



**HAL**  
open science

## 3D characterisation of the thermohaline structure in the southwestern tropical Atlantic derived from functional data analysis of in situ profiles

Ramilla V. Assunção, Alex C. Silva, Amédée Roy, Bernard Boulès, Carlos Henrique S. Silva, Jean-Francois Ternon, Moacyr Araujo, Arnaud Bertrand

### ► To cite this version:

Ramilla V. Assunção, Alex C. Silva, Amédée Roy, Bernard Boulès, Carlos Henrique S. Silva, et al.. 3D characterisation of the thermohaline structure in the southwestern tropical Atlantic derived from functional data analysis of in situ profiles. *Progress in Oceanography*, 2020, 187, pp.102399. 10.1016/j.pocean.2020.102399 . hal-02984588

**HAL Id: hal-02984588**

**<https://hal.science/hal-02984588>**

Submitted on 22 Aug 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 **3D characterisation of the thermohaline structure in the southwestern tropical Atlantic derived**  
2 **from functional data analysis of *in situ* profiles**

3 Ramilla V. Assunção<sup>a,b,c,\*</sup>, Alex C. Silva<sup>a</sup>, Amédée Roy<sup>b</sup>, Bernard Boulès<sup>d</sup>, Carlos Henrique S. Silva<sup>e</sup>, Jean-  
4 François Ternon<sup>b</sup>, Moacyr Araujo<sup>a,f</sup>, Arnaud Bertrand<sup>b,a,e</sup>

5 <sup>a</sup>*Laboratório de Oceanografia Física Estuarina e Costeira, Depto. Oceanografia, UFPE, Recife-PE, Brazil.*

6 <sup>b</sup>*Institut de recherche pour le développement (IRD), MARBEC, Université Montpellier, CNRS, Ifremer, IRD, Sète, France.*

7 <sup>c</sup>*IRD, UMR 6539 LEMAR IFREMER/IRD/CNRS/UBO, Technopole Brest Iroise, 29280 Plouzané, France*

8 <sup>d</sup>*Institut de recherche pour le développement (IRD), Délégation Régionale Ouest, IMAGO, Plouzané, France*

9 <sup>e</sup>*Universidade Federal Rural de Pernambuco, Recife-PE, Brazil*

10 <sup>f</sup>*Brazilian Research network on Global Climate Change, Rede CLIMA, São José dos Campos-SP, Brazil.*

11

12 \*Corresponding author.

13 E-mail address: [ramillavieira@hotmail.com](mailto:ramillavieira@hotmail.com) (R.V. Assunção).

14

15

16 **Abstract**

17 The dynamic of the thermohaline structure of the upper ocean, which depends on ocean-atmosphere  
18 interactions, drives most near surface oceanic processes, including the control of gases and heat fluxes,  
19 and nutrient availability in the photic layer. The thermohaline structure of the southwestern tropical  
20 Atlantic (SWTA), a key region for diagnosing variation of the Atlantic Meridional Overturning  
21 Circulation, has prime impact on global climate. Characterising the thermohaline structure is typically  
22 based on the application of classical statistical methods on vertical profiles. Such approach has  
23 important limitations since classical methods do not explicitly contemplate the vertical nature of the  
24 profiles. Functional Data Analysis (FDA) is a new alternative to solve such drawbacks. Here, we apply  
25 an FDA approach to characterise the 3D canonical thermohaline structure of the SWTA in austral spring  
26 and fall. Our results reveal a clear spatial pattern with the presence of three areas with significantly  
27 different thermohaline structure. Area 1, mostly located along the continental slope, reflects the western  
28 boundary current system, with low static stability and high frequency of occurrence of barrier layer  
29 (BL). Conversely, Area 2, located along the Fernando de Noronha chain, presents strong static stability  
30 with a well-marked thermocline. This area, under the influence of the eastern Atlantic, is characterised  
31 by a low BL frequency, which is seasonally modulated by the latitudinal oscillation of the Intertropical  
32 Convergence Zone, controlling the regime of precipitation. In turn, Area 3 behaves as a transition zone  
33 between A1 and A2 with the presence of the water core of maximum salinity in subsurface, and  
34 therefore presence of strong-moderate BL. Beyond this study, FDA approach emerges as a powerful  
35 way to describe, characterise, classify and compare ocean patterns and processes. It can be applied to *in*  
36 *situ* data but could also be used to deeply and comprehensively explore ocean model output.

37

38 Keywords: Thermocline, barrier layer, mixed layer, western boundary current, ocean stratification,  
39 North Brazilian Undercurrent system

40

41

## 1 1. Introduction

2 An important and prevalent feature of the thermohaline structure of the upper ocean (here defined as  
3 the ocean region from the surface to 300 m depth) is the mixed layer (ML) occupying the first meters of  
4 the water column, in which temperature and salinity are vertically homogenous (Brainerd and Gregg,  
5 1995). The thickness of the ML (Mixed Layer Depth - MLD) and the underlying discontinuity layers  
6 vary at different spatiotemporal scales (Grados et al., 2016; Kara, 2003). They are indeed controlled by  
7 surface forcing (heat exchange, wind-driving turbulent mixing, evaporation – precipitation budget, river  
8 inputs), Ekman pumping, advection of upwelled waters and internal waves (Halpern, 2002; Ker et al.,  
9 2016; Liu, 1993; Sprintall and Cronin, 2010).

10 Dynamical interactions between the oceanic ML and the thermocline/pycnocline drive most near  
11 surface oceanic motions (Chen et al., 1994; Rippert et al., 2015). In addition to ocean-atmosphere  
12 interaction, the storage of several gases (e.g. carbon dioxide and methane) and heat content are  
13 influenced by the variations in MLD (de Boyer Montégut et al., 2004; Kraus and Businger, 1994).  
14 Changes in MLD and thermocline thickness also affect the primary productivity (Jang et al., 2011;  
15 Sverdrup, 1953) by altering nutrients availability in the photic layer (Carranza et al., 2018; Madhupratap  
16 et al., 1981). Furthermore, deformations of the thermocline/pycnocline drive the seascape biological  
17 structure from zooplankton to top predators (Bertrand et al., 2014).

18 In some oceanic areas, the upper limit of the halocline is shallower than that of the thermocline,  
19 generating a Barrier Layer (BL) (Lukas and Lindstrom, 1991; Sprintall and Tomczak, 1992). The BL  
20 exerts an important influence on ML dynamics and, in particular, the interplay between kinetic and  
21 potential energy processes. This may affect the ocean heat budget (Pailler et al., 1999; Swenson and  
22 Hansen, 1999) through the heat fluxes with the atmosphere impacting meteorological conditions and  
23 rainfall regimes, with, for example, the generation of heavy precipitations (Balaguru et al., 2012;  
24 Hounsou-gbo et al., 2015). The BL also inhibits the transport of nutrients from deep water into the ML,  
25 which may results in nutrients depleted surface water (Williams and Grottole, 2010).

26 The thermohaline circulation and associated inter-hemispheric transports of mass, heat, and salt in  
27 the southwestern tropical Atlantic (SWTA) has prime impact on global climate (Bourlès et al., 1999).  
28 The western boundary current system off Brazil is indeed a key region for diagnosing variations of the  
29 Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation (AMOC) by the southern wind-driven subtropical-tropical  
30 cell (STC). The STC is a shallow meridional overturning circulation transporting water subducted in the  
31 subtropics during the winter season to the tropics, where it is upwelled to the surface (Hummels et al.,  
32 2015; Zhang et al., 2003). It is an area through which oceanic signals on various timescales, from intra-  
33 seasonal to decadal scales pass (Dengler et al., 2004; Stramma and England, 1999). In this region, the  
34 intrusion of subtropical underwater (SUW) advected by the southern branch of the South Equatorial  
35 Current (sSEC) and then by North Brazilian Undercurrent (NBUC) (Bourles et al., 1999; Rodrigues et  
36 al., 2007; Silva et al., 2009; Stramma and Schott, 1999), is pointed out as a major process contributing to  
37 seasonal BL variability (Araujo et al., 2011).

38 The characterization of the thermohaline structure of an ocean region, as the SWTA, is typically  
39 based on vertical profiles measurements, where data is as discrete set of observations of temperature and

1 salinity sampled at varying depths. However, the use of classical statistical methods for comparing or  
2 clustering such datasets (e.g. Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and Analysis of variance (ANOVA))  
3 have important limitations. Indeed, classical methods do not explicitly contemplate the vertical nature of  
4 the profiles. For example, in a PCA matrix, vertical profiles depths are ordered in columns but PCA is  
5 invariant under permutation of columns in the data matrix. Functional Data Analysis (FDA) are a new  
6 alternative to solve this and other problems such as the use of diverse and heterogeneous datasets (Nerini  
7 et al., 2010; Pauthenet et al., 2019, 2017; Reyes et al., 2015).

