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Abstract

We describe the third version of Minnesota Earth System Model for Ocean biogeochemistry (MESMO 3), an earth system model of intermediate complexity, with a dynamical ocean, a dynamic-thermodynamic sea ice, and an energy moisture balanced atmosphere. A major feature of Version 3 is the flexible C:N:P ratio for the three phytoplankton functional types represented in the model. The flexible stoichiometry is based on the power law formulation with environmental dependence on phosphate, nitrate, temperature, and light. Other new features include nitrogen fixation, water column denitrification, oxygen and temperature-dependent organic matter remineralization, and CaCO₃ production based on the concept of the residual nitrate potential growth. Also, we describe the semi-labile and refractory dissolved organic pools of C, N, P, and Fe that can be enabled in MEMSO 3 as an optional feature. The refractory dissolved organic matter can be degraded by photodegradation at the surface and hydrothermal vent degradation at the bottom. These improvements provide a basis for using MESMO 3 in further investigations of the global marine carbon cycle to changes in the environmental conditions of the past, present, and future.
1. Introduction

Here we document the development of the third version of the Minnesota Earth System Model for Ocean biogeochemistry (MESMO 3). As described for the first two versions (Matsumoto et al., 2008, 2013), MESMO is based on the non-modular version of the Grid ENabled Integrated Earth (GENIE) system model (Lenton et al., 2006; Ridgwell et al., 2007). The computationally efficient ocean-climate model of Edwards and Marsh (Edwards and Marsh, 2005) forms the core of GENIE's physical model. MESMO is an earth system model of intermediate complexity (EMIC), which occupies a midpoint in the continuum of climate models that span high resolution, comprehensive coupled models on one end and box models at the other end (Claussen et al., 2002). MESMO has a 3D dynamical ocean model on a 36 x 36 equal-area horizontal grid with 10° increments in longitude and uniform in the sine of latitude. There are 16 vertical levels. It is coupled to a 2D energy moisture balanced model of the atmosphere and a 2D dynamic and thermodynamic model of sea ice. Thus, MESMO retains important dynamics, which allow for simulations of transient climate change, while still being computationally efficient.

Since the first version, MESMO has continued to be developed chiefly for investigations of ocean biogeochemistry (Table 1). Briefly, in MESMO 1, the main improvements over the predecessor GENIE focused on the biological production and remineralization as well as on the uptake of natural radiocarbon ($^{14}$C) and anthropogenic transient tracers (Matsumoto et al., 2008). The net primary production (NPP) in MESMO 1 occurred in the top two vertical levels representing the surface 100 m and depended on temperature, nutrients, light, and mixed layer depth (MLD). The nutrient dependence was based on the Michaelis-Menten uptake kinetics of phosphate ($P_{O_4}$), nitrate ($N_{O_3}$), and aqueous CO$_2$. The limiting nutrient was determined by the Liebig's rule of the minimum relative to the fixed uptake stoichiometry of C:N:P=117:16:1. A single generic phytoplankton functional type (PFT) carried out NPP, which was split between particulate organic matter (POM) and dissolved organic matter (DOM) in a globally constant ratio of 1:2. The semi-labile form of the dissolved organic carbon (DOC) was the only form of DOM simulated in MESMO 1. The POM flux across the 100 m level defined the export production. The vertical flux of POM was
driven by a fixed rate of sinking and a temperature-dependent, variable remineralization rate.

The main aim of MESMO 2 was a credible representation of the marine silica cycle (Matsumoto et al., 2013). To this end, the set of limiting nutrients (P, N, and C) in MESMO 1 was augmented to include iron (Fe) and silicic acid (Si(OH)_4) in MESMO 2 (Table 1). The stable isotope of Si (^{30}Si) was also added as a state variable. The Fe cycle included an aeolian flux of Fe, complexation with organic ligand, and particle scavenging of free Fe. The scavenged Fe that reached the seafloor was removed from the model domain. This burial flux of Fe balanced the aeolian flux at steady state. Also, a new PFT was added in MESMO 2 to represent diatoms. This new "large" PFT was limited by Si and characterized by a high maximum growth rate and large half-saturation constants for the nutrient uptake kinetics. It represented fast and opportunistic phytoplankton that do well under nutrient replete conditions. In comparison, the "small" PFT was characterized with a lower maximum growth rate and smaller half-saturation constants and outperformed the large PFT in oligotrophic subtropical gyres. CaCO_3 production was associated with the "small" PFT in MESMO2. The addition of Fe, Si, and the large PFT in MESMO 2 allowed it to have a Fe-dependent, variable Si:N uptake ratio (Hutchins and Bruland, 1998; Takeda, 1998), which is critical to simulate important features of the global ocean Si distribution.

MESMO 1 and 2 were assessed and calibrated by multi-objective tuning and extensive model-data comparisons of transient tracers (anthropogenic carbon, CFCs), deep ocean Δ^{14}C, and nutrients (Matsumoto et al., 2008, 2013). These versions have been employed successfully in a number of studies of global distributions of carbon and carbon isotopes under various conditions of the past, present, and future (Cheng et al., 2018; Lee et al., 2011; Matsumoto et al., 2010, 2020; Matsumoto and McNeil, 2012; Matsumoto and Yokoyama, 2013; Sun and Matsumoto, 2010; Tanioka and Matsumoto, 2017; Ushie and Matsumoto, 2012). Also, MESMO 1 and 2 have participated in model intercomparison projects (Archer et al., 2009; Cao et al., 2009; Eby et al., 2013; Joos et al., 2013; Weaver et al., 2012; Zickfeld et al., 2013).
In this contribution, we describe the third and latest version of MEMSO with a number of substantial biogeochemical model modifications and new features that bring MESMO up to date with the evolving and accumulating knowledge of the ocean biogeochemical cycle (Table 1). There is no change in the physical model between MESMO 3 and MESMO 2. The most significant new feature of MESMO 3 over the previous versions is the power law formulation of flexible phytoplankton C:N:P ratio. Other new features include additional PFT diazotrophs that carry out N-fixation, water column denitrification, the dependence of organic matter remineralization on the dissolved oxygen (O\textsubscript{2}) and temperature, and CaCO\textsubscript{3} production based on the concept of the residual nitrate potential growth. Also, we describe the semi-labile DOM for P, N, and Fe (DOP\textsubscript{sl}, DON\textsubscript{sl}, and DOFe\textsubscript{sl}), and the refractory DOM for C, P, and N (DOC\textsubscript{r}, DOP\textsubscript{r}, and DON\textsubscript{r}), which can be activated as an optional feature in MESMO 3. Some of these features have been described separately in different publications (Matsumoto et al., 2020; Matsumoto and Tanioka, 2020; Tanioka and Matsumoto, 2017, 2020a). This work consolidates the descriptions of all these features in a single publication.

2. Model Description
Here we present the full set of biogeochemical equations of MESMO 3 as well as key model parameters (Table 2). We describe only the biogeochemical source and sink terms and omit the physical (advective and diffusive) transport terms that are calculated by the ocean circulation model. We discuss the production terms first, followed by remineralization terms, followed by conservation equations that incorporate both terms.

2.1 Phytoplankton Nutrient Uptake
NPP occurs in the top two vertical levels of the ocean domain above the fixed compensation depth (z\textsubscript{c}) of 100 m. Key parameter values are given in Table 2a. Nutrient uptake by phytoplankton type i (Γ\textsubscript{i}) depends on the optimal nutrient uptake timescale (τ\textsubscript{i}), nutrients, temperature (T), irradiance (I), and mixed layer depth (z\textsubscript{ml}):
\[ \Gamma_i = \frac{1}{\tau_i} \cdot F_{N,i} \cdot F_T \cdot F_i \cdot \max \left( 1, \frac{Z_C}{Z_{ml}} \right) \]

Subscript i refers to PFT (i = 1: eukaryotes, i = 2: cyanobacteria, i = 3: diazotrophs). The nutrient dependence \( F_{N,i} \) is given by Liebig’s law of minimum combined with Michael-Menten uptake kinetics of limiting nutrients: \( \text{PO}_4, \text{NO}_3, \text{CO}_2, \text{aq}, \) total dissolved iron (sum of free iron and ligand-bound iron; \( \text{FeT} = \text{Fe}^\text{'} + \text{FeL} \)), and silicic acid (\( \text{Si(OH)}_4 \)):

\[ F_{N,i} = \min \left( \frac{[\text{PO}_4]}{[\text{PO}_4] + K_{\text{PO}_4,i}}, \frac{[\text{NO}_3]}{[\text{NO}_3] + K_{\text{NO}_3,i}}, Q_{N,i}^{-1}, \frac{[\text{CO}_2\text{aq}]}{[\text{CO}_2\text{aq}] + K_{\text{CO}_2,i}}, [\text{Si(OH)}_4] \cdot Q_{\text{Si}}^{-1} \right) \]

where \( K_{X,i} \) is the half-saturation concentration of nutrient \( X \) for PFT \( i \). Only eukaryotes \( (i=1) \) are limited by \( \text{Si(OH)}_4 \). Diazotrophs \( (i=3) \) are not limited by \( \text{NO}_3 \). Nutrient uptake \( \Gamma \) is based on the master nutrient variable \( P \), and all other nutrient uptake is related to \( \Gamma \) by the uptake stoichiometry \( Q_{X,i} \), where \( X \) is \( N, \text{Fe}, \text{Si}, \) or \( C \). For example, \( Q_{C,i} = \frac{1}{[P:C]_i} \) for PFT \( i \). Thus, \( Q_{C,i} \) is numerically equivalent to \( \text{C:P} \) for PFT \( i \), but we write the equations in terms of \( P:C \) for numerical stability and convenience. The \( Q_{X,i} \) ratios represent the flexible phytoplankton uptake stoichiometry and describe more fully in the following section 2.2.

