A.J. Poulton (Referee) • Comment 1. Is strain PML B92/11 (isolated from Bergen, Norway) the best strain of *E. huxleyi* to present a niche description of *E. huxleyi*? My query here is whether the authors have considered the potential need to consider multiple strains when trying to describe the fundamental and realised niche of the species *E. huxleyi*. Though the authors state that cold-water (Southern Ocean) strains need to be considered more, would not a broader study of several strains of *E. huxleyi*, isolated from various geographical regions, result in a better description of the species as a whole? Related to this is whether the authors have considered examining different (geographically) strains of *G. oceanica* and whether the limitations of *G. oceanica*’s niche could relate to the limited number of strains available for this species? These comments are not meant to detract from the present study, but rather emphasize the broader context.

We agree that considering multiple strains, from diverse ocean regions, would benefit our study in describing the fundamental and realised niches for a species in more general terms. Nevertheless, despite the fact that our realised niche projections are based on only one strain for each species, they do generally fit to modern day observations. This indicates that the differences in requirements and sensitivities of the two species as described here are large enough to be revealed by choosing only two representatives. This has now been detailed in the final paragraph of section 4.4.2 (page 14 lines 31-33 and page 15 lines 1-3) as follows “Considering multiple strains, from diverse ocean regions, would aid our study in describing the fundamental and realised niches for a species in more general terms. However, even though our realised niche projections are based on only one strain for each species, they do generally agree with experimental observations of other strains, and with planktonic and sediment observations of each species as a whole. This indicates that the differences in requirements and sensitivities of the two species as described here are large enough to be revealed by choosing only one representative for each species.”

• Comment 2. The authors use a ‘recently proposed metric’ for coccolithophore calcification rates (CCPP), but proposed by who? No reference is mentioned in the paper. Could the authors provide more context and information on this new metric?

This metric was proposed by us in a recently published paper. We have added the reference for this metric on page 3 line 14.

Specific points • Pg 1, Ln 4 (Ln 29) – *Emiliania huxleyi* is certainly one of the most abundant species, but not sure if *G. oceanica* can be classified in the same category. The two are common, though *E. huxleyi* has such a broad bio-geographical range compared to a narrower one for *G. oceanica* and generally a tropical range. Maybe relative abundance is not the characteristic to emphasize and either a commonality in many coccolithophore communities or bloom-formation by the two is more relevant (to global PIC production).

We agree and have changed the wording on page 1 lines 4-5 to: “the two most common bloom-forming species in present day coccolithophore communities appear adapted to…”

• Pg 1, Ln 13 – As well as the R^2 of the correlation, it would be good to know what the slope of the line looks like and the p-value in the abstract.

We have added the p-value and slopes to the abstract and discuss the slope of the line on page 16 lines 10-20.

• Pg 8, Ln 13-15 – Have the authors considered how total cell carbon (PIC+POC) to PON ratios would influence their data? In many ways, the N requirement of a coccolithophore cell is to produce both the PIC and POC. Also, are the PIC:POC ratios of 1 and 2 for *E. huxleyi* and *G. oceanica*, respectively, averages of the values given on Lines 23-24? Some justification for the use of these values, given the ranges known in the literature, is needed.

We have justified/explained total cell carbon:PON and the PIC:POC values as follows. “We first assumed a Redfieldian ratio of 106:16 C:N to determine the maximum POC production possible from the amount of available nitrate. We then calculated the amount of PIC which would be co-produced based on a mean PIC:POC. The average PIC:POC of *E. huxleyi* and *G. oceanica* was calculated as the average of all treatments between 300-1000 µatm from Sett et al. (2014), Zhang et al. (2015) and this study. Based on these averages (PIC:POC of 0.8 and 1.35 for *E. huxleyi* and *G. oceanica*, respectively), and assuming Redfieldian production a corresponding PIC:PON of 5.3 and 8.94 was calculated.” This explanation has now been included on page 8 (lines 31-33) and 9 (lines 1-3).

• Pg 14, Lns 21-23 – Surprised the review article by Monteiro et al. (2016) is not mentioned when considering viral attack and top-down effects as this article concluded that these were key considerations in the ecology of coccolithophores.

We have added a reference to the review article on pge 15 lines 16-17. • Pg 16, Lns 2 and 3 – Rather than citing the PhD thesis of Charalampopoulou (2011), why don’t the authors cite the peer-reviewed papers derived from this piece of work that address these points? Charalampopoulou et al. (2011) Irradiance and pH affect coccolithophore community composition on a transect between the North Sea and the Arctic Ocean. Marine Ecology Progress Series 431, 25-43, doi: 10.3354/meps09140. Charalampopoulou et al. (2016) Environmental drivers of coccolithophore abundance and calcification across Drake Passage
Anonymous (Referee 2) Abstract: • As I understand it, the inhibitory effect of increasing CO₂ on G. oceanica is the main reason for this species’ projected contraction under a future scenario. This should be emphasized in the abstract (1). As it is now, the projection of a contracted G. oceanica niche is surprising because it is generally the warmer water adapted species. Also, since E. huxleyi CCPP shows a better correlation with satellite-derived PIC than when combine with G. oceanica, this should be mentioned in the abstract (2). Otherwise, given the title of the paper, one assumes that the CCPP estimates are derived from partitioning niches between E. huxleyi and G. oceanica. Also, maybe a sentence at the beginning of Abstract describing why these two particular species are being compared would be helpful.

1. We have modified page 1 lines 9-10 to “For a future RCP 8.5 climate change scenario (1000 µatm fCO₂) we project a CO₂ driven niche contraction for G. oceanica to regions of even higher temperatures.” 2. We have modified page 1 lines 13-16 to “Based on E. huxleyi alone, as there was interestingly a better correlation than when in combination with G. oceanica, and excluding the Antarctic province from the analysis we found a good correlation between CCPP and satellite derived PIC in the other regions 15 with an R² of 0.73, p<0.01 and a slope of 1.03 for Austral winter/Boreal summer and an R² of 0.85, p<0.01 and a slope of 0.32 for Austral summer/Boreal winter.” 3. We have modified lines 4-5 of the abstract to “Based on our analysis, the two most common bloom-forming species in present day coccolithophore communities appear to be . . . . . .”

Intro: • Page 2, lines 3-9: This paragraph on future changes to the surface ocean environment needs expanding. What happens to nutrient availability with increasing stratification? How could this affect CaCO₃ production and growth rate in coccolithophores? How could increasing CO₂ affect growth rate/ calcification of coccolithophores? The impact of increasing light is described but not the other effects of climate change. Increasing temperature would also increase metabolic rates, unless
nutrient limitation becomes too strong. Overall this paragraph just needs more development with respect to the effects of anthropogenic climate change on coccolithophore habitat and how each effect could impact growth/calcification.

The potential effects of CO$_2$ on phytoplankton in general and coccolithophores in particular are already covered in the previous and following paragraph. Nevertheless, we have modified the text on page 2 lines 4-11 to “Under current scenarios, ocean temperatures are projected to increase from 2.6 to 4.8$^\circ$C by 2100 (IPCC, 2013b). In addition, warming of the ocean is expected to enhance vertical stratification of the water column, resulting in a shoaling of the surface mixed layer and increasing overall light and decreasing nutrient availability in the euphotic zone (Bopp et al., 2001; Rost and Riebesell, 2004; Lefebvre et al., 2012). While increased light intensity and temperatures often accelerate growth in phytoplankton, excessive levels of light and temperature can cause damage to the photosynthetic apparatus and reduce effectiveness of enzymes thus decreasing growth
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Emiliania huxleyi is very widespread, but how abundant is G. oceanica? Where does G. oceanica tend to thrive? Also mention that there are several different mophotypes of E. huxleyi and how they might differ. A bit of biogeography background would be helpful. This would then lead into the fundamental vs. realized niche paragraph.

We have added the following text in page 2 line 15 “The coccolithophores Emiliania huxleyi and Gephyrocapsa oceanica are considered the most common species in present day coccolithophore communities. E. huxleyi is a ubiquitous coccolithophore species having been observed from polar to equatorial regions, nutrient poor ocean gyres to nutrient rich upwelling systems, and from the bright sea surface down to 200m depth (McIntyre Be 1967; Winter et al. 1994; Hagino Okada 2006; Boeckel Baumann 2008; Mohan et al. 2008; Henderiks et al. 2012). The wide tolerance of E. huxleyi to different environmental conditions is believed to be at least partially, explained by the existence of several environmentally selected ecotypes and morphotypes within the species (Paasche 2001; Cook et al. 2011). G. oceanica is also found in most oceanographic regions (McIntyre and Be 1967; Okada and Honjo 1975; Roth and Coulbourn 1982; Knappertsbusch et al. 1993; Eynaud et al., 1999; Andruleit et al. 2003; Saaveda-Pellitero et al. 2010), however with a tendency towards warmer waters with very few specimens observed below 13$^\circ$C (McIntyre and Bé, 1967; Eynaud et al., 1999; Hagino et al., 2005).”

• Page 2 lines 28-35: the CCPP- PIC comparison is left out of this paragraph. It would be good to mention this here to indicate how it ties in with the E. hux – G. oceanica niche comparison.

We have added the following to the end of the paragraph on page 3 lines 5-14 “Finally, we compare satellite derived particulate inorganic carbon estimates with a recently proposed metric for coccolithophore success on the community level, i.e. the temperature, light and carbonate chemistry speciation dependent calcium carbonate potential (Gafar et al. 2018).”

Methods: • Page 3, line 4: Why test such high CO$_2$ values? Are these even realistic? For instance, if end of the century CO$_2$ concentration of 985atm (about 50mol kg$^{-1}$ aqueous CO$_2$), corresponds to a 4.8$^\circ$C temperature increase, then why go up to 250mol kg$^{-1}$ CO$_2$? The range of CO$_2$ is therefore bigger than the temperature range in terms of real world conditions. An explanation for this experimental setup would be helpful.

Fitting non-linear responses of multiple stressors to data requires a broad range of environmental conditions, as otherwise the shaping factors of limitation and inhibition are lost (absent from data while present in model equation). With this broader range we also have the added benefit for identifying tipping points and changes in sensitivities to CO$_2$ with changing light and temperature. We have made our rational more clear in the methods section by adding the following to page 3 line 17: “To accurately identify optimal conditions, tipping points and sensitivities of rates in response to changing CO$_2$, light and temperature, a broad range of experimental conditions are required. Hence, mono-specific. . . . . . .”

• Page 3, section 2.1: The authors need to mention the particular E. hux morphotype being tested (PML B92/11 is morphotype A).

We have added the requested information to page 3 line 19.

• Page 4, line 22: Why would there be a lag phase? It seems the growth rate is calculated correctly (after the lag phase is over), but a quick explanation of why there is a lag phase at extreme CO$_2$ and whether this is a normal phenomenon in phytoplankton culturing and physiological testing would be helpful.

We have added the following information to page 5 lines 4-8. “At both, the extreme low and high CO$_2$ treatments, carbonate chemistry at the end of the pre-incubation phase can significantly deviate from initial and hence experimental treatment con-
ditions due to enhanced air/water CO₂ gas exchange during regular cell abundance monitoring. As a result, at some extreme CO₂ levels there was an initial lag phase and therefore growth rates were calculated from densities only during the exponential part of the growth phase.”

• Page 5, section 2.7: I find this section about the data transformation confusing, particularly about the temperature. Is this just for growth rate? How do the resulting temperature-dependent growth rates compare to other studies on coccolithophores (Fielding 2013, Buitenhuis et al., 2008)?