8 FDA accounts for the functional nature of the data *i.e.* observed data are considered as a function  
9 rather than a vector of multiple measurements (Bayle et al., 2015; Pauthenet et al., 2017). Besides that,  
10 the extension of kriging techniques to the functional setting meets the need of interpolating complex  
11 data collected in a limited number of spatial locations and thus improve spatial inference (Menafoglio et  
12 al., 2013). If the functional nature of a functional dataset is ignored, results typically are sub-optimal as  
13 valuable information related to the functional nature of a dataset is not properly utilised (Hadjipantelis  
14 and Müller, 2018; Nerini et al., 2010).

15 Here, we propose to use functional statistics methods to characterise the 3D thermohaline structure  
16 of the SWTA in austral spring and fall. For that purpose, we used temperature and salinity profiles from  
17 two multidisciplinary surveys performed in northeast Brazil in spring 2015 and fall 2017. To construct a  
18 canonical picture of the spring and fall conditions we also used available profiles achieved in the SWTA  
19 in the same seasons in other years. Merging these databases was possible since the results of functional  
20 ANOVA did not reveal significant difference among datasets. From this, we provide a synoptic view of  
21 seasonal states of the thermohaline structure in the SWTA and reveal the presence of two different areas  
22 and one transition region, evidencing the variety of ocean-atmosphere processes in play in the region.

## 23 **2. Material and Methods**


### 24 **2.1. Data**

25 Conductivity, Temperature, Depth (CTD) hydrographic profiles were acquired using a CTD Seabird  
26 SBE911+ during the two multidisciplinary surveys Acoustic along the BRAZILIAN CoaSt (ABRACOS).  
27 The surveys were performed in northeast Brazil (Fig. 1, triangles) onboard the French R/V Antea in  
28 September and October 2015 (austral spring; ABRACOS1; Bertrand, 2015) and in April and May 2017  
29 (austral fall; ABRACOS2; Bertrand, 2017).

30 To provide a more comprehensive view of the thermohaline structure in the SWTA in spring and  
31 fall, we also considered the use of ancillary vertical CTD profiles or profiling floats data from: (i) the  
32 World Ocean Atlas 2013 (<https://www.nodc.noaa.gov/OC5/WOD13/>); (ii) the REVIZEE program  
33 (Araujo et al. 2019); and (iii) the PANGAEA Data Publisher for Earth & Environmental Science  
34 (<https://www.pangaea.de/>). These ancillary data were selected considering the months of the ABRACOS  
35 surveys and the SWTA area ( $3^{\circ}$  -  $10^{\circ}$ S/ $30^{\circ}$  -  $36^{\circ}$ W), whatever the year. A total of 182 and 176  
36 hydrographic profiles were considered for the periods of spring (Sep. – Oct.) and fall (Apr. - May),  
37 respectively (Table 1, Fig. 1). To describe the upper ocean thermohaline structure, ABRACOS and  
38 ancillary profiles were considered from the surface to 300 m depth.

1 To investigate the atmospheric forcing, we analysed monthly average freshwater budget  
 2 (evaporation minus precipitation – E-P) and near surface wind speed. For that, we used product  
 3 composites of the Hamburg Ocean Atmosphere Parameters and Fluxes (HOAPS – v.4) with a regular  
 4  $0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$  from 1988 to 2014. All variables were derived from recalibrated and intercalibrated  
 5 measurements from SSM/I and SSMIS passive microwave radiometers compiled by the EUMETSAT's  
 6 Satellite Application Facility on Climate Monitoring (CM SAF) (Andersson et al., 2017).

7



8  
 9 Figure 1. Study area in the southwestern tropical Atlantic (SWTA). Triangles: ABRACOS data; Circles:  
 10 WOA 2013, REVIZEE and PANGAEA datasets. Red symbols: spring data; Yellow symbols: fall data. The  
 11 continental shelf is represented in light grey; the dashed line represents the shelf break (60 m isobath); other  
 12 bathymetric contours (solid lines) are by 1000 m intervals. RA: Rocas Atol; FN: Fernando de Noronha  
 13 archipelago.

14  
 15 Table 1. Databases in use.

Data	Number of profiles	Year of data acquisition		Coverage area Lat - Long
		Spring	Fall	
ABRACOS	62	2015	2017	3.26°S - 9.21°S 36.38°W - 31.97°W
WOA	237	1990,1992,1993,1995	1983,1984,1993 1994,1995,2003 2010,2017,2018	3.00°S - 9.99°S 31.5°W - 35.88°W
REVIZEE	39	1995,2000	1997,1999	3.39°S – 9.67°S 31.33°W - 35.01°W
PANGEA	80	2015,2016	2000,2003,2014	3.00°S – 5.63°S 31.5°W – 35.10°W

1

2 **2.2. Defining the thermohaline structure**

3 To describe the thermohaline structure, we defined a series of parameters or limits (Fig. 2): the  
 4 MLD, the BLT, the upper and lower limits of the thermocline and the pycnocline. There is no consensus  
 5 for such definitions that vary according to the thermohaline structure of the studied area (Araujo et al.,  
 6 2011; de Boyer Montégut et al., 2004; Holte and Talley, 2009; Ker et al., 2016, 2015). Here we defined  
 7 these limits considering the specificity of the vertical profiles in the SWTA (Fig. 2).

8 We determined the MLD using the criteria from Sprintall and Tomczak (1992), i.e. the depth at  
 9 which density ( $\sigma$ ) is equal to the density at the reference depth ( $z_0 = 10$  m depth), plus an increment  
 10 ( $\frac{\partial \sigma_\theta}{\partial \theta} \Delta_\theta$ ), which is equivalent to temperature steps  $-\Delta_\theta = 0.5^\circ\text{C}$  and its equivalent in density change at  
 11 constant salinity ( $s_{z_0}$ ). Moreover, previous studies in the western tropical Atlantic also used the  $0.5^\circ\text{C}$   
 12 criterion for the isothermal layer and its equivalent in density change (Araujo et al., 2011; Silva et al.,  
 13 2005; Tanguy et al., 2010), whose are found to be the most adaptable due to their robustness.

$$14 \quad MLD = z \left( \sigma_{\theta_{z_0}} + \frac{\partial \sigma_\theta}{\partial \theta} \Delta_\theta \right) \quad (\text{Eq. 1})$$


15 To define the Upper Thermocline Depth (UTD), we compared three criteria: the depth of the  
 16 maximum temperature gradient, the isothermal layer with  $0.5^\circ\text{C}$  as a threshold (Tanguy et al., 2010), and  
 17  $\partial_\theta / \partial_z = 0.1^\circ\text{C}/\text{m}$  (Ker et al., 2016). The two last criteria reached similar results, while the maximum  
 18 gradient method tends to overestimate the UTD. Following Ker et al. (2016) and checking by visual  
 19 inspection, we used  $\partial_\theta / \partial_z = 0.1^\circ\text{C}/\text{m}$  to identify the UTD.

20 To determine the Lower Thermocline Depth (LTD), which also coincides with the Lower Pycnocline  
 21 Depth (LPD) (Fig. 2), we used the Brunt Väisälä frequency ( $N^2$ , the buoyancy frequency squared),

$$22 \quad N^2 = - \frac{g}{\sigma_0} \frac{\partial \sigma_z}{\partial z} \quad (\text{Eq. 2})$$

23 where,  $g$  is the acceleration of gravity and  $\sigma_0$  is a reference density at 10 m (Kim and Miller, 2007; Liu  
 24 et al., 2016). Specifically, we considered the lower thermocline/pycnocline depth to be the last depth  
 25 below the UTD where  $N^2$  is of up to four orders of magnitude ( $N^2 \geq 10^{-4}$ ). This method was chosen  
 26 based on evidence that in the thermocline/pycnocline that acts as a transition layer, the shear instabilities  
 27 can produce higher buoyancy frequencies compared to the stable layers above and below it. In vertical  
 28 profiles (Fig. 2),  $N^2$  is close to zero (in the order of  $1 \times 10^{-6}$ ) above the pycnocline; it increases  
 29 continuously within the thermocline/pycnocline layer (Maes and O’Kane, 2014) reaching values greater  
 30 than  $1 \times 10^{-3}$ . Below the pycnocline/thermocline,  $N^2$  decreases to reach values similar to those of the  
 31 mixed layer (Johnston and Rudnick, 2009; Maes and O’Kane, 2014; Sun et al., 2013). In such an  
 32 environment, the criterion  $N^2 \geq 10^{-4}$  was well fitted to define the base of the thermocline.

1 The thermocline thickness (TT) was calculated by the difference between the upper and lower limits  
 2 of the thermocline ( $TT = LTD/LPD - UTD$ ). Finally, the Barrier layer thickness (BLT) was calculated as  
 3 the difference between the MLD and the UTD ( $BLT = MLD - UTD$ ) (Lukas and Lindstrom, 1991).




4  
 5 Figure 2. Examples of CTD profiles from ABRACOS 1 (spring) with the representation of the thermohaline  
 6 structure as defined from the temperature, salinity, density and squared buoyancy frequency ( $N^2$ ). MLD: mixed  
 7 layer depth; UTD: upper thermocline depth; LTD/LPD: lower thermocline/pycnocline depth; BL: barrier layer  
 8 (present in the right profile only).

