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Key Points:
- Photochemical degradability of western Arctic Ocean DOM was tested in a solar simulator
- Solar irradiation caused significant decreases in CDOM light absorption at UV wavelengths
- Continued declines in sea ice cover should result in enhanced CDOM photodegradation
Abstract

A warming and shifting climate in the Arctic has led to significant declines in sea ice over the last several decades. Although these changes in sea ice cover are well documented, large uncertainties remain in how associated increases in solar radiation transmitted to the underlying ocean water column will impact heating, biological and biogeochemical processes in the Arctic Ocean. In this study, six under-ice marine, two ice-free marine, and two ice-free terrestrially-influenced water samples were irradiated using a solar simulator for 72 hours (representing ~10 days of ambient sunlight) to investigate dissolved organic matter (DOM) dynamics from the Chukchi and Beaufort seas. Solar irradiation caused chromophoric DOM (CDOM) light absorption at 254 nm to decrease by 48 to 63%. An overall loss in total DOM fluorescence intensity was also observed at the end of all experiments, and each of 6 components identified by parallel factor analyses (PARAFAC) was shown to be photoreactive in at least one experiment. DOM fluorescence (FDOM) also indicated that the majority of DOM in under-ice and ice-free marine waters was likely algal-derived. Measurable changes in dissolved organic carbon (DOC) were only observed for sites influenced by riverine runoff. Losses of CDOM absorbance at shorter wavelengths suggest that the beneficial UV protection currently received by marine organisms may decline with the increased light transmittance associated with sea ice melt ponding and overall reductions of sea ice. Our FDOM analyses demonstrate that DOM irrespective of source was susceptible to photobleaching. Additionally, our findings suggest that photodegradation of CDOM in under-ice waters is not currently a significant source of carbon dioxide (CO2) (i.e., we did not observe systematic DOC loss). However, increases in primary production and terrestrial freshwater export expected under future climate change scenarios may cause an increase in CDOM quantity and shift in quality throughout Arctic Ocean surface waters.
As arctic temperatures continue to warm and summer sea ice further declines, examination of the resulting enhanced photodegradation processes and their impacts on the interplay between primary production, carbon cycling, and surface ocean heating processes will be paramount.
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1. Introduction

Recent climate warming has caused significant decreases in sea ice extent across the Arctic [Serreze et al., 2007; Stroeve et al., 2007; Comiso et al., 2008], with a record minimum in September 2012 that was 49% below the 1979–2000 average [Perovich et al., 2012]. Over the past three decades, there has also been an increase in the length of the summer melt season [Markus et al., 2009] and an increasing percentage of thin first-year ice as compared with thicker multi-year ice [Maslanik et al., 2007, Kwok and Rothrock, 2009; Maslanik et al., 2011; Comiso, 2012]. Declining sea ice extent reduces surface albedo, thereby enhancing the amount of solar radiation absorbed by associated ocean waters and ice. Furthermore, melt ponds form more easily and cover more surface area on thin first-year ice than on multi-year ice [Fetterer and Untersteiner, 1998; Nicolaus et al., 2012], and light transmittance through these melt ponds can be up to an order of magnitude greater than through unpooled sea ice [Light et al., 2008; Frey et al., 2011, Nicolaus et al., 2012]. In future climate scenarios, Arctic sea ice is expected to continue thinning, decreasing in areal extent, and increasing its melt-pond coverage [Wang and Overland, 2009; Schröder et al., 2014], yet large uncertainties remain in how the resulting
increase in solar radiation transmitted to the underlying ocean waters will impact biological and biogeochemical processes in the Arctic Ocean.

A major uncertainty linked to sea ice decline is to what extent dissolved organic matter (DOM) in underlying ocean waters will be impacted. In the Arctic Ocean, DOM primarily results from either: (a) \emph{in situ} biological production in the upper water column and within sea ice; or (b) inputs of terrestrially-derived organic matter transported to the ocean by fluvial systems [Carlson, 2002; Holmes et al., 2012; Raymond and Spencer, 2015]. Chromophoric DOM (CDOM) is the optically active fraction of this dissolved material, absorbing ultraviolet (UV) and visible light, and acting as one of the primary regulators of light penetration in surface waters [Blough and Del Vecchio, 2002; Nelson and Siegel, 2002]. CDOM regulates the amount of photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) in the water column, which influences the rates and distribution patterns of primary production [Retamal et al., 2008]. CDOM also efficiently blocks UV radiation, thereby protecting marine organisms from DNA damage and other harmful effects [Williamson et al., 2001]. By absorbing shortwave visible radiation (380–760 nm), CDOM can additionally contribute to the heating of surface waters and subsequent melting of sea ice [Kirk, 1988, 1994; Pegau, 2002; Granskog et al., 2007; Hill, 2008]. The absorption of light by CDOM can lead to photodegradation of DOM [Mopper et al., 2015], generally resulting in a decrease in CDOM absorption (i.e., photobleaching; Helms et al., 2008; 2014). Through these photodegradation processes, a pool of DOM can be directly photomineralized to inorganic carbon, with subsequent outgassing of CO$_2$ to the atmosphere [Stubbins et al., 2008; Powers and Miller, 2015]. In addition, photochemical alteration of DOM influences the bioavailability of residual DOM to aquatic bacteria [Moran and Zepp, 1997; Bittar et al., 2015]. The presence and
characteristics of arctic sea ice can therefore play a critical role in determining light penetration, in turn influencing CDOM distribution and biogeochemical cycling in surface ocean waters.

Over the past ~30 years, the Chukchi and Beaufort seas of the western Arctic have experienced some of the greatest declines in sea ice extent across the Arctic Ocean [Comiso et al., 2008], exposing the marine environment in this region to continually increasing amounts of solar radiation [Perovich et al., 2007]. To date, only a few studies have investigated DOM in the western Arctic Ocean, with these typically focusing on the distribution of CDOM in open waters [Guéguen et al., 2005, 2007; Retamal et al., 2007; Matsuoka et al., 2007, 2011; Hill, 2008; Walker et al., 2009]. Furthermore, given the heavily riverine-influenced nature of the Arctic Ocean [Opsahl et al., 1999; Dittmar and Kattner, 2003], DOM photoreactivity studies have focused primarily on terrigenous DOM in the coastal regions [Belanger et al., 2006; Osburn et al., 2009]. Thus, despite the critical need to understand the impacts of a shrinking and thinning sea ice cover, to the best of our knowledge this work represents the first study to focus upon the photoreactivity of DOM beneath sea ice. In this study, we used a series of controlled laboratory-based photodegradation experiments to investigate DOM dynamics in under-ice ocean waters collected from the Chukchi and Beaufort seas during the summer of 2011. Absorbance and fluorescence spectroscopy were used to identify the likely source of DOM, and to trace changes in CDOM optical properties during photochemical degradation. These results were then examined alongside changes in dissolved organic carbon (DOC) concentration to assess the relative importance of photobleaching and photomineralization. Finally, we discuss the potential photochemical susceptibility of Arctic Ocean DOM and how future changes to sea ice may
influence primary productivity, carbon biogeochemistry, and the heat balance in the Arctic Ocean.