This transform is applied to all rates to reduce skew and are common practice in multi-variate fitting procedures. As mentioned within section 2.7, this temperature transform compares well to other temperature dependant growth rate equations such as the single species responses to the Eppley temperature envelope curve and the Norberg model. Our temperature-dependant growth rate estimates show a similar response to the optimal growth function in Buitenhuis et al. 2008 and the Flinn equation in Fielding et al. 2013. The power function in Fielding et al. 2013 also follows a similar pattern, of growth rate increase with rising temperature, as our transform but lacks a term to inhibit rates as temperatures rise above optimum. However, our temperature transform results in a much stronger decrease in inhibition of growth rates above and below optimum temperatures than is observed for any of the above equations. This feature was chosen by us as it is backed up by response data from multiple E. huxleyi strains in Zhang et al. 2014 Between- and within-population variations in thermal reaction norms of the coccolithophore Emiliana huxleyi Limnology and Oceanography, 59(5), 1570–1580.

• Page 7, line 4: Unneeded commas before and after “relatively simple”...or just rewrite for clarity “As such we wanted to examine how projections of productivity using our relatively simple equation compared to coccolithophorid productivity patterns observed in natural systems”

We have rewritten the sentence as suggested above on page 7 lines 21-22.

• Page 7, line 13: A citation of the CCPP metric is needed.

The citation for the CCPP metric is now referenced on page 7 line 32.

• Page 8, line 14: Need citation for the PIC:POC ratios used for E. huxleyi and G. oceanica

This has been corrected as detailed in the response to reviewer 1.

• Page 8, last paragraph: I took me awhile to figure out the CCPP estimates were made in three ways: 1) just E. huxleyi 2) just G. oceanica 3) both species combined Is this correct? Only results for E. huxleyi CCPP was presented so maybe clarify here that only the results with the highest correlation to satellite PIC are shown. It’s confusing because there are details described in the previous paragraphs about deriving CCPP for each species but then the results only show E. huxleyi CCPP.

Yes, the estimates were made using just E. huxleyi, just G. oceanica and then both species combined. Only results for E. huxleyi were presented as G. oceanica alone and in combination with E. huxleyi did not provide as good a correlation to satellite PIC. We have now stated on page 9 lines 19-20 “While three CCPP scenarios are presented above, only the results with the highest correlation to satellite PIC is shown and discussed below.”

• Page 8, lines 26 and 27: Need parentheses around year for citations Gregg and Casey (2007) and Longhurst (2007).

We have adopted this suggestion on page 9 lines 14 and 15.

Results: • Page 9, Results section in general: Please specify in the headings that these are only the results for E. huxleyi (not G. oceanica).

We have adopted this suggestion by changing headings for sections 3.1, 3.2 and 3.3 to “E. huxleyi responses to . . . . .”.

• Page 9, line 2: Perhaps develop this small section a bit more. Which rate showed the best fit?

We have changed the sentence at the start of section 3 (page 9 lines 22-23) to “The fit equation (Eq. 2) was able to explain up to 85% of growth, 80% of calcification and 73% of photosynthetic rate variability in E. huxleyi across a broad range of carbonate chemistry (25-4000 µatm), light (50-1200 µmol photons m⁻²s⁻¹) and temperature (10-20°C) conditions (Table 1).”

• Page 9, line 6: Instead of just saying “all rates”, please remind the reader what metabolic rates you are examining and refer to the equation presented in the methods.

We have changed the sentence at the start of section 3.1 (page 9 line 26) to “Based on fits of Eq. (2), growth, calcification and photosynthetic carbon fixation rates all had. . . . . .”

• Page 9, line 7: It’s hard to understand exactly what to look at in Table 2 and 3 to support this sentence (2nd sentence of the paragraph). It seems like CO₂ concentrations of K1/2 sat range form 0.85 to almost 5 mol kg⁻¹ depending on light and temperature...

The difference in K1/2 sat concentration between treatments is not what is important here. Rather it is the difference in K1/2
sat between the different processes for the same conditions that supports this sentence. Under all conditions the difference in CO₂ concentration, between the three processes, required to support half of maximum rates is less than 1-2 μmol kg⁻¹. We have clarified this by changing this sentence (page 9 lines 27-29) to “Growth, calcification and photosynthetic carbon fixation rates required similar CO₂ concentrations, with differences of less than 3 μmol kg⁻¹ under comparable temperature and light conditions, to stimulate rates to half the maximum, K₁/₂CO₂ sat (Table 2, Table 3)”.

- Page 9, lines 8-10: Mention what are the optimal CO₂ concentrations and put this into units of atm to make it more relatable to the reader. Are we at the optimum CO₂ already for coccolithophores or will it come in the near future? At what CO₂ concentrations is K₁/₂ inhibit reached? More specifics would give the reader more useful information.

We have added the CO₂] concentrations for optima and K₁/₂ inhibit on page 9 lines 30-31 and page 10 lines 1-2. The reason we use CO₂ concentrations rather than fugacities is that for the same concentrations, the fugacity would be different for two temperatures.

- Page 9, line 14/15: What columns in table 2 are the reader supposed to be looking at? Are you referring to the Vmax column? Yes. The Vmax not only represents the maximum rate in a treatment, but also is where we see the greatest change in rates due to temperature and light. This is because Vmax is achieved under optimal CO₂ conditions and, based on our findings, rates under optimal CO₂ conditions are the ones which are most sensitive to changes in temperature and light conditions.

- Page 9, line 18: I had to read this sentence several times before I actually understood it. Would this be a better way to put this?: “CO₂ half saturation concentration were insensitive to temperature. However, under increasing temperatures CO₂ optima for growth and inhibition occurred at lower CO₂ concentrations”

We have changed these sentences (page 10 lines 6-8) to “CO₂ half saturation concentrations (K₁/₂CO₂ sat) were insensitive to temperature (Table 2). However, under increasing temperatures CO₂ concentrations for both optimal growth and for inhibition of rates to half the maximum (K₁/₂CO₂ inhibit) decreased (Table 2).”

Discussion: • Page 10, line 6: Since this is a major conclusion of the paper, it should be shown directly somehow. All the original G. oceanica data is published elsewhere, so a graphical summary of BOTH the E. huxleyi and G. oceanica data would be helpful. This could be done through line plots comparing the metabolic rates of the two species under varying CO₂ concentrations and put this into units of atm to make it more relatable.

Actually, the data for the response of G. oceanica to CO₂ under different light conditions is already presented for easy comparison in a supplementary table. We have added this cross-reference to page 11 line 9. This table is already referenced multiple times in the paper and we do not wish to repeat information by also presenting it in graphic form. The data for the response of G. oceanica to CO₂ under different temperatures is the only data not available for direct comparison to E. huxleyi in this paper and we feel it does not add enough to this paper to be included here as well. Besides this, the main focus of the comparison between the species for this paper is in the fundamental and realised niche descriptions.

- Page 10, line 30: A change in CO₂ optima of 11 mol kg⁻¹ is not that small.

We have changed this (page 11 lines 19-21) to “Changes in temperature produced little (<1 μmol kg⁻¹) change in CO₂ substrate half-saturation (K₁/₂CO₂ sat) levels, at least within the measured range (Figure 1, Table 2). CO₂ requirements for optimum rates tended to slightly decrease with warming temperatures. Similar results were observed for...............

- Page 11, line 5: Unneeded commas around “at least some”

Commas on page 11 line 29 have been removed.

- Page 11, line 15: Again, here is where a comparison figure between E. hux and G. oceanica would be helpful.

All information is available in the accompanying tables.

- Page 12, line 3: The range tested in this study is so much higher than even what projected under RCP8.5 at the end of the century. The temperature range tested in this study is much more realistic. How warm would the world be under 5000atm CO₂?

Please see our response to the comment on Page 3 line 4.

- Page 12, line 12: I think a major limitation of this study is the focus on just one strain of one morphotype of E. huxleyi. Different E. huxleyi morphotypes show significant genetic and physiological variability (see Read et al., 2013; Langer et al., 2009; Krumhardt et al., 2017). Accounting for these differences could add significant uncertainty to the conclusions. I think that the last sentence of section 4.4 (before section 4.4.1) would fit better in a section on the “Limitations of this study” at the end of the Discussion section, where you describe how E. huxleyi strain PML B92/11 is used to be representative of all E. huxleyi for determining niche and projections under future CO₂ and warming in this study. This doesn’t make the results
invalid, but is just a limitation that needs to be made clearer. This would then lead in nicely with the conclusion that more testing with colder water strain/species/morphotypes of E. huxleyi is necessary.

Please refer to our reply to the first comment of reviewer one for our response on the limitations of using a single strain. In terms of creating a limitations section, we believe it makes it easier to follow the paper, and remind readers of its limitations, if we mention the specific limitations of our research not as a separate section but rather as part of the discussion for each section. In this way it can be made more clear what the limitations are and what they mean for each section.

- Page 12, line 22: Capitalize “Figure”
- Page 13, line 7: I think it’s well established that E. huxleyi is a generalist, given its widespread distribution from subpolar to tropics.

We have changed this (page 13 lines 30-31) to “For example, E. huxleyi is projected to reach higher growth rates than G. oceanica under a broader range of temperature, light and CO₂ conditions (Figures 3, 4 and 5), supporting the notion that E. huxleyi is rather a generalist.”.
- Page 13, line 9: Unneeded comma after “niche”
- Page 13, line 25: Reference needed for this
- Page 13, line 32/33: I’m confused by this lower CO₂ extreme of 25 atm. By Figure 5 it looks like G. oceanica outcompetes E hux at temps > 25°C at 25 atm CO₂.

For clarity we have changed this section (page 14 lines 25-30) to read “CO₂ level also influences the relative growth rates of E. huxleyi and G. oceanica. Under current day levels of 400 µatm, E. huxleyi would dominate at temperatures up to 22°C (Figure 5). Nevertheless, over the naturally observed temperature range, G. oceanica’s niche would be expected to decrease towards higher CO₂ levels.”.

- Page 13, line 35: By “productivity”, do you mean calcification?
- Page 14, line 4/5: The sentence seems like it shouldn’t have the “under a broader range of CO₂ conditions” part at the end. Under higher temperature alone (holding CO₂ at about 400 atm) G. oceanica outcompetes E hux at temps > 22°C. Or perhaps I’m misunderstanding this sentence completely?

Yes, this is a misunderstanding. What we mean by this is that as temperatures alone increase, the range of CO₂ conditions under which G. oceanica outcompetes E. huxleyi becomes broader (i.e. expands from 300-500atm to 200-600atm). More importantly G. oceanica becomes less sensitive to high CO₂ conditions under elevated temperatures which is the point we wanted to highlight. We have made this more clear on page 14 lines 28-30 with the following change “At the same time, combined warming in a future ocean would partially mitigate the higher CO₂ sensitivity of G. oceanica (Figure 5). Nevertheless, over the naturally observed temperature range, G. oceanica’s niche would be expected to decrease towards higher CO₂ levels.”.

- Page 14, last paragraph of section 4.4.2: This would be better in a “Limitations of this study” section, as mentioned above.
- Page 15, line 12: By “productivity”, do you mean calcification?

It is production of particulate inorganic carbon (PIC). This has been clarified by changing the sentence to “The fact that three other global estimates, based on different sets of environmental parameters, all estimate very little PIC productivity in the Southern Ocean seems to support this theory.” On page 16 lines 5-6.

- Page 15, lines 14-22: Would this paragraph better fit in the Results section?

We have opted to leave it where it is (page 16 lines 10-19) as it is part of the general discussion on how well our CCPP estimates fit to satellite derived CCPP.
- Page 16, lines 8-20: Could it be that E. huxleyi CCPP just matches better because it’s so much more abundant than G. ocean-
While that would help, abundance alone does not completely control global PIC production. It is also the ratio of abundance/growth to PIC production. The thought was that adding *G. oceanica* might help improve the fit by accounting for the greater amount of PIC production made by more heavily calcifying species in warmer regions (Now on page 17 lines 5-17).

- Page 16, line 14/15: I do not understand this sentence. So, the combined CCPP in the North Pacific and Atlantic is greater or less than the *E. huxleyi* CCPP?
  - Yes, as mentioned at the end of the sentence, all differences are relative to the *E. huxleyi* alone fit (Now on page 17 lines 11-12).