The temperature dependence \( F_T \) of Equation 1 is given by:

\[ F_T = \frac{T(\,^\circ C) + 2}{T(\,^\circ C) + 10} \]

which is analogous to the commonly used \( Q_{10} = 2 \) relationship. Light limitation \( F_i \) of Equation 1 is described by a hyperbolic function:
where $I$ is the seasonally variable solar short-wave irradiance in $\text{W m}^{-2}$. Light is attenuated exponentially from the ocean surface with a $20\text{ m}$ depth scale.

Nutrient uptake in Equation 1 has a dependence on $z_{mb}$ which is diagnosed using the $\sigma_t$ density gradient criterion (Levitus, 1982). Following the Sverdrup (1953) model of the spring bloom, Equation 1 allows for the shoaling of $z_{ml}$ relative to $z_c$ to enhance nutrient uptake.

2.2 Phytoplankton uptake stoichiometry

As noted above, all nutrients and $O_2$ are related to the main model currency $P$ by $Q_{X_i}$. We describe three different, mutually exclusive formulations in this section. The standard formulation is the power law model (Matsumoto et al., 2020; Tanioka and Matsumoto, 2017). The other two (Linear model and Optimality-based model of stoichiometry) are alternative formulations that have been coded, and the user can activate them (one at a time) in place of the power law formulation. However, the alternative formulations are not calibrated. Key parameter values are given in Table 2b for the power law formulation.

2.2.1 Power law model of stoichiometry

The uptake $P:C$ and $N:C$ ratios are calculated using the power-law formulation as a function of ambient concentrations of phosphate [$PO_4$], nitrate [$NO_3$], temperature ($T$), and Irradiance ($I$):
Equations 5 and 6 are the power-law equations that calculate the change in P:C and N:C for fractional changes in environmental drivers relative to the reference P:C and N:C, respectively (Matsumoto et al., 2020; Tanioka and Matsumoto, 2017). The exponents are the sensitivity factors determined by a meta-analysis (Tanioka and Matsumoto, 2020a). Subscript "0" indicates the reference values (Table 2b).

The P:C and N:C ratios from Equations 5 and 6 can then be converted to $Q_{N,i}$ and $Q_{C,i}$ for use in Equation 2.

\[
Q_{C,i} = \frac{1}{[P:C]_i} \tag{7}
\]

\[
Q_{N,i} = \frac{1}{[P:N]_i} = \frac{[N:C]_i}{[P:C]_i} \tag{8}
\]

### 2.2.2 Linear model of stoichiometry by Galbraith & Martiny

A much simpler, alternative formulation for P:C and N:C is the model of Galbraith & Martiny (2015) where P:C is a linear function of $[PO_4]$ (in µM), and N:C is a Holling type 2 functional form with a frugality behavior only at very low $[NO_3]$ (in µM). The same P:C and N:C values are applied to all three PFTs.
The optimality-based model of phytoplankton growth is based on the chain model, which connects the cellular P, N, and C acquisition by a chain of limitations, where the P quota limits N assimilation and the N quota drives carbon fixation (Pahlow et al., 2013; Pahlow and Oschlies, 2009, 2013). Resource-allocation of cellular P, N, and C among different cellular compartments are derived from balancing energy gain from gross carbon fixation and energy loss due to nutrient acquisition and light-harvesting. The optimality-based model by Pahlow et al. (2013) computes C:N and C:P as a function of nutrient availability (PO$_4$ and NO$_3$), irradiance, and day length. Temperature dependence was added by Arteaga et al. (2014) following the simple logarithmic temperature dependence on maximum nutrient uptake rate following (Eppley, 1972).

Different versions of this optimality-based model have previously been successfully implemented in global ocean biogeochemical models, such as the Pelagic Interactions Scheme for Carbon and Ecosystem Studies (PISCES) (Kwiatkowski et al., 2018, 2019) and the University of Victoria Earth System Model (UVIC) (Chien et al., 2020; Pahlow et al., 2020). However, as we are not describing any results in this paper, we will only mention here that there is an option to calculate C:N:P using this stoichiometry model in MESMO 3.

The full description of the optimality-based stoichiometry model and its parameter calibration are presented specifically for the UVic model elsewhere (Chien et al., 2020; Pahlow et al., 2020).

### 2.2.4 Stoichiometry of iron and silica

Iron uptake stoichiometry $Q_{Fe,i}$ is calculated as a function of FeT following the power-law formulation of Ridgwell (2001). Key parameter values are given in Table 2c.
\[ Q_{Fe,i} = [Fe:P]_i = [Fe:C]_i \cdot Q_{C,i} \]

\[ [Fe:C]_i = 1.0 / ([C:Fe]_{min,i} + [C:Fe]_{ref,i} \cdot [FeT]^{-s_{Fe:C}}) \]

For all PFTs, the power law exponent \( s_{Fe:C} \) in Equation 12 is -0.65. The allowable Fe:C ratio is bounded at the low end by the hard-bound minimum Fe:C of 1:220,000. The scaling constant or \([C:Fe]_{ref,i}\) is set differently for PFTs, with eukaryotes having a higher base \([C:Fe]_{ref,i}\) than cyanobacteria and diazotrophs (115,623:1 and 31,805:1, respectively). The high end of the allowable Fe:C ratio is bounded by \([C:Fe]_{min,i}\) (i.e., maximum Fe:C) of 15,000:1 for eukaryotes and 20,000:1 for cyanobacteria/diazotrophs. These parameters directly follow Ridgwell (2001), who fitted power-law functions to the experimental data (Sunda and Huntsman, 1995).

Silica uptake stoichiometry by eukaryotes \( Q_{Si} \) is a power law of total dissolved iron \([FeT]\) and increases with a decrease in \([FeT]\) (Brzezinski, 2002). The power law exponent \( s_{Si:N} \) is set to 0.7. The Si:N ratio is limited to a maximum of 18 and a minimum of 1.

\[ Q_{Si} = [Si:P] = [Si:N] \cdot Q_{N,1} \]

\[ [Si:N] = \min \left( [Si:N]_{max,\text{max}} \left( [Si:N]_{min} \left( \frac{[FeT]}{0.5 \text{ nmol kg}^{-1}} \right)^{-s_{Si:N}} \right) \right) \]

\( O_2 \) liberated by phytoplankton during photosynthesis per PO\(_4\) consumed \((Q_{-O_{2,i}})\) is calculated from the uptake C:P and N:P ratios (Tanioka and Matsumoto, 2020b):

\[ Q_{-O_{2,i}} = 1.1Q_{C,i} + 2Q_{N,i} \]

### 2.3 Production of POM and DOM
In the top 100 m of the model domain, where phytoplankton P uptake occurs (i.e., \( \Gamma_i > 0 \)), see section 2.1, NPP is produced and immediately routed to POM and DOM pools (Figure 1). The production fluxes of POM, DOM\(_{sl}\), and DOM\(_{sr}\) from NPP are given as J\(_{prod}\). Here we write the equations in terms of P, which is the mater nutrient variable:

\[
J_{prod\_POM} = (1 - f\_DOM) \cdot \Gamma_i \tag{16}
\]

\[
J_{prod\_DOM\_sl} = \sum_i (1 - f\_DOM_r) \cdot f\_DOM \cdot \Gamma_i \tag{17}
\]

\[
J_{prod\_DOM\_sr} = \sum_i f\_DOM_r \cdot f\_DOM \cdot \Gamma_i \tag{18}
\]

The term f\(_{DOM}\) denotes the fraction of NPP that is routed to DOM as opposed to POM. Likewise, f\(_{DOM\_r}\) is the fraction of DOM that is routed to DOM\(_r\) as opposed to DOM\(_{sl}\). The value of f\(_{DOM\_r}\) is not well known but estimated to be ~1% (Hansell, 2013), which we tentatively adopt in MESMO 3. If DOM\(_r\) is not selected in the model run, f\(_{DOM\_r}\) = 0. In previous versions of MESMO, f\(_{DOM}\) was assigned a constant value of 0.66. In reality, a large variability is observed for this ratio, ranging from 0.01-0.2 in temperate waters to 0.1-0.7 in the Southern Ocean (Dunne et al., 2005; Henson et al., 2011; Laws et al., 2000). In MESMO 3, f\(_{DOM}\) is calculated as a function of the ambient temperature following Laws et al. (2000):

\[
f\_DOM = 1.0 - \min\left(0.72, \max\left(0.04, 0.62 - 0.02 \cdot T(\degree C)\right)\right) \tag{19}
\]

This formulation gives low export efficiency (i.e., high f\(_{DOM}\)) in the warmer regions compared to the colder high latitude regions. We impose fixed f\(_{DOM}\) upper and lower bounds of 0.96 and 0.28, respectively, as estimated from a previous study (Dunne et al., 2005).

