likely to efficiently acclimate to higher irradiances (Table 2). Furthermore, the $^{14}$C-derived PE curve (Fig. 7a), revealed that pelagic algae were light limited with all irradiances up to daily averages of ~$90 \mu\text{mol photons m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$. Based on this (and the continuously increasing FRRf-derived $\text{ETR}_{\text{max}}$ from the field observations), we conclude that the pelagic algae were generally light limited during this study. The in situ incubation experiment also indicated a more efficient carbon assimilation in the low irradiance range in pelagic compared to the sympagic algae (Fig. 7). While the FRRf-based $\alpha$ was similar in sympagic and pelagic algae, $^{14}$C-based $\alpha$ values were twice as high in the latter, indicating that the energy transfer efficiency from photochemistry to biomass build-up was much higher in pelagic compared to sympagic algae (Schuback et al. 2016, Schuback et al. 2017). Hence, natural pelagic algae assemblages exhibited overall higher electron transport and carbon assimilation rates during the incubation underneath the sea ice compared to sympagic algae. Thus, the in situ experiment confirms higher photoacclimative capacities towards increasing irradiances in pelagic algae, and also that they were able to take more advantage of low light compared to sympagic algae. These results are in line with recent findings showing that pre-bloom phytoplankton were acclimated to reduced irradiances beneath the sea ice and efficiently exploited increasing irradiances, explaining the ability of phytoplankton to stay photosynthetically healthy and generate blooms underneath the sea ice (Lewis et al. 2018).

In the sympagic algal assemblages, NO$_3$ limitation impeded photoacclimation to higher irradiances and contributed to the strongly reduced photosynthetic efficiency in high light/low nutrient environment. In pelagic assemblages however, no notable trends in physiological or biochemical parameters were observed with decreasing NO$_3$ concentrations. For example, while POC:Chl $a$ and C:N ratios were very variable (ranging between $12 – 1027 \mu\text{g} \mu\text{g}^{-1}$ and $2 – 19 \text{mol mol}^{-1}$, respectively, Fig. 5b, 6e), no trends with either irradiance or NO$_3$ levels were apparent. POC have been shown to be largely decoupled from Chl $a$ concentrations when significant contribution of organic carbon comes from heterotrophic/mixotrophic production (Niemi & Michel 2015). Given the heterogenous pelagic community composition, which was also dynamically changing, this could explain the highly variable POC:Chl $a$ and C:N, and subsequent lacking trends with irradiance and NO$_3$ levels in this study (Frigstad et al. 2014).
Furthermore, the pelagic algal assemblages encounter more nutrient resupply on small scales (e.g. from turbulence) than those growing in the sympagic realm, meaning that even though the measured nutrients were similarly low in ice and open water, nutrient limitation was probably still more pronounced for the sympagic algal assemblages.

**Underlying reasons for the differences between sympagic and pelagic algae**

As outlined above, the field observations and the *in situ* incubation experiment prove that pelagic algae exhibited higher plasticity towards increasing irradiances, were more efficient in draining energy into carbon fixation (both in low and high light) and were less affected by low NO₃ levels, compared to sympagic algae.