**Tables:** • Tables 2 and 3: Put parentheses around units for K1/2CO₂ inhib and K1/2CO₂ sat in tables.

**Figures:** • Figures 1 and 2: Indicate that this data is just for *E. huxleyi* in the caption. Also, show relevant CO₂ range with a shaded area as in Sett et al., 2014 and indicate average oceanic CO₂ concentration at present day.

- We have adopted the suggestion by now stating “(A) Fitted particulate inorganic carbon (PIC), (B) particulate organic carbon (POC) production, and (C) growth rates (solid lines) of *E. huxleyi* in response...” in the caption. As for the second, based on the carbonate chemistry data used for our global projections, modern CO₂ concentrations range from 8.45-29.94 µmol kg⁻¹. We have added these boundaries as a shaded area in Figures 1 and 2.
  - Figure 3: Each “slice” looks the same.. maybe there’s a better way to show differences between light levels or lack thereof? Also I do not understand the colors – add color legend.

- Figure 3 is a full three dimensional niche comparison between *E. huxleyi* and *G. oceanica*. The visual similarity of slices at different light levels shows an important point, i.e. a small influence of light in modulating the CO₂ and temperature response. A figure legend has now been added.
  - Figure 4: Make the EH >GO bigger or put it next to the color bar. It’s a bit hard to notice and this is critical for understanding the figure.

- We have increased the font size.
  - Figure 5: same suggestion as for Figure 4.

- We have adopted the requested changes.

- Figure 7: It needs to be mentioned in the caption that these maps are CCPP for *E. huxleyi* only.
  - The caption has been amended to “Austral summer/Boreal winter (A) and Austral winter/Boreal summer (D) satellite measured particulate inorganic carbon. Austral summer/Boreal winter (B) and Austral winter/Boreal summer (E) *E. huxleyi* based CCPP estimates accounting for carbonate chemistry (substrate and hydrogen ion concentrations), light intensity and temperature...”.

- Figure 8: Again, this is just CCPP for *E. huxleyi*, right? This should be indicated in the figure caption. Also, a little map of the provinces (like in the supplemental section) would be great next to these bar plots. Having a map next to this data would make the figure much more relatable.

- Yes, it is. We have moved the map into the same figure as the bar plots and changed the caption to “Satellite derived particulate inorganic carbon (black bars) and *E. huxleyi* based CCPP (white bars) estimates for major ocean biogeographical provinces as percentages of total production in (A) Austral winter/Boreal summer and (B) Austral summer/Boreal winter. (C) Major ocean biogeographical province definitions.”.

**Community comments Mario Cachao** • You present a very interesting and useful piece of work. You selected the two species you refer as the most common. *Emiliania huxleyi* (Eh) is unquestionably the currently dominating species in oceanic niches. *Gephyrocapsa oceanica* (Go) is for sure the most abundant but in neritic domain (at least in my area, not sure about Australia), not exactly the most common in the overall oceans. In addition, from a paleoecological point of view, records of Eh are always compared to another small placolith species (small Gephyrocapsids; sG), not to Go, both in terms of relative and absolute abundances. I understand that Eh and Go are among those coccolithophores that better perform in cultures but shouldn’t we compare Eh against sG instead? What’s your opinion?

It is more that these two species are the most common in terms of their presence in coccolithophore communities rather than their dominance. Both species have a broad distribution across multiple ocean basins, for detail please see our response to reviewer 2 Page 2 line 18. It is this reason, plus the fact that data on responses to changing CO₂, temperature and light are available for both species, that we decided to compare the two species.
It would also be of interest to compare *E. huxleyi* against the small Gephyrocapsids. However, from what we understand the small Gephyrocapsids consist of multiple small Gephyrocapsa spp. which are not always identified to the species level (e.g. Table 3 Flores et al. 1999). As such, a niche comparison with *E. huxleyi* would be very difficult to accomplish from an experimental point of view.

*G. oceanica* is often mentioned alongside *E. huxleyi* in sediment core data (i.e. McIntyre and Be 1967, Chen and Shieh 1982, Roth and Coulburn 1982, Knappertsbusch et al. 1993, Findlay and Flores 2000, Andruleit and Rogalla 2002, Boeckel et al. 2006, Fernando et al. 2007, Saaveda-Pellitero et al. 2010). Further, it seems that in longer geological records that *E. huxleyi* is usually compared to larger Gephyrocapsa species such as *G. mullerae*, *G. caribbeana* and *G. oceanica* as well as the small Gephyrocapsids (Flores et al. 1997, Findlay and Florin 2000, Flores et al. 2003, Backman et al. 2009). So, we believe it is equally reasonable to compare *E. huxleyi* and *G. oceanica* as it is to compare *E. huxleyi* to the small Gephyrocapsids.
A three-dimensional niche comparison of *Emiliania huxleyi* and *Gephyrocapsa oceanica*: Reconciling observations with projections
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**Abstract.** Coccolithophore responses to changes in carbonate chemistry speciation such as CO$_2$ and H$^+$ are highly modulated by light intensity and temperature. Here we fit an analytical equation, accounting for simultaneous changes in carbonate chemistry speciation, light and temperature, to published and original data for *Emiliania huxleyi*, and compare the projections with those for *Gephyrocapsa oceanica*. Based on our analysis, the two most common bloom-forming species in present day coccolithophore communities appear to be adapted for a similar fundamental light niche but slightly different ones for temperature and CO$_2$, with *E. huxleyi* having a tolerance to lower temperatures and higher CO$_2$ levels than *G. oceanica*. Based on growth rates, a dominance of *E. huxleyi* over *G. oceanica* is projected below temperatures of 22°C at current atmospheric CO$_2$ levels. This is similar to a global surface sediment compilation of *E. huxleyi* and *G. oceanica* coccolith abundances suggesting temperature dependent dominance shifts. For a future RCP 8.5 climate change scenario (1000 µatm fCO$_2$) we project a CO$_2$ driven niche contraction for *G. oceanica* to regions of even higher temperatures. However, the greater sensitivity of *G. oceanica* to increasing CO$_2$ is partially mitigated by increasing temperatures. Finally, we compare satellite derived particulate inorganic carbon estimates in the surface ocean with a recently proposed metric for potential coccolithophore success on the community level i.e. the temperature, light and carbonate chemistry dependent CaCO$_3$ production potential (CCPP). Based on *E. huxleyi* alone, as there was interestingly a better correlation than when in combination with *G. oceanica*, and excluding the Antarctic province from the analysis we found a good correlation between CCPP and satellite derived PIC in the other regions with an $R^2$ of 0.73, $p<0.01$ and a slope of 1.03 for Austral winter/Boreal summer and an $R^2$ of 0.85, $p<0.01$ and a slope of 0.32 for Austral summer/Boreal winter.

1 Introduction

Since the Industrial Revolution in the late 18th century, burning of fossil fuels, as well as wide scale deforestation have contributed to significant increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide, CO$_2$ (IPCC, 2013a). Depending upon the decisions in the next few decades, atmospheric CO$_2$ levels are projected to reach between 420 µatm (RCP2.6 scenario) and 985 µatm (RCP8.5 scenario) by 2100 (Caldeira and Wickett, 2005; Orr et al., 2005; IPCC, 2013a). To date approximately one third of the anthropogenic carbon emissions have been absorbed by the world’s oceans (Sabine et al., 2004). As atmospheric partial pressures of CO$_2$ (pCO$_2$) increase, CO$_2$ concentrations in the surface ocean also increase, resulting in increased bicarbonate and hydrogen...
ions but also in decreased carbonate ion concentrations and pH (Doney et al., 2009; Schulz et al., 2009). These changes, often termed ocean carbonation and acidification, can have both positive and negative effects for different phytoplankton species and groups (e.g. Engel et al. 2005; Feng et al. 2010; Moheimani and Borowitzka 2011; Endo et al. 2013; Schulz et al. 2017).

Associated with rising $pCO_2$ is the phenomenon of global warming. Under current scenarios, ocean temperatures are projected to increase from 2.6 to 4.8°C by 2100 (IPCC, 2013b). In addition, warming of the ocean is expected to enhance vertical stratification of the water column, resulting in a shoaling of the surface mixed layer and increasing overall light and decreasing nutrient availability in the euphotic zone (Bopp et al., 2001; Rost and Riebesell, 2004; Lefebvre et al., 2012). While increased light intensity and temperatures often accelerate growth in phytoplankton, excessive levels of light and temperature can cause damage to the photosynthetic apparatus and reduce effectiveness of enzymes thus decreasing growth (Powles, 1984; Rhodes et al., 1995; Crafts-Brandner and Salvucci, 2000; Zondervan et al., 2002; Helm et al., 2007; Pörtner and Farrell, 2008). Meanwhile, reduced nutrient availability could diminish overall productivity.

Coccolithophores play an important role in the marine carbon cycle through the precipitation of calcium carbonate, via calcification and the formation and settling of coccolith aggregates, as well as inorganic carbon fixation by photosynthesis (Rost and Riebesell, 2004; Broecker and Clark, 2009; Poulton et al., 2007, 2010). The coccolithophores *Emiliania huxleyi* and *Gephyrocapsa oceanica* are considered the most common species in present day coccolithophore communities. *E. huxleyi* is a ubiquitous coccolithophore having been observed from polar to equatorial regions, nutrient poor ocean gyres to nutrient rich upwelling systems, and from the bright sea surface down to 200m depth (McIntyre and Bé, 1967; Winter et al., 1994; Hagino and Okada, 2006; Boeckel and Baumann, 2008; Mohan et al., 2008; Henderiks et al., 2012). The wide tolerance of *E. huxleyi* to different environmental conditions is believed to be, at least partially, explained by the existence of several environmentally selected ecotypes and morphotypes within the species (Paasche, 2001; Cook et al., 2011). *G. oceanica* is also found in most oceanographic regions (McIntyre and Bé, 1967; Okada and Honjo, 1975; Roth and Coulbourn, 1982; Knappertsbusch, 1993; Eynaud et al., 1999; Andruleit et al., 2003; Saavedra-Pellitero et al., 2014), however with a tendency towards warmer waters with very few specimens observed below 13°C (McIntyre and Bé, 1967; Eynaud et al., 1999; Hagino et al., 2005). It is well established that rising $pCO_2$ will have significant effects on coccolithophorid growth, calcification and photosynthetic carbon fixation rates (Riebesell et al., 2000; Bach et al., 2011; Raven and Crawford, 2012). Furthermore, it has been shown that the response to rising $pCO_2$ of both *G. oceanica* and *E. huxleyi* is strongly influenced by light intensity and temperature (Zondervan et al., 2002; Schneider, 2004; De Bodt et al., 2010; Sett et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2015). However, to which degree species specific responses may shape individual distribution and abundance in the future ocean is far less clear.

This is because the distribution and abundance of a species is controlled by several factors. Firstly, each species has a specific range of environmental conditions under which they can successfully grow and reproduce called the fundamental niche. The fundamental niche describes the multi-dimensional combination of environmental conditions, such as temperature, light and $pCO_2$, required for survival of a species assuming no other species are present (Leibold, 1995). However, species do not exist
in a vacuum and where the niche of a species overlaps with another species interactions such as competition for resources and predation can occur (Hutchinson, 1957; Leibold, 1995), resulting in the realised niche (Leibold, 1995; Zurell et al., 2016). Hence it is not only important to determine how environmental change shapes the fundamental niche of individual species, but also consider the impact of niche overlap of different species in shaping the realised niches and hence community composition.