2. Methods

2.1. Sample Collection

Sampling took place during the NASA Impacts of Climate Change on the Eco-Systems and Chemistry of the Arctic Pacific Environment (ICESCAPE) mission in the Chukchi and Beaufort seas during the summer melt season in July 2011 on the US Coast Guard Cutter (USCGC) Healy. Water samples were collected from 10 locations distributed across three north-south transects (Figure 1). The westernmost transect was located on the continental shelf of the Chukchi Sea (IFM1 and ICM1–3). The central transect crossed the shelf-basin interface in the Chukchi Sea (IFM2 and ICM4–5). The easternmost transect extended into a region of the Beaufort Sea basin impacted by river runoff, primarily from the Colville River (IFT1–2 and ICM6).

At six ice-covered stations (ICM1–6; Figure 1), water samples were collected from directly below the ice at the ice-water interface by hand-deploying a 2 L Kemmerer (vertically oriented) water sampler. At the remaining 4 stations located in open water, surface water samples were collected using the ship’s CTD rosette, which consisted of a 12-place rosette with 30 L Niskin bottles. Two of these stations were located near the ice edge (IFM1–2; Figure 1) and two were from surface waters likely influenced by the Colville River (IFT1–2). Salinity measurements for each sample were made onboard using a Guildline Autosal salinometer. Immediately after sampling, water samples for photodegradation experiments were filtered through a pre-rinsed 0.2 μm filter (Whatman PolyCap) and transferred into acid washed (10% HCl) precombusted (450°C for 6
hours) Kimax glass bottles. Samples were kept frozen (-20°C) and dark until return to the laboratory.

2.2. Photodegradation Experiments

After slowly thawing overnight, water samples were transferred into acid-washed (10% HCl), precombusted (450°C for 6 hours) round bottom quartz flasks (70 ml; Quartz Scientific Inc., OH, USA) and closed with ground-glass stoppers to exclude air bubbles. Flasks were rinsed with sample water three times prior to filling and then placed bottom side up in a 20°C water bath containing Milli-Q water. Samples were positioned just under the water surface. The bath was mounted inside an Atlas Suntest XLS+ solar simulator fitted with an Atlas NXe 1700w bulb and daylight filter, to provide a light spectrum similar to that of natural sunlight between 280 and 800 nm. Total lamp power was 765 W m⁻² with a constant exposure of 65 W m⁻² between 300 to 400 nm. Samples were exposed for 72 hours, receiving a radiant exposure of 16,865 ± 6.7 kJ m⁻² of energy (time integral of spectral irradiance), equivalent to approximately 10 days of ambient sunlight during the summer months at 70°N (based on the System for Transfer of Atmospheric Radiation (STAR) [Ruggaber et al., 1994] and following adaptations described in Powers and Miller [2015]). CDOM, fluorescent DOM (FDOM) and DOC were measured (details below) at the beginning of the experiment and then again after 4, 12, 24, and 72 hours of light exposure. Triplicate samples and a single dark control (treated identically but wrapped in foil) were used at all time points, with triplicate dark controls for the initial and final (72-hour) time points.
2.3. CDOM Analysis

CDOM absorbance was measured using a Shimadzu UV-1800 UV-Visible spectrophotometer at 1 nm intervals between 800 and 200 nm using a 10 cm quartz cuvette. All sample spectra were blank corrected and referenced against Milli-Q water (18.2 Ω). In order to minimize temperature effects, all measurements were made after samples had equilibrated to laboratory temperature. CDOM absorbance was assumed to be zero above 750 nm, therefore the average sample absorbance between 750 nm and 800 nm was subtracted from the spectrum to correct for offsets owing to instrument baseline drift, temperature, scattering and refractive effects [Green and Blough, 1994; Helms et al., 2008]. CDOM absorption coefficients were calculated from:

$$a(\lambda) = 2.303A(\lambda)/l$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

where $a$ is the Naperian light absorption coefficient (m$^{-1}$) at $\lambda$ (the wavelength in nanometers), $A$ is the absorbance at $\lambda$ wavelength, and $l$ is the cell path length in meters [Green and Blough, 1994].

Spectral slopes ($S$, nm$^{-1}$) for each CDOM absorbance spectrum were derived using an exponential function:

$$a(\lambda) = a(\lambda_0) e^{-S(\lambda-\lambda_0)}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where $a(\lambda)$ is the absorption coefficient of CDOM (m$^{-1}$) at wavelength $\lambda$ and $\lambda_0$ is the reference wavelength. Spectral slopes were calculated across the wavelength ranges of 275–295 nm and
350–400 nm. Spectral slope parameters can provide information pertaining to DOM molecular weight, photochemical processing and source [Blough and Del Vecchio, 2002; Helms et al., 2008], and have been found to be largely independent of CDOM concentration [Brown, 1977]. The 275–295 nm and 350–400 nm slope ranges were chosen as they have been shown to contain the greatest variation in a wide range of samples, including DOM-rich terrestrial, estuarine, coastal and highly photobleached waters [Helms et al., 2008; Spencer et al., 2012]. The ratio of these slopes ($S_{275-295}$) has been shown to be particularly sensitive to changes in molecular weight and was calculated by dividing $S_{275-295}$ by $S_{350-400}$ [Helms et al., 2008]. All slopes are reported as positive numbers such that higher (i.e., steeper) slopes indicate a greater decrease in absorption with increasing wavelength.

2.4. FDOM Analysis

The fluorescent portion of CDOM (FDOM) was characterized using fluorescence excitation emission matrix (EEM) spectroscopy, which creates three-dimensional structures composed of multiple emission spectra at a range of excitations and provides additional information about the chemical composition and sources of CDOM [Coble, 1996; 2007; Stedmon et al., 2003; Stubbins et al., 2014]. FDOM measurements were collected on a FluoroMax 4 spectrofluorometer (Horiba Jobin-Yvon). EEMs were obtained by recording sample emission across 320 to 500 nm (with 2 nm increments) after excitation from 250 to 450 nm wavelengths (with 5 nm increments). A single sample EEM was collected at each time point (0, 4, 12, 24, and 72 hours). Owing to low fluorescence intensities, samples were run using long integration periods (0.5 s) to minimize measurement noise. All EEMs were blank corrected and Raman calibrated [Lawaetz and Stedmon, 2009; Murphy et al., 2010] using Milli-Q water spectra run on the same day. Finally, to
eliminate Rayleigh scattering effects, zeroes were inserted in the region where emission wavelengths are less than or equal to the excitation wavelength (+30 nm). The absorption coefficients of all samples were <10 m⁻¹, eliminating the need for inner filter corrections \cite{Stedmon and Bro, 2008; Murphy et al., 2010].