At first glance, it might seem surprising that pelagic algae were more efficiently transferring energy from photochemistry to biomass build-up under low irradiance levels compared to sympagic algae, especially when sympagic algae production typically peaks in early spring when pelagic production is minimal. However, large scale phytoplankton blooms have recently been observed beneath the sea ice (Mundy et al. 2014, Assmy et al. 2017), where irradiance levels are even lower (both due to absorption by sympagic algae and water) than at the ice-water interface. Also, measurable rates of net primary production in Arctic pelagic algal assemblages at light levels as low as 0.5 μmol photons m⁻¹ s⁻¹ have recently been observed, indicating that phytoplankton communities can remain net productivity under more extreme low light conditions than previously thought (Kvernvik et al. 2018). We thus speculate that because sympagic algae are adapted to extreme conditions of reduced temperature, high salinities and extremely variable nutrient and carbon levels, they allocate more of the photosynthetic resources (such as ATP and NADPH) for associated cellular processes (e.g. cryoprotection, osmoregulation, nutrient transport, carbon concentrating mechanisms etc.) so that less of the energy is ending up in the Calvin Cycle and subsequent biomass build-up (Behrenfeld et al. 2008). In fact, Goldman et al. (2014) have suggested that high levels of cyclic electron flow may be a characteristic of psychrophilic phytoplankton that allows them to account for the associated high ATP demand. Some of these pathways are also observed to be upregulated under high irradiances and supports the suggestion that acclimation to low temperatures looks like acclimation to high irradiances (Mock & Kroon 2002). Since sympagic algae live in more extreme low temperature regimes than pelagic algae, such alternative pathways for electrons could explain the observed lower photosynthetic efficiencies and capacity in the former. Furthermore, while the sympagic algae showed strong signs of high light
stress when average daily irradiance levels increased to > 8 μmol photons m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\), the pelagic algae were light limited within the same irradiance ranges. This could be explained by adaption to strongly contrasting irradiance regimes normally encountered by the two algal assemblages. Reported transmittance through ice and snow layers in the Arctic are often very low (Leu et al. 2010, Leu et al. 2015, Campbell et al. 2016, Assmy et al. 2017, Hancke et al. 2018), and since sympagic algae live in a spatially restricted environment that is normally not undergoing rapid changes, they usually experience gradually changing irradiances on low amplitudes, as seen in Fig 8a. In comparison, vertical mixing of phytoplankton cells within deeply mixed surface layers goes along with strong and rapid fluctuations in irradiance levels (MacIntyre et al. 2000; Fig. 8b). Hence, it makes sense that pelagic phytoplankton have evolved pronounced mechanisms into being flexible with different irradiances they encounter (e.g. Behrenfeld et al. 1998). This is in line with the fact that Arctic pelagic phytoplankton assemblages have also been shown to be rather resistant to changes in temperature, irradiance and \(\rho\)CO\(_2\), a finding that has been explained by the high environmental variability they have to cope with (Hoppe et al. 2018b).

Another underlying mechanism possibly explaining the different physiological and biochemical characteristics between pelagic and sympagic algal assemblages could be temporal developments in the taxonomic composition (Suggett et al. 2009). The sympagic algal assemblage was much more homogenous (i.e. strongly dominated by pennate diatoms between stations and dates), whereas the pelagic community was more heterogenous (i.e. mixed and variable dominance between groups) as well as more dynamically changing over time and differing between stations (Fig. 3). This could be explained by the fact that taxonomic changes within highly diverse pelagic communities are driven by selection of genotypes that are better adapted to the prevailing light and nutrient environment (Cullen & MacIntyre 1998, Godhe & Rynearson 2017), while the resupply of new genotypes is restricted in the sympagic realm, potentially causing generally lower diveristy. For example, pelagic communities underneath the sea ice (stations MS and Vmf 2 between 23\(^{rd}\) of April and 2\(^{nd}\) of May, Fig. 3b) were mostly dominated by diatoms and Phaeocystis pouchetii, which are known to prevail under low growth irradiances (Assmy et al. 2017, Lacour et al. 2017). During summer (June and August), when NO\(_3\) and SiO\(_4\) levels were strongly depleted, diatoms were outcompeted by Phaeocystis pouchetii which have lower nutrient requirements than diatoms (Egge & Aksnes 1992, Jiang et al. 2014), and flagellate species that have differences in energy acquisition strategies (autotrophy vs. heterotrophy; McKie-Krisberg & Saunders 2014). Given the subtle to absent
effects of environmental differences in pelagic algal assemblages, taxonomic variations seem to provide functional redundancy as previously observed for Arctic phytoplankton (Hoppe et al. 2018a, Wolf et al. 2018).