### 9 2.3. Functional Data Analysis (FDA)

10 FDA is a branch of statistic that provides tools for describing and modelling sets of functions (or  
 11 curves) rather than vectors of discrete values (Ramsay, 2006). The guiding idea of this approach is to  
 12 describe data as parameterized functions, and to use these parameters for clustering, comparing or  
 13 interpolating functions. In particular, classical statistical tools can be adapted to functional data such as  
 14 functional principal component analysis (fPCA) to summarize and characterize significant variation in  
 15 finite dimension among a sample curves (Dabo-Niang and Ferraty, 2008; Ramsay, 2006). Functional  
 16 analysis of variance (fANOVA) uses all the information of each mean functional curve to test the  
 17 possible differences in the datasets, based on the shape and temporal (along the depth) variability of the  
 18 curves (Cuevas et al., 2004; Ramsay, 2006).

19 Here, each temperature and salinity profile were treated as a separate function (curve) in FDA and  
 20 we used a variety of functional statistical methods to define and characterise the 3D thermohaline  
 21 structure. A summary flowchart documenting the methodology sequence for the use of FDA is presented

1 in Figure 3 and described below. All analyses (i.e. fitting, clustering, and kriging) were done separately  
 2 for salinity and temperature profiles.



3  
 4 Figure 3. Summary flowchart documenting the methodology sequence for the Functional Data Analysis approach  
 5 and definition of the themohaline structure. This framework has been followed for both temperature and salinity  
 6 profiles, separately.

7

8

1

2

3

### 2.3.1 Fitting B-spline functions

4

5

6

To apply FDA (Ramsay, 2006), the first step consists in transforming the data into function (Fig. 3, step 1). To describe a vertical profile as a single entity, the existence of a smooth function giving rise to the observed data is assumed. It is expressed as:

7

$$y_i = x(z_i) + \epsilon_i \quad (\text{Eq. 3})$$

8

9

10

where  $(z_i, y_i), i = 1, \dots, N$  are the data,  $z$  is depth and  $y$  temperature or salinity,  $\epsilon_i$  is a remainder that is expected to be as small as possible. The function  $x(z)$  is in the form of a linear combination of each basis function  $\phi_k(z), k = 1, \dots, K$  such that:

11

$$x(z) = \sum_{k=1}^K c_k \phi_k(z) \quad (\text{Eq. 4})$$

12

13

where  $c_k$  are coefficients estimated by penalized regression using pointwise data  $(z_1, y_1), \dots, (z_N, y_N)$  (Ramsay, 2006).

14

15

16

17

18

19

Spline functions to smooth data are the most common choice of approximation system for non-periodic functional data. It combines fast computation of polynomials approach with substantially greater flexibility. Therefore, a B-spline basis of degree 3 (Boor, 2001) has been used. Then, to reduce the impact of noise in the measurement when interpolating, a solution is to determine a roughness parameter  $\lambda$ , such that parameters of  $x_i$  will be estimated by minimizing the penalized squared difference (error):

20

$$PSE = \sum_{k=i}^n (y_i - x_i(z))^2 + \lambda \int [D^2 x(z)]^2 dz \quad (\text{Eq. 5})$$

21

where the notation  $D^2 x(z)$  refers to the second derivative of fit (Ramsay, 2006).

22

23

24

25

26

27

A good choice of the dimension of the basis  $K$ , and of the penalized parameter  $\lambda$  of the basis consists in finding the right balance between smoothing and interpolating the data. The higher the number of  $K$ -functions, the more complexity is preserved. We first defined an interval of potential  $K$ , by making a sensitivity test by carrying out smoothing for temperature and salinity according to different  $K$ . Then, we performed a Generalized Cross-Validation (GCV) to estimate the optimal basis  $K$  and  $\lambda$ , within this interval, using the R packages “fda” and “fda.usc” (Febrero-Bande and Fuente, 2012).

28

29

### 2.3.2 Comparing ABRACOS and ancillary datasets

30

31

32

Once the hydrographic profiles have been described with a relevant functional basis, the next step was to compare the ABRACOS and ancillary data. Indeed, we aimed at determining if these datasets could be merged to be representative of spring and fall canonical states in the study region. This

1 question has been addressed in two steps (Fig. 3, steps 2 and 3) using the most recent ABRACOS  
2 observations as a reference.

3 First (Fig. 3, step 2), we characterised the ABRACOS profiles by applying fPCA and a functional  
4 hierarchical clustering (fCluster), achieved on the coefficients of the fPCA decomposition (Febrero-  
5 Bande and Fuente, 2012). Reproducing the aim of PCA, the idea of the fPCA is to summarize  
6 multivariate dataset with principal component seen as a linear combination of the variables (the same  
7 apply for fCluster). In comparison, the method is adapted to deal with function rather than vector and the  
8 principal components corresponds to dominant modes of variation of functional data (Shang, 2014).  
9 fPCA allowed identifying the main patterns of variation of the vertical profiles while fCluster were used  
10 to statistically define homogeneous groups of profiles. These groups were then plotted spatially to  
11 determine if they correspond to specific areas.

12 Second (Fig. 3, step 3), once homogeneous areas were defined from ABRACOS profiles, we applied  
13 a fANOVA to compare ABRACOS and ancillary profiles present in each area. fANOVA is based on the  
14 so-called one-way analysis of variance for univariate functional data using L2-norm-based parametric  
15 bootstrap test for homoscedastic samples (Cuevas et al., 2004). This procedure considers  $l$  groups of  
16 independent random functions such that each function of the group  $A$  is assumed to be a stochastic  
17 process with mean function  $\mu_k(t), A = 1 \dots l$  and tests the null hypothesis:

$$18 \quad H_0: \mu_1(t) = \dots = \mu_l(t).$$

19 This analysis has been performed with the use of “fdanova” R package (Febrero-Bande and  
20 Fuente, 2012).

### 21 *2.3.3 Data characterisation and 3D spatial interpolation*

22 In case of no rejection of the null hypothesis (Fig. 3, step 4), profiles from the different datasets can  
23 be merged to build complete dataset representative of spring and fall canonical states. Then fPCA,  
24 fCluster and fANOVA can be applied on the complete merged dataset to characterise the profiles and  
25 their spatial variability (Fig. 3, step 5).

26 To interpolate temperature and salinity profiles in 3D (Fig. 3, step 6) we applied a functional  
27 geostatistical analysis (Giraldo et al., 2007). Geostatistics (or kriging methods) are well-known tools for  
28 model-based spatial interpolation, taking into account the spatial autocorrelation of an estimated set of  
29 variables (Matheron, 1963). The fundamental premise of kriging methods is that spatial data constitute a  
30 joint realization of spatially dependent random variables, collectively referred as a random function.  
31 Ordinary kriging refers to spatial prediction under the assumption of stationarity as specified by Cressie  
32 (1993) and Wackernagel (2003). More precisely, the random function is supposed stationary, meaning  
33 that the expectation of the random function is independent of the position. This framework has been  
34 generalized to be useful within the FDA context. Yet, because we are dealing with functions, the  
35 stumbling block remains in the estimation of a spatial covariance between curves.

36 The functional geostatistical analysis has been performed according to ordinary trace kriging method  
37 (Giraldo et al., 2011) in order to described the spatial autocorrelation structure of functional data. The  
38 method is implemented in “fdagstat” R package (<https://github.com/ogru/fdagstat>), and has involved

1 the two following steps: (i) the analysis of spatial structure (i.e. through the calculation and fitting of a  
2 variogram); (ii) and the use of this structure for predicting functional data at unknown location.  
3 Spherical model has been used to fit the different variograms to temperature and salinity profiles

4 To evaluate the quality of the functional geostatistical models we performed cross-validation  
5 analyses. For that, we randomly removed 2% of the sampled curves (profiles) and performed the  
6 functional Kriging predictor for the remaining 98% curves to predict the removed curves. Observed  
7 profiles, fitted with 41 and 44 B-spline basis ( $K$ ) to temperature and salinity, respectively, were  
8 compared with a Kriging-predicted curve for each site. This procedure was applied the number of times  
9 enough to cover all profiles sampled *in situ*. We used the Mean Square (MSD) differences i.e., the mean  
10 of the squared error between predicted and real transects (for all depth) to evaluate the quality of the  
11 prediction. Finally (Fig. 3, step 7), we applied the criteria defining the MLD, the BLT, the upper  
12 thermocline depth, and the lower thermocline/pycnocline depth to the interpolated fields of temperature  
13 and salinity, to obtain a comprehensive vision of the thermohaline structure in the SWTA. In each area  
14 and for each season, we also calculated the BL occurrence frequency (BLF, in %) defined as the  
15 percentage of area with BLT higher than 5 m (Zeng and Wang, 2017).