In the present study, we therefore compare species specific sensitivities and responses to combined light, temperature and carbonate chemistry changes of two of the most abundant coccolithophores *Emiliania huxleyi* and *Gephyrocapsa oceanica*. For that purpose, *E. huxleyi* was grown at twelve *p*CO$_2$ levels and five light intensities and growth, photosynthetic carbon fixation and calcification rates were measured in response. These data were then combined with a previously published data set on temperature and CO$_2$ interaction (Sett et al., 2014) and fitted to an analytical equation describing the combined effects of changing carbonate chemistry speciation, light and temperature. The resulting projections are then compared to those previously published for *G. oceanica* (Gafar et al., 2018) in an attempt to assess their individual success and potential realised niche in a changing ocean. Finally, we compare satellite derived particulate inorganic carbon estimates with a recently proposed metric for coccolithophore success on the community level, i.e. the temperature, light and carbonate chemistry speciation dependent calcium carbonate potential (Gafar et al., 2018).

## Methods

### 2.1 Experimental set-up

To accurately identify optimal conditions, tipping points and sensitivities of rates in response to changing CO$_2$, light and temperature, a broad range of experimental conditions are required. Hence, mono-specific cultures of the coccolithophore *E. huxleyi* (strain PML B92/11 morphology A isolated from Bergen, Norway) were grown in artificial seawater (ASW) at 20$^\circ$C and a salinity of 35 across a *p*CO$_2$ (partial pressure of CO$_2$) gradient from $\sim$25-7000 µatm. Light intensities were set to 50, 400 and 600 µmol photons m$^{-2}$s$^{-1}$ of photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) on a 16:8 h light-dark cycle in a Panasonic Versatile Environmental Test Chamber (MLR-352-PE). An additional set of cultures was also incubated at 1200 µmol photons m$^{-2}$s$^{-1}$ under a Philips SON-T HPS 600W light in a water-bath set to 20$^\circ$C. Light intensities at each bottle position for all experiments were measured using a LI-193 spherical sensor (LI-COR). Cells were pre-acclimated to experimental conditions for 8-12 generations. To account for differences in growth rate between the extreme high/low CO$_2$ treatments and the intermediate CO$_2$ treatments, initial cell densities chosen between 20-80 cells ml$^{-1}$. Treatments were run using a dilute-batch culture setup, mixed daily and harvested before dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC) consumption exceeded 10%.

### 2.2 Media

Artificial seawater (ASW) with a salinity of 35 was prepared according to Kester et al. (1967). ASW was enriched with f/8 trace metals (EDTA bound Fe, Cu, Mo, Zn, Co, Mn) and vitamins (thiamine, biotin, cyanocobalamin) according to Guillard
(1975), 64 $\mu$mol kg$^{-1}$ nitrate ($NO_3^-$), 4 $\mu$mol kg$^{-1}$ phosphate ($PO_4^{3-}$), 10 nmol kg$^{-1}$ SeO$_2$ and 1 ml kg$^{-1}$ of coastal seawater (collected at Shelly beach, Ballina, NSW, Australia) to prevent possible limitation by trace elements during culturing which had not been added to the artificial seawater mix. ASW medium was sterile-filtered (0.2 $\mu$m pore size, Whatman™ Polycap 75 AS) directly into autoclaved acclimation (0.5 L) or experimental (2 L) polycarbonate bottles (Nalgene®), leaving a small head-space for the adjustment of carbonate chemistry conditions.

2.3 Carbonate chemistry manipulation, measurements and calculation

Carbonate chemistry, i.e. total alkalinity (TA) and dissolved inorganic carbon (DIC), for each treatment was adjusted through calculated additions of hydrochloric acid (certified 3.571 mol L$^{-1}$ HCl, Merck) and Na$_2$CO$_3$ (Sigma-Aldrich, TraceSELECT® quality, dried for 2 hours at 240°C). Samples for TA and DIC measurements were taken at the end of the experiment. TA samples were filtered through GF/F filters, stored in the dark at 4°C and processed within 7 days (Dickson et al. 2007 SOP 1). TA samples were measured by potentiometric titration using a Metrohm Titroino Plus automatic titrator with 0.05 mol kg$^{-1}$ HCl as the titrant, adjusted to an ionic strength of 0.72 mol kg$^{-1}$ with NaCl (Dickson et al. 2007 SOP 3b).

DIC samples were sterile filtered by gentle pressure filtration with a peristaltic pump (0.2 $\mu$m pore size polycarbonate, Sartorius) into glass stoppered 100 ml bottles (Schott Duran) with overflow of at least 50% of bottle volume similar to Bockmon and Dickson (2014), sealed without head-space and stored in the dark at 4°C until processing within 7 days. To determine DIC, 2 ml of sample was analysed on a Marianda AIRICA system by acidification with 10% phosphoric acid to convert all DIC into CO$_2$, followed by extraction with N$_2$ (5.0) and concomitant CO$_2$ analysis with an IR detector (LI-COR LI-7000 CO$_2$/H$_2$O analyser). Both TA and DIC measurements were calibrated against Certified Reference Materials (batches 139, 141, 150) following Dickson (2010). Initial DIC and TA concentrations were estimated by adding measured total particulate carbon build-up during incubations to measured final DIC, and double the particulate inorganic carbon build-up during incubations to measured final TA concentrations. Carbonate chemistry speciation for each treatment was calculated from mean TA, mean DIC, measured temperature, salinity and [PO$_3^{4-}$] using the program CO2SYS (Lewis et al., 1998), the dissociation constants for carbonic acid determined by Lueker et al. (2000), K$_S$ for sulphuric acid determined by Dickson et al. (1990) and K$_B$ for boric acid following Uppström (1974).

2.4 Particulate organic and inorganic carbon

Sampling started approximately two hours after the onset of the light period and lasted no longer than 3 hours. Duplicate samples for total and particulate organic carbon (TPC and POC) were filtered (-200 mbar) onto GF/F filters (Whatman, pre-combusted at 500°C for 4 hours) and stored in glass petri-dishes (pre-combusted at 500°C for 4 hours) at -20°C until analysis. POC filters were placed in a desiccator above fuming (37%) HCl for 2 hours to remove all particulate inorganic carbon (PIC). All filters were dried overnight at 60°C, and analysed for carbon content and corresponding isotopic signature according to Sharp (1974) on an elemental analyser (Flash EA, Thermo Fisher) coupled to an isotope ratio mass spectrometer (IRMS, Delta V plus, Thermo Fisher). Particulate inorganic carbon (PIC) was calculated by subtracting measured POC from TPC.
2.5 Growth

Cell densities were measured every 3-4 days after the commencement of the experiment using a flow cytometer (Becton Dickinson FACSCalibur) on high flow settings (58 \( \mu l/\)minute) for two minutes per measurement. Living cells were detected by their red autofluorescence in relation to their orange fluorescence in scatter plots (FL3 vs. FL2). At both, the extreme low and high CO\(_2\) treatments, carbonate chemistry at the end of the pre-incubation phase can significantly deviate from initial and hence experimental treatment conditions due to enhanced air/water CO\(_2\) gas exchange during regular cell abundance monitoring. As a result, at some extreme CO\(_2\) levels there was an initial lag phase and therefore growth rates were calculated from densities only during the exponential part of the growth phase. After disregarding lag phase measurements, the majority of treatments had only two to three data-points in the exponential phase. As a result, specific growth rates were calculated as:

\[
\mu = \frac{\ln(C_f) - \ln(C_0)}{d}
\]  

where \(C_f\) represents cell densities at time of sampling, \(C_0\) represents cell densities at the beginning of the exponential growth phase, and \(d\) is the duration of the exponential phase in days. Calcification and photosynthetic rates were calculated by multiplying cellular PIC and POC quotas with respective growth rates.

2.6 Fitting procedure

Coccolithophore metabolic rate (MR) responses of growth, calcification and photosynthetic carbon fixation to combined changes in temperature, light and carbonate chemistry speciation can be described as follows (Gafar et al., 2018).

\[
MR(T,I,S,H) = \frac{k_1 SIT}{k_2 HT + k_3 SHT + k_4 I + k_5 SI + SIT + k_6 SHP^2 T^2}
\]  

where, \(k_1\) (pg C cell\(^{-1}\) day\(^{-1}\) or day\(^{-1}\)), \(k_2\) (\(\mu\)mol photons m\(^{-2}\)s\(^{-1}\)), \(k_3\) (kg mol\(^{-1}\) \(\mu\)mol photons m\(^{-2}\) s\(^{-1}\)), \(k_4\) (mol kg\(^{-1}\) \(\circ\)C), \(k_5\) (\(\circ\)C), \(k_6\) (kg mol\(^{-1}\) \(\mu\)mol photons\(^{-1}\) m\(^2\)s \(\circ\)C\(^{-1}\)) are fit coefficients, and \(MR(T,I,S,H)\) is the metabolic rate of photosynthesis, calcification or growth dependent on temperature (T), light intensity (I), substrate (\(S = [CO_2] + [HCO_3^-]\)) and \([H^+]\) (H). Inputs to the equation consisted of calculated CO\(_2\), HCO\(_3^-\) and H\(^+\) (H in total scale) concentrations, as well as measured metabolic rates, and light (I) and temperature (T) levels of all treatments (please see below for information on temperature and light transforms).

Data from this study (Tables S1, S2) and Sett et al. (2014) were fitted to Eq. (2) using the non-linear regression fit procedure nlinfit in MATLAB (the Mathworks). The reason only these studies were chosen, from the multitude of \(E.\) huxleyi datasets, is because 1) they use the same strain (PML B92/11), 2) they have the same nutrient conditions and 3) they use the same carbonate chemistry manipulation methods. Nevertheless, the two chosen studies provided light (six levels) and temperature (three levels) interactions over a broad carbonate chemistry speciation range. It is noted that in both studies the carbonate chemistry system
is coupled, meaning that a change in CO₂ results in a change in pH. This method reflects the changes in carbonate chemistry speciation due to ongoing ocean acidification (Bach et al., 2011, 2013). However, some studies have examined the effects of decoupled carbonate chemistry where CO₂ is changed at a constant pH. This approach is used to tease apart the independent effects of H⁺ and CO₂ on physiological responses (see Bach et al. 2013). While Eq. (2) can also be used to explain responses under decoupled carbonate chemistry conditions (see Gafar et al. 2018 for details), the fit obtained here is only valid for coupled CO₂/pH changes as no data from decoupled experiments (i.e. Bach et al. 2011) has been used. The reason for this being that Bach et al. (2011) does not contain data of temperature, light and carbonate chemistry interactions.

2.7 Temperature and light transformations

To reduce skew and to better accommodate certain features (i.e. light and temperature inhibition and limitation) both temperature and light data were transformed. Light data was square root transformed with light (I) = \sqrt{PFD}, where PFD is the photon flux density (µmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹) of an incubation. To accommodate for known temperature inhibition below 2°C and above 30°C (Rhodes et al., 1995; van Rijssel and Gieskes, 2002; Helm et al., 2007; Zhang et al., 2014) at a much narrower experimental range (10-20°C), the upper and lower limits for E. huxleyi growth were added into the equation with a general transform of T = (T_t - 2) × (30 - T_t), where T_t is the temperature of an incubation. To accurately express the onset of high temperature inhibition, the transform was further modified with a square root transform to give T = (T_t - 2) × \sqrt{(30 - T_t)}. This transform produces reasonable results when compared to the Eppley temperature envelope curve and the Norberg model (see Gafar et al. 2018).

2.8 Physiological rate response parameter estimations to changes in carbonate chemistry, temperature and light

Equation (2) was used to assess the combined effects of carbonate chemistry, temperature and light on growth, calcification and photosynthetic carbon fixation rates, with a focus on general physiological features, such as limitation and inhibition, as well as how much variability could be explained. For growth, photosynthetic carbon fixation and calcification rates optimum CO₂ concentrations for maximum production rates (V_max) and half saturation values were calculated at each experimental light and temperature level. K_1/2 values consisted of: K_1/2_{CO₂ sat} which is the CO₂ concentration (at certain T and I) at which rates are saturated to half the maximum, and K_1/2_{CO₂ inhib}, which is the CO₂ concentration (at certain T and I) at which high proton concentrations reduce physiological rates to half the maximum. Fitting results (R², fit coefficients, p-values, F-values and degrees of freedom), as well as V_max, K_1/2 and CO₂ optima are presented in Tables 1, 2 and 3. Species specific differences in response to changing carbonate chemistry, temperature and light were assessed by comparing the above fit to that recently produced for Gephyrocapsa oceanica (Gafar et al., 2018).