In MEMSO 3, a new DOM production pathway below the production layer is available as an option. In previous MESMO versions, sinking POM was respired in the water column with
the loss of O₂ directly to the dissolved inorganic forms (i.e., POC→DIC, POP→PO₄, and POP→NO₃). In the new "deep POC split" pathway, sinking POM is simply broken down into DOM without the loss of O₂ (Figure 1). If DOM₆ is selected in the model, the broken down POM is further routed to both DOM₆ and DOM₉ according to fDOM₆. If not, all of the broken down POM is converted to DOM₆. Thus, when the deep POC split is activated, the presence of DOM in the deep ocean can be accounted for by in situ production of DOM and DOM₆ in addition to DOM transport from the surface. Thus, the deep POC split pathway offers an alternative means to control deep ocean DOM distribution.

2.4 Production of CaCO₃ and opal by eukaryotes

In MESMO 2, opal production was associated with the large PFT and CaCO₃ production was associated with the "small" PFT. We recognize that coccolithophorids and diatoms, which are the producers of these biogenic tests, are both eukaryotes. Therefore, in MESMO 3, we associate both CaCO₃ and opal production with the POM production by the same eukaryote PFT (JprodPOM₁):

\[ J_{prod_{CaCO₃}} = r_{CaCO₃:POC} \cdot J_{prod_{POM₁}} \cdot Q_{C,1} \]
\[ J_{prod_{opal}} = J_{prod_{POM₁}} \cdot Q_{Si} \]

The concept of the residual nitrate potential growth (RNPG) (Balch et al., 2016) is useful in allowing competition between diatoms and non-siliceous phytoplankton within the same PFT (Matsumoto et al., 2020). Typically, in the real ocean, non-Si phytoplankton are able to grow faster and dominate the community if Si concentration is low and diatom growth is Si limited. Otherwise, diatoms are more competitive, as they have higher intrinsic growth rates. The RNPG index recasts the ambient concentrations of NO₃ and Si(OH)₄ into potential algal growth rates:
If RNPG is more positive, the index indicates that nitrate-dependent growth exceeds silicate-dependent growth. Thus, non-Si phytoplankton are more competitive, and this leads to higher CaCO₃ production. On the other hand, a more negative RNPG implies that silicate limitation for diatoms is relieved, leading to enhanced diatom growth and reduced CaCO₃ production. The RNPG index is incorporated in the calculation of the rain ratio $r^{\text{CaCO}_3,\text{POC}}$ presented in Equation 20 as:

$$r^{\text{CaCO}_3,\text{POC}} = r_0^{\text{CaCO}_3,\text{POC}} \cdot (\Omega - 1)^\eta \cdot \min(1, \max(0.1, \text{RNPG})) \cdot k_{T,\text{CaCO}_3}$$  \hspace{1cm} (23)$$

Equation 23 indicates the base rain ratio $r_0^{\text{CaCO}_3,\text{POC}}$ (set to 0.30) is also modified by the carbonate ion saturation state $\Omega$ by $\eta$ (set to 1.28) by as well as by temperature (see Ridgwell et al. (2007) and references therein):

$$\Omega = \frac{[Ca^{2+}][CO_3^{2-}]}{K_{sp}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (24)$$

$$k_{T,\text{CaCO}_3} = \min \left(1.0, \frac{T(\degree C) + 2}{T(\degree C) + 8}\right)$$  \hspace{1cm} (25)$$

$K_{sp}$ is the solubility product of CaCO₃. The temperature dependency of CaCO₃ formation ($k_{T,\text{CaCO}_3}$) is similar to that of Moore et al. (2004) where warmer temperatures favor the growth of carbonate-bearing phytoplankton.

### 2.5 Remineralization of POM and DOM

Once produced, both POM and DOM undergo remineralization throughout the water column. Key remineralization parameter values are given in Table 2d. Previously, POM remineralization had a temperature dependence and decayed exponentially with depth.
(Yamanaka et al., 2004). In MESMO 3, we incorporate an additional dependency on dissolved oxygen following Laufkötter et al. (2017):

\[ R_{POM_i} = V_{POM} \cdot e^{k_R T \cdot \left[ O_2 \right] + K_{O_2} \cdot [POM_i]} \]

\[ V_{POM} \] is the base remineralization rate, parameter \( k_R \) expresses the temperature sensitivity of remineralization, and \( K_{O_2} \) is half-saturation constant for oxygen-dependent remineralization. When the sediment model is not coupled, any POM that reaches the seafloor dissolves completely to its inorganic form and is returned to the overlying water.

In MESMO 3, all forms of semi-labile DOM remineralize at the same rate. It is represented by \( \tau_{sl} \), the inverse of the time scale of \( DOM_{sl} \) decay, which has been estimated previously to be \( \sim 1.5 \) years (Hansell, 2013):

\[ R_{DOM_{sl}} = \tau_{sl} \cdot [DOM_{sl}] \]

All forms of DOM, also remineralize at the same rate in MESMO 3. In total, there are three optional, additive sinks of DOM, in the model: slow background decay, photodegradation, and degradation via hydrothermal vents (Figure 1). Observations clearly indicate that the \( ^{14}C \) age of deep ocean DOC is \( 10^3 \) years (e.g., Druffel et al., 1992), much older than DI\(^{14}C\). Also, the deep ocean DOC concentration decreases modestly along the path of the deep water from the deep North Atlantic to the deep North Pacific (Hansell and Carlson, 1998). Thus, it is understood that there is a slow DOM background decay in the deep ocean. We represent this process with \( \tau_{bg} \), which is the inverse of the background decay time scale, estimated to be \( \sim 16,000 \) years (Hansell, 2013).

Observations to date indicate that photodegradation is a major sink of DOM, (e.g., Mopper et al., 1991). This process is believed to convert DOM that is upwelled from the ocean interior into the euphotic zone into more labile forms of DOM. We represent
photodegradation with $\tau_{photo}$, the inverse of the decay time scale, estimated to be \~70 years (Yamanaka and Tajika, 1997).

Finally, observations of DOM emanating from different types of hydrothermal vents indicate that they have variable impacts on the deep sea DOM$_r$ (Lang et al., 2006). However, the off-axis vents circulate far more seawater through the fractured oceanic crust than the high temperature and diffuse vents and thus believed to determine the overall impact of the vents on the deep sea DOM$_r$ as a net sink (Lang et al., 2006). Here we assume simply that seawater that circulates through the vents loses all DOM$_r$ (i.e., $1/\tau_{vent} < \Delta t$, where $\Delta t$ is the biogeochemical model time step of 0.05 year). This means that the more seawater circulates through the vents, the more DOM$_r$ is removed: the total removal rate depends on the vent flux of seawater $H_{flux}$. We implement the vent degradation of DOM$_r$ in MESMO 3 by first identifying the wet grid boxes located immediately above known mid-ocean ridges. We then distribute the annual global $H_{flux}$ of $4.8 \times 10^{16}$ kg yr$^{-1}$ (Lang et al., 2006) equally among those ridge-associated grid boxes. The grid cells contain a mass of seawater much greater than the mass that circulates through vents in $\Delta t$ ($10^{21}$ kg vs. $10^{13}$ kg). Therefore, the seawater mass in the vent grid cells that does not circulate through the vents in $\Delta t$ is subject only to background degradation in MESMO 3.

The three DOM$_r$ sinks are not mutually exclusive. They can thus be combined to yield the total DOM$_r$ remineralization rate:

$$R_{DOM_r} = (\tau_{bg} + \tau_{photo} + \tau_{vent} \cdot \frac{SW_{flux, local}}{SW_{grid}}) \cdot [DOM_r]$$

where $SW_{flux, local}$ is the mass of seawater that circulates through the vents in each grid box in $\Delta t$, and $SW_{grid}$ is the total mass of seawater in the same grid box.

The amount of $O_2$ respired as a result of these POM and DOM remineralization processes is related to the organic carbon pools by the respiratory quotients of POC and DOC, $r_{O_2:POC}$.
and \( r_{-O_2:DOC} \), respectively. These are molar ratios of \( O_2 \) consumed per unit organic carbon resired. They are variable and calculated from the ambient POM and DOM concentration (Tanioka and Matsumoto, 2020b):

\[
r_{-O_2:POC} = 1.1 + \frac{2[PON]}{[POC]} \tag{29}
\]

\[
r_{-O_2:DOC} = 1.1 + \frac{2[DON]}{[DOC]} \tag{30}
\]

### 2.6 Remineralization of \( CaCO_3 \) and opal

Remineralization of \( CaCO_3 \) and opal particles occurs as they sink through the water column and remains the same as in MESMO 2. Key parameter values are given in Table 2d. Remineralization of \( CaCO_3 \) is a function of temperature similar to that of particulate organic matter remineralization but without oxygen dependency. The temperature dependence term \( k_R \) modifies the base remineralization rate \( V_{CaCO_3} \):

\[
R_{CaCO_3} = V_{CaCO_3} \cdot e^{k_R \cdot T} \cdot [CaCO_3] \tag{31}
\]

Opal remineralization in the water column follows Ridgwell et al. (2002). The rate of opal remineralization \( R_{opal} \) is given by the product of normalized dissolution rate \( (r_{opal}) \), base opal dissolution rate \( (k_{opal}) \), and opal concentration \([opal]\):

\[
R_{opal} = r_{opal} \cdot k_{opal} \cdot [opal] \tag{32}
\]

\[
r_{opal} = 0.16 \cdot \left( 1 + \frac{T(\mathcal{C})}{15} \right) \cdot u_{opal} + 0.55 \cdot \left( 1 + \frac{T(\mathcal{C})}{400} \right)^4 \cdot u_{opal}^{9.25} \tag{33}
\]

\[
u_{opal} = \frac{[\text{Si(OH)}_4]_{\text{eq}} - [\text{Si(OH)}_4]}{[\text{Si(OH)}_4]_{\text{eq}}} \tag{34}
\]
$r_{\text{opal}}$ is a function of temperature ($T$) and the degree of under-saturation ($u_{\text{opal}}$), which in turn is calculated from the ambient $[\text{Si(OH)}_4]$ and $[\text{Si(OH)}_4]$ at equilibrium. The equilibrium concentration is a function of ambient temperature:

$$\log_{10}([\text{Si(OH)}_4]_{eq}) = 6.44 - \frac{968}{T(K)}$$

Without the sediment module of MESMO activated, both CaCO$_3$ and opal particles that reach the seafloor are completely dissolved back to inorganic forms.