Many fluorescent components have overlapping peaks making it difficult to identify individual components within an EEM. To identify independently varying FDOM components within our dataset, and to assess changes in marine- vs. terrestrial-derived material, we conducted parallel factor analyses (PARAFAC) in MATLAB using the DOMFluor Toolbox following the methods as outlined in \textit{Stedmon and Bro} [2008]. In total, we included 50 EEMs containing 5 different time points for each of the 10 experiments. By tracing processes using time-series measurements of FDOM, PARAFAC modeling may yield more meaningful results than if applied to discrete samples \cite{Stedmon & Bro, 2008}. To simplify the modelling process and minimize noise, we included only emission wavelengths from 320 to 476 nm in the EEMs. No EEMs were identified as outliers. A series of PARAFAC models (utilizing between 2 to 7 components) were applied and initial model fitting assessed using the steps as outlined in \textit{Stedmon & Bro} [2008]. Final model validation was conducted using a range of techniques including random split half analysis and random initialization \cite{Stedmon & Bro, 2008}. Split half validation involves splitting the sample data into two halves and comparing model fits after running models on the two halves independently. Random initialization was then used to ensure that the models were in fact the least squares result and represented local minima.
2.5. Dissolved Organic Carbon Analysis

After the experiments, samples for DOC analyses were acidified (pH < 2) by addition of HCl and analyzed for non-purgable organic carbon using a Shimadzu TOC-VCPH analyzer fitted with a Shimadzu ASI-V autosampler. Standards were prepared by the volumetric dilution of a stock solution containing 500 μM-DOC (potassium hydrogen phthalate, p.a.) to produce the following series of standards: 0, 2, 5, 8, 10, 25, 50, 75, 100 μM-DOC. In addition to standards, aliquots of deep seawater reference material (Batch 10, Lot# 05-10) from the Consensus Reference Material Project (CRM) were analyzed to ensure the precision and accuracy of the DOC analyses. Analyses of the CRM deviated by less than 5% from the reported value for these standards (41 to 44 μM-DOC; http://yyy.rsmas.miami.edu/groups/biogeochem/Table1.htm). Standard and sample volumes analyzed were 20 to 40 mL. Routine minimum detection limits in the investigators laboratory using the above configuration are 2.8±0.3 μM-C and standard errors are typically 1.7 ±0.5 % of the DOC concentration [Stubbins and Dittmar, 2012].

3. Results

3.1. Photodegradation of CDOM

Photodegradation experiments were conducted on waters from 10 separate stations across the Chukchi and Beaufort seas. Figure 2 shows absorption coefficient spectra over the course of a 72-hour experiment (including triplicate analyses for each time step) for a typical ice-covered marine (ICM1), ice-free marine (IFM1), and ice-free terrestrial-influenced (IFT1) sample. CDOM measurements from replicate samples at each individual time step and experiment demonstrated little between-flask variability (with a coefficient of variance <0.06 at 254 nm for all experiments). Therefore, from here on we present only sample means of triplicate
measurements. All under-ice (ICM1–6) and marine samples (IFM1–2) had lower initial CDOM absorption values (ranging from 1.36 to 2.17 m$^{-1}$ at 254 nm) than terrestrially-influenced (IFT1–2) samples (3.12 to 5.79 m$^{-1}$ at 254 nm). Despite these initial differences, CDOM from all 10 stations was found to be photoreactive (Table 1, Figure 3a). For all experiments, photochemically induced changes in the absorption coefficient at 254 nm ($a_{254}$) over the 72-hour period were found to be statistically significant ($p < 0.05$; two-tailed Student’s t-test on triplicate samples from the beginning and end of each experiment) with total losses in $a_{254}$ of between 48 and 63%. No significant differences were observed between initial $a_{254}$ values and those of the dark controls after 72 hours ($p < 0.05$) across any of the experiments, confirming photochemical processes led to the observed reductions in absorbance. With the exception of samples ICM5 and IFM1, sample waters also showed statistically significant photobleaching at 365 nm ($a_{365}$), with a greater decrease observed in the IFT samples than in the marine samples (Table 2). Initial absorption coefficients at 440 nm ($a_{440}$) were relatively low (most were at or below the detection limit of the spectrophotometer ($\pm 0.002$ absorbance or 0.05 m$^{-1}$)) and losses in $a_{440}$ were not statistically significant for 7 of the 10 experiments (Table 2).

CDOM absorption values at 254 nm for the marine samples, whether from under-ice (ICM) or ice-free (IFM) waters, were not significantly different from one another (at both initial and final time points), yet both were statistically different ($p < 0.05$) from terrestrially-influenced samples. Overall, the marine samples had lower initial $a_{254}$ values (mean for ICM and IFM = 1.65 m$^{-1}$) and exhibited smaller decreases in $a_{254}$ (mean = 0.88 m$^{-1}$) as compared to the terrestrially-influenced samples (mean $a_{254} = 4.46$ m$^{-1}$, showing a mean loss of 2.63 m$^{-1}$, Table 2).
As samples were not all optically thin, to more accurately determine changes in the efficiency of photobleaching between samples, the CDOM absorption coefficient was additionally plotted as a function of cumulative UV light (280–400 nm) absorbed (Figure 3b). The range of 280–400 nm was chosen because these are quantitatively the most important wavelengths for environmental photoreactions involving CDOM [Mopper et al., 2015]. The decrease in the CDOM absorption coefficient at 254 nm was approximately exponential and could be modeled using the following three-parameter exponential decay equation:

\[
C(u) = C_{\infty} + z_0 e^{-ku}
\]  

where \(u\) is cumulative UV light absorbed in kW/m², \(C(u)\) is the modeled absorption coefficient, \(C_{\infty}\) is the non-photoreactive component, \(z_0\) is the photoreactive component, and \(k\) is the rate of decay. The exponential decay models fit the experimental results well with adjusted R² values ranging from ~0.94 to 0.98 for all experiments (Table 3). Overall, marine samples had smaller photoreactive components \((z_0)\) and residual nonphotoreactive \((C_{\infty})\) components compared to the terrestrially influenced samples. Additionally, the rate of decay \((k)\) was greater for marine samples compared to the terrestrially-influenced samples, with the exception of IFM2 which had a rate of decay similar to IFT2. There is also a strong relationship (adjusted R² = 0.99) between the initial absorption coefficient \((C(0))\) and the photoreactive component \((z_0)\) (Figure 4).

Changes in DOM composition were also apparent during the 72-hour irradiation experiments with clear shifts in the spectral slope parameters. For all experiments, \(S_{275-295}\) decreased within the first 6 hours of irradiation, and then showed either little change, or a slight increase at
subsequent time points (Figure 5a). For most of the experiments, $S_{350-400}$ decreased over time or showed little change (Figure 5b). Over the full length of the experiment, 9 of the 10 experiments (except IFT$_1$) showed a statistically significant decrease ($p < 0.5$; two-tailed Student’s t-test on triplicate samples from the beginning and end of each experiment) in $S_{275-295}$ (Table 4). For $S_{350-400}$, 9 of the 10 experiments (except ICM$_3$) also showed a statistically significant ($p < 0.5$) decrease (Table 4). Of the experiments that had a statistically significant change in $S_R$, all increased over the course of the experiment with the exception of ICM$_6$ (Table 4).

### 3.2. Photodegradation of FDOM and PARAFAC results

An overall loss in total DOM fluorescence intensity was observed at the end of all experiments. Figure 6 shows EEMs from four representative experiments (ICM$_1$, IFM$_1$, IFT$_1$, IFT$_2$) during the 72-hour irradiation period. Under-ice marine samples had consistently lower initial FDOM intensities as compared to ice-free marine and terrestrially-influenced samples. Furthermore, a greater proportion of the fluorescence signal was typically present at emission wavelengths less than 400 nm in the ICM and IFM samples, relative to the terrestrially-influenced sites. The two terrestrially-influenced samples clearly contained additional fluorescence signatures dominated by broad fluorescence peaks at emission wavelengths greater than 400 nm. Although all ten samples showed an overall decay in FDOM intensity over the 72-hour experiments, several samples showed an increase in total fluorescence intensity at intermediary time points (e.g. sample IFT$_2$ at $t_4$ in Figure 6), which then subsequently decayed.