2.9 Niche comparison

To examine the potential of ongoing ocean change to influence realised niches and hence individual success, ranges for light and temperature where both Emiliania huxleyi and Gephyrocapsa oceanica might be expected to co-exist were selected (i.e.
50-1000 \( \mu \text{mol photons m}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1} \) and 8-30\(^\circ\)C. \( E. \text{huxleyi} \) and \( G. \text{oceanica} \) were chosen for comparison as they are currently the only two species with response data over a range of carbonate chemistry, temperature and light conditions. Growth rates were selected as the point of comparison because they can be used as a measure of relative abundance and therefore dominance of a species, and because growth rates largely control carbon fixation rates. To assess competitive ability, and the potential realised niche, the difference in growth rates between the species was visualised using contour plots.

The effect of temperature on growth rates and hence potential dominance was then compared to phytoplankton community data from global surface sediment samples above the lysocline (McIntyre and Bé, 1967; Chen and Shieh, 1982; Roth and Coulbourn, 1982; Knappertsbusch, 1993; Andruleit and Rogalla, 2002; Boeckel et al., 2006; Fernando et al., 2007; Saavedra-Pellitero et al., 2014). As \( E. \text{huxleyi} \) and \( G. \text{oceanica} \) have similar average numbers of coccoliths per cells, 28 and 21, respectively (Samtleben and Schroder, 1992; Knappertsbusch, 1993; Baumann et al., 2000; Boeckel and Baumann, 2008; Patil et al., 2014), the abundance ratio of \( E. \text{huxleyi} \) to \( G. \text{oceanica} \) coccoliths was here assumed to be a suitable proxy for species dominance. It is noted that \( E. \text{huxleyi} \) has been found to produce excess coccoliths towards the end of blooms when inorganic nutrients become limiting for cellular growth (Balch et al., 1992; Holligan et al., 1993; Paasche, 1998), which would result in an over-estimate of \( E. \text{huxleyi} \) dominance in our study. Nevertheless, given that the coccoliths ratio varies orders of magnitude in modern marine sediments, none of our general conclusions should be affected. Temperature for each sampling site was retrieved from the NOAA 1° resolution annual temperature climatology (Boyer et al., 2013).

2.10 Global calcium carbonate production potential

While our fit equation has previously explained variability in lab experiments quite well (Gafar et al., 2018), natural systems are much more complex, with the interactions of dozens of variables including temperature, light, nutrients, predation and competition all influencing productivity (Behrenfeld, 2014). As such we wanted to examine how projections of productivity using our relatively simple equation compared to coccolithophorid productivity patterns observed in natural systems. Productivity can be defined in a few ways, traditionally, changes in cellular calcification rates, in response to ocean change, have been used as indicator for the potential success of coccolithophores in the future ocean. However, the exponential nature of phytoplankton growth amplifies even small differences in cellular growth rates, when applied on the community level. For instance, a phytoplankton bloom occurring over one week at a growth rate of 1.0 \text{d}^{-1} and a starting cell density of 50 cells \text{ml}^{-1} would lead to a peak density of about 55,000 cells \text{ml}^{-1}. This is in stark contrast to conditions where growth is only 10% lower as peak cell densities, and hence biomass and PIC standing stock, will only be half.

Recently, a new metric was proposed, the \( \text{CaCO}_3 \) production potential (CCPP) which 1) should be a better representation of potential coccolithophore success on the community level and 2) can be tested against modern observations of surface ocean \( \text{CaCO}_3 \) distribution (Gafar et al., 2018). CCPP is defined as the amount of \( \text{CaCO}_3 \) produced within a week by a coccolithophore community (with a set starting cell count) for a certain environmental condition, calculated from Eq. (2) derived growth rates and inorganic carbon quotas. Inorganic carbon quotas are calculated as the quotient of calcification and growth
rates. As CCPP is calculated from calcification and growth rates, it accounts for the individual effects of temperature, light and carbonate chemistry on growth rates and on carbon production. It was for these reasons that CCPP was the metric chosen for comparison.

Provided values for temperature, light, substrate (CO$_2$ + HCO$_3^-$) and hydrogen ion concentrations (H) for the surface mixed layer, coccolithophore CaCO$_3$ production potential can be projected for the world oceans. CCPP can then be cautiously evaluated against and compared to satellite derived global particulate inorganic carbon concentration estimates (PIC$_s$). As inorganic nutrients are a critical factor influencing phytoplankton abundance, and especially bloom formation, in the ocean (Browning et al., 2017) nitrate concentrations were also included in the analysis (for details see below). As a result, climatological datasets consisted of, World Ocean Atlas 2013 v2 (WOA) nitrate concentrations at 1° resolution (Boyer et al., 2013); SeaWiFS mixed layer depth (MLD 2° resolution) from de Boyer Montégut et al. (2004); surface photosynthetically available radiation (PAR $\mu$mol photons m$^{-2}$s$^{-1}$ 9 km resolution) from the Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS)-Aqua (NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, 2014b); diffuse attenuation coefficients at 490nm (9 km resolution) from Pascal (2013); and NOAA dissolved inorganic carbon, $p$CO$_2$, pH (total scale), [CO$_3^{2-}$], temperature and salinity (4x5° resolution) from Takahashi et al. (2014). A 9 km resolution climatology for particulate inorganic carbon (PIC$_s$) concentration (mol PIC m$^{-3}$) was also retrieved from the Moderate Resolution Imaging Spectroradiometer (MODIS)-Aqua (NASA Goddard Space Flight Center, 2014a). Once acquired, all datasets were interpolated to a 1° resolution.

Hydrogen ion concentrations were calculated as $10^{-pH}$, CO$_2$, after conversion of $p$CO$_2$ to $f$CO$_2$ as described in CO2SYS (Lewis et al., 1998), as $[fCO_2]*K_0$ (with K$0$ being the temperature and salinity dependent Henry's constant), HCO$_3^-$ as $[HCO_3^-] = DIC - ([CO_2] + [CO_2^{2-}])$, and substrate (S) as the sum of CO$_2$ and HCO$_3^-$ concentrations. Mean mixed layer nitrate concentrations were calculated by determining concentrations for each depth and averaging from surface to the mixed layer depth for each grid cell. Mean mixed layer irradiance was calculated in one-meter depth increments for each grid cell as

$$I = \sum_{i=1}^{MLD} \exp^{-k_d(i)} * I_0$$

where $I$ is the average PAR ($\mu$mol photons m$^{-2}$s$^{-1}$), $k_d$ is the attenuation coefficient (m$^{-1}$), MLD denotes the mixed layer depth in meters, and $I_0$ is the incident PAR at the surface ($\mu$mol photons m$^{-2}$s$^{-1}$).

Global coverage of oceanic nutrient concentrations are often limited to only a few macro-nutrients (nitrate, silicate, phosphate). However, concentrations of these nutrients are often strongly correlated (e.g. phosphate and nitrate in Boyer et al. 2013). To ensure there was sufficient nutrients to support the level of production estimated by CCPP, we opted to use a single nutrient, i.e. nitrate, in combination with a simple scaling metric. We first assumed a Redfieldian ratio of 106:16 C:N to determine the maximum POC production possible from the amount of available nitrate. We then calculated the amount of PIC which would be co-produced based on a mean PIC:POC. The average PIC:POC of *E. huxleyi* and *G. oceanica* was calculated as the average
of all treatments between 300-1000 µatm from Sett et al. (2014), Zhang et al. (2015) and this study. Based on these averages (PIC:POC of 0.8 and 1.35 for <i>E. huxleyi</i> and <i>G. oceanica</i>, respectively), and assuming Redfieldian production a corresponding PIC:PON of 5.3 and 8.94 was calculated. Hence, maximum CaCO₃ production potential (CCPP<sub>max</sub>) in a grid cell would be 5.3 and 8.94 times the nitrate concentration for <i>E. huxleyi</i> and <i>G. oceanica</i> respectively. If estimated CCPP for a cell exceeded CCPP<sub>max</sub>, and therefore the nitrate required to produce that much PIC, then it was replaced with the CCPP<sub>max</sub> value. If CCPP was less than C<sub>max</sub> then no further changes were applied.

To ensure that mean global CCPP and mean global PIC<sub>s</sub> would be of the same magnitude, starting cell counts for CCPP calculations were set at 1 ml<sup>−1</sup> for <i>E. huxleyi</i> alone, 0.25 ml<sup>−1</sup> for <i>G. oceanica</i> alone and 0.25 ml<sup>−1</sup> for each species when combined. To allow comparison, CCPP and PIC<sub>s</sub> were both converted to units of µmol PIC L<sup>−1</sup>. All data were then averaged for Austral summer/Boreal winter (December-February) and Austral winter/Boreal summer (June-August). Austral summer/Boreal winter and Austral winter/Boreal summer were chosen as they provide prominent differences between minimum and maximum PIC, while spring and autumn do not. A direct comparison between PIC<sub>s</sub> and CCPP was achieved by splitting results into major ocean biogeographical provinces following Gregg and Casey (2007) with the single change of adjusting the Antarctic and the north ocean regions to start at 45° as in Longhurst (2007) rather than 40° (Figure 8C). For each major province, the total amount of PIC<sub>s</sub> and CCPP for all comparable grid cells were calculated for Austral summer/Boreal winter and Austral winter/Boreal summer. For comparison, values for each basin and season were then converted into percentages of annual global (global summer plus global winter) PIC<sub>s</sub> or CCPP production. Agreement between the satellite and CCPP estimates was then assessed using a linear correlation. While three CCPP scenarios are presented above, only the results with the highest correlation to satellite PIC is shown and discussed below.

### 3 Results

The fit equation (Eq. 2) was able to explain up to 85% of growth, 80% of calcification and 73% of photosynthetic rate variability in <i>E. huxleyi</i> across a broad range of carbonate chemistry (25-4000 µatm), light (50-1200 µmol photons m<sup>−2</sup>s<sup>−1</sup>) and temperature (10-20°C) conditions (Table 1).

#### 3.1 <i>E. huxleyi</i> responses to changing carbonate chemistry: CO₂ and H⁺

Based on fits of Eq. (2), growth, calcification and photosynthetic carbon fixation rates all had a similar optimum curve response to the broad changes in carbonate chemistry speciation (Figure 1) regardless of temperature and light intensities. Growth, calcification and photosynthetic carbon fixation rates required similar CO₂ concentrations, with differences of less than 3 µmol kg<sup>−1</sup> under comparable temperature and light conditions, to stimulate rates to half the maximum, K<sub>1/2 CO₂ sat</sub> (Table 2, Table 3). Optimum CO₂ concentrations for calcification (8.4-19.1 µmol kg<sup>−1</sup>) were slightly lower than for photosynthesis (9.9-52.1 µmol kg<sup>−1</sup>) or growth (15-29.1 µmol kg<sup>−1</sup> Table 2, Table 3). At CO₂ concentrations beyond the optimum, a much higher
sensitivity to increasing $[H^+]$, i.e. $K_{\text{c}^{\text{inh}}\text{hib}}$ was observed for calcification (47.4-118.5 \(\mu\)mol kg\(^{-1}\)) than for photosynthesis (73.0-250+ \(\mu\)mol kg\(^{-1}\)) or growth rates (157.7-250+ \(\mu\)mol kg\(^{-1}\)). 

3.2 \textit{E. huxleyi} responses to temperature

The effect of temperature on rates was dependent upon CO\(_2\), with the greatest effect observed at optimum CO\(_2\) concentrations (Figure 1). Increasing temperature increased maximum growth rates ($V_{\text{max}}$) up to twofold, photosynthetic rates up to 43% and calcification rates up to 52% (Figure 1, Table 2) under optimal CO\(_2\) concentrations. CO\(_2\) half saturation concentrations ($K_{\text{c}^{\text{sat}}\text{at}}$) were insensitive to temperature (Table 2). However, under increasing temperatures CO\(_2\) concentrations for both optimal growth and for inhibition of rates to half the maximum ($K_{\text{c}^{\text{inh}}\text{hib}}$) decreased (Table 2).