2.7 Conservation of organic matter and biogenic tests

The time rate of change of the biogenic organic matter and tests are given by the sum of the production terms (i.e., sources) and the remineralization terms (i.e., sinks). The circulation-related transport terms are omitted as noted above, but the vertical transport due to particle sinking is included here. The sinking speed $w$ is the same for all particles. The sum of POM$_i$ of all the PFTs give the total POM concentrations:

$$\frac{\partial [\text{POP}]_i}{\partial t} = J_{\text{prod}_{\text{POP},i}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial z}(w[\text{POP}]_i) - R_{\text{POP},i}$$

$$\frac{\partial [\text{POC}]_i}{\partial t} = J_{\text{prod}_{\text{POC},i}} \cdot Q_{C,i} - \frac{\partial}{\partial z}(w[\text{POC}]_i) - R_{\text{POC},i}$$

$$\frac{\partial [\text{PON}]_i}{\partial t} = J_{\text{prod}_{\text{PON},i}} \cdot Q_{N,i} - \frac{\partial}{\partial z}(w[\text{PON}]_i) - R_{\text{PON},i}$$

$$\frac{\partial [\text{POFe}]_i}{\partial t} = J_{\text{prod}_{\text{POFe},i}} \cdot Q_{Fe,i} - \frac{\partial}{\partial z}(w[\text{POFe}]_i) - R_{\text{POFe},i}$$

$$[\text{POM}] = \sum_i [\text{POM}]_i$$

The time rate of change of CaCO$_3$ and opal is expressed in much the same way as POM:
The DOM pools have the production and remineralization terms without the particle sinking term:

\[
\frac{\partial [\text{CaCO}_3]}{\partial t} = J_{\text{prod}_{\text{CaCO}_3}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (w[\text{CaCO}_3]) - R_{\text{CaCO}_3}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial [\text{opal}]}{\partial t} = J_{\text{prod}_{\text{opal}}} - \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (w[\text{opal}]) - R_{\text{opal}}
\]

2.8 Conservation of inorganic nutrients

The time rate of change of the inorganic nutrients have organic carbon production as sink terms and remineralization as source terms. The production terms (\(J_{\text{prod}}\)) are zero below the upper ocean production layer. Nutrients generally have a unit of \(\mu\text{mol element kg}^{-1}\), except for iron, whose unit is nmol Fe kg\(^{-1}\).
\[
\frac{\partial [PO_4]}{\partial t} = - \sum_i \Gamma_i + \sum_i R_{PO_{4},i} + R_{DOP,sl} + R_{DOP,r}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial [NO_3]}{\partial t} = - \sum_i \Gamma_i \cdot Q_{N,i} + \sum_i R_{PON,i} + R_{DON,sl} + R_{DON,r} + \text{Fix}_N - \text{Den}_N
\]

\[
\frac{\partial [DIC]}{\partial t} = - \left( \sum_i \Gamma_i Q_{C,i} + J_{prod_{CaCO_3}} \right) + \sum_i R_{POC,i} + R_{DOC,sl} + R_{DOC,rr} + R_{CaCO_3} + F_{gas,CO_2}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial [ALK]}{\partial t} = - \left( 2 \cdot J_{prod_{CaCO_3}} - \sum_i \Gamma_i Q_{N,i} \right) - \sum_i R_{PON,i} - R_{DON,sl} - R_{DON,r} - \text{Fix}_N + \text{Den}_N + 2 \cdot R_{CaCO_3}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial [FeT]}{\partial t} = - \sum_i \Gamma_i Q_{Fe,i} + \sum_i R_{POFe,i} + R_{DOFe,sl} + R_{POMFe} + \text{Aeolian}_{Fe}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial [Si(OH)_4]}{\partial t} = - J_{prod_{opal}} + R_{opal}
\]

\[
\frac{\partial [O_2]}{\partial t} = \sum_i \Gamma_i \cdot Q_{O_2,i} - \left( r_{-O_2:DOC} \cdot (R_{DOC,sl} + R_{DOC,rr}) + \sum_i r_{-O_2:POC,i} \cdot R_{POC,i} \right) + 1.25 \text{Den}_N + F_{gas,O_2}
\]

In Equation 51, \text{Fix}_N is the N-fixation carried out by diazotrophs, and \text{Den}_N is the water column denitrification. There is an air-sea gas exchange term \text{F}_{gas} in Equations 52 and 56 for gaseous CO$_2$ and O$_2$, respectively. In Equation 53, alkalinity increases with decreasing nitrate concentrations and increasing CaCO$_3$ dissolution. Equation 54 contains \text{R}_{POMFe}, which is an iron source that represents remineralization of the Fe' scavenged by sinking particles. These terms are explained in the following sections.

2.9 Prognostic nitrogen cycle
Biological production by diazotrophs is stimulated when the ambient NO$_3$ is low. Nitrogen fixed by diazotrophs during their growth is added to the marine NO$_3$ pool. The prognostic nitrogen fixation model employed here is similar to that used in the HAMOCC biogeochemical module (Paulsen et al., 2017):

$$Fix_N = I_3 \cdot Q_{N,3} \cdot I_{NO_3},$$

$$I_{NO_3} = \left(1.0 - \frac{[NO_3]^2}{K_{N_2}^2 + [NO_3]^2}\right),$$

where $Fix_N$ is the nitrogen fixation rate and $I_{NO_3}$ is the nitrate dependency term in quadratic Michaelis-Menten kinetics form with the half-saturation constant $K_{N_2}$. See Table 2e for the values related to the N cycle.

Water-column denitrification is formulated in an approach similar to that of the original GENIE model (Ridgwell et al., 2007), in which 2 moles of NO$_3$ are converted to 1 mole of N$_2$ and liberating 2.5 moles of O$_2$ as a byproduct:

$$2NO_3^- + 2H^+ \rightarrow 2.5O_2 + N_2 + H_2O$$

Denitrification takes place in grid boxes, in which O$_2$ concentration is below a threshold concentration ($O_{2,\text{def}}$) and is stimulated if the total global inventory of NO$_3$ relative to PO$_4$ is high. In other words, denitrification can effectively act as negative feedback to nitrogen fixation. The threshold O$_2$ concentration ($O_{2,\text{def}}$) takes the minimum of the hard-bound O$_2$ threshold concentration ($O_{2,\text{crit}}$) and the NO$_3$ to PO$_4$ ratio, scaled by a parameter $k_D$. The parameters $O_{2,\text{crit}}$ and $k_D$ are calibrated to give the global denitrification rate of roughly 100 Tg N yr$^{-1}$, which balances the total nitrogen fixation rate in the model.
The iron cycle in MESMO 3 remains the same as in MESMO 2. Key parameter values are given in Table 2e. The two species of dissolved iron (Fe' and FeL) are partitioned according to the following equilibrium relationship:

\[
K_{\text{ligand}} = \frac{[FeL]}{[Fe] \cdot [L]}
\]

where \([L]\) is the ligand concentration, and \(K_{\text{ligand}}\) is the conditional stability constant. The sum of ligand and FeL is set at a constant value of 1 nmol kg\(^{-1}\) everywhere. Iron is introduced into the model domain by a constant fraction (3.5 weight %) of aeolian dust deposition at the surface (\(F_{\text{in}}\)) following the prescribed modern flux pattern (Mahowald et al., 2006) with constant solubility (\(\beta\)):

\[
S_{Fe} = \beta \cdot F_{in}
\]

Particle-scavenged iron POM\(_{Fe}\) (note the difference from POFe) is produced below the productive layer when sinking POM scavenges Fe' to sinking POM:

\[
J_{Fe} = -\tau_{sc} \cdot K_{o} \cdot [POC]^{0.58} \cdot [Fe]
\]

where \(\tau_{sc}\) and \(K_{o}\) are empirical parameters that determine the strength of scavenging. Remineralization of Fe scavenged to POM (POM\(_{Fe}\)) is identical in form to that of POM remineralization:
The conservation equation of the particle scavenged iron is thus expressed as:

\[
R_{POMFe} = V_{POM} \cdot e^{k_{Fe} \cdot [O_2]} \cdot [POM_{Fe}]
\]

\[
\frac{\partial [POM_{Fe}]}{\partial t} = J_{Fe} - \frac{\partial}{\partial z} (w[POM_{Fe}]) - R_{POMFe}
\]

Any scavenged iron that escapes remineralization in the water column reaching the seafloor is removed from the model domain in order to keep the total Fe inventory at a steady state.