Hence, it seems that both taxonomic composition and the physiological acclimation of these taxa to variable irradiance and nutrient levels must be considered when assessing photosynthetic performance in algae assemblages. Despite such underlying dynamics, however, we see clear differences in the acclimation potential of sympagic and pelagic algae communities that align well with specific physiology of key species of these habitats (e.g. Kvernvik et al. under revision) as well as the environmental conditions they have adapted to. Congruently, the results from this study imply major differences in energy allocation between sympagic and pelagic algae. Sympagic algae, which were also more sensitive to higher irradiances, seem to allocate more energy into photoprotective mechanisms and alternative energy sinks (e.g. NPQ, photorespiration, Mehler reaction, cyclic electron transport through PSI), that may allow optimization of cellular processes for tolerating extreme environmental conditions but result in lower rates of linear electron transport and carbon assimilation. In pelagic algae, high photoacclimative capacity due to vertical mixing resulting in highly fluctuation conditions together with higher probability of nutrients resupply, in addition to taxonomic changes, were probably the underlying reasons for the subtle or absent trends in photophysiology and biochemical responses, but in return ensured high rates of photosynthesis under a wide range of irradiance and NO₃ levels. It seems that the contrasting environmental conditions in polar seas and sea ice may have led to such specific adaptations and acclimation strategies.

**Conclusion**

Knowledge of physiological and biochemical responses of sea ice algae and phytoplankton towards their changing environment is essential to understand how the balance between sea ice-based vs. pelagic primary production will change with respect to timing and quantity in a future Arctic. The results from this study suggest that sea ice algae will be more sensitive than phytoplankton towards the expected environmental changes, in particular increased irradiance. Our findings also clearly highlight the importance of considering interactive effects of environmental variables, as well as the value of comparing functionally distinct communities to gain mechanistic understanding of response patterns. Pelagic algal assemblages, with their high plasticity and potential for functional redundancy, will likely continue to make major contributions to annual primary production in the Arctic, while their habitat is furthermore
expected to become more prevalent in the future. However, in the sympagic assemblage, which showed less plasticity towards increasing irradiances, we could anticipate a decrease in their relative contribution to annual production. This finding may be especially relevant as the importance of ephemeral sea ice (i.e. melting and re-forming) is likely to increase in the future (Onarheim et al. 2018). Hence, organisms inhabiting the sea ice will have to deal with much more dynamic environmental settings, and with ongoing climate change, characteristic sympagic species might be outcompeted by less sensitive species, thereby potentially altering the algal colonization of young Arctic sea ice. This could have important implications for trophic interactions, carbon fluxes and budgets, and thus in modeling context, parametrization of sea ice algal vs. phytoplankton-derived primary production needs to include such functional differences of algal communities.
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Table 1. Station list with coordinates and dates as well as environmental characteristics of the sea ice (ice thickness and snow depth), bottom depth of the station and the sampled water depths. At each station sympagic and/or pelagic algae were sampled designated by S and P.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Sympagic/Pelagic</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Latitude (°N)</th>
<th>Longitude (°E)</th>
<th>Ice thickness (cm)</th>
<th>Snow depth (cm)</th>
<th>Bottom depth [m]</th>
<th>Water depth (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>28.04.17</td>
<td>77.884</td>
<td>16.730</td>
<td>7.5 - 8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>28.04.17</td>
<td>77.865</td>
<td>16.705</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>09.03.17</td>
<td>77.860</td>
<td>16.709</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>07.04.17</td>
<td>77.860</td>
<td>16.709</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4 - 8</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>S/P</td>
<td>23.04.17</td>
<td>77.860</td>
<td>16.709</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.5 – 20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0, 5, 15, 25, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>S/P</td>
<td>30.04.17</td>
<td>77.860</td>
<td>16.709</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0, 5, 15, 25, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>S/P</td>
<td>02.05.17</td>
<td>77.860</td>
<td>16.709</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0 - 20</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0, 5, 15, 25, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vmf 1</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>08.04.17</td>
<td>77.831</td>
<td>16.619</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5 - 7</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vmf 1</td>
<td>S/P</td>
<td>30.04.17</td>
<td>77.831</td>
<td>16.619</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>15.5 – 16.5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>0, 5, 15, 25, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vmf 1</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>23.08.17</td>
<td>77.831</td>
<td>16.619</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>5, 15, 25, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vmf 2</td>
<td>S/P</td>
<td>26.04.17</td>
<td>77.835</td>
<td>16.308</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.5 – 27.5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0, 5, 15, 25, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vmf 3</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>13.03.17</td>
<td>77.794</td>
<td>15.805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>0, 5, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vmf 4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>29.04.17</td>
<td>77.793</td>
<td>15.483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5, 15, 25, 50, 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vmf 4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>13.06.17</td>
<td>77.793</td>
<td>15.483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5, 15, 25, 50, 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vmf 4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>23.08.17</td>
<td>77.793</td>
<td>15.483</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>5, 15, 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vmf 5</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>14.03.17</td>
<td>77.766</td>
<td>15.044</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0, 5, 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Average photosynthetic parameters (with one standard deviation in parentheses) in sympagic and pelagic algal assemblages from field observations (FRRf-based parameters only) and from the in situ incubation experiment conducted underneath the sea ice (FRRf- and ¹⁴C-based parameters). The maximum dark-acclimated PSII quantum yield ($F_v/F_m$), the absorption cross-section of PSII ($\sigma_{\text{PSII}}$ [nm² PSII⁻¹]), the rate of reopening of PSII reaction centers ($\tau_{\text{ES}}$ [ms]) and non-photochemical quenching (NPQ) were derived from FRRf variable fluorescence measurements. Fit parameters ($\text{ETR}_{\text{max}}/P_{\text{max}}$, $\alpha$ and $E_k$) were derived from either FRRf- or ¹⁴C-based PE curves. FRRf-derived $\text{ETR}_{\text{max}}$ (mol e⁻ (mol RCII)⁻¹ s⁻¹) is the light saturated maximum rate of charge separation in RCII, while the FRRf-derived $\alpha$ is the light-dependent increase of charge separation in RCII before saturation (mol e⁻ m² (mol RCII)⁻¹ (mol photons)⁻¹). ¹⁴C derived $P_{\text{max}}$ is the light saturated maximum rate of ¹⁴C uptake (µg C (µg Chl a)⁻¹ d⁻¹). ¹⁴C derived $\alpha$ is the light-dependent increase in the rate of ¹⁴C-uptake before saturation (µg C (µg Chl a)⁻¹ d⁻¹ (µmol photons m⁻²s⁻¹⁻¹). Both FRRf- and ¹⁴C-derived $E_k$ is the light saturation parameter (µmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹). Asterix (*) designates significant differences between sympagic and pelagic algae.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field observations</th>
<th>In situ incubation experiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRRf-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sympagic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_v/F_m$</td>
<td>0.27 (0.12) * 0.34 (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\text{PSII}}$</td>
<td>5.1 (1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{\text{ES}}$</td>
<td>7.6 (4.8) * 4.7 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPQ</td>
<td>13.0 (7.2) * 4.9 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\text{ETR}<em>{\text{max}}/P</em>{\text{max}}$</td>
<td>31 (23) * 80 (37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>0.16 (0.08) * 0.36 (0.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$E_k$</td>
<td>221 (156)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure legends