Six independent fluorescent components were validated using PARAFAC analysis (Figure 7).
fluorophores, but instead represent a group of fluorophores that have similar properties and variability within the dataset (Baker and Spencer, 2004; Murphy et al., 2010; Stubbins et al., 2014). In particular, component 5 exhibited a shoulder that indicates that this component likely represents a mixture of fluorophores that the model was not able to separate because they co-varied in the dataset [Stedmon and Markager, 2005a]. The excitation and emission spectra of the components derived here are statistically compared to previously identified components in the OpenFluor database using the Tucker congruence coefficient in order to identify potential sources for each (Murphy et al., 2014b; Table 5). Components 1,3,4 and 5 were statistically similar to other components in the database and components 2 and 6 resembled components found in other studies (Table 5).

Components 1, 2 and 6 had spectra resembling humic-like DOM, with broad emission spectra around and above 400 nm and a broader excitation spectra compared to the other components (Figure 7). Components 1 and 2 exhibit characteristics of humic-like terrestrially-derived material [Stedmon and Markager, 2005a, b; Stedmon et al., 2007a; Kowalczuk et al., 2009; Yamashita et al., 2010b; Jørgensen et al., 2011; Murphy et al., 2011; Seredynska-Sobecka et al., 2011; Shuto, et al., 2014; Tanaka et al., 2014]. Component 6 has also been identified as humic-like [Stedmon and Markager, 2005a; Stedmon et al., 2007a; Stedmon et al., 2007b; Yamashita et al., 2010a; Jørgensen et al., 2011] and Stedmon and Markager [2005a] categorized it as marine derived or anthropogenic in nature. Components 3, 4 and 5 exhibited spectra resembling ‘protein-like’ DOM, with emission spectra maxima below 400 nm. Component 3 most closely resembles amino acids, free or bound in proteins [Murphy et al., 2008; 2014a] and component 4 resembles tyrosine [Yamashita et al., 2011; Graeber et al., 2012; Yamashita et al., 2013], both of
which are considered to be primarily microbially derived in marine waters [Stedmon and Markager, 2005b; Coble, 1996]. Component 5 is more difficult to classify, however, it is similar to component 6 in Jørgensen et al. [2011] that has been previously linked to surface water productivity.

Terrestrially-influenced samples IFT$_1$ and IFT$_2$ had the highest overall fluorescence at the beginning of the experiments and were largely dominated by the humic-like component 1 (29–40% of initial fluorescence; Table 6). The IFM$_1$ sample was initially dominated by component 5 (48%) and also contained high levels of the protein-like components 3 (22%) and 4 (20%). The IFM$_2$ and under-ice samples generally exhibited low initial FDOM intensities with no clearly dominant fluorescent component. The exception was ICM$_6$, which exhibited greater contributions from component 4 (56%).

Distinct similarities and differences between sample types were observed with respect to how components changed over the 72-hour irradiation experiments (Figure 8, Table 6). In general, under-ice marine waters exhibited only small changes in each component with irradiation (typically less than 0.03 r.u.). For the ice-free marine samples, IFM$_1$ exhibited large changes in fluorescence in the three protein-like components, whereas IFM$_2$ showed little change in any component. For the terrestrially-influenced samples, IFT$_1$ showed large losses in each component (55–99%) and IFT$_2$ exhibited large declines in components 2, 3, 4, and 5 (50–83%). Both IFT$_1$ and IFT$_2$ showed the greatest losses in ‘humic-like’ components 4 and 5 (80–99%).
3.3 Photomineralization of DOC

DOC concentrations from the beginning and end of nine of the experiments are shown in Table 1 (sample loss prohibited measurement on the IFM1 sample). Initial DOC concentrations in ICM and IFM samples were relatively low (53.6–71.9 μM), with higher concentrations in the two terrestrially-influenced samples (105.4 and 80.5 μM). There was no apparent relationship between salinity and DOC. Of the nine experiments, only three (ICM6, IFT1, and IFT2) showed a statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) change in DOC at the end of the 72-hour irradiation period. Photomineralization losses were greatest in river-influenced samples, which showed an 8% (IFT1) and 7% (IFT2) decrease from initial DOC concentrations. The under-ice marine sample ICM6 showed a 3% loss of DOC over this period. Overall losses in CDOM were far greater than for DOC (Figure 9a). In particular, the percent loss in $a_{254}$ ranged from ~48 to 62%, whereas the percent loss in DOC was only ~0 to 8% (Figure 9b).

4. Discussion

4.1. Impact of Photodegradation on CDOM from Sea-Ice Melt

Initial CDOM absorption values were lower in ICM and IFM samples than in terrestrially-influenced samples, in good agreement with many previous studies that report typically higher CDOM absorption in coastal, river-influenced regions than in open ocean regions [Blough and Del Vecchio, 2002; Kitidis et al., 2006; Osburn et al., 2009]. CDOM in the water column has been shown to be excluded from sea ice during formation [Amon, 2003]. Therefore, in the absence of sea ice algae producing CDOM in situ [Scully and Miller, 2000], it would be expected that CDOM within sea ice melt would be low as well. The range in initial CDOM absorption values for ICM and IFM samples (1.36–2.17 m$^{-1}$) could be partially explained by the range in
salinity (17.4–31.7), which suggests that DOM in these surface waters was of various sources and likely variable ages and residence times and therefore had undergone varying amounts of photochemical degradation prior to sampling. Despite differences in initial CDOM absorption values, CDOM was shown to be photoreactive irrespective of sampling location. Continuous losses of absorbance at 254 nm were observed (Figure 3a), suggesting photochemical exposure caused the average aromatic content of the DOM pool to be progressively reduced during irradiation [Osburn et al., 2001; Stubbins et al., 2010; Helms et al., 2014].