16

## 17 **3. Results**

### 18 **3.1 Merging the datasets**

19 For both seasons, the fPCA and fCluster analysis of the ABRACOS thermohaline profiles revealed  
20 two significant areas (classes, the dendrograms are provided in the Supplementary Figure S1), in which  
21 profiles display similar shape (Fig. 4). The first area corresponds to the surrounding of the SWTA slope,  
22 hereafter referred to as A1. The second area hereafter referred as A2 encompasses the oceanic islands  
23 (Fernando de Noronha and Rocas Atoll) and seamounts (Fig. 4e, j).

1



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Figure 4. Scores of the first two PCA components temperature in spring (a) and fall (f), and salinity in spring (c) and fall (h) from ABRACOS data only. The colour corresponds to the class defined by the functional clustering performed on the data (blue: class A1; red: class A2). Mean temperature (b, g) and salinity (d, i) profiles for each class obtained from the in spring (b, d) and fall (f, i). Spatial distribution of the classes/area for spring (e) and fall (j). The grey dashed and full lines illustrate the variation over the mean profiles.

9

10

11

12

13


14

15

16

17

In each area and for each variable (temperature and salinity) and season (spring and fall), no significant differences (fANOVA,  $p > 0.05$ ) were observed between the profiles from ABRACOS and other data (Fig. 5). fANOVA results verify that the data obtained during the ABRACOS surveys, are representative of a canonical state of spring and fall for SWTA. We thus merged all datasets in one complete dataset (from now the reference) of oceanic profiles per season (see Fig. 3, step 4). When performing the fPCA and fCluster analyses on the complete dataset, in addition to the A1 and A2, we identified a third thermohaline class, hereafter referred as A3, corresponding to the central offshore zone between A1 and A2 (Fig. 6).




1  
 2 Figure 5. Functional ANOVA between the mean profiles from different databases by area: spring temperature in  
 3 A1 (a); spring temperature in A2 (b); fall temperature in A1 (c); fall temperature in A2 (d); spring salinity in A1  
 4 (e); spring salinity in A2 (f); fall salinity in A1 (g); and fall salinity in A2 (h). Colours refer to data sources; blue:  
 5 ABRACOS, red: WOA, green: PANGEA and black: REVIZEE.

6

7

### 3.2 Typology of thermohaline patterns

8 The application of the fPCA and fCluster on the complete dataset allowed dividing the study area  
 9 into three significantly different areas during both seasons (Fig. 6, the dendrograms are provided in the  
 10 Supplementary Figure S1). We observed the two classes of profiles already depicted using ABRACOS  
 11 data only (A1 and A2 in Fig. 4) with A1 extending to the entire longitudinal extension (35°W-30°W)  
 12 south of 8°S at both seasons (Fig. 6b, d, f, h). In addition to A1 and A2, we identified a third class, A3,  
 13 corresponding to the central offshore zone between A1 and A2 (Fig. 6). Note that some spatial overlap  
 14 between profiles characterised in different area occurs, mainly in the transition zone between A2 and A3  
 15 (Fig. 6b, d, f, h).



1  
 2 Figure 6. Mean vertical profiles of temperature (a, c) and salinity (f, h) of each class/area identified by functional  
 3 PCA and clustering in spring (a, f) and fall (c, h). The grey solid and dashed lines illustrate the variation over the  
 4 mean profiles. Spatial distribution of the classes/area for temperature (b, d) and salinity (g, i). (e) TS diagrams for  
 5 each class, with spring represented by dashed lines and fall by solid lines. (j) Static stability (in terms of buoyancy  
 6 frequency,  $N^2$ ). In all plots, the colours blue, red and green represent the areas 1, 2 and 3, respectively.  
 7

8 In A1, temperature profiles were characterised by a low stratification with a thermocline extending  
 9 from 70 m to 172 m in spring (Fig. 6a) with a thermal difference of  $7.7^\circ\text{C}$ , and from 58 m to 166 m in  
 10 fall (Fig. 6c) with a temperature difference of  $9.7^\circ\text{C}$ . Salinity profiles presented the saltiest waters with  
 11 a peak of salinity reaching 37.1 at 98 m in spring (Fig. 6e), and 37.2 at 68 m in fall (Fig. 6g).

12 In A2, temperature profiles were characterized by a high stratification with a sharp thermocline  
 13 extending from 86 m to 132 m in spring (Fig. 6a) with a thermal difference of  $10.8^\circ\text{C}$ , and from 50 m to  
 14 100 m in fall (Fig. 6c) with a thermal difference of  $12.3^\circ\text{C}$ . Salinity profiles presented the lowest  
 15 salinity, with maximum values reaching 36.6 at 100 m in spring (Fig. 6e) and 36.4 at 72 m in fall (Fig.  
 16 6g).

17 In A3, temperature profiles were characterized by low stratification with a thermocline extending  
 18 from 90 m to 160 m in spring (Fig. 6a) with a thermal difference of  $10.7^\circ\text{C}$  in, and from 64 to 158 m in  
 19 fall (Fig. 6c) with a thermal difference of  $9.9^\circ\text{C}$ . Salinity profiles presented intermediate salinity values  
 20 with a maximum of 36.7 at 108 m in spring (Fig. 6e), and 36.8 at 92 m in fall (Fig. 6g).

21 To identify the water-masses present in each area for each season we used TS diagram (Fig. 6e).  
 22 Surface Tropical South Water are warm surface water (Stramma and England, 1999) with  $\sigma_\theta$  above  $24.5$   
 23  $\text{kg}\cdot\text{m}^{-3}$  (Gasparin et al., 2014; Urbano et al., 2008) observed in all three areas with seasonal changes


1 mostly driven by the temperature. Below, in the upper part of the thermocline, lies the Subtropical  
 2 Underwater (SUW) (Lambert and Sturges, 1977) formed by the excess of evaporation over precipitation  
 3 in the subtropics and advected westward within the subtropical gyre (Bourlès et al., 1999). This water-  
 4 mass, observed in all three areas, is characterised by its high salinity (>36.5; Stramma and England,  
 5 1999). Finally, in subsurface, in the lower part and below the thermocline, the South Atlantic Central  
 6 Water ( $24.5 < \sigma_\theta < 27$  kg.m<sup>-3</sup>, Stramma and England, 1999) dominates, whatever the season or area.

7

### 8 3.3 3D thermohaline patterns

9 From functional geostatistics, we characterised the 3D temperature and salinity fields for the  
 10 canonical state of spring and fall in the SWTA. Validation procedure (Fig. 7 for spring, see  
 11 Supplementary Figure S2 for fall) shows that the ordinary trace-kriging provides an acceptable  
 12 estimation of temperature and salinity profiles at any locations of the sampled domain, independent of  
 13 the areas (A1, A2 and A3). Examples of original profiles for randomly selected sites and their predicted  
 14 equivalents are shown, for each profile the root mean square of the differences between predicted and  
 15 observed values (applied along the profile) was calculated to estimate the accuracy. The boxplots of the  
 16 MSD (Fig. 7) and associated global statistics show that in most cases the goodness of fit was good with  
 17 similar predicted and observed smoothed curves. However, in some extreme cases the goodness of fit  
 18 was not optimal (e.g. profiles 2 and 4 in Fig. 7) but the shape was preserved.

19



20


21 Figure 7. Validation for Functional Ordinary Kriging of temperature (°C) (a, b, c) and salinity (d, e, f) in spring  
 22 using the Mean Square Difference (MSD). Maps of the distribution of the MSD for all stations for temperature (a)  
 23 and salinity (d). Examples of good (1 and 3) and worst (2 and 4) predictions for temperature (b) and salinity (e).

1 The corresponding profiles are circled in (a) and (d). The red solid lines correspond to the observations and the  
2 blue solid line to the predictions. The boxplots of the MSD for temperature (c) and salinity (f) are presented to  
3 evaluate the global performance of the estimators.


#### 4 *3.3.1 Temperature and salinity 3D fields*

5 3D temperature and salinity interpolated fields are available in supplementary material  
6 (supplementary movies SM1, 2, 3 and 4.) and are presented in 2D at three depths (Figs. 8 and 9). These  
7 depths were chosen to represent the patterns in surface (10 m), within (110 m) and below (200 m) the  
8 thermocline/pycnocline. In spring, the Sea Surface Temperature (SST, temperature at 10 m depth) (Fig.  
9 8a) was nearly homogeneous (median  $\sim 26.6^{\circ}\text{C}$ ) over the whole study area, while it was about  $2^{\circ}\text{C}$   
10 higher in fall (Fig. 8b), ranging from  $28.0^{\circ}\text{C}$  to  $29.2^{\circ}\text{C}$  (median  $\sim 28.6^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), with highest values in the  
11 central part of A3. At 110 m, a clear temperature gradient was observed during both seasons (Fig. 8c, d)  
12 with lower temperature north of  $\sim 6^{\circ}\text{S}$  (A2) than further south (A1 and A3). At 200 m (Fig. 8e, f), we  
13 observed strong spatial patterns with a core of warm waters over the continental slope (A1).