### 2.11 Air-sea gas Exchange

The air-sea gas exchange formulation remains the same as in MESMO 2 and follows Ridgwell et al. (2007). It is the function of gas transfer velocity, the ambient dissolved gas concentration, and saturation gas concentration. The flux of CO₂ and O₂ gases across the air-sea interface is given by:

\[
F_{gas,CO_2} = k \cdot \rho \cdot ([CO_2]_{sat} - [CO_2]) \cdot (1 - A)
\]

\[
F_{gas,O_2} = k \cdot \rho \cdot ([O_2]_{sat} - [O_2]) \cdot (1 - A)
\]

where \(k\) is the gas transfer velocity, \(\rho\) is the density of seawater, \([CO_2]_{sat}\) and \([O_2]_{sat}\) are saturation concentrations, and \(A\) is the fractional ice-covered area that is calculated by the physical model. Gas transfer velocity \(k\) is a function of wind speed \(u\) following Wanninkhof (1992) where \(Sc\) is the Schmidt Number for a specific gas:
3 Results and Discussion

All new results from MESMO 3 presented here are from the steady state. The "standard" MESMO 3 has the power law model of flexible stoichiometry but no DOM. The results from the standard model (hereafter just MESMO 3) are presented in Section 3.1, and the results from the DOM$_r$-enabled model are presented in Section 3.2. In Table 3, we summarize and compare key biogeochemical diagnostics from MESMO 3 against those from MESMO 2 and available observational constraints. The global NPP, as well as global export production of POC, DOC, and opal, are comparable or somewhat lower in MESMO 3 than MESMO 2. For example, the global opal export production is nearly the same at 128-130 Tmol Si y$^{-1}$, while the global POC export is 9.4 Pg C y$^{-1}$ in MESMO 3 and 11.9 Pg C y$^{-1}$ in MESMO 2. One reason for the lower POC export in the new model is that the global mean, production-layer fDOM, which was 0.66 everywhere in MESMO 2, increased to 0.71 in MESMO 3.

Before discussing the new features of MESMO 3, we note that the new model does just as well if not better than MESMO 2 in terms of the global distributions of PO$_4$, NO$_3$, O$_2$, Si(OH)$_4$, and FeT (Supplemental Figures S1, S2, S3, S4, and S5). Overall there is a stronger nutrient depletion in the new model. For example, the surface concentrations of PO$_4$ and NO$_3$ of the two models are both depleted in the subtropical gyres but more so in MESMO 3, which is more in line with the World Ocean Atlas (Figure S1). The spatial pattern of POC export that drives this surface nutrient pattern is similar in the two models (Figure S2). There is a marked improvement in the subsurface distribution of O$_2$ in MESMO 3 over MESMO 2. Whereas the depth of the oxygen minimum was ~300 m in MEMOS 2, it is ~1000 m in both MESMO 3 and the World Ocean Atlas (Figure S3). The O$_2$ improvement comes in part from adjusting the particle sinking speed and fDOM. As for Si(OH)$_4$, MESMO 3 preserves MESMO 2’s surface depletion in much of the world ocean except in the North Pacific and Southern Ocean (Figure S4). This is a feature captured by Si$^*$$<$0 (Si$^*$=Si(OH)$_4$-[NO$_3$]) in observations (Sarmiento et al., 2004) and simulated previously by MESMO 2 and now MESMO 3. Finally,
surface FeT is also depleted more strongly in MESMO 3 over MESMO2, except the North Atlantic, where aeolian deposition of dust from the Sahara maintains a steady Fe supply (Figure S5).

3.1 Novel features of MESMO 3
An important new feature of MESMO 3 is the representation of the primary producers by three PFTs (Figure 2). The eukaryotes are characterized by the highest maximum growth rate and high half-saturation constants. Thus, the eukaryotes are more dominant than the other PFTs in the more eutrophic waters of the equatorial and polar regions (Figure 2a).

The cyanobacteria have smaller half-saturation constants and thus are more dominant in the oligotrophic subtropical gyres (Figure 2c). The diazotrophs do not have NO$_3$ limitation but have the lowest maximum growth rate. Thus it is much lower in abundance than the other two PFTs generally, and outcompeted in transient blooms and thus excluded in higher latitudes (Figure 2e). Figure 1 also indicates that all three PFTs show Fe limitation in the Southern Ocean. Outside the Southern Ocean, the eukaryotes are primarily limited by Si(OH)$_4$ (Figure 1b), while the cyanobacteria is limited by NO$_3$ (Figure 2d). The diazotrophs are limited by iron in much of the world ocean except in the Atlantic basin (Figure 2f), where surface PO$_4$ is strongly depleted in both observations (Mather et al., 2008) and in our model (Figure S1).

Figure 3 illustrates the influence of the RNPG index, which was implemented in MESMO 3 to allow for the effect of competition between diatoms and coccolithophores within the same PFT (Equations 22 and 23). The eukaryote NPP (Figure 3a) is effectively split into two parts: one is associated with diatoms and opal production (Figure 3b), and the other is associated with coccolithophores and CaCO$_3$ production (Figure 3c). According to the RNPG index, opal production is simulated more in the higher latitudes of the Southern Ocean and the North Pacific, where surface [Si(OH)$_4$] is abundant. Elsewhere, CaCO$_3$ production is relatively larger. The decoupling is prominent in the North Indian. Note that the spatial pattern of CaCO$_3$ production is quite different in MEMOS 3 (Figure 3c) and MESMO 2 (Figure 3d), because CaCO$_3$ production was associated in MESMO 2 with the "small" PFT, which corresponds to the cyanobacteria PFT in MESMO 3.
The global pattern of the mean C:P uptake ratio in the production layer is shown in Figure 4. Consistent with observations (Martiny et al., 2013), the simulated C:P ratio of the phytoplankton community is elevated in the oligotrophic subtropical gyres and low in the eutrophic polar waters (Figure 4a). The community C:P ratio exceeds 200 in the gyres and reaches as low as 40-50 in the Southern Ocean. The community C:P has contributions from both physiological effects (i.e., environment acts on each PFT's C:P ratio) and taxonomic effects (i.e., the shift in the community composition changes the weighting of each PFT's C:P ratio). Figure 4b shows that the community C:P is high in oligotrophic gyres partly because cyanobacteria and to a lesser extent diazotrophs dominate the community, and their C:P ratio is high. Conversely, the community C:P is low in the polar waters in part because the eukaryotes dominate and their C:P ratio is low. For both eukaryotes and cyanobacteria, their C:P is high in oligotrophic subtropical gyres because PO₄ is low (Figure 4c and d). This physiological effect is larger in eukaryotes than cyanobacteria because the former has greater sensitivity (i.e., larger sensitivity factor $s_{P_{04}}^{E}$, Equation 5, Table 2b). However, the cyanobacteria PFT's C:P ratio has an additional sensitivity to temperature (i.e., $s_{P_{04}}^{E} \neq 0$) that elevates their C:P in the lower latitudes. We do not show the C:P ratio for diazotrophs because it is very similar to that of cyanobacteria (Figure 4b, d).

In order to gain more insights into the spatial patterns of the C:P ratio (Figure 4), we examined the relationships between the C:P and C:N ratios and the four possible environmental drivers for eukaryotes and cyanobacteria (Figure 5; again, diazotrophs are not shown). The red plots show that there is a causal relationship between the ratios and the drivers as formulated by the power law model (Equations 5 and 6). The black plots show the absence of a causal relationship. For example, the C:P ratio of both eukaryotes and cyanobacteria are strongly correlated with PO₄ because there is a causal relationship (Figure 5a, b shown in red). Similarly, the C:N ratio of the same two PFTs have a strong correlation with PO₄ (Figure 5c, d in black), but there is actually not a causal relationship (i.e., $s_{P_{04}}^{N} = 0$, Table 2b). The C:N-PO₄ correlation exists, simply because the nutrients are well correlated. Similarly, because temperature and photosynthetically active radiation
(PAR) tend to be correlated via latitude, the stoichiometry has a similar correlation to the
two drivers. For example, cyanobacteria C:P has a strong correlation with both
temperature and PAR (Figure 5j, 4n), but only the temperature is a real driver. Figure 5
indicates which are the dominant drivers of the C:N:P ratio in MESMO 3. For the eukaryote
C:P ratio, it is PO₄. For the cyanobacteria C:P ratio, the important drivers are temperature
and PO₄. For the C:N ratio for both eukaryotes and cyanobacteria, NO₃ is more important
than PAR. Figure 5 also serves to remind us of one of the most basic lessons of statistics,
that correlation does not indicate causation.

Figure 6 shows the community C:P and C:N ratios plotted against the four environmental
drivers. Unlike Figure 5, which reflected the individual PFT's physiological response, Figure
6 includes the effect of taxonomy as well. Still, the effects of PO₄ and temperature are
clearly visible on the community C:P ratio. Both low [PO₄] and warmer waters are found in
the lower latitudes, so the P frugality and temperature effects are additive. The effect of
NO₃ on the community C:N ratio is also very clear, but the effect of PAR is not as clear. Thus
overall, the physiological effects seen in the PFT-specific C:N:P are obvious in the
community C:N:P ratio.