Photobleaching kinetics for $a_{254}$ in these experiments are well described by three parameter exponential decay models. Based on the photoreactive component ($z_0$) predicted to be lost after infinite photo-exposure by these models, $a_{254}$ could decrease by at least half for almost all of the samples if exposed to the sun indefinitely, indicating that UV absorption by CDOM at these shorter wavelengths is diminished by photodegradation. However, these models indicated that, regardless of sample type or initial CDOM values, residual amounts ($C_\infty$) of $a_{254}$ (~0.57–0.91 m$^{-1}$ for under-ice and ice-free marine samples, and 1.36 and 1.63 m$^{-1}$ for the two terrestrially influenced samples) would survive infinite photo-exposure, suggesting a persistent, yet small fraction of non-photoreactive DOM (that absorbs shortwave UV) was present in all waters. Additionally, there is also a strong relationship (adjusted $R^2 = 0.99$) between the initial absorption coefficient ($C(0)$) and the photoreactive component ($z_0$) of all sample types (Figure 4) indicating that final $a_{254}$ could potentially be predicted from initial measurements based on a regional model.
In our experiments, samples demonstrating significant changes in the spectral slope parameter, generally exhibited decreases in both $S_{275-295}$ and $S_{350-400}$, and an increase in $S_R$ during irradiation. For $S_{275-295}$ in particular, much of the change occurred within the first 6 hours of the 72-hour irradiation (Figure 5a) indicating rapid initial photo-alteration in DOM composition. Similar to our experiments, Helms et al. [2008] showed increases in $S_R$ and decreases in $S_{350-400}$, however they showed that $S_{275-295}$ increased during their photodegradation experiments. In another study, Spencer et al. [2009] showed that (despite an initial increase in $S_{275-295}$) $S_{275-295}$ values decreased in Congo River DOM during irradiation after extensive light exposure. We suggest therefore that the decreases in $S_{275-295}$ in most of our samples may have been caused by extensive prior photo-degradation in the environment, although these optical patterns may also derive from the freshly-produced algal nature of CDOM in sea ice impacted waters. For example, irradiation of CDOM from algal cultures can result in $S_{275-295}$ becoming shallower during photobleaching [Bittar et al. 2015]. Changes in spectral slope parameters during irradiation have been related to changes in mean molecular weight [Helms et al., 2008], where there have been particularly strong relationships between increases in $S_R$ and decreases in average DOM molecular weight. Five of our experiments (ICM1, ICM3, ICM4, IFM2, IFT1) showed a significant increase in $S_R$ during exposure. Based upon these results our samples may have undergone a significant decrease in mean DOM molecular weight during irradiation. However, the work by Helms et al. [2008] looked at samples across a strong terrigenous-to-marine DOM gradient in the Southeastern US, far from the current study site in terms of geography and biogeochemical system. Therefore, inferences about DOM quality based upon spectral slope and $S_R$ in our current system must be interpreted with due caution until work
shows that CDOM spectral qualities have similar empirical relationships to DOM quality in high
latitude, sea ice impacted surface waters.

4.2. Impact of Photodegradation on FDOM from Sea-Ice Melt

A greater relative proportion of fluorescence at emission wavelengths less than 400 nm was
typically present in each of the under-ice and ice-free marine samples, as compared to the
terrestrially-influenced sites. This is often referred to as ‘protein-like’ fluorescence, has
commonly been reported in marine samples [Coble, 1996; Stedmon and Markager, 2001], and
appears to be associated with a family of low molecular weight molecules, including aliphatics
and nitrogen-enriched aromatics [Stubbins et al., 2014]. The two terrestrially-influenced samples
contained fluorescence signatures dominated by broad fluorescent peaks at emission wavelengths
greater than 400 nm. This is typical of waters influenced by river runoff and commonly referred
to as ‘humic-like’ fluorescence [Coble, 1996; Stedmon and Markager, 2001; Fellman et al,
2010]. These signatures have been associated with nitrogen-poor, relatively high mass molecular
families [Stubbins et al., 2014]. All ten samples show an overall decay in FDOM intensity over
the 72-hour experiments, with the exception of protein-like production in several samples
(occurring after 4 hours in sample IFT2, Figure 5), which subsequently decayed. Photo-induced
production of tyrosine-like fluorescence (which contributes to the protein-like fluorescence
signal) has been previously observed in lacustrine [Stedmon et al., 2007a] and marine waters
[Mann, 2010].

PARAFAC decomposition identified 6 components and overall, these fluorescent components
were shown to decay, or remain constant, over the course of the experiments. Under-ice and ice—
free marine waters were dominated by the protein-like components, whereas terrestrially
influenced samples contained higher proportions of the humic-like fluorophores (Figure 8 and
Table 5). All components were shown to be photoreactive in at least one of our experiments,
further demonstrating that DOM irrespective of source was susceptible to photobleaching.
Under-ice and ice-free marine waters showed the greatest decreases in FDOM of protein-like
components (which are associated with recently algal-produced labile DOM), whereas the
greatest decreases in the terrestrially-influenced samples occurred in humic-like components.

Studies have indicated that photo-degradation of DOM can result in increasing [Moran and
source. In general, both field and laboratory studies suggest that photodegradation causes humic-
rich DOM to become more bioavailable whereas recently produced algal-derived DOM in
surface waters becomes less biolabile [Benner and Biddanda, 1998; Obernosterer et al., 1999;
2001; Tranvik et al., 1999; Tranvik and Bertilsson, 2001; Bittar et al., 2015]. In particular,
protein-like fluorescence of algal origin has been shown to be both biolabile and photolabile,
indicating these two processes compete to mineralize fresh, algal DOC (Stedmon and Markager,
2005b; Bittar et al., 2015). Based on our FDOM analyses, the majority of CDOM in under-ice
and ice-free marine waters appears to be algal-derived, therefore we may expect photoirradiation
of these waters to reduce the availability of biolabile DOC through direct photo-mineralization
and through photo-alteration to less biolabile material as found for DOM produced by algal
cultures [Bittar et al., 2015]. Thus, photochemistry of algal-derived DOM in sea ice systems may
short-circuit the microbial loop, whereas photo-degradation of terrigenous DOM is likely to
increase DOM biolability and enhance bacterioplankton productivity.
4.3. Photobleaching vs. Photomineralization

Three of our samples displayed significant changes in DOC concentration with irradiation. The three samples (ICM6, IFT1 and IFT2) were all from the easternmost transect that was closest to the mouth of the Colville River and were likely influenced by the relatively high-DOC, high-CDOM riverine water runoff. Investigating the various components identified in the PARAFAC analysis, changes in component 2 (identified as humic-like and terrestrially-derived; Table 5) had the strongest significant correlation with changes in DOC ($R = 0.78, p < 0.02$) indicating that there may be a link between this component and DOC. These results suggest that as melt ponds form and sea ice retreats, terrestrial DOM below the ice would be susceptible to photomineralization to dissolved inorganic carbon.

Our experiments suggest that it is not possible to calculate DOC from CDOM using a constant, linear relationship in the Chukchi and Beaufort seas. Several methods for using CDOM measurements as a proxy for DOC have previously been proposed [Ferrari et al., 1996; Del Vecchio and Blough, 2004; Guéguen et al., 2005] because CDOM can be measured at a much higher spatial resolution using remote sensing and at a high temporal resolution using in situ measurements, and as such, it has the potential to more easily provide broader spatial and temporal coverage. A promising new approach was suggested by Fichot and Benner [2011], which derives DOC concentrations from CDOM absorption coefficients at 275 and 295 nm and their approach worked well for the coastal waters of the Beaufort Sea (eastward of our study area). However, based on the results of our photodegradation experiments, the method is likely not applicable for the nearby under-ice and ice-free marine waters (that are less influenced by
river runoff) as while there were measurable changes in the absorption coefficients at shorter wavelengths with irradiation, there were no measurable changes in DOC.