**Fig. 1.** Map of Van Mijenfjorden. The stations Vmf 3 (88 m), Vmf 4 (88 m) and Vmf 5 (116 m) are located in the outer basin, which is ~10 km wide and 100 m deep. The inner station (IS; 2 m), intermediate station (IMS; 14 m), main station (MS; 54 m), Vmf 1 (78 m) and Vmf 2 (61 m) are located in the inner basin, which is 5 km wide and has an average depth of ~30 m.

**Fig. 2.** Environmental conditions during the field campaign in Van Mijenfjorden, 2017; (a) Temporal development of snow (cm) and ice (cm) thickness at main station (MS) between 13.03.2017 and 02.05.2017, (b) Temporal development of air temperature (°C) between 13.03.2017 and 23.08.2017, and (c) temporal development of sympagic and pelagic Chl *a* concentrations (mg L⁻¹) in Van Mijenfjorden between 13.03.2017 and 23.08.2017.

**Fig. 3.** Abundance (%) of microalgae groups dominating the sympagic algal assemblages (a; blue) and pelagic algal assemblages (b; red). The sympagic assemblages are divided in stations (MS, Vmf 1 and Vmf 2), dates (from 03.03.2017 to 02.05.2017) as well as high (20+ cm) and low (0 - 5cm) snow sites (HS and LS, respectively). The pelagic assemblages are divided in stations (MS, Vmf 2, Vmf 4 and Vmf 2), dates (from 23.04.2017 to 23.08.2017) as well as water depths (0, 5, 25 and 50 m).