3.2 DOM-enabled MESMO 3

In MESMO 2, DOC₂₃ was a standard state variable. In MESMO 3, other forms of DOM are
available as options. They are the semi-labile forms of DOM: DOP₃₈, DON₃₄, and DOFe₃₁; and
the refractory forms of DOM: DOCᵣ, DOPᵣ, and DONᵣ. MESMO 3 is not yet calibrated with
respect to all the DOM variables, but here we demonstrate their potential use in future
biogeochemical investigations by presenting steady state DOM results from the model
experiment LV (experiment ID: 201027c). In this run, all three sinks of DOMᵣ are activated:
slow background decay, photodegradation, and degradation in hydrothermal vents.

The experiment name LV stands for "literature values." In LV, we use the literature values
for the key DOM remineralization model parameters (Table 2d) and fDOMᵣ = 0.01 (Hansell,
2013). All other model parameter values in the LV run are identical to the standard MESMO
3 model (Table 2). The black lines in Figure 7 show the global mean vertical profiles of the
total DOC \((DOC_t = DOC_{sl} + DOC_r)\) in solid line and \(DOC_r\) in dashed line. Qualitatively, the simulated profiles are consistent with the observations, showing a near-uniform \(DOC_r\) concentration and a \(DOC_{sl}\) profile that rapidly with depth in the top few hundred meters (Hansell, 2013). However, the simulated values reach 130 µmol kg\(^{-1}\) in the surface, which is approximately twice the observations. More typically, the observed \(DOC_r\) is 30~40 µmol kg\(^{-1}\), and the observed \(DOC_{sl}\) attenuates with depth from 30~40 µmol kg\(^{-1}\) near the surface. So their sum, which is represented by \(DOC_t\), is approximately 60-80 µmol kg\(^{-1}\) at the surface in observations.

Figure 8 adds a lateral perspective to Figure 7. The rapid \(DOC_t\) attenuation in the vertical is strong in the lower latitudes where stratification is generally stronger. The transport of \(DOC_{sl}\) from the surface to deeper waters is evident in the high latitudes of the North Atlantic and the Southern Ocean. The \(DOC_t\) change in the deep ocean is limited. Observations of deep ocean \(DOC_t\) indicates a reduction by 29% or 14 µmol kg\(^{-1}\) from the deep North Atlantic to the deep North Pacific (Hansell and Carlson, 1998). Figure 8 shows that the deep ocean \(DOC_t\) gradient in \(LV\) is approximately 10 µmol kg\(^{-1}\) from 70-75 µmol kg\(^{-1}\) in the North Atlantic to <65 µmol kg\(^{-1}\) in the North Pacific.

The horizontal \(DOC_t\) distributions from the \(LV\) run can also be compared to a global extrapolation based on an artificial neural network (ANN) of the available \(DOC_t\) data (Roshan and DeVries, 2017). At the surface, the extrapolation indicates higher \(DOC_t\) concentrations in the subtropical gyres (Figure 9a), while our simulation does not clearly delineate the gyres (Figure 9c). In our model, fDOM is temperature-dependent and strongly controls the production of DOM. The surface \(DOC_t\) is thus more elevated in the lower latitudes. Interestingly, the ANN study diagnosed higher rates of DOM production in the subtropical gyres. Since the oligotrophic subtropical gyres have low NPP, the diagnosis would thus suggest that somehow fDOM is higher in the gyres. At depths, both the extrapolated and simulated \(DOC_t\) show a gradual decline in concentrations from the North Atlantic to the North Pacific (Figure 9b, d). The highest deep \(DOC_t\) in the \(LV\) run is seen just south of Greenland, where convection occurs in the model.
Finally, we show that the deep ocean radiocarbon aging is larger in DIC than in DOC, in the model (Figure 10). The North Pacific-North Atlantic $\Delta^{14}$C gradient is roughly -100‰ for DIC and -70‰ for DOC. The oldest DOC, $\Delta^{14}$C is approximately -430‰ in the North Pacific. If $^{14}$C decay were the only mechanism of change along the path of the deepwater circulation, the $\Delta^{14}$C gradient should be quite similar between DIC and DOC, which are both dissolved phases and transported passively by the same circulation. The one potentially important difference is that the addition of the relatively young DI$^{14}$C and DO$^{14}$C to the deep ocean by the "deep POC split" (see Section 2.3) impacts DOC, $\Delta^{14}$C more than DIC $\Delta^{14}$C, because DOC is two orders of magnitude lower in concentration than DIC.

In observations, the aging of DIC and DOC is reportedly similar in the Antarctic Bottom Water (below 4000 m) of the deep Pacific (Druffel et al., 2019). This may be explained by the fact that there would not be much deep POC split occurring so deep in the ocean. The North Pacific-North Atlantic $\Delta^{14}$C gradient, accounting for thermonuclear bomb $^{14}$C, may be as large as -100‰ for DOC (about -550‰ in the deep Pacific and -456‰ in the deep Atlantic) (Druffel et al., 2019). This gradient is not rigorously determined, because there is not enough data to do an objective analysis. Therefore, the equivalent $\Delta^{14}$C gradient for DIC cannot be determined. However, the DIC $\Delta^{14}$C endmember values by inspection (about -250‰ in the deep Pacific and -70‰ in the deep Atlantic) (Matsumoto and Key, 2004) indicate a clearly larger $\Delta^{14}$C gradient for DIC than DOC as simulated by the experiment LV. One lesson from the data-LV run mismatch in the overall DOC concentration (Figure 7) and surface DOC pattern (Figure 9) is that the parameter values from the literature do not fully capture the DOC cycle and/or MESMO 3 is still lacking some important DOC process. For example, fDOMr is a key parameter that is not well constrained by observations. Had we used 0.2% instead of 1% for fDOMr, the global mean surface DOC drops to 76 µmol kg$^{-1}$ (red line, Figure 7), consistent with observations. For achieving a better surface DOC pattern, we may need a different formulation of fDOM that is, for example, negatively...
related to nutrient concentrations so that fDOM increases in the oligotrophic subtropical gyres (Roshan and DeVries, 2017).

Another lesson from the DOM modeling exercise is that it is important to simulate DOP, reasonably well in order to preserve the favorable results we achieved in MESMO 3 with respect to biological production and the phytoplankton C:N:P ratio. We find that in the experiment LV, the global mean DOP concentration becomes steady at 0.45 µmol-P kg⁻¹.

Given that the mean DOC is about 40 µmol-C kg⁻¹, and the DOC:DOP ratio is estimated to be ~1370:1 (Letscher and Moore, 2015), DOP concentration should be on the order of 0.03 µmol-P kg⁻¹. Thus, the simulated DOP = 0.45 µmol-P kg⁻¹ is too high. Because there is more P in the form of DOP, in LV, the oceanic inventory of PO₄ declines, causing a nearly 10% drop in export production compared to the standard MESMO 3. In LV, the decline in the surface ocean PO₄ that accompanies the change in the PO₄ inventory acts on the phytoplankton physiology (i.e., P effect on C:P in Equation 5), which leads to a large rise in the global mean phytoplankton community C:P export ratio from 113:1 to 127:1. The implementation of preferential remineralization of DOP (and DON) over DOC (Letscher and Moore, 2015) is one way to deal with the problem of too high DOP concentrations.

3.3 Large-scale patterns of N₂ fixation and denitrification

The modeled habitat of diazotrophs is concentrated in tropical and subtropical waters between 40°S and 40°N and limited by iron (Figure 1e, f). Most noticeably in North Pacific subtropical gyre, diazotrophs constitute ~40% of total NPP. The latitudinal extent of diazotrophs is mainly determined by surface nitrate availability and physical factors such as surface temperature and irradiance. Low nitrate availability in subtropical gyres gives diazotrophs a competitive advantage over small cyanobacteria. Warm temperature and high irradiance also critical physical factors that drive the growth of diazotrophs in the model.

The modeled global depth-integrated N₂ fixation is 109 Tg N yr⁻¹ (Table 3), and this value falls well within the range of observational and geochemical constraints of 80 – 200 Tg N.
In general, N\textsubscript{2} fixation occurs in the regions where the diazotroph’s productivity is high, such as North Pacific and mid-to-low latitudes of the Atlantic basin (Supplementary Figure S6). The elevated N\textsubscript{2} fixation rate in the North Pacific, where nitrate limits eukaryotes and cyanobacteria (Figure 1b, d), can be explained by the healthy growth of diazotrophs, which is not limited by N. In the subtropical and tropical Atlantic and the Indian Ocean, high N\textsubscript{2} fixation is driven by elevated C:P and N:P ratio (Figure 4), exemplified by low phosphate availability and warm surface temperature. This spatial pattern agrees with a recent inverse model study (Wang et al., 2019), which showed an elevated N\textsubscript{2} fixation rate in subtropical gyres.

Global water-column denitrification is 109 Tg N yr\textsuperscript{-1} (Table 3) and is equal to the global N\textsubscript{2} fixation because the model has reached steady state. Denitrification is restricted to the subpolar North Pacific, where sub-surface oxygen concentration is significantly depleted (Figure S3d). Enhanced denitrification in this region is in qualitative agreement with a previous modeling study (Bianchi et al., 2018), which showed the anaerobic niche due to particle microenvironments can significantly expand the hypoxic expanses in the North Pacific. However, the extents of denitrification in our model do not include equatorial Eastern Pacific and Northern Indian Ocean, typically considered as the main hotspots for denitrification (Codispoti, 2007; Deutsch et al., 2007). This issue is typical of coarse-resolution global ocean biogeochemistry models that lack spatial resolution in reproducing intense upwelling (Marchal et al., 1998; Najjar et al., 1992; Yamanaka and Tajika, 1997).