14 In spring, the surface salinity (Fig. 9a) ranged between 36.1 and 36.6, with the highest values along  
15 the continental slope (A1). In fall, the surface salinity (Fig. 9b) gradient was stronger with the highest  
16 values (up to 37.4) also near the continental slope (A1). The lowest salinities were observed offshore  
17 between  $3^{\circ}\text{S} - 6^{\circ}\text{S}$  (A2, A3). At 110 m, the salinity gradient reinforced (Fig. 9c, d) with lower salinity  
18 36.0 (35.4) in spring (fall) north of  $7^{\circ}\text{S}$  (A2, A3) than along the continental slope and in southern region  
19 (A1) where salinity reached 37.1 (37.3) in spring (fall). At 200 m, the salinity was lower than in upper  
20 layers, but the gradient was still observed (Fig. 9e, f) with higher salinity in A1 than A2 and A3, where  
21 the lowest salinity was observed.



1  
 2 Figure 8. Sea temperature in spring (a, c, e) and fall (b, d, f) at 10 m (a, b), 110 m (c, d) and 200 m (e, f) in the  
 3 southwestern tropical Atlantic. Grey solid lines delimit areas A1, A2 and A3 defined in section 3.2. The  
 4 continental shelf limited by the isobaths of 60 m is represented by light grey. RA: Rocas Atoll; FN: Fernando de  
 5 Noronha archipelago. The main currents are represented. cSEC: central branch of the South Equatorial Current.  
 6 SEUC: South Equatorial Undercurrent. NBUC. North Brazilian Undercurrent; NBC: North Brazilian Current.  
 7 Note that the temperature scale varies according to the depths 10 m, 110 m and 200 m.




1  
 2 Figure 9. Sea salinity in spring (a, c, e) and fall (b, d, f) at 10 m (a, b), 110 m (c, d) and 200 m (e, f) in the  
 3 southwestern tropical Atlantic. Grey solid lines delimit areas A1, A2 and A3 defined in section 3.2. The  
 4 continental shelf limited by the isobaths of 60 m is represented by light grey. RA: Rocas Atoll; FN: Fernando de  
 5 Noronha archipelago. The main currents are represented. cSEC: central branch of the South Equatorial Current.  
 6 SEUC: South Equatorial Undercurrent. NBUC. North Brazilian Undercurrent; NBC: North Brazilian Current.  
 7 Note that the temperature scale varies according to the depths 10 m, 110 m and 200 m.  
 8  
 9  
 10

1           3.3.2 *Thermohaline structure*

2           The MLD, the BLT, the upper thermocline depth and the lower thermocline/pycnocline depth were  
3 estimated from the interpolated temperature and salinity fields for each season (Fig. 10, see Table 2 for  
4 synthetic description). To verify the robustness of these estimates we also performed these calculations  
5 using the B-spline fitted original profiles for each Area. This comparison (Table 2) reveals very small  
6 differences. To better illustrate the spatial patterns, we also plotted the thermohaline structure over  
7 vertical sections along the slope, cross-shore (at 5.5°S and 8°S) and along the Fernando de Noronha  
8 chain (Figs. 11 and 12). A clear seasonal variability was observed with shallower limits for both  
9 variables in fall compared with spring (Figs. 10-12).

10           The MLD was shallower in A1 than in other areas with a sharp transition in the limit between A1  
11 and A3 (Figs. 10-12). The BLT followed an opposite pattern, with thicker BL in A1 than in other areas,  
12 although low values were also observed close to the shelf break. Some hotspots of high BLT (>40 m)  
13 were observed in A1 in spring and in A1 and A3 in fall (Fig. 10). The BLT was on average thicker and  
14 the BLF higher in fall than spring (Table 2). More specifically, the BLF was the highest in A1 with 80%  
15 and 77% in spring and fall, respectively. A3 presented intermediate BLF values with 63% and 70% in  
16 spring and fall, respectively. The lowest BLF were observed in A2 with 14% and 33% in spring and fall,  
17 respectively. The seasonal and spatial patterns of the UTD were alike to the one of the MLD. The LTD  
18 presented a clear spatial pattern, shallow at low latitudes (A2, and in a lesser extent, A3) and deep close  
19 to the coast and in the extreme northwest of the study area (Figs. 10-12). In addition, small-scale vertical  
20 displacements of isotherms and isohalines were observed around islands and seamounts (Figs. 11c, d  
21 and 12c, d).

22




1  
 2 Figure 10. Thermohaline structure estimated from the interpolated temperature and salinity fields in spring (a, c,  
 3 e, g) and fall (b, d, f, h) in the southwestern tropical Atlantic. The panels show MLD (a, b); BLT (c, d); UTD (e, f)  
 4 and LTD (g, h). Grey solid lines delimit areas A1, A2 and A3 defined in section 3.2. The continental shelf limited  
 5 by the isobaths of 60 m is represented in light grey. RA: Rocas Atoll; FN: Fernando de Noronha archipelago.

Table. 2. Characteristics of the thermohaline descriptors by area and by season from the smoothed original profiles and from interpolated fields (in parenthesis).


		Mixed layer depth (m)		Barrier layer thickness* (m)		Upper thermocline depth (m)		Lower thermocline depth (m)		Thermocline thickness (m)		Maximum salinity		Depth of maximum salinity (m)	
		S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F	S	F
A1	Mdn	58 (60)	36 (46)	18 (16)	20 (16)	76 (80)	60 (58)	175 (180)	168 (168)	104 (100)	110 (110)	37.2 (37.1)	37.2 (37.1)	92 (92)	80 (82)
	$\bar{m}$	53 (61)	39 (43)	19 (18)	20 (16)	73 (79)	60 (60)	187 (177)	173 (171)	104 (100)	114 (112)	37.2 (37.1)	37.2 (37.1)	92 (90)	78 (84)
	std	16 (16)	15 (11)	12 (9)	15 (11)	18 (13)	13 (9)	37 (15)	24 (11)	26 (18)	28 (14)	0.1 (0.1)	0.2 (0.1)	16 (8)	24 (20)
A2	Mdn	92 (84)	46 (44)	2 (2)	2 (4)	94 (86)	48 (48)	134 (130)	98 (102)	40 (44)	48 (52)	36.7 (36.5)	36.4 (36.4)	98 (100)	66 (66)
	$\bar{m}$	90 (85)	46 (43)	2 (2)	4 (5)	92 (87)	51 (48)	135 (130)	99 (104)	43 (44)	48 (55)	36.7 (36.5)	36.4 (36.4)	100 (99)	68 (66)
	std	7 (4)	11 (4)	3 (3)	4 (3)	9 (4)	10 (5)	12 (8)	13 (13)	12 (9)	10 (12)	0.1 (0.1)	0.2 (0.2)	7 (3)	12 (9)
A3	Mdn	85 (84)	55 (56)	7 (8)	8 (10)	94 (92)	65 (66)	178 (174)	160 (156)	88 (76)	94 (88)	37.0 (36.8)	36.8 (36.7)	107 (110)	90 (92)
	$\bar{m}$	82 (82)	52 (55)	10 (10)	12 (11)	92 (92)	64 (66)	179 (173)	157 (154)	87 (79)	93 (87)	37.0 (36.8)	36.8 (36.7)	107 (109)	89 (92)
	std	16 (10)	14 (7)	11 (6)	12 (8)	14 (6)	11 (5)	13 (9)	13 (15)	21 (8)	12 (14)	0.2 (0.1)	0.2 (0.1)	12 (6)	13 (7)

*BLT\** The frequency of BLTs larger than 5 m was 80% (77%), 14% (33%) and 63% (70%) in spring (fall) for A1, A2 and A3, respectively

S = spring; F = fall; Mdn = median;  $\bar{m}$  = mean; Std = standard deviation



1  
 2 Figure 11. Vertical sections of temperature in spring (a, c) and fall (b, d). Sections in (a, b) include two along-  
 3 shore transects (9.95°S/35°W – 7.4°S/34°W and 7.4°S/34°W – 4.7°W/35°W) and two cross-shore transects  
 4 (8°S/35 – 31.3°W and 5.5°S/35 – 31.3°W). Sections in (d,e) include a transect along 3.87°S from 36°W to 31°  
 5 and a transect crossing Fernando de Noronha island (FN) at 32.4°W from 3.5°S to 4.5°S. The grey areas represent  
 6 the relief; RA: Rocas Atoll; FN: Fernando de Noronha archipelago. The black solid lines show the MLD. The  
 7 black dashed lines show the upper and lower limits of the thermocline. The difference between the MLD and the  
 8 upper limit of the thermocline illustrates the presence of the BL. The main currents are represented. cSEC: central  
 9 branch of the South Equatorial Current; NBUC: North Brazilian Undercurrent; NBC: North Brazilian Current.  
 10 The central panel shows the localisation of the transects depicted in the 3D plots.