Photodegradation resulted in measurable changes in the optical properties of DOM in all sample waters, yet none of the ice-free and under-ice marine samples from the westernmost and central transects showed a significant change in DOC with irradiation. Several studies have shown that photochemical loss of DOC is less efficient than CDOM photobleaching \cite{Moran et al., 2000; Vahatalo and Wetzel, 2004; Spencer et al., 2009}. Furthermore, Osburn et al. \cite{2009} conducted photoreactivity experiments on water samples from the Mackenzie River, estuary, shelf and gulf regions of the western Canadian Arctic and found less than 1% loss in DOC after 3 days in ambient arctic sunlight. Similar results were found for sea ice brine from Antarctic sea ice \cite{Norman et al., 2011}. The absence of measurable changes in DOC in waters in the westernmost and central transects in this study indicates that either there is a decoupling between CDOM photobleaching and DOC photomineralization or that any changes in DOC were below the detection limit of our instrument.

Photochemistry can result in the production of CO2 through two different pathways: (a) the abiotic photomineralization of DOC into CO2 and CO; and (b) a photochemical-biotic pathway through which photodegradation alters the bioavailability of DOM potentially making it more labile allowing it to be consumed by bacteria and converted into biomass and CO2 \cite{Mopper et al., 2015}. Not only was there very little photomineralization evident in the western and central transects in our study, but the changes in spectral slopes and fluorescence components observed in these experiments suggest that there may have been an overall reduction
in the biolability of DOM in under-ice and marine surface waters. Therefore, it appears that photodegradation of marine waters and sea ice melt does not result in significant outgassing of CO₂ to the atmosphere via either the purely photochemical pathway or the combined photochemical-biological pathway. Results presented here suggest that photodegradation of under-ice waters is far more important for photobleaching (and changes in light penetration in the euphotic zone) than it is for carbon cycling.

5. Implications and Conclusions

As the Arctic continues to warm and sea ice extent declines, the photoreactivity of DOM may have important implications for primary productivity and the heat balance of the Arctic Ocean. Thirty years ago much of the Arctic Ocean was covered with thick multi-year ice throughout the summer [Serreze et al., 2007; Kwok and Rothrock, 2009], which limited the amount of UV and visible light reaching under-ice waters. With decreasing sea ice extent and increases in thin first-year ice and surface melt ponds, the surface layer of the Arctic Ocean is being exposed to more solar radiation during the summer melt season. Several studies suggest that primary productivity will increase in arctic waters owing to this decrease in sea ice extent [Arrigo et al., 2008; Arrigo and van Dijken, 2011] and increase in melt pond coverage [Arrigo et al., 2012] and the corresponding increase in PAR reaching ocean surface waters. However, continued ponding, thinning, and ultimate loss of summer sea ice cover would also lead to a decrease in UV absorption by surface CDOM with photodegradation. Combined with the unprecedented loss in Arctic ozone in recent years [Solomon et al., 2007; Manney et al., 2011], this may result in exposure of marine organisms to more harmful UV radiation and may in turn negatively impact primary productivity. An additional complication is that the decrease in sea ice extent and
increase in open water during the summer months have been shown to coincide with an increase in cloud coverage [Wang and Key, 2005; Eastman and Warren, 2010; Palm et al., 2010], which limits the amount of shortwave radiation reaching the ocean surface. Models show that these trends will likely continue in the future [Vavrus et al., 2010] potentially counteracting the increase in UV exposure owing to changes in sea ice, but also limiting the amount of available PAR [Belanger et al., 2013]. This presents challenges for predicting future trends in the amount of UV and visible radiation reaching surface waters and quantifying the overall impact that CDOM photodegradation will have on primary production.

Warming temperatures in the Arctic are leading to permafrost thaw [Romanovsky et al., 2010] and increases in riverine discharge [Peterson et al., 2002], which in turn will likely lead to increases in terrestrial DOM output to surface waters of the Arctic Ocean [Frey and McClelland, 2009]. Our results suggest that increasing terrestrial DOM supply will result in a measureable increase in DOM photodegradation and loss of DOC, since significant changes in DOC were observed in samples exhibiting greater contributions from humic-like terrestrially sourced FDOM components. Increases in daily minimum flow rates, particularly in winter, have been shown for arctic rivers [Smith et al., 2007], which could potentially increase the amount of terrestrial DOM transported to surface waters of the Arctic Ocean [Holmes et al., 2008; Stedmon et al., 2011]. Since this would occur when there is little light north of the Arctic Circle and the Arctic Ocean is largely covered in sea ice, this DOM would initially be protected from photodegradation and could be transported well into shelf seas and possibly the Arctic Ocean basin interior. Furthermore, the spring freshet period has been shown to export a major fraction of the annual DOM load of Arctic rivers and DOM exported during this period is relatively more
aromatic in character and more photolabile in comparison to other times of year [Spencer et al., 2008; Holmes et al., 2012; Mann et al., 2012]. This major pulse of photoreactive DOM enters the Arctic Ocean at the onset of spring and thus with the decrease in sea ice extent and increase in melt ponding during the following spring and summer, our results suggest that this DOM would be poised for significant photodegradation during the subsequent melt season. This combined with increased DOM from under-ice blooms and subsequent photodegradation could alter CO₂ saturation in surface waters.

By absorbing sunlight and subsequently re-emitting it as heat, CDOM also contributes to the heating of surface waters [Kirk, 1988]. With increasing sea ice melt, more light may be transmitted through sea ice and absorbed and emitted as heat by the existing CDOM below. This increase in heat absorption by the under-ice water column could increase local sea surface temperatures and potentially lead to further sea ice melt from below, thus initiating a positive feedback to sea ice melt [Hill, 2008]. A future increase in CDOM supply, particularly from riverine sources, would considerably increase CDOM absorption and it is likely that photodegradation will substantially decrease the light absorption of this additional riverine CDOM. At present, the combined effect of increases in CDOM additions from in situ production and riverine sources as well as increasing CDOM photobleaching as ice cover recedes upon ocean surface heating remain unclear.