3.3 \textit{E. huxleyi} responses to light

Light intensities affected all physiological rates, with the greatest effect generally being observed at CO\(_2\) concentrations at or above the optimum (Figure 2). Between 50 and 1200 \(\mu\)mol photons m\(^{-2}\)s\(^{-1}\), calcification rates doubled, photosynthetic rates tripled and growth rates increased around 36% (Figure 2, Table 3). Both optimum CO\(_2\) and CO\(_2\) concentrations at which rates were half saturated ($K_{\text{c}^{\text{sat}}\text{at}}$) increased slightly with increasing light intensity (Table 3). CO\(_2\) concentrations required to inhibit rates to half of maximum ($K_{\text{c}^{\text{inh}}\text{hib}}$) for calcification and photosynthesis increased with increasing light intensity, while those for growth increased from 50-150 \(\mu\)mol photons m\(^{-2}\)s\(^{-1}\) before decreasing with further increases in light (Table 3).

4 Discussion

4.1 Responses to changing carbonate chemistry: CO\(_2\) and H\(^+\)

Rates of photosynthesis, calcification and growth in coccolithophores are strongly influenced by CO\(_2\) (Bach et al., 2011; Sett et al., 2014; Zhang et al., 2015). Increasing CO\(_2\) concentrations resulted in enhanced rates up to an optimum level beyond which they then declined again. This pattern in growth, photosynthetic carbon fixation and calcification rates has been observed previously for several coccolithophore species (Sett et al., 2014; Bach et al., 2015). The availability of substrate (CO\(_2\) and HCO\(_3^-\)) was suggested as the factor influencing the increase in rates on the left side of the optimum, while the proton concentration ($[H^+]$) was the factor most likely driving declines to the right side of the optimum (Bach et al., 2011, 2015).

Of the two species, \textit{E. huxleyi} has a higher CO\(_2\) optimum than \textit{G. oceanica} (Tables 2, 3 and S3, Gafar et al. 2018) for all rates and under most conditions. This could suggest that \textit{E. huxleyi} has a slightly higher substrate requirement than \textit{G. oceanica}. However, considering that \textit{G. oceanica} has both a larger cell size and higher carbon quotas per cell the opposite would be expected (Sett et al., 2014; Bach et al., 2015). An explanation for achieving maximum rates only at higher CO\(_2\) concentrations in \textit{E. huxleyi}, in comparison to \textit{G. oceanica} despite a lower inorganic carbon demand, might be a less efficient or capable
carbon uptake/concentrating mechanism. Alternatively, a decreased sensitivity to high [H\(^+\)] in *E. huxleyi*, in comparison to *G. oceanica* (see below), would lead to a shift in the optimum towards higher CO\(_2\) as well and might be a more likely explanation.

Of the three rates, calcification in *E. huxleyi* had both the lowest CO\(_2\) requirement and the highest sensitivity to increasing [H\(^+\)] (Tables 3 and 2). This is a pattern previously observed for *G. oceanica* under varying temperature and light conditions (Gafar et al. 2018, See also Table S3). As evidenced by higher K\(_{2CO2inhib}\) values for all processes, *E. huxleyi* also appears less sensitive to the inhibiting effects of increasing [H\(^+\)] than *G. oceanica* (i.e. K\(_{2CO2inhib}\) = 47-250 µmol kg\(^{-1}\) versus 25-99 µmol kg\(^{-1}\) for *G. oceanica* depending on light intensities or K\(_{2CO2inhib}\) = 62-250 µmol kg\(^{-1}\) versus 25-130 µmol kg\(^{-1}\) for *G. oceanica* depending on temperature) (Tables 2, 3, S3, Gafar et al. 2018). This also supports earlier results in a model analysis by Bach et al. (2015) where *E. huxleyi* reacted less sensitively to higher CO\(_2\) (and [H\(^+\)]) than *G. oceanica*.

A lower sensitivity of rates to changes in carbonate chemistry speciation, in particular calcification rates, could be explained by the lower degree of calcification in *E. huxleyi* (PIC:POC ratios 0.24-1.38) when compared to *G. oceanica* (PIC:POC ratios 0.84-2.44) (Sett et al., 2014). Higher rates of calcification result in greater production of intracellular H\(^+\) (Ca\(^{2+}\) + HCO\(_3^-\) ⇌ CaCO\(_3\) + H\(^+\)), potentially decreasing [CO\(_3^{2-}\)] in the coccolith producing vesicle and hence the CaCO\(_3\) saturation state (Bach et al., 2015). Furthermore, increased [H\(^+\)] has been found to result in declines in [HCO\(_3^-\)] uptake, the primary carbon source for calcification (Kottmeier et al., 2016).

### 4.2 Responses to temperature

Temperature was observed to have few modulating effects on CO\(_2\) responses in *E. huxleyi*. Changes in temperature produced little (<1 µmol kg\(^{-1}\)) change in CO\(_2\) substrate half-saturation (K\(_{2CO2sat}\)) levels, at least within the measured range (Figure 1, Table 2). CO\(_2\) requirements for optimum rates tended to slightly decrease with warming temperatures. Similar results were observed for *G. oceanica* (Gafar et al., 2018). This indicates that while overall rates change, carbon uptake mechanisms appear to scale to maintain internal substrate concentrations and thus cellular requirements regardless of temperature conditions.

In contrast, the inhibition of rates by rising [H\(^+\)] i.e. K\(_{2CO2inhib}\) was more sensitive to temperature. The CO\(_2\) concentration at which rates were reduced to half the maximum increased with decreasing temperatures (Table 2). These results were also observed for *G. oceanica* which had a lower sensitivity to increasing [H\(^+\)] at the lowest tested temperature (Gafar et al., 2018). This also agrees with De Bodt et al. (2010) in which a greater decline in calcification rate was observed with increasing CO\(_2\) at 18\(^\circ\)C than at 13\(^\circ\)C. These results indicate that at least some coccolithophores may be less sensitive to high CO\(_2\) levels at lower temperatures. As a result, both *G. oceanica* and *E. huxleyi* may become more vulnerable to the negative effects of ocean acidification as ocean temperatures increase due to climate change.
4.3 Responses to light

The sensitivity of all rates in *E. huxleyi* to changing carbonate chemistry, in particular increasing \([H^+]\), was clearly modulated by light intensity (Figure 2), agreeing with earlier findings (Zondervan et al., 2002; Feng et al., 2008; Gao et al., 2009; Rokitta and Rost, 2012; Zhang et al., 2015). \(CO_2\) half-saturation (\(K_{\frac{1}{2} CO_2 sat}\)) for all rates were insensitive to increasing light intensities (Table S3). This agrees with results for *G. oceanica* which also displayed little change in \(CO_2\) half-saturation concentrations with increasing light (Table S3). Increasing light intensity induced increases in \(CO_2\) optima in all rates, however these changes were small (<10 \(\mu mol kg^{-1}\)) for calcification and growth rates. This contrasts with *G. oceanica* for which a distinct decrease in optimal \(CO_2\) concentrations for growth rates with increasing light intensities was observed (Table S3). However, *G. oceanica* projections are based on a dataset with only three \(CO_2\) concentrations (~16, 31, 45 \(\mu mol kg^{-1}\)). As such, it is difficult to determine how robust the estimates of \(CO_2\) optima and half-saturation requirements may be for this species (Zhang et al., 2015).

In *E. huxleyi* the relationship between \(H^+\) sensitivity and light intensity was the same for the three rates. Calcification and photosynthetic carbon fixation and growth rates were most sensitive to \(H^+\) at the lowest (50 \(\mu mol photons m^{-2}s^{-1}\)) and growth rates were also slightly more sensitive at the highest (1200 \(\mu mol photons m^{-2}s^{-1}\)) light intensities (Table 3). This result is in part due to an underestimation of growth rates by the fitting equation under high \(CO_2\) conditions at 50 \(\mu mol photons m^{-2}s^{-1}\) light (Figure 2). However, it may be that sub-optimal light intensities add additional stress to the cells resulting in them having less resources with which to handle the stress of increasing high \([H^+]\). Hence rates are lower, but also appear more sensitive to changing carbonate chemistry. These findings agree with findings by Rokitta and Rost (2012) where a diploid *E. huxleyi* strain became insensitive to the effects of rising \(CO_2\) (380 vs. 1000 \(\mu atm\)) when light intensities were increased from 50 to 300 \(\mu mol photons m^{-2}s^{-1}\). However, this differs to *G. oceanica* which, with rising light intensities, had no change in sensitivity for calcification rates, a decrease in sensitivity for photosynthesis and an increase in sensitivity for growth rates (Table S3). Again, although this could be indicative for species specific differences in sensitivity, it may also be a result of the low number of \(CO_2\) treatments used in the light data of *G. oceanica* (see Zhang et al. 2015).

4.4 *E. huxleyi* and *G. oceanica* a niche comparison

In the future ocean \(CO_2\), temperature and light availability are all expected to change (Rost and Riebesell, 2004; IPCC, 2013b). Levels of \(fCO_2\) are expected to reach as high as 985 \(\mu atm\) by the end of the century with concomitant rise in global ocean temperature of up to 4.8°C (RCP8.5 scenario IPCC 2013a, b). Light intensities in the surface ocean are also expected to increase as a result of mixed layer depth shoaling (Rost and Riebesell, 2004). By calculating and comparing growth rates for *E. huxleyi* and *G. oceanica* over a range of environmental conditions, it is possible to differentiate between the fundamental (physiological) niche of a species and its potentially realised niche when in competition with others. For this purpose, light, temperature and \(CO_2\) ranges were restricted to those where both species would be expected to co-occur, i.e. 20-1000 \(\mu mol photons m^{-2}s^{-1}\), 8-30°C and 25-4000 \(\mu atm\), respectively. The calculated difference in growth rates in response to \(CO_2\) and temperature does
not significantly change with light intensity (Figure 3 and 4). It should be noted, however, that light intensity might modify observed growth rate differences for other strains of the same species than used here as they can possess different sensitivities and requirements (i.e. Langer et al. 2009; Müller et al. 2015).

4.4.1 Fundamental niche

Experimentally, *E. huxleyi* has been found to grow in a range of ∼6 to 2500 μmol photons m⁻²s⁻¹ with high light resulting in no inhibition of maximum rates in some strains, and up to 20% reduction in others (Balch et al., 1992; van Bleijswijk et al., 1994; Nielsen, 1995; Nanninga and Tyrrell, 1996; van Rijssel and Gieskes, 2002). In contrast, *G. oceanica* is more sensitive in a similar experimental range of ∼6-2400 μmol photons m⁻²s⁻¹ with maximum rates inhibited by up to 38% at high light intensities (Larsen, 2012). Light intensities below 6 μmol photons m⁻²s⁻¹ for *E. huxleyi* and *G. oceanica* resulted in no growth for both species (van Bleijswijk et al., 1994; van Rijssel and Gieskes, 2002; Larsen, 2012). So, while *G. oceanica* is more sensitive to high light, the potential upper light limit for growth in both species is beyond naturally occurring maxima. Within this light range both species show a similar increase in projected absolute growth rates of 0-1.57 (d⁻¹) for *E. huxleyi* and 0-1.51 (d⁻¹) for *G. oceanica* (based on Figure 4).