1  
 2 Figure 12. Vertical sections of salinity in spring (a, c) and fall (b, d). Sections in (a, b) include two along-shore  
 3 transects ( 9.95°S/35°W – 7.4°S/34°W and 7.4°S/34°W – 4.7°S/35°W) and two cross-shore transects (8°S/35 –  
 4 31.3°W and 5.5°S/35 – 31.3°W). Section in (d,e) include a transect along 3.87°S from 36°W to 31° and one  
 5 transect crossing Fernando de Noronha island (FN) at 32.4°W from 3.5°S to 4.5°S. The grey areas represent the  
 6 relief. RA: Rocas Atoll; FN: Fernando de Noronha archipelago. The black solid line shows the MLD. The black  
 7 dashed lines show the upper and lower limits of the thermocline. The difference between the MLD and the upper  
 8 limit of the thermocline illustrate the presence of the BL. The main currents are represented. cSEC: central  
 9 branch of the South Equatorial Current; NBUC. North Brazilian Undercurrent; NBC: North Brazilian Current. The  
 10 central panel shows the localisation of the transects depicted in the 3D plots.  
 11

### 12 3.3.3 Atmospheric forcing

13  
 14 In spring, the E-P budget (Fig. 13a) is positive throughout the SWTA domain, with values reaching  
 15 6 mm.d<sup>-1</sup> in the offshore region, south of 8°S. In fall (Fig. 13b), a north-south gradient occurs with  
 16 negative E-P budget (freshwater inflow) north of 5°S, mostly in A2 (Supplementary Figures S3). South  
 17 of ~6°S the E-P budget was positive (up to 4 mm.d<sup>-1</sup>), but with lower values than in spring.

- 1 Southeast trade winds (Fig. 13c, d) are stronger in spring ( $7.3$  to  $9$   $\text{m.s}^{-1}$ ) than in fall ( $5.4$  to  $7$   $\text{m.s}^{-1}$ ).
- 2 In spring, weakest winds are observed in A1, south of  $8^{\circ}\text{S}$ ; while in fall, weakest winds are observed
- 3 north of  $\sim 5^{\circ}\text{S}$  in A2, and strongest winds in the southeast region of the SWTA.



- 4
- 5 Figure 13. SWTA climatology evaporation minus precipitation budget (E-P) and wind speed at 10 m in
- 6 spring (a, c) and fall (b, d) according to HOAPS data for 1988 to 2014. Grey solid lines delimit areas
- 7 A1, A2 and A3 defined in section 3.2.
- 8

#### 9 4. Discussion

- 10 Applying a FDA approach on CTD profiles from a variety of sources, we finely describe the
- 11 canonical states of the thermohaline structure of the upper ocean of the SWTA in austral spring (Sept. –
- 12 Oct.) and fall (Apr.- May). The application of an FDA approach has several advantages. First, it allows
- 13 to explicitly consider the shape of the profiles (verticality) even when dealing with heterogenic data
- 14 (Bayle et al., 2015; Pauthenet et al., 2017). For example, in our case most hydrographic profiles had
- 15 regular sampling but some were irregular. In addition, fANOVA enable a statistical comparison of
- 16 profiles (curves) that is not possible to achieve with classical methods. This allowed, for example, to
- 17 objectively compare CTD profiles from different years and sources. The application of fANOVA did not

1 reveal significant differences in temperature and salinity profiles between the reference set of data  
2 (ABRACOS) and ancillary data sets that span over the period 1983-2017 (Fig. 5). This result was not  
3 necessarily expected since Dommenget and Latif (2000) reported decadal variability in SST in the  
4 tropical Atlantic during 1903-1994. However, our study area, was one of the least affected by such  
5 variability (Dommenget and Latif, 2000). In the same way, an increase in salinity was observed in the  
6 last decades but such trend was lower in the South Atlantic central waters (Hummels et al., 2015). In  
7 addition, Dossa et al. (under review) showed that ocean circulation during ABRACOS periods was  
8 representative of the climatological data (1993-2018) for each season.

9 Second, FDA opens the way to robust and objective classification of thermohaline profiles (curves)  
10 that led us depicting areas statistically different and geographically separated. Third, the kriging of the  
11 profiles in a functional geostatistical framework was highly powerful to interpolate in 3D a high amount  
12 of *in situ* measurements and predictions considering explicitly the shape of all profiles.

13 Indeed, the FDA application using ordinary kriging with the assumption of stationarity led to  
14 consistent results (Fig. 7). In most cases, goodness of fit was very high with similar predictable and  
15 observed curves. Nevertheless, the presence of three areas with different thermohaline patterns led to  
16 some low adjustment (MSD - profile 4, Fig. 7) mostly in the boundaries between areas where some  
17 overlapping occurs (Fig. 6). This was expected since the boundaries between areas cannot be entirely  
18 steady. Considering the presence of 3 different areas in the SWTA demonstrating a lack of thermohaline  
19 stationarity in the SWTA domain, an alternative approach for future studies accounting for the no  
20 stationarity would be the use of Universal Kriging (Menafoglio et al., 2016, 2013), which supposes that  
21 the random field has an expectation that depends of the area.

#### 22 **4.1 Thermohaline structure and associated processes**

23 By the application of the FDA, we reveal the complex panorama of the thermohaline structure in the  
24 SWTA. The portray of the canonical thermohaline structure illustrates seasonal differences with deeper  
25 MLD and thermocline in spring (Sept. – Oct.) than in fall (Apr.-May). In addition, we reveal the  
26 existence of three spatially delimited thermohaline provinces (A1, A2 and A3) with significant structural  
27 differences (Fig. 6) corresponding to different dynamical processes (atmospheric and oceanic). In most  
28 oceanic regions and in particular in the SWTA, a precise representation of the thermohaline structure is  
29 missing. This is due to a lack of spatial or temporal coverage. This prevents describing the actual  
30 spatiotemporal variability. In consequence, large areas encompassing a variety of conditions are often  
31 exemplified by a single TS diagram considered as representative (e.g. Tsuchiya et al., 1994). For  
32 example, Araujo et al. (2011) constructed TS diagram by latitudinal band encompassing areas that are  
33 significantly different as demonstrated in this study.

34 The overall seasonal differences we observed agree with the intraannual variability reported by early  
35 studies (Kara, 2003; Sato et al., 2006; Veneziani et al., 2014). It can be attributed to changes in mixing  
36 (wind stress), heat fluxes and the meridional displacement of the Intertropical Convergence Zone (ITCZ)  
37 (Biaostoch et al., 2008; Hüttl and Böning, 2006; Lorbacher et al., 2006). In spring (Sep. – Oct.), the  
38 deeper MLD (Fig. 10a) and upper thermocline (Fig. 10e) are attributed to the negative surface heat flux  
39 and the lower SST (Fig. 8a) that increase the density of the surface layer (Veneziani et al., 2014). In

1 addition, the strong winds (Fig. 13c) due northern position of the ITCZ at around 5°–8°N; Mignot et al.  
2 (2012), the elevated density and the improved mixing cause convective overturning of water, deepening  
3 the ML to a greater depth (Lorbacher et al., 2006; Tomczak and Godfrey, 1994). In turn, the shallower  
4 MLD (Fig. 10b) and upper thermocline (Fig. 10f) in fall (Apr. – May) (Fig. 8b) are a consequence of the  
5 gained buoyancy and higher SST due to the positive heat flux trend started since late spring (Lazar,  
6 2002; Veneziani et al., 2014). This positive buoyancy is also coupled with the relaxation of southeastern  
7 trade winds (Fig. 13b) due the southmost position, ~4°N, of the ITCZ (Supplementary Figure S4; Colna,  
8 2017), which shallows the MLD.

### 9 *Salinity*

10 The seasonal rate of change of salinity (Fig. 9) is not as marked as for temperature. However, the  
11 salinity meridional gradient observed at any depth with a reduction of salinity from A1 to A2 (Fig. 9) is  
12 sharper in fall than spring. Sea surface salinity (SSS) is mainly controlled by the E-P budget (Fig. 13a,  
13 b). In fall, this gradient is driven by the higher precipitation (Supplementary Figure S3) near the  
14 equatorial band related to the move back of the ITCZ towards the equator and the evaporation-  
15 dominated subtropics (Assunção et al., 2016; Awo et al., 2018; I Camara et al., 2015; Melzer and  
16 Subrahmanyam, 2017).

17 In subsurface (110 m and 200 m, Fig. 9c-f), maximum salinity observed in A1 corresponds to the  
18 SUW (core salinity >36.5) advected by the NBUC (Dossa et al., under review); Stramma et al., 2005).  
19 Salinity vertical core was more extended in fall than spring all along A1 while evaporation is lower in  
20 fall in particular north of 8°S (Supplementary Figure S3). However, the SUW is originated by surface  
21 evaporation in the subtropical gyre region (10°-25°S) where E-P budget is always positive (Fig. 13 and  
22 Supplementary Figure S4). Salter water are then injected into the interior ocean and subsequently  
23 advected from the subtropical gyre to the SWTA region by the sSEC and the NBUC (Blanke et al.,  
24 2002; Bourlès et al., 1999; Mémerly et al., 2000). There is therefore a delay between formation and  
25 entrance of saline waters in A1. Another factor, perhaps the most important, driving the vertical  
26 expansion of the salinity core in fall (Figs. 9 and 12) is the shoaling and the greater extension of the  
27 NBUC core (Dossa et al., under review; Schott et al., 1998; Silva et al., 2005; Stramma et al., 1995),  
28 increasing turbulence in surface layer and saline diffusion up to the ML. Our observations are coherent  
29 with Araujo et al. (2011) and Domingues et al. (2017) but the exact processes have yet to be elucidated.