Finally, we note that an important feature of the global ocean that is faithfully simulated in MESMO 3 is that the ratio of the global inventories of NO\textsubscript{3} and PO\textsubscript{4} is <16 at steady state (Gruber and Sarmiento, 1997). One key model parameter in achieving this result was the nitrate uptake half saturation constant of diazotrophs, K\textsubscript{NO\textsubscript{3},3} in Equation 2. A large value of K\textsubscript{NO\textsubscript{3},3} will make it hard for diazotrophs to obtain fixed N from NO\textsubscript{3}, which would facilitate N\textsubscript{2} fixation and pushes up the global N/P ratio. With a smaller value of K\textsubscript{NO\textsubscript{3},3}, diazotrophs will more easily uptake NO\textsubscript{3}, thus depressing N\textsubscript{2} fixation, lowering the global N/P ratio.

### 4. Conclusions
MESMO 3, the third and latest version of MESMO, is comprehensively described here. With a fully flexible C:N:P ratio in three PFTs, a prognostic N cycle, and more mechanistic schemes of organic matter production and remineralization, MESMO 3 reflects the evolving and accumulating knowledge of the ocean biogeochemistry. The model thus remains an effective tool for investigations of the global biogeochemical cycles especially on long time scale given the model's computational efficiency. In particular, MESMO 3 holds promise for studying the marine DOM cycle. The optional features of MESMO 3 include the semi-labile and refractory pools of C, P, N, and Fe. The fact that the literature values regarding the present marine DOM cycle are unable to simulate key observations indicates an opportunity for MESMO 3 to contribute to an improved understanding of the marine DOM cycle.
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Table 1. MESMO Development

PFT = phytoplankton functional types. MESMO2 PFTs are LG = large/diatoms and SM = small. MESMO 3 PFTs are Eu = eukaryotes, Cy = cyanobacteria, and Dz = diazotrophs. OM = organic matter. RNPG = residual nitrate potential growth. T = temperature. PAR = photosynthetically active radiation. fDOM = fraction of NPP routed to dissolved organic matter (DOM). The two types of DOM are semi-labile (DOC, DOP, DON, and DOFe) and refractory (DOCr, DOPr, and DONr). Carbon isotopes (\(^{12}\)C, \(^{13}\)C, and \(^{14}\)C) are calculated separately for DOC and DOCr.

Table 2. MESMO 3 Biogeochemical Model Parameters Values

Table 3. Key Biogeochemical Model Diagnostics

References for independent constraints: (1) global NPP (Carr et al., 2006); (2) global POC export (DeVries and Weber, 2017); (3) global DOC export assumed to be 20% of total carbon export (Hansell et al., 2009; Roshan and DeVries, 2017); (4) global opal (Dunne et al., 2007); (5) global CaCO\(_3\) export (Berelson et al., 2007); (6) global N fixation and denitrification rates (Landolfi et al., 2018); (7) uptake C:N:P ratio is based on POM measurements (Martiny et al., 2013); (8) export C:N:P ratio is assumed to equal the subsurface remineralization ratio (Anderson and Sarmiento, 1994); (9) Deep O\(_2\) from WOA13 below 100 m (Garcia et al., 2013).
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Figure 1. Schematic diagram of DOM cycling in MESMO 2 versus MESMO 3. In the new model, DOM$_r$ can be activated. DOM$_r$ is produced from POM breakdown, which can occur in the production layer or throughout the water column in the "deep POC split." Possible DOM$_r$ remineralization mechanisms are the slow background degradation that occurs everywhere, thermal degradation in hydrothermal vents, and photodegradation in the surface. See text for details.

Figure 2. NPP-based surface phytoplankton functional type (PFT) abundance and nutrient limitation in MESMO 3. Fractional abundance and nutrient limitation for eukaryotes (a, b), cyanobacteria (c, d), and diazotrophs (e, f).

Figure 3. The effect of the residual nitrate potential growth (RNPG) on the eukaryote production in MESMO 3. Eukaryote NPP (a), opal export (b), and CaCO$_3$ export (c) in MESMO 3. CaCO$_3$ export in MESMO 2 (d). Unit = mol m$^{-2}$ year$^{-1}$.

Figure 4. Uptake C:P ratio in the top 100 m in MESMO 3: (a) phytoplankton community C:P, (b) zonal mean C:P of all three PFTs and phytoplankton community, (c) eukaryote C:P, and (d) cyanobacteria C:P. The colors in (b) indicate: black = community C:P, red = eukaryote C:P, green = cyanobacteria C:P, and blue = diazotroph C:P.

Figure 5. Scatter plots of surface ocean eukaryote and cyanobacteria C:P and C:N vs. environmental drivers in MESMO 3. Columns: 1 = eukaryote C:P, 2 = cyanobacteria C:P, 3 = eukaryote C:N, and 4 = cyanobacteria C:N. Rows: 1 = PO$_4$, 2 = NO$_3$, 3 = temperature, and 4 = PAR. Red indicates causal relationship according to the power law formulation of flexible C:N:P ratio. PAR = photosynthetically active radiation in W m$^{-2}$.

Figure 6. Scatter plots of surface ocean community C:P and C:N vs environmental drivers in MESMO 3.
Figure 7. Global mean vertical profiles of DOC from the DOM$\text{R}$-enabled MESMO 3. DOC$_t$ (black line) and DOC$_r$ (black dashed line) from the LV run. Red line is DOC$_t$ after reducing fDOM$_r$ from 1% in LV to 0.2%. Unit = µmol kg$^{-1}$.

Figure 8. Global depth-latitude transect of DOC$_t$ from the DOM$\text{R}$-enabled MESMO 3 LV run. Transects are N-S along 25°W in the Atlantic, E-W along 60°S in the Southern Ocean, and N-S along 165°E in the Pacific. Unit = µmol kg$^{-1}$.

Figure 9. Assessment of surface and deep ocean DOC$_t$ from the DOM$\text{R}$-enabled MESMO 3 LV run. Data-derived DOC$_t$ distributions in the top 100 m (a) and 2500-4000 m (b). Model-simulated DOC$_t$ distributions in the top 100 m (c) and 2500-4000 m (d). Date-derived DOC$_t$ are from Roshan and DeVries (Roshan and DeVries, 2017). Unit = µmol kg$^{-1}$.