In conclusion, our observed reductions in CDOM absorbance at shorter wavelengths suggest that the beneficial UV protection currently received by marine organisms may significantly reduce with sea ice melt ponding and overall declines of sea ice cover. However, some of these CDOM
losses may be balanced by increasing CDOM inputs from increased primary production and terrestrial carbon export. We additionally show that under current conditions, photodegradation of CDOM in under-ice waters is not a significant source of CO₂, and it is unclear whether the potential for surface ocean heating is compromised with irradiation. However, as arctic temperatures warm and summer sea ice continues to disappear, continued examination of the resulting enhanced photodegradation processes and their impacts on the interplay between primary production, carbon biogeochemistry, and surface ocean heating will be vital.
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Table 1. Initial, final and percent remaining after 72 hour irradiation experiments for \(a_{254}\) and DOC for all experiments. Bold numbers indicate statistically significant changes \((p < 0.05)\). *NA* indicates that the value is unavailable owing to sample loss.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample Name</th>
<th>Collection Date</th>
<th>Salinity</th>
<th>(a_{254}) ((m^{-1}))</th>
<th>DOC ((\mu M))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICM1</td>
<td>7/4/2011</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>Initial 1.41 ± 0.03</td>
<td>67.8 ± 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final 0.66 ± 0.02</td>
<td>65.8 ± 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Remaining <strong>47.1</strong></td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM2</td>
<td>7/5/2011</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>Initial 1.55 ± 0.01</td>
<td>71.9 ± 2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final 0.72 ± 0.02</td>
<td>68.7 ± 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Remaining <strong>46.5</strong></td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM3</td>
<td>7/6/2011</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>Initial 1.37 ± 0.04</td>
<td>61.1 ± 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final 0.62 ± 0.01</td>
<td>60.6 ± 0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Remaining <strong>44.8</strong></td>
<td>99.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM4</td>
<td>7/10/2011</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>Initial 1.36 ± 0.02</td>
<td>53.6 ± 3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final 0.63 ± 0.01</td>
<td>53.7 ± 2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Remaining <strong>46.5</strong></td>
<td>100.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM5</td>
<td>7/13/2011</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>Initial 2.17 ± 0.01</td>
<td>71.1 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final 0.98 ± 0.03</td>
<td>68.0 ± 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Remaining <strong>44.9</strong></td>
<td>95.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM6</td>
<td>07/19/11</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>Initial 2.01 ± 0.03</td>
<td>69.4 ± 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final 0.98 ± 0.02</td>
<td>67.0 ± 0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Remaining <strong>48.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>96.6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFM1</td>
<td>7/3/2011</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>Initial 1.49 ± 0.04</td>
<td><strong>51.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final 0.77 ± 0.04</td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFM2</td>
<td>7/9/2011</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>Initial 1.89 ± 0.01</td>
<td>71.2 ± 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final 0.83 ± 0.02</td>
<td>71.9 ± 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Remaining <strong>44.0</strong></td>
<td>100.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFT1</td>
<td>07/21/11</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>Initial 5.79 ± 0.03</td>
<td>105.4 ± 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final 2.17 ± 0.05</td>
<td>97.1 ± 2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Remaining <strong>37.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>92.1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFT2</td>
<td>07/20/11</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>Initial 3.12 ± 0.00</td>
<td>80.5 ± 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Final 1.48 ± 0.06</td>
<td>74.7 ± 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Remaining <strong>47.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>92.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Average initial and final values for the 72 hour irradiation experiments for $a_{254}$, $a_{365}$ and $a_{440}$ for ice-covered marine (ICM), ice-free marine (IFM), and ice-free terrestrial (IFT) samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$a_{254}$ (m$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$a_{365}$ (m$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$a_{440}$ (m$^{-1}$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ICM$_{mean}$</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>Initial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.62 ± 0.32</td>
<td>0.76 ± 0.16</td>
<td>0.14 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFM$_{mean}$</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>1.69 ± 0.22</td>
<td>0.17 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>0.80 ± 0.05</td>
<td>0.08 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFT$_{mean}$</td>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>4.46 ± 1.46</td>
<td>0.50 ± 0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Final</td>
<td>1.82 ± 0.38</td>
<td>0.18 ± 0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Three parameter exponential decay models for $a_{254}$ vs. cumulative UV light absorbed for all experiments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ICM$_{1}$</th>
<th>ICM$_{2}$</th>
<th>ICM$_{3}$</th>
<th>ICM$_{4}$</th>
<th>ICM$_{5}$</th>
<th>ICM$_{6}$</th>
<th>IFM$_{1}$</th>
<th>IFM$_{2}$</th>
<th>IFT$_{1}$</th>
<th>IFT$_{2}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$z_0$</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$K$</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C_{n}$</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C(\theta)$</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Initial, final and percent remaining after 72 hour irradiation experiments for the spectral slope parameters $S_{275-295}$, $S_{350-400}$ and $S_R$ for all experiments. Bold numbers indicate statistically significant changes ($p < 0.05$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ICM₁</th>
<th>ICM₂</th>
<th>ICM₃</th>
<th>ICM₄</th>
<th>ICM₅</th>
<th>ICM₆</th>
<th>IFM₁</th>
<th>IFM₂</th>
<th>IFT₁</th>
<th>IFT₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$S_{275-295}$</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>0.0241</td>
<td>0.0266</td>
<td>0.0264</td>
<td>0.0299</td>
<td>0.0311</td>
<td>0.0337</td>
<td>0.0255</td>
<td>0.0260</td>
<td>0.0203</td>
<td>0.0284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>0.0233</td>
<td>0.0238</td>
<td>0.0238</td>
<td>0.0257</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0255</td>
<td>0.0197</td>
<td>0.0249</td>
<td>0.0202</td>
<td>0.0242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.0008</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.0028</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.0026</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.0043</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.0052</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.0081</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.0011</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.0001</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.0041</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ICM₁</th>
<th>ICM₂</th>
<th>ICM₃</th>
<th>ICM₄</th>
<th>ICM₅</th>
<th>ICM₆</th>
<th>IFM₁</th>
<th>IFM₂</th>
<th>IFT₁</th>
<th>IFT₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$S_{350-400}$</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>0.0180</td>
<td>0.0170</td>
<td>0.0185</td>
<td>0.0217</td>
<td>0.0161</td>
<td>0.0197</td>
<td>0.0148</td>
<td>0.0170</td>
<td>0.0184</td>
<td>0.0202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>0.0136</td>
<td>0.0158</td>
<td>0.0116</td>
<td>0.0139</td>
<td>0.0181</td>
<td>0.0188</td>
<td>0.0121</td>
<td>0.0109</td>
<td>0.0171</td>
<td>0.0198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.0044</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.0012</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.0069</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.0078</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.0021</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.0009</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.0026</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.0060</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.0013</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.0004</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ICM₁</th>
<th>ICM₂</th>
<th>ICM₃</th>
<th>ICM₄</th>
<th>ICM₅</th>
<th>ICM₆</th>
<th>IFM₁</th>
<th>IFM₂</th>
<th>IFT₁</th>
<th>IFT₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>$S_R$</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial</td>
<td>1.3371</td>
<td>1.5692</td>
<td>1.4257</td>
<td>1.3830</td>
<td>1.9370</td>
<td>1.7120</td>
<td>1.7253</td>
<td>1.5275</td>
<td>1.1029</td>
<td>1.4046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final</td>
<td>1.7154</td>
<td>1.5036</td>
<td>2.0480</td>
<td>1.8492</td>
<td>1.4288</td>
<td>1.3581</td>
<td>1.6264</td>
<td>2.2728</td>
<td>1.1793</td>
<td>1.2241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.3783</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.0656</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.6223</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.4662</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.5081</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.3539</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.0989</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.7452</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.0764</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.1805</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Spectral characteristics of the six components identified by PARAFAC compared to previously identified components. Secondary maxima are shown in parentheses. Component matches (>0.95 tucker congruent coefficient) identified using the OpenFluor database (http://www.openfluor.org, Murphy et al. [2014b]) are in bold. Matches not in bold were based on visual inspection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>Excitation Maxima (nm)</th>
<th>Emission Maxima (nm)</th>
<th>Other Studies</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1          | <250 (330)             | 468                  | C1 (Jørgensen et al., 2011)  
C1 (Kowalezuk et al., 2009)  
G1 (Murphy et al., 2011)  
C3 (Seredynska-Sobecka et al, 2011)  
C1 (Shutova et al., 2014)  
C1 (Stedmon and Markager, 2005b)  
C1 (Stedmon et al., 2007a)  
C1 (Tanaka et al., 2014)  
C1 (Yamashita et al., 2010b) | humic-like, terrestrial |
| 2          | 255 (280)              | 392                  | C3 (Stedmon and Markager, 2005a)  
C2 and C3 (Stedmon and Markager, 2005b) | humic-like, terrestrial |
| 3          | 280                    | 340                  | C7 (Murphy et al., 2008)  
C5 (Murphy et al. 2014a) | Amino acids, free or bound in proteins |
| 4          | 270                    | 320                  | C7 (Graeber et al., 2012)  
C4 (Yamashita et al., 2011)  
C3 (Yamashita et al., 2013) | Protein- and tyrosine-like, positively related to bioavailability |
| 5          | <250                   | 352                  | C6 (Jørgensen et al., 2011) | protein-like, resembles free tryptophan |
| 6          | <250 (325)             | 392                  | C4 (Jørgensen et al., 2011)  
C6 (Stedmon and Markager, 2005a)  
C2 (Stedmon et al., 2007a)  
C3 (Stedmon et al., 2007b)  
C2 (Yamashita et al., 2010a) | humic-like, marine  
also common in wastewater and agricultural catchments |
Table 6. Fluorescence intensities (R.U.) of individual components identified using PARAFAC at the beginning and end of the 72 h irradiation. Percent of total fluorescence intensity is shown in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components</th>
<th>ICM₁</th>
<th>ICM₂</th>
<th>ICM₃</th>
<th>ICM₄</th>
<th>ICM₅</th>
<th>ICM₆</th>
<th>IFM₁</th>
<th>IFM₂</th>
<th>IFT₁</th>
<th>IFT₂</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.022 (13)</td>
<td>0.026 (21)</td>
<td>0.022 (16)</td>
<td>0.019 (17)</td>
<td>0.027 (20)</td>
<td>0.021 (16)</td>
<td>0.022 (6)</td>
<td>0.036 (25)</td>
<td>0.136 (40)</td>
<td>0.049 (29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.017 (27)</td>
<td>0.019 (23)</td>
<td>0.016 (26)</td>
<td>0.018 (20)</td>
<td>0.025 (22)</td>
<td>0.024 (43)</td>
<td>0.017 (17)</td>
<td>0.021 (17)</td>
<td>0.060 (56)</td>
<td>0.044 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.008 (5)</td>
<td>0.018 (15)</td>
<td>0.008 (6)</td>
<td>0.013 (11)</td>
<td>0.019 (14)</td>
<td>0.029 (22)</td>
<td>0.001 (0)</td>
<td>0.015 (10)</td>
<td>0.063 (18)</td>
<td>0.029 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.004 (7)</td>
<td>0.005 (6)</td>
<td>0.004 (6)</td>
<td>0.005 (5)</td>
<td>0.008 (7)</td>
<td>0.008 (15)</td>
<td>0.000 (0)</td>
<td>0.003 (2)</td>
<td>0.015 (14)</td>
<td>0.014 (15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.037 (22)</td>
<td>0.020 (16)</td>
<td>0.031 (22)</td>
<td>0.016 (15)</td>
<td>0.020 (14)</td>
<td>0.000 (0)</td>
<td>0.085 (22)</td>
<td>0.026 (18)</td>
<td>0.030 (9)</td>
<td>0.011 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.018 (28)</td>
<td>0.023 (28)</td>
<td>0.007 (12)</td>
<td>0.007 (8)</td>
<td>0.021 (19)</td>
<td>0.002 (4)</td>
<td>0.031 (31)</td>
<td>0.031 (25)</td>
<td>0.007 (7)</td>
<td>0.005 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.036 (21)</td>
<td>0.032 (26)</td>
<td>0.032 (23)</td>
<td>0.028 (25)</td>
<td>0.030 (21)</td>
<td>0.074 (56)</td>
<td>0.075 (20)</td>
<td>0.029 (20)</td>
<td>0.035 (10)</td>
<td>0.030 (18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.017 (25)</td>
<td>0.017 (20)</td>
<td>0.014 (24)</td>
<td>0.023 (26)</td>
<td>0.006 (5)</td>
<td>0.007 (12)</td>
<td>0.034 (34)</td>
<td>0.026 (21)</td>
<td>0.004 (4)</td>
<td>0.006 (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.054 (32)</td>
<td>0.014 (11)</td>
<td>0.037 (27)</td>
<td>0.028 (25)</td>
<td>0.031 (23)</td>
<td>0.000 (0)</td>
<td>0.180 (48)</td>
<td>0.021 (15)</td>
<td>0.037 (11)</td>
<td>0.032 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.001 (1)</td>
<td>0.010 (12)</td>
<td>0.013 (21)</td>
<td>0.027 (31)</td>
<td>0.039 (35)</td>
<td>0.003 (5)</td>
<td>0.010 (10)</td>
<td>0.031 (26)</td>
<td>0.001 (0)</td>
<td>0.005 (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.011 (7)</td>
<td>0.014 (11)</td>
<td>0.010 (7)</td>
<td>0.007 (6)</td>
<td>0.012 (8)</td>
<td>0.014 (7)</td>
<td>0.014 (4)</td>
<td>0.016 (11)</td>
<td>0.044 (13)</td>
<td>0.018 (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.008 (12)</td>
<td>0.009 (11)</td>
<td>0.007 (11)</td>
<td>0.008 (9)</td>
<td>0.013 (11)</td>
<td>0.008 (20)</td>
<td>0.008 (9)</td>
<td>0.011 (9)</td>
<td>0.020 (19)</td>
<td>0.018 (19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1. Station locations for under-ice marine samples (white), ice-free marine samples (blue) and terrestrially-influenced samples (red). The location of the ice edge on the first day of sampling (July 3, 2011) and the last day of sampling (July 21, 2011) are indicated by the purple and blue lines respectively.