### 30 *Barrier layer*

31 BLs were observed in the SWTA in both spring and fall in most of the study area. However, the  
32 BLT was lower than 5 m and “porous” in most (73% in spring; 70% in fall) of the study area. In such  
33 conditions, the BL cannot effectively obstruct the heat transfer (Mignot et al., 2009). Our results  
34 complement and clarify the observations identified by de Boyer Montégut et al. (2007) who indicated  
35 that BLs are quasi-permanent in the western tropical Atlantic. However, this last study was global, with  
36 a grid of two degree, which can explain the difference with our fine-scale study at southwestern Atlantic.

37 The BLT was thick, reached up to 50 m, in a band roughly conforming to the shape of the coast (Fig.  
38 10c, d). This pattern can be primarily related to a higher influence of the SUW, which is entrained into  
39 the region within the NBC/NBUC system that flows northwestward along the Brazilian continental

1 slope ( Dossa et al., under review; Stramma et al., 2005, 1995), in A1. In addition, sea surface salinity  
2 fronts induce the formation of BL (Sato et al., 2006; Veneziani et al., 2014). Thicker BLT (Fig. 11b)  
3 were indeed observed where salinity fronts occur (Fig. 9a, b), mainly on the fresh side of the fronts  
4 agreeing Sato et al. (2006, 2004) and Veneziani et al. (2014). Accordingly, it is in fall conditions,  
5 characterized by salty subsurface waters and striking salinity fronts, that the BLT was more preeminent,  
6 in particular in the ‘frontal’ central region (encompassing part of areas A1 and A3 between 6°S and 8°S)  
7 of the SWTA.

### 8 *Diagnosing Areas 1, 2 and 3*

9 The three thermohaline domains (areas) share the same water-masses (Fig. 6e), but with different  
10 density range. Tropical South Water dominates in surface, the SUW in the upper part of the thermocline  
11 and the South Atlantic Central Water below. While each water-mass encompasses a large range of  
12 temperature or salinity conditions, considering water-masses only is not enough to portray the ocean  
13 characteristics in the study area. Our results show that more important are the actual values of  
14 temperature (Fig. 6a, c) and salinity (Fig. 6f, h) along sections between areas (also depicted by TS  
15 diagram, Fig. 6e). In the slope area (A1) where the maximum salinity values are observed (Fig. 6f, h),  
16 the thermocline is thick (Fig. 12a, c) with low static stability and thus stratification (Fig. 6j). This  
17 structure changes towards lower salinity (Fig. 6f, h), thinner thermocline (Fig. 6a, c), higher stability and  
18 stratification (Fig. 6j) when moving offshore and north with strong stratification in A2 and intermediate  
19 conditions in A3.

### 20 *Area 1 (A1)*

21 A1 corresponds to the western boundary system of the NBUC (Fig. 8) originated by the bifurcation  
22 of the sSEC at ~12°-20°S in the subsurface layer (Stramma and Schott, 1999). The NBUC flows  
23 northwards at a speed up to 1.2 m.s<sup>-1</sup> along the continental slope with a core located within and below  
24 the thermocline (at ~150-450 m; Dossa, et al., under review; Tomczak and Godfrey, 2001). This system  
25 forms part of the AMOC and is a crucial link within the southern wind-driven tropical-subtropical cell  
26 (Schott et al., 2005; Zheng et al 2003).

27 A1 encompasses the shallower MLD/UTD and the thickest thermocline (Table 2) associated with the  
28 lower thermic gradient and thus a weak stratification (Figs. 6, 8 and 11). As observed in other boundary  
29 systems (Preusse et al., 2010; Todd et al., 2016), the presence of strong western boundary currents  
30 (NBUC presents only in A1) reduces the static stability as illustrated by the shear instability ( $N^2$  in Fig.  
31 6j), promoting vertical salinity diffusion from the SUW to the isothermal layer. This process favours the  
32 formation of long-lasting BL in A1. The presence of thick BLs tends to shoal the MLD (de Boyer  
33 Montégut et al., 2007). However, close to the slope, some areas do not encompass thick BL (Fig. 10c, d)  
34 but still present shallow MLD/UTD, especially in spring. The shallowest MLD in A1 is likely driven by  
35 the NBUC water influx rising the thermocline. This process is magnified in spring by the proximity of  
36 the sSEC bifurcation (at ~13°S) causing intense mesoscale activities (Peterson and Stramma, 1991;  
37 Schott et al., 2005; Thévenin et al., 2019). Thus, in this area, NBUC-related oceanic processes seem to  
38 overwhelm atmospheric (wind) forcing, especially in the slope area.

### 39 *Area 2 (A2)*

1 A2 encompasses most of the Fernando de Noronha chain and is characterised by high static stability  
2 due to high buoyancy frequency (Fig. 6j) at the thermocline depth. This reflects the dominance of a  
3 relatively weak ( $\sim 0.34 \text{ m.s}^{-1}$ ) surface current ( $\sim 0\text{-}100 \text{ m}$ ), the cSEC (Fig. 11c, d), that carries water from  
4 the eastern Atlantic with lower salinity compared with the waters of the SWTA (Lumpkin and Garzoli,  
5 2005; Peterson and Stramma, 1991). At the sub-thermocline, A2 is dominated by the eastward SEUC  
6 (Fig. 8), located between  $3^\circ\text{S}$  and  $5^\circ\text{S}$  (Goes et al., 2005) and supplied by the NBC/NBUC system (Goes  
7 et al., 2005; Stramma et al., 2005). Even under the influence of the SUW, A2 presents the lowest BLF of  
8 the study area. The increase in BLF from 14% in spring to 32% in fall can be explained by ITCZ-  
9 induced precipitations, hence negative E-P budget at low latitudes (Fig. 13b, Supplementary Figures S3  
10 and S4; Awo et al., 2018; Da-Allada et al., 2013) decreasing the SSS (Fig. 9b).

11 The deeper MLD observed in spring can be associated with the negative heat flux, stronger winds  
12 (Fig. 13a; Sato et al., 2006) and low precipitation (Supplementary Figure S3a northern position of the  
13 ITCZ), leading to higher SSS and therefore higher density and convective overturning of the surface  
14 layer. In spring, the thermocline is also locally shallower downstream FN (Fig. 12d). These  
15 displacement could be originated by orographic influences on the cSEC (wake effect) as shown by  
16 Tchamabi et al. (2017). This orographic interaction reduces the thermocline depth, increasing nutrient  
17 supply and related biological production (Jales et al., 2015; Silva, 2018).

### 18 *Area 3 (A3)*

19 Overall, A3 acts as a transition zone and mixing of water bodies. Indeed, with an intermediate  
20 stratification pattern (Fig 6j) and, therefore, moderate static stability, A3 is still influenced by the  
21 western boundary system but is not directly affected by the NBUC. The northmost part of A3 is  
22 influenced by the westward flow of the southern limb of the cSEC ( $3^\circ - 5^\circ\text{S}$ , Molinari, 1982). In fall, the  
23 low temperatures (Fig. 8e, f) and salinities (Fig. 9e,f) observed at 200 m along A3 could be originated by  
24 the advection of subsurface colder and less saline eastern Atlantic waters advected westwards with a  $\sim 9$   
25  $\text{cms}^{-1}$  velocity near  $7^\circ\text{S}$  (Bourlès et al., 1999; Molinari, 1983, 1982).

26

## 27 **5 Conclusion**

28 This study shows that the application of an FDA approach on hydrographic data allows for a robust  
29 and precise characterising and estimation of the ocean thermohaline 3D structure. Even if based on a  
30 stationarity assumption for the mean function in a non-stationary context, our approach brought insights  
31 on the thermohaline structure of the tropical southwestern Atlantic. By characterising the canonical  
32 seasonal states of spring and fall in the SWTA, we reveal a clear spatial pattern with the presence of  
33 three areas with significantly different thermohaline structure. Area 1, mostly located along the  
34 continental slope, reflects the western boundary current system, with low static stability and high  
35 frequency of occurrence of barrier layer (BL). Conversely, Area 2, located along the Fernando de  
36 Noronha chain, presents strong static stability with a well-marked thermocline. This area is under the  
37 influence of the eastern Atlantic. It is characterised by a low BLF, which is seasonally modulated by the  
38 latitudinal oscillation of ITCZ, controlling the regime of precipitation. In turn, A3 behaves as a transition

1 zone between A1 and A2 with still the presence of the water core of maximum salinity in subsurface,  
2 and therefore strong/moderate presence of BL.