**Fig. 4.** Contour plots showing changes in the maximum dark-acclimated quantum yield of PSII (**F*ₐ/Fₐ**ₘ) in response to irradiance and NO₃ levels in sympagic (a; blue) and pelagic (d; red) algal assemblages. The four bottom graphs show marginal plots for sympagic (b, c; blue) and pelagic (e, f; red) algae, where changes in **F*ₐ/Fₐ**ₘ is separated for irradiance (b, e) and NO₃ levels (f, e). All variables are log transformed, and raw data values are shown with GAM curve fits expressed as solid lines and confidence intervals expressed as dotted lines.

**Fig. 5.** Changes in light utilization coefficient (**α**; a), particulate organic carbon (POC) to Chl *a* ratios (POC:Chl *a*; b), maximum photosynthetic efficiency (**ETR**ₘₐₓ; c), light protective pigment ratios (**DD**+**DT**:Chl *a*; d) and non-photochemical quenching at 300 μatm m⁻² s⁻¹ (**NPQ**₃₀₀; e) in response to irradiance levels in sympagic (blue) and pelagic (red) algae. All variables are log transformed, and raw data values are shown with GAM curve fits expressed as solid lines and confidence intervals expressed as dotted lines.

**Fig. 6.** Contour plots showing changes in the particulate organic carbon to particulate organic nitrogen ratios (C:N) in response to irradiance and NO₃ levels in sympagic (a; blue) and pelagic (d; red) algal assemblages. The four bottom graphs show marginal plots for sympagic (b, c;
blue) and pelagic (e, f; red) algae, where changes in C:N is separated for irradiance (b, e) and NO₃ levels (f, e). All variables are log transformed, and raw data values are shown with GAM curve fits expressed as solid lines and confidence intervals expressed as dotted lines.

**Fig. 7.** ¹⁴C-based photosynthesis vs. irradiance (PE) curves (a) and FRRf-based PE curves (b) in sympagic (blue) and pelagic (red) algal assemblages from the *in situ* incubation experiment conducted underneath the sea ice in van Mijenfjorden, 2017. Raw data values of ¹⁴C-fixation (μg C (μg Chl a⁻¹ d⁻¹) and electron transport through photosystem II (ETR; mol e⁻¹ (mol RCII)⁻¹ s⁻¹) are shown as a function of increasing irradiance, and the model fit of Eilers & Peeters (1988) are expressed as lines. Parameters derived from the ¹⁴C- and FRRf-based PE curves are found in Table 2.

**Fig. 8.** Temporal changes in the irradiance regimes at the ice-water interface (a; blue) and in open water (b; red). Irradiance at the ice-water interface were retrieved from a Licor LI-192 Underwater Quantum Sensor measuring PAR every hour between 27.03.17 – 02.05.2017 at MS. Daily fluctuations of irradiance regimes in open water was modelled with a mixing pattern down to 20 m. Daily integrated surface PAR (measured in May), a Kd of 0.3 m⁻¹ and a mixing rate of x m s⁻¹, were used to model daily irradiance regimes down to 20 m. Irradiances were then corrected for PAR measurements retrieved from the ocean observatory, continuously monitoring PAR every second hour at 12 m depth at Vmf 1 between 20.04.2017 - 02.05.2017.

**Supplementary material:**

**Fig. S1.** Maximum dark-acclimated quantum yield of PSII (Fᵥ/Fₘ) and the absorption cross-section of PSII (σₚₛₛ [nm² PSII⁻¹]) of different pelagic algal assemblages; (i) mixed community between photosynthetic species (diatoms and *Phaeocystis pouchetii*) and mixotrophic species (dinoflagellates), (ii) communities dominated > 80 % *Phaeocystis pouchetii*, and (iii) mixed community consisting of heterotrophic and mixotrophic species.

**Fig. S2.** Irradiance regimes during the *in situ* incubation experiment (1ˢᵗ of May – 2ⁿᵈ of May) conducted underneath the sea ice in van Mijenfjorden, 2017.
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