*E. huxleyi* has been successfully cultured at pCO₂ levels between ∼20-5600 μatm, while *G. oceanica* has been successfully cultured at pCO₂ levels of ∼20-3400 μatm (Sett et al., 2014). Again, the upper tolerance limit for growth in both is not known and well above what is expected for most ocean systems. Responses in projected growth rates with rising CO₂ differ between the two species with *G. oceanica* rates dropping to 50% of maximum at fCO₂ levels above ∼1760 μatm while *E. huxleyi* drops to 50% of maximum at ∼5950 μatm. In terms of temperature *E. huxleyi* has a broader niche of 3-29°C in comparison to *G. oceanica* at 10-32°C. Within this temperature niche both species again show a similar change in absolute growth rates of 0-1.40 (d⁻¹) for *G. oceanica* and 0-1.43 (d⁻¹) for *E. huxleyi* (based on figure 5).

It should be noted however, that although niche ranges and maximum rates are similar for both species, different requirements (K¹₂sat and sensitivities (K¹²inhib) will lead to different actual rates at a specific environmental condition. This becomes evident when examining the temperature, light and CO₂ niches to find a combination of conditions at which growth rate for each species is at its maximum. For *E. huxleyi* maximum growth rates of 1.62 (d⁻¹) are projected at ∼970 μmol photons m⁻²s⁻¹ light, ∼640 μatm CO₂ and 20.2°C. In contrast, the conditions for optimal growth rates of 1.52 (d⁻¹) for *G. oceanica* are achieved at ∼500 μmol photons m⁻²s⁻¹ light, ∼430 μatm CO₂ and 24.4°C. Differences in sensitivity and therefore performance under certain conditions will influence the potentially realised niche of the species. For example, *E. huxleyi* is projected to reach higher growth rates than *G. oceanica* under a broader range of temperature, light and CO₂ conditions (Figures 3, 4 and 5), supporting the notion that *E. huxleyi* is rather a generalist.
4.4.2 Potentially realised niche

Temperature and CO$_2$ both have substantial effects on the potentially realised niche of *E. huxleyi* and *G. oceanica* (Figures 4 and 5). In contrast, light intensity has very little effect (Figure 3). *E. huxleyi* appears able to exceed growth rates of *G. oceanica* at temperatures below 22°C under most CO$_2$ and light conditions (Figures 4 and 5). A similar difference in temperature preferences has also been observed in New Zealand isolates of *Gephyrocapsa oceanica* and *Emiliania huxleyi* with *G. oceanica* and *E. huxleyi* growing between 10-25°C and 5-25°C at optimum temperatures of 22°C and 20°C, respectively (Rhodes et al., 1995). While these results are based on single strain laboratory experiments, there is evidence that such differences in temperature sensitivity may also hold true in the modern ocean. For example, data gathered from multiple phytoplankton monitoring cruises indicate that while both species are found at higher temperatures, *G. oceanica* largely vanishes from the assemblage at temperatures below 13°C (McIntyre and Bé, 1967; Eynaud et al., 1999; Hagino et al., 2005). However, phytoplankton monitoring cruises can be seasonally biased and represent a single point in time.

Another way to relate our niche comparison to today’s oceans is through surface sediments. Surface sediment samples represent an integrated signal of the composition of a phytoplankton community over time and can therefore be a more suitable proxy of species dominance in a certain location. Global surface sediment data on *G. oceanica* and *E. huxleyi* coccolith abundance indicate that the dominance of these two species is influenced by temperature, particularly in the Pacific Ocean (Figure 6). It is noted, however, that samples from the south-equatorial to equatorial Atlantic Ocean in Boeckel et al. (2006) do not follow the general temperature trend observed in other ocean basins (Figure 6). In this location it appears that *G. oceanica* abundance is driven more by increasing nutrient concentrations than by temperature. It seems oceanic upwelling in this region is driving a different relationship between *E. huxleyi* and *G. oceanica* than observed in other areas. Globally the data suggests that dominance switches from *E. huxleyi* to *G. oceanica* at temperatures above 25°C which is similar to our projections. While both species have a similar upper limit to their fundamental thermal niche (i.e. Rhodes et al. 1995), it would appear that the higher minimum temperature of *G. oceanica*, combined with its greater tolerance for high temperatures, restricts its realised niche to the upper end of the temperature range (Figures 4 and 6).

CO$_2$ level also influences the relative growth rates of *E. huxleyi* and *G. oceanica*. Under current day levels of ~400 µatm, *E. huxleyi* would dominate at temperatures up to 22°C (Figure 5). However, at higher and lower CO$_2$ levels, *E. huxleyi* begins to outgrow *G. oceanica* at progressively higher temperatures. At the same time, combined warming in a future ocean would partially mitigate the higher CO$_2$ sensitivity of *G. oceanica* (Figure 5). Nevertheless, over the naturally observed temperature range, *G. oceanica*’s niche would be expected to decrease towards higher CO$_2$ levels.

This comparison only considers the responses of single strains of *E. huxleyi* and *G. oceanica*. Considering multiple strains, from diverse ocean regions, would aid our study in describing the fundamental and realised niches for a species in more general terms. However, even though our realised niche projections are based on only one strain for each species, they do
generally agree with experimental observations of other strains, and with planktonic and sediment observations of each species as a whole. This indicates that the differences in requirements and sensitivities of the two species as described here are large enough to be revealed by choosing only one representative for each species. Another consideration to be made is the fact that coccolithophore communities can be made up of dozens of species (McIntyre and Bé, 1967; Winter and Siesser, 1994), all of which are likely to have different preferences for and sensitivities to changes in \( f_{CO_2} \), temperature and light. Shifts in plankton community structure, as a result of different species and group preferences, in response to environmental change have already been observed in the past (Beaugrand et al., 2013; Rivero-Calle et al., 2015), while simulations also suggest shifts in plankton community under future climate conditions (Dutkiewicz et al., 2015). Community structure shifts and changes in coccolithophore species composition are likely to alter ocean biogeochemistry with implications for ocean-atmosphere \( CO_2 \) partitioning.

### 4.5 Global calcium carbonate production potential

The \( CaCO_3 \) production potential (CCPP) is based on cellular \( CaCO_3 \) quotas and growth rates calculated for a given set of temperature, light and carbonate chemistry conditions (see section 2.10). Here we test how this measure for productivity compares to estimated surface ocean \( CaCO_3 \) content observed by satellite imaging (PICs). At this point it is important to remember that CCPP does not account for top-down controls such as grazing or viral attack (Holligan et al., 1993; Wilson et al., 2002; Behrenfeld, 2014), and bottom-up controls such as competition for macro or micro-nutrients (Zondervan, 2007; Monteiro et al., 2016; Browning et al., 2017). Thus, a potential for high \( CaCO_3 \) production is not necessarily realised when exposed to different top-down and bottom up pressures.

Calculated CCPP of \( E. huxleyi \) alone (Figure 7) for the global ocean visually reproduces the mid-latitude production belts, however at lower latitudes than satellite PIC estimates. This agrees with the NEMO and OCCAM models of coccolithophore dominance (Sinha et al., 2010) and the chlorophyll a NASA Ocean Biogeochemical Model (NOBM) model for the Southern hemisphere and central North Atlantic provinces (Gregg and Casey, 2007). CCPP also estimates seasonal changes with higher productivity during summer in both hemispheres (see figure 7A and D vs. B and E). This pattern is driven mainly by temperature, which influences the latitudinal location of the bands, and light intensity, which influences whether the northern or southern band of productivity is stronger in a season. Nutrients are an essential, and in the ocean often limiting, requirement for biological productivity (Kattner et al., 2004; Browning et al., 2017). As such it would be expected that nutrients should also be strongly influencing seasonal patterns of PIC production. However, with the starting cell concentrations for the CCPP calculations chosen here, there was sufficient nitrate to support the projected production in most ocean regions (Figure 7C and F). High temperatures drove relatively low productivity in the equatorial regions in agreement with satellite PIC. Similar low levels of coccolithophores are estimated in Sinha et al. (2010) in the equatorial Pacific and Atlantic with the mixed phytoplankton functional group dominating with or without coccolithophores due to low iron and moderate phosphate concentrations and in Gregg and Casey (2007) for the equatorial Indian and Atlantic provinces. CCPP underestimates production at cold high latitudes, in particular in the Southern Ocean, when compared to the satellite. Similar low levels of coccolithophores
have been projected in the Southern Ocean in Gregg and Casey (2007) (very low coccolithophore chlorophyll a), Krumhardt et al. (2017) (growth rates at or close to zero which equates to low to zero CCPP) and Sinha et al. (2010) (high nutrients resulting in coccolithophores being dominated by diatoms). For the Southern Ocean, it has been suggested that satellite PIC concentrations in subantarctic waters are overestimated by a factor of 2-3 while those in Antarctic waters may be even more so (Holligan et al., 2010; Balch et al., 2011; Trull et al., 2018). The fact that three other global estimates, based on different sets of environmental parameters, all estimate very little PIC productivity in the Southern Ocean seems to support this theory. However, there are also specifically cold adapted strains of *Emiliania huxleyi* found at high latitudes which at least partially could explain discrepancies between the mentioned model projections and satellite derived PIC concentrations (see also below).

In Austral winter/Boreal summer CCPP (for *E. huxleyi*) and satellite PIC estimates closely match ($R^2=0.73 \ F=26.78 \ p<0.01$ slope=1.03) with low PIC in the South and central South provinces, very low PIC in the equatorial, North Indian and Antarctic provinces and higher PIC in the North central Pacific, North Pacific and North Atlantic provinces (Figure 8A). In Austral summer/Boreal winter CCPP (for *E. huxleyi*) and satellite PIC estimates in individual ocean provinces are also generally of overall good agreement but with a much lower slope ($R^2=0.85 \ F=50.01 \ p<0.01$ slope=0.32). Both CCPP and satellite PIC estimates for Austral summer/Boreal winter are low in all equatorial and North ocean provinces with slightly higher CCPP and satellite PIC production for the North central provinces and higher production in the South and South central provinces (Figure 8B). The reason for the relatively small slope of 0.32 in Austral summer, meaning that CCPP overestimates the total production by a factor of three, are the high values of satellite derived PIC in the Antarctic province. To rectify this issue, a simple scaling factor could be introduced.

Despite having similar PIC patterns, overall PIC estimates can differ significantly between CCPP and PICs in some provinces. These provinces can be divided into two groups characterized by either greater or lesser PIC estimates than those observed by satellite (Figure 8). The mid-latitude provinces of central South and central North Pacific and Atlantic and central South Indic in the summer season belong to the former, with higher CCPP than PICs. Recently, low phytoplankton biomass in these subtropical gyre systems have been hypothesized to be the result of strong grazing pressure despite high cellular growth rates (Behrenfeld, 2014), lending an explanation of why CCPP is higher than satellite PIC standing stocks. The lower PIC standing stocks estimated from the satellite could also be the result of other phytoplankton functional groups, such as diatoms, taking a comparatively bigger nutrient share (Iglesias-Rodríguez et al., 2002) thereby leaving less for PIC production by coccolithophores.

In contrast, in Austral summer/Boreal winter in the Antarctic and Austral winter/Boreal summer in the North Pacific, CCPP is smaller than satellite PIC estimates (Figure 8). *E. huxleyi*, which our projections are based off, has been found to dominate assemblages in polar areas, particularly in the southern hemisphere (Okada and Honjo, 1973; Gravalosa et al., 2008; Mohan et al., 2008; Charalampopoulos et al., 2016). The strains of *E. huxleyi* found here are special cold-adapted ones which can survive at temperatures as low as -1.7°C in the Antarctic (Cubillos et al., 2007) and -0.9°C in the Arctic (Charalampopoulos et al., 2016).
et al., 2011)). As our CCPP is based on a temperate coccolithophore strain, lacking the cold adapted ones, our projections underestimate coccolithophore productivity in these areas. Additionally, differences in CCPP and satellite PIC in the Southern Ocean may also be connected to satellite overestimation of PIC at high southern latitudes (see above).