Figure 2. Loss of CDOM absorbance with irradiation for triplicate samples from experiments (a) ICM1, (b) IFM1 and (c) IFT1. CDOM absorbance is shown at the start of the experiment (t0) and after 4, 12, 24 and 72 hours (t4, t12, t24 and t72).

Figure 3. Loss of CDOM absorbance at 254 nm as a function of (a) time and (b) the amount of cumulative UV light (280–400 nm) absorption at each time interval for all experiments.

Figure 4. Relationship between the initial CDOM absorption coefficient at 254 nm (C(0)) and the photoreactive component (z0) from the three parameter exponential decay model.

Figure 5. Changes in the spectral slope S_{275–295} (a) and S_{350–400} (b) at each time interval for all experiments.

Figure 6. EEMs from a representative under-ice sample (ICM1), ice-free marine sample (IFM1), terrestrially-influenced sample (IFT1), and a sample that shows protein-like production (IFT2).
**Figure 7.** The six-components for the PARAFAC model. The top two rows show the excitation (red lines) and emission (blue lines) loadings for each component and the bottom two rows show the individual components.

**Figure 8.** Variability in fluorescence for the six PARAFAC components for all experiments over the 72-hour irradiation experiments.

**Figure 9.** (a) Changes in CDOM absorbance at 254 nm as a function of the change in DOC after 72 hours for all experiments. (b) Percent loss in CDOM absorbance at 254 nm after 72 hours as a function of the percent loss in DOC for all experiments.
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