Figure 10. $\Delta^{14}$C of deep ocean DIC (a) and DOC$_t$ (b) from the DOM$\text{R}$-enabled MESMO 3 LV run. Vertical average over 2500-4000 m water depth. Unit = ‰.
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Table 1. Summary of MESMO Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model (run ID)</th>
<th>Biogeochemical features</th>
<th>Physical features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MESMO3 (190917c)</td>
<td>3 PFTs: Eu, Cy, and Dz</td>
<td>Seasonal winds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uptake C:N:P=f(PO$_4$, NO$_3$, T, PAR) by power law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N cycle (N-fixation, denitrification)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OM remineralization=f(O$_2$, T)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CaCO$_3$ production by Eu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>RNPG: competition w/in single Eu PFT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fDOM=f(T)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optional: Alternative uptake C:N:P by cell quota</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optional: DOC, DOP, DON, DOFe (semi-labile)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Optional: DOCr, DOPr, DONr (refractory)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESMO 2 (120531a)</td>
<td>Nutrients= PO$_4$, NO$_3$, CO$_2$, Fe, Si</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 PFTs: LG, SM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Si cycle (Si, $^{30}$Si)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fe cycle (Fe', FeL)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uptake C:Fe=(FeT)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uptake Si:N=f(FeT) by LG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CaCO$_3$ production by SM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESMO1 (090309a)</td>
<td>$J_{prod}$=(PAR, nutrients, T, MLD)</td>
<td>16 vertical levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nutrients=PO$_4$, NO$_3$, CO$_2$(aq)</td>
<td>Arctangent $K_v(z)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DOC (semi-labile)</td>
<td>Seasonal PAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fDOM=0.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PFT=phytoplankton functional types. MESMO2 PFTs are LG=large/diatoms and SM=small. MESMO3 PFTs are Eu=eukaryotes, Cy=cyanobacteria, and Dz=diazotrophs. OM=organic matter. RNPG=residual nitrate potential growth. T=temperature. PAR=photosynthetically available radiation. fDOM=fraction of NPP routed to dissolved organic matter (DOM). The two types of DOM are semi-labile (DOC, DOP, DON, and DOFe) and refractory (DOCr, DOPr, and DONr). Carbon isotopes ($^{12}$C, $^{13}$C, and $^{14}$C) are calculated separately for DOC and DOCr.
### Table 2. MESMO 3 Biogeochemical Model Parameters Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>MESMO 2</th>
<th>MESMO 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LP/Eukaryotes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \tau )</td>
<td>Optimal uptake</td>
<td>yr(^{-1} )</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_{PO4} )</td>
<td>PO(_4) half saturation const</td>
<td>( \mu )mol kg(^{-1} )</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_{NO3} )</td>
<td>NO(_3) half saturation const</td>
<td>( \mu )mol kg(^{-1} )</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_{CO2} )</td>
<td>CO(_2) (aq) half saturation const</td>
<td>( \mu )mol kg(^{-1} )</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>0.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_{Fe} )</td>
<td>FeT half saturation const</td>
<td>nmol kg(^{-1} )</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_{Si(OH)4} )</td>
<td>Si(OH)(_4) half saturation const</td>
<td>( \mu )mol kg(^{-1} )</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SM/Cyanobacteria</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \tau )</td>
<td>Optimal uptake</td>
<td>yr(^{-1} )</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_{PO4} )</td>
<td>PO(_4) half saturation const</td>
<td>( \mu )mol kg(^{-1} )</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_{NO3} )</td>
<td>NO(_3) half saturation const</td>
<td>( \mu )mol kg(^{-1} )</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_{CO2} )</td>
<td>CO(_2) (aq) half saturation const</td>
<td>( \mu )mol kg(^{-1} )</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_{Fe} )</td>
<td>FeT half saturation const</td>
<td>nmol kg(^{-1} )</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diazotrophs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \tau )</td>
<td>Optimal uptake</td>
<td>yr(^{-1} )</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_{NO3} )</td>
<td>NO(_3) half saturation const</td>
<td>( \mu )mol kg(^{-1} )</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_{NO3,Nfix} )</td>
<td>( K_{NO3} ) for N-fixation</td>
<td>( \mu )mol kg(^{-1} )</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_{CO2} )</td>
<td>CO(_2) (aq) half saturation const</td>
<td>( \mu )mol kg(^{-1} )</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( K_{Fe} )</td>
<td>FeT half saturation const</td>
<td>nmol kg(^{-1} )</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2b. Power law model of flexible C:N:P stoichiometry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>MESMO 2</th>
<th>MESMO 03</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>([\text{PO}_4]^0)</td>
<td>Reference ([\text{PO}_4])</td>
<td>(\mu\text{mol kg}^{-1})</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([\text{NO}_3]^0)</td>
<td>Reference ([\text{NO}_3])</td>
<td>(\mu\text{mol kg}^{-1})</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(T_0)</td>
<td>Reference temperature</td>
<td>°K</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(I_0)</td>
<td>Reference light level</td>
<td>W m(^{-2})</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Eukaryotes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>([P:C]_0)</td>
<td>Reference P:C molar ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([N:C]_0)</td>
<td>Reference N:C molar ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>151.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s^{PC}_{\text{PO}_4})</td>
<td>Sensitivity of P:C to ([\text{PO}_4])</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s^{NC}_{\text{NO}_3})</td>
<td>Sensitivity of N:C to ([\text{NO}_3])</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s^{PC}_T)</td>
<td>Sensitivity of P:C to temperature</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cyanobacteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>([P:C]_0)</td>
<td>Reference P:C molar ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([N:C]_0)</td>
<td>Reference N:C molar ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>151.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s^{PC}_{\text{PO}_4})</td>
<td>Sensitivity of P:C to ([\text{PO}_4])</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s^{NC}_{\text{NO}_3})</td>
<td>Sensitivity of N:C to ([\text{NO}_3])</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s^{PC}_T)</td>
<td>Sensitivity of P:C to temperature</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diazotrophs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>([P:C]_0)</td>
<td>Reference P:C molar ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>([N:C]_0)</td>
<td>Reference N:C molar ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>151.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s^{PC}_{\text{PO}_4})</td>
<td>Sensitivity of P:C to ([\text{PO}_4])</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s^{PC}_T)</td>
<td>Sensitivity of P:C to temperature</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sensitivity factors not listed here have a value of zero (e.g., \(s^{NC}_{\text{PO}_4}=0\)); thus the environmental driver \([\text{PO}_4]\) does not drive the N:C ratio.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>MESMO 2</th>
<th>MESMO3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[C:Fe]_{min}</td>
<td>Minimum C:Fe molar ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15,000:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[C:Fe]_{ref}</td>
<td>Scaling C:Fe molar ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>103,684:1</td>
<td>115,623:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s_{Fe:C})</td>
<td>Power law exponent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.4225</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP/Eukaryotes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[C:Fe]_{min}</td>
<td>Minimum C:Fe molar ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20,000:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[C:Fe]_{ref}</td>
<td>Scaling C:Fe molar ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>103,684:1</td>
<td>31,805:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s_{Fe:C})</td>
<td>Power law exponent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.4225</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM/Cyanobacteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[C:Fe]_{min}</td>
<td>Minimum C:Fe molar ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[C:Fe]_{ref}</td>
<td>Scaling C:Fe molar ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31,805:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s_{Fe:C})</td>
<td>Power law exponent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diazotrophs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[C:Fe]_{min}</td>
<td>Minimum C:Fe molar ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[C:Fe]_{ref}</td>
<td>Scaling C:Fe molar ratio</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31,805:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(s_{Fe:C})</td>
<td>Power law exponent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2d. Parameters related to POM, DOM, CaCO₃, and Opal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>MESMO 2</th>
<th>MESMO3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Particle sinking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>sinking speed</td>
<td>m d⁻¹</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POM remineralization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{POM}$</td>
<td>Base remineralization rate</td>
<td>d⁻¹</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_T$</td>
<td>Temperature sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{O2}$</td>
<td>O₂ half saturation constant</td>
<td>µmol kg⁻¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DOM remineralization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{al}$</td>
<td>DOMₐ decay time scale</td>
<td>yr⁻¹</td>
<td>0.5⁻¹</td>
<td>1.5⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{bg}$</td>
<td>DOMₐ background decay time scale</td>
<td>yr⁻¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,000⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{photo}$</td>
<td>DOMₐ photodegradation time scale</td>
<td>yr⁻¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{vent}$</td>
<td>DOMₐ vent decay time scale</td>
<td>yr⁻¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&gt;Δt⁻¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_{flux}$</td>
<td>Global annual seawater flux through hydrothermal vents</td>
<td>kg yr⁻¹</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.8 x 10⁻¹⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CaCO₃ remineralization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{CaCO3}$</td>
<td>Base remineralization rate</td>
<td>d⁻¹</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_T$</td>
<td>Temperature sensitivity</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opal remineralization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{Opal}$</td>
<td>Base remineralization rate</td>
<td>d⁻¹</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>MESMO 2</td>
<td>MESMO3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N cycle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{N_2}$</td>
<td>$N_2$ half saturation constant in $I_{NO_3}$</td>
<td>$\mu$mol kg$^{-1}$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_0$</td>
<td>Scaling constant in eq 62</td>
<td>$\mu$mol kg$^{-1}$</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fe cycle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{ligand}$</td>
<td>Cond. stability of constant</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.25x10$^{11}$</td>
<td>1.0x10$^{11}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\tau_{sc}$</td>
<td>Fe scavenging rate scale factor</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_0$</td>
<td>Base Fe scavenging rate</td>
<td>d$^{-1}$</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.079</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Key Biogeochemical Diagnostics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnostics</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Constraint</th>
<th>MESMO 2</th>
<th>MESMO 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(120531a)</td>
<td>(190917a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phytoplankton community/Bulk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP</td>
<td>Pg C y⁻¹</td>
<td>30-70</td>
<td>36.0ᵃ</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC export</td>
<td>Pg C y⁻¹</td>
<td>4-10</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOC export</td>
<td>Pg C y⁻¹</td>
<td>0.4-2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opal export</td>
<td>Tmol Si y⁻¹</td>
<td>70-185</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CaCO₃ export</td>
<td>Pg C y⁻¹</td>
<td>0.4-1.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fDOM</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N fixation</td>
<td>Tg N y⁻¹</td>
<td>80-200</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denitrification</td>
<td>Tg N y⁻¹</td>
<td>60-150</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptake C:N:P</td>
<td>molar ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>146:20:1</td>
<td>117:16:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Export C:N:P</td>
<td>molar ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>117:16:1</td>
<td>117:16:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep O₂</td>
<td>µmol kg⁻¹</td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LP/Eukaryotes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptake C:N:P</td>
<td>molar ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>117:16:1</td>
<td>102:14:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC export</td>
<td>Pg C y⁻¹</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abundance</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>73ᵇ</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM/Cyanobacteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptake C:N:P</td>
<td>molar ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>117:16:1</td>
<td>198:23:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC export</td>
<td>Pg C y⁻¹</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abundance</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>27ᵇ</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diazotrophs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptake C:N:P</td>
<td>molar ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>213:32:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC export</td>
<td>Pg C y⁻¹</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abundance</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ᵃNPP for MESMO 2 was unavailable as a model output and therefore estimated from POC and fDOM=0.66.ᵇThe calculation of the PFT abundance requires NPP in terms of P. NPP was unavailable as a model output for MESMO 2, so PFT % was estimated from POC export.

References for independent constraints: (1) global NPP (Carr et al., 2006); (2) global POC export (DeVries and Weber, 2017); (3) global DOC export assumed to be 20% of total carbon export (Hansell et al., 2009; Roshan and DeVries, 2017); (4) global opal (Dunne et al., 2007); (5) global CaCO₃ export (Berelson et al., 2007); (6) global N fixation and denitrification rates (Landolfi et al., 2018); (7) uptake C:N:P ratio is based on POM measurements (Martiny et al., 2013); (8) export C:N:P ratio is assumed to equal the
subsurface remineralization ratio (Anderson and Sarmiento, 1994); (9) Deep O$_2$ from WOA13 below 100 m (Garcia et al., 2013).