Comparing satellite PIC and CCPP in different oceanic provinces (Figure 8C) E. huxleyi alone provided the greatest agreement between both. The addition of G. oceanica to CCPP calculations negatively affected correlations with satellite PIC. This is counter-intuitive as one would expect increasing correlation of CCPP with satellite PIC as more species are used for the projection of the former. Indeed, estimates based on a combination of E. huxleyi and G. oceanica in Austral summer/Boreal winter were similar to those for E. huxleyi alone. However, in Austral winter/Boreal summer estimates based on a combination of E. huxleyi and G. oceanica resulted in much lower agreement between CCPP and satellite PIC when compared to E. huxleyi alone. This difference is driven by greatly increased CCPP estimates in the central North Pacific and Atlantic, combined with greatly decreased CCPP estimates in the North Pacific and Atlantic, relative to the E. huxleyi alone fit. Being a warm adapted species including G. oceanica would result in more productivity in the sub-tropical zones. However, these zones are also regions of potentially significant top-down control (see above for details). Meanwhile the North Pacific and Atlantic are likely dominated by cold-adapted species (see above for details), so including the warm-adapted G. oceanica in CCPP calculations would further reduce estimates in these regions. As a result, the inclusion of G. oceanica does not assist in making global estimates of coccolithophore PIC production.

5 Conclusions

Our analysis of the projected combination of increased temperature and CO$_2$ on potential success, in terms of growth rates, suggests that E. huxleyi will gain further competitive advantage over G. oceanica. Due to a greater sensitivity to CO$_2$, G. oceanica's niche will likely contract to regions of higher temperature under future ocean conditions. In general, changes in community composition can influence community level carbon production and sequestration by coccolithophores. Such changes could have significant implications for climate feedback mechanisms, one being the relative strengths of the organic and inorganic carbon pumps in ecosystems where coccolithophores are abundant enough to significantly impact the air-sea CO$_2$ flux (e.g. coccolithophore blooms) and/or dominate the deep-sea flux of particulate material (e.g. subtropical gyres). Temperature and light were found to be important factors driving projections of CaCO$_3$ production potential (CCPP) on a global scale. Comparison of satellite derived inorganic carbon versus estimated inorganic carbon suggests that E. huxleyi CCPP is a good proxy for coccolithophore community production in most biogeographical provinces. However, results indicate that data on the responses of polar species and strains, to environmental change, may be required to improve estimates in the high-latitudes, while the effects of top-down controls might be needed to improve estimates in the mid-latitudes.
Data availability. All data used for the calculation of model fits and coefficients for *Emiliania huxleyi* can be found in the supplementary material for this paper. Fit coefficients used for calculation of *Gephyrocapsa oceanica* niches can be found in Gafar et al. (2018) (DOI: 10.3389/fmars.2017.00433). Third party data sets used for calculation of global calcium carbonate production potential are detailed in Sect. 4.5.
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Tables and Figures
Table 1. Fit coefficients ($k_1$ to $k_6$), $R^2$, F-values, degrees of freedom and p-values obtained for calcification (pg C cell$^{-1}$ d$^{-1}$), photosynthetic carbon fixation (pg C cell$^{-1}$ d$^{-1}$) and growth rates (d$^{-1}$) from Eq. (2) fitted to data from this study and Sett et al. (2014). For calcification and photosynthetic carbon fixation rates the unit for $v$ = pg C cell$^{-1}$ day$^{-1}$ while for growth rates the unit for $v$ = day$^{-1}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Calcification</th>
<th>Photosynthesis</th>
<th>Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$k_1$ (pg C cell$^{-1}$ day$^{-1}$ or day$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>-11.98</td>
<td>-17.68</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_2$ (μmol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>-1.75E+06</td>
<td>-4.63E+06</td>
<td>-9.34E+05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_3$ (kg mol$^{-1}$ μmol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>6.43E+07</td>
<td>1.39E+09</td>
<td>3.10E+08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_4$ (mol kg$^{-1}$ °C)</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-7.28E-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_5$ (°C)</td>
<td>28.14</td>
<td>26.72</td>
<td>-38.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_6$ (kg mol$^{-1}$ μmol photons$^{-1}$ m$^2$ s$^{-1}$ °C$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>-3.09E+03</td>
<td>4.40E+03</td>
<td>-2.70E+03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$ (p-value)</td>
<td>0.7957 (&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>0.7302 (&lt;0.001)</td>
<td>0.8460 (&lt;0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-value (degrees of freedom)</td>
<td>389.51 (100)</td>
<td>273.52 (100)</td>
<td>552.74 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Optimum CO$_2$ concentrations, CO$_2$ K$^{1/2}$ concentrations and maximum rates ($V_{\text{max}}$) at 10, 15 and 20°C from Eq. (2) fit to: CO$_2$-light data at 20°C in this paper and *E. huxleyi* CO$_2$ data from Sett et al. (2014) at 10°C, 15°C and 20°C and 150 µmol photons m$^{-2}$s$^{-1}$ light intensity. Note that the CO$_2$ working range for the equation for this species was 0-250 µmol kg$^{-1}$. Values exceeding this range were reported as >250 µmol kg$^{-1}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO$_2$ optima (µmol kg$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>10°C</th>
<th>15°C</th>
<th>20°C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calcification</td>
<td>16.94</td>
<td>12.91</td>
<td>11.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photosynthesis</td>
<td>20.34</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>13.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth rate</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>20.78</td>
<td>18.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{\text{max}}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcification (pg C cell$^{-1}$ d$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>9.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photosynthesis (pg C cell$^{-1}$ d$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>12.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth rate (d$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$K^{1/2}_{\text{CO}_2}$ inhib (µmol kg$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>10°C</th>
<th>15°C</th>
<th>20°C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calcification</td>
<td>118.47</td>
<td>75.04</td>
<td>62.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photosynthesis</td>
<td>&gt;250</td>
<td>119.54</td>
<td>100.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth rate</td>
<td>&gt;250</td>
<td>&gt;250</td>
<td>192.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$K^{1/4}_{\text{CO}_2}$ sat (µmol kg$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>10°C</th>
<th>15°C</th>
<th>20°C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calcification</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photosynthesis</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth rate</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Optimum CO$_2$ concentrations, CO$_2$ $K_{\frac{1}{2}}$ concentrations and maximum rates ($V_{\text{max}}$) at 50-1200 $\mu$mol photons m$^{-2}$s$^{-1}$ from Eq. (2) fit to: CO$_2$ data at 50, 400, 600 and 1200 $\mu$mol photons m$^{-2}$s$^{-1}$ and 20°C in this paper and *E. huxleyi* CO$_2$ data from Sett et al. (2014) at 150 $\mu$mol photons m$^{-2}$s$^{-1}$ light intensity and 10°C, 15°C and 20°C. Note that the CO$_2$ working range for the equation for this species was 0-250 $\mu$mol kg$^{-1}$. Values exceeding this range were reported as >250 $\mu$mol kg$^{-1}$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CO$_2$</th>
<th>50 PAR</th>
<th>150 PAR</th>
<th>400 PAR</th>
<th>600 PAR</th>
<th>1200 PAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CO$_2$ optima ($\mu$mol kg$^{-1}$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcification</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>11.67</td>
<td>15.21</td>
<td>16.75</td>
<td>19.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$V_{\text{max}}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcification (pg C cell$^{-1}$ d$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>12.47</td>
<td>13.48</td>
<td>15.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photosynthesis (pg C cell$^{-1}$ d$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>9.16</td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>19.82</td>
<td>27.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth rate (d$^{-1}$)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{\frac{1}{2}}$ CO$_2$ inhib ($\mu$mol kg$^{-1}$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcification</td>
<td>47.38</td>
<td>63.01</td>
<td>80.19</td>
<td>87.68</td>
<td>99.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photosynthesis</td>
<td>73.04</td>
<td>104.90</td>
<td>182.32</td>
<td>&gt;250</td>
<td>&gt;250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth rate</td>
<td>157.71</td>
<td>208.62</td>
<td>206.04</td>
<td>192.60</td>
<td>163.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K_{\frac{1}{2}}$ CO$_2$ sat ($\mu$mol kg$^{-1}$)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcification</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photosynthesis</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth rate</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. (A) Fitted particulate inorganic carbon (PIC), (B) particulate organic carbon (POC) production, and (C) growth rates (solid lines) of *E. huxleyi* in response to changes in carbonate chemistry at 10°C, 15°C and 20°C using Eq. (2) and fit coefficients from table 1. Symbols represent rate measurements from Sett et al. (2014) at 10°C, 15°C and 20°C and 150 μmol photons m⁻² s⁻¹. Shaded areas represent modern ocean CO₂ concentrations of 8.5-30 μmol kg⁻¹ based on data from Takahashi et al. (2014).
Figure 2. Fitted (solid lines) and measured (symbols) (A) particulate inorganic carbon (PIC) and (B) particulate organic carbon (POC) production, and (C) growth rates of *E. huxleyi* in response to changes in CO$_2$ concentration at six different light intensities using Eq. (2) and fit coefficients from table 1. Symbols represent rate measurements from this paper at a constant temperature (20°C) and 50, 150, 400, 600 and 1200 µmol photons m$^{-2}$s$^{-1}$. Shaded areas represent modern ocean CO$_2$ concentrations of 8.5-30 µmol kg$^{-1}$ based on data from Takahashi et al. (2014).
Figure 3. Predicted difference in growth rates between *E. huxleyi* and *G. oceanica* across a temperature range of 8-30°C and a fCO$_2$ range of 25-4000 µatm at 50, 150, 600 and 1000 µmol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ of PAR based on Eq. (2). Note the response to varying CO$_2$ or temperature is not significantly influenced by light intensity. Note positive values indicate *E. huxleyi* dominance while negative values indicate *G. oceanica* dominance.
Figure 4. Predicted difference in growth rates between *G. oceanica* and *E. huxleyi* across a light range of 50-1000 μmol photons m$^{-2}$ s$^{-1}$ and a temperature range of 8-30°C at 400 μatm fCO$_2$, based on Eq. (2).
Figure 5. Predicted difference in growth rates between *E. huxleyi* and *G. oceanica* across a temperature range of 8-30°C and a fCO$_2$ range of 25-4000 µatm at 150 µmol photons m$^{-2}$s$^{-1}$ of light based on Eq. (2).
Figure 6. Log ratio of *E. huxleyi* to *G. oceanica* coccoliths versus temperature in the global oceans. Symbols and colours represent different ocean basins with data taken from McIntyre and Bé (1967); Chen and Shieh (1982); Roth and Coulbourn (1982); Knappertsbusch (1993); Andrulet and Rogalla (2002); Boeckel et al. (2006); Fernando et al. (2007); Saavedra-Pellitero et al. (2014). Symbols denote samples from different oceanic regions with Atlantic B specifically representing samples from Boeckel et al. (2006) which appear influenced by upwelling of nutrients (see section 4.4.2), while Atlantic A refers to samples from the Atlantic ocean from all other studies. The line at zero indicates a shift in dominance from *E. huxleyi* (>0) to *G. oceanica* (<0). The grey line represents a linear regression through the entire dataset with p<0.05 and F of 156.05 with 95% prediction bounds for new observations. For details see Sect. 2.9.
Figure 7. Austral summer/Boreal winter (A) and Austral winter/Boreal summer (D) satellite measured particulate inorganic carbon. Austral summer/Boreal winter (B) and Austral winter/Boreal summer (E) *E. huxleyi* based CCPP estimates accounting for carbonate chemistry (substrate and hydrogen ion concentrations), light intensity and temperature. Note the strong bands of CCPP at the mid-latitudes. Austral summer/Boreal winter (C) and Austral winter/Boreal summer (F) CCPP estimates accounting for carbonate chemistry (substrate and hydrogen ion concentrations), light intensity and temperature and nitrate concentrations (nutrient proxy).
Figure 8. Satellite derived particulate inorganic carbon (black bars) and *E. huxleyi* based CCPP (white bars) estimates for major ocean biogeographical provinces as percentages of total production in (A) Austral winter/Boreal summer and (B) Austral summer/Boreal winter. (C) Major ocean biogeographical province definitions.