

1 **Supplementary Material:**

2 **2.2. Apparent optical property measurements: diffuse attenuation coefficients for**
3 **downwelling irradiance and related variables**

4 The average daily PAR irradiance for the SML was computed in accordance with Babin et
5 al. (1996):

6

7

8

9 where \bar{E}_d (PAR⁻⁰), which represents the daily downwelling PAR irradiance just beneath the air-
10 water interface, was derived from the measurement performed on deck after accounting for the
11 loss of irradiance due to reflection from the water surface (Kirk, 2011; Morel and Maritorena,
12 2001), Z_{SML} is the depth of the SML determined using temperature differences, and $Z_{1\%}$ is the
13 depth of euphotic layer.

14

15 **2.3. Inherent optical properties and related variables**

16 The partition of the chlorophyll-specific phytoplankton absorption coefficient in the
17 absorption associated with photosynthetically active pigments [$a_{ph-psp}^*(\lambda)$] and that associated
18 with nonphotosynthetic (photoprotective) pigments [$a_{ph-ppc}^*(\lambda)$] was calculated following the
19 expressions proposed by Babin et al. (1996):

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 where $F_{nps}(\lambda)$ represents the part of phytoplankton absorption attributed to photoprotective
28 carotenoids, and $a_i^*(\lambda)$ and C_i were previously defined in equation 5'. This approach is based
29 on the actual a_{ph}^* spectrum and offers the advantage that the packaging effect is accounted for
30 (Allali et al., 1997).

31

32 **2.4.2. Pigment-based estimation of phytoplankton size classes**

33 The diagnostic pigment analysis (DPA) was originally proposed by Vidussi et al. (2001),
34 and refined by Uitz et al. (2006). The biomass proportions associated with each size class were
35 computed following Uitz et al., (2006) as:

36
37
38
39
40
41

42 where DP is the sum of the weighted concentrations of all diagnostic pigments:

43
44
45

46 Then, the size index (*SI*) proposed by Bricaud et al. (2004) was used to assess the variations of
47 the dominant size class of the phytoplankton communities as follows:

48

49 where 1, 5 and 50 μm are taken as a central diameter value of each size class
50 (picophytoplankton, nanophytoplankton and microphytoplankton, respectively), which are
51 weighted by the biomass proportion *F* of the corresponding class.

52 The numerical coefficients used in the above equations (from V to VIII) were computed
53 by Uitz et al. (2006) using multiple regression analysis from a global ocean data set that
54 encompasses Case 1 waters in different hydrological and trophic conditions. It should be noted
55 that this method provides only approximate proportions, because we made strong assumptions
56 when (i) ascribing a certain pigment to a given size class, and (ii) assigning a fixed mean
57 diameter to each size class to compute *SI*. On occasions a given diagnostic pigment could be
58 shared by different size classes or some taxonomic groups that harbour specific diagnostic
59 pigments may vary in size (see Brewin et al., 2013 and references therein). Moreover, each of
60 the three phytoplanktonic classes actually presents a rather large size range. Despite this, the
61 approach of Uitz et al. (2006) has been used extensively in biological oceanographic research
62 providing reliable results at regional (e.g., Kheireddine et al., 2018; Organelli et al., 2011; Wang
63 et al., 2014) and large-scale assessments (e.g., Bricaud et al., 2004; Uitz et al., 2015). Besides,
64 different works implemented this pigment-based method for the analysis of temporal variation in
65 phytoplankton size fractions (e.g., Gernez et al., 2011; Mayot et al., 2017).

66

67 | **References**

68

69 Gernez, P., Antoine, D., Huot, Y., 2011. Diel cycles of the particulate beam attenuation
70 coefficient under varying trophic conditions in the northwestern Mediterranean Sea:

71 Observations and modeling. *Limnol. Oceanogr.* 56, 17–36.
72 <https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2011.56.1.0017>

73 Morel, A., Maritorena, S., 2001. Bio-optical properties of oceanic waters: A reappraisal. *J.*
74 *Geophys. Res. Ocean.* 106, 7163–7180. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2000JC000319>

75 Uitz, J., Stramski, D., Reynolds, R.A., Dubranna, J., 2015. Assessing phytoplankton community
76 composition from hyperspectral measurements of phytoplankton absorption coefficient and
77 remote-sensing reflectance in open-ocean environments. *Remote Sens. Environ.* 171, 58–
78 74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rse.2015.09.027>

79 |

80 |

81 |