3 From our results, the spring and fall thermohaline structure of the upper ocean did not vary  
4 significantly during the last decades. However, the expected changes in AMOC circulation (Chang et al.,  
5 2008) should affect the 3D transport of heat, salt, as well as the regional distributions of water mass  
6 boundaries, and may lead to shifts in ecosystems (Foltz et al., 2019; Hummels et al., 2015). This work  
7 can thus serve as a reference for diagnosing future variations in the AMOC and subtropical-tropical cell  
8 variability.

9 On the basis of this and other studies (e.g. Pauthenet et al., 2019, 2017), FDA approach emerges as a  
10 powerful way to describe, characterise, classify and compare ocean patterns and processes. It can be  
11 applied to *in situ* data but could also be used to deeply and comprehensively explore ocean models  
12 outputs. Further, this approach is applicable to any fields where data are present in the form of curves.  
13

## 14 Acknowledgments

15 We acknowledge the French oceanographic fleet for funding the at-sea survey and the officers and crew  
16 of the R/V Antea for their contribution to the success of the operations during the ABRACOS cruises.  
17 We thanks the Helmholtz-Zentrum für Ozeanforschung Kiel (GEOMAR) for PANGEA data  
18 availability. The Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq) by supported  
19 through a PhD scholarship grant for Assunção, Ramilla. M.A. thanks the support of the Brazilian  
20 Research network on Global Climate Change FINEP/Rede CLIMA (grants 01.13.0353-00). This work is  
21 a contribution to the International Joint Laboratory TAPIOCA ([www.tapioca.ird.fr](http://www.tapioca.ird.fr)), CAPES/COFECUB  
22 program (88881.142689/2017-01), PADDLE project (funding by the European Union's Horizon 2020  
23 research and innovation programme - grant agreement No. 73427).  
24

## 25 References

- 26  
27 Andersson, A., Graw, K., Schröder, M., Fennig, K., Liman, J., Bakan, S., Hollmann, R., Klepp, C., 2017. Hamburg Ocean  
28 Atmosphere Parameters and Fluxes from Satellite Data - HOAPS 4.0 [WWW Document]. *Satell. Appl. Facil. Clim.*  
29 *Monit. (CM SAF)*. [https://doi.org/10.5676/EUM\\_SAF\\_CM/HOAPS/V002](https://doi.org/10.5676/EUM_SAF_CM/HOAPS/V002)
- 30 Araujo, M., Limongi, C., Servain, J., Silva, M., Leite, F.S., Veeda, D., Lentini, C.A.D., 2011. Salinity-induced mixed and  
31 barrier layers in the southwestern tropical Atlantic Ocean off the northeast of Brazil. *Ocean Sci.* 7, 63–73.  
32 <https://doi.org/10.5194/os-7-63-2011>
- 33 Assunção, R. V., Silva, A.C., Martins, J., Flores Montes, M., 2016. Spatial-Temporal Variability of the Thermohaline  
34 Properties in the Coastal Region of Fernando de Noronha Archipelago, Brazil. *J. Coast. Res.* 75, 512–516.  
35 <https://doi.org/10.2112/SI75-103.1>
- 36 Awo, F.M., Alory, G., Da-Allada, C.Y., Delcroix, T., Jouanno, J., Kestenare, E., Baloïtcha, E., 2018. Sea Surface Salinity  
37 Signature of the Tropical Atlantic Interannual Climatic Modes. *J. Geophys. Res. Ocean.* 7420–7437.  
38 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JC013837>
- 39 Balaguru, K., Chang, P., Saravanan, R., Jang, C.J., 2012. The barrier layer of the Atlantic warmpool: formation mechanism  
40 and influence on the mean climate. *Tellus A Dyn. Meteorol. Oceanogr.* 64, 18162.  
41 <https://doi.org/10.3402/tellusa.v64i0.18162>
- 42 Bayle, S., Monestiez, P., Guinet, C., Nerini, D., 2015. Moving toward finer scales in oceanography: Predictive linear  
43 functional model of Chlorophyll a profile from light data. *Prog. Oceanogr.* 134, 221–231.  
44 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pocean.2015.02.001>

- 1 Bertrand, A., 2017. ABRACOS 2 cruise, RV Antea [WWW Document]. <https://doi.org/10.17600/17004100>
- 2 Bertrand, A., 2015. ABRACOS cruise, RV Antea [WWW Document]. <https://doi.org/10.17600/15005600>
- 3 Bertrand, A., Grados, D., Colas, F., Bertrand, S., Capet, X., Chaigneau, A., Vargas, G., Mousseigne, A., Fablet, R., 2014.
- 4 Broad impacts of fine-scale dynamics on seascape structure from zooplankton to seabirds. *Nat. Commun.* 5.
- 5 <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms6239>
- 6 Biastoch, A., Böning, C.W., Getzlaff, J., Molines, J.-M., Madec, G., 2008. Causes of Interannual–Decadal Variability in the
- 7 Meridional Overturning Circulation of the Midlatitude North Atlantic Ocean. *J. Clim.* 21, 6599–6615.
- 8 <https://doi.org/10.1175/2008JCLI2404.1>
- 9 Blanke, B., Arhan, M., Lazar, A., Prévost, G., 2002. A Lagrangian numerical investigation of the origins and fates of the
- 10 salinity maximum water in the Atlantic. *J. Geophys. Res.* 107, 3163. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2002JC001318>
- 11 Boor, C. De, 2001. A practical guide to splines. *Springer Handbooks Comput. Stat.* 302.
- 12 Bourlès, B., Gouriou, Y., Chuchla, R., 1999. On the circulation in the upper layer of the western equatorial Atlantic. *J.*
- 13 *Geophys. Res. Ocean.* 104, 21151–21170. <https://doi.org/10.1029/1999JC900058>
- 14 Bourles, B., Molinari, R.L., Johns, E., Wilson, W.D., Leaman, K.D., 1999. Upper layer currents in the western tropical North
- 15 Atlantic (1989–1991). *J. Geophys. Res. Ocean.* 104, 1361–1375. <https://doi.org/10.1029/1998JC900025>
- 16 Brainerd, K.E., Gregg, M.C., 1995. Surface mixed and mixing layer depths. *Deep. Res. Part I* 42, 1521–1543.
- 17 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0967-0637\(95\)00068-H](https://doi.org/10.1016/0967-0637(95)00068-H)
- 18 Camara, I., Kolodziejczyk, N., Mignot, J., Lazar, A., Gaye, A.T., 2015. On the seasonal variations of salinity of the tropical
- 19 Atlantic mixed layer. *J. Geophys. Res. Ocean.* 120, 4441–4462. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JC010865>
- 20 Camara, I., Kolodziejczyk, N., Mignot, J., Lazar, A., Gaye, A.T., 2015. On the seasonal variations of salinity of the tropical
- 21 Atlantic mixed layer. *J. Geophys. Res. Ocean.* 120, 4441–4462. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JC010865>
- 22 Carranza, M.M., Gille, S.T., Franks, P.J.S., Johnson, K.S., Pinkel, R., Girtton, J.B., 2018. When Mixed Layers Are Not
- 23 Mixed. Storm-Driven Mixing and Bio-optical Vertical Gradients in Mixed Layers of the Southern Ocean. *J. Geophys.*
- 24 *Res. Ocean.* 123, 7264–7289. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2018JC014416>
- 25 Chen, D., Busalacchi, A.J., Rothstein, L.M., 1994. The roles of vertical mixing, solar radiation, and wind stress in a model
- 26 simulation of the sea surface temperature seasonal cycle in the tropical Pacific Ocean. *J. Geophys. Res.* 99, 20345.
- 27 <https://doi.org/10.1029/94JC01621>
- 28 Colna, K.E., 2017. Latitudinal Position and Trends of the Intertropical Convergence Zone (ITCZ) and its Relationship with
- 29 Upwelling in the Southern Caribbean Sea and Global Climate Indices. University of South Florida.
- 30 Cressie, N.A.C., 1993. *Statistics for Spatial Data*, Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.,
- 31 Hoboken, NJ, USA. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119115151>
- 32 Cuevas, A., Febrero, M., Fraiman, R., 2004. An anova test for functional data. *Comput. Stat. Data Anal.* 47, 111–122.
- 33 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CSDA.2003.10.021>
- 34 Da-Allada, C.Y., Alory, G., Du Penhoat, Y., Kestenare, E., Durand, F., Hounkonnou, N.M., 2013. Seasonal mixed-layer
- 35 salinity balance in the tropical Atlantic Ocean: Mean state and seasonal cycle. *J. Geophys. Res. Ocean.* 118, 332–345.
- 36 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2012JC008357>
- 37 Dabo-Niang, S., Ferraty, F., 2008. *Functional and Operatorial Statistics, Contributions to Statistics*. Physica-Verlag HD,
- 38 Heidelberg. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-7908-2062-1>
- 39 de Boyer Montégut, C., Madec, G., Fischer, A.S., Lazar, A., Iudicone, D., 2004. Mixed layer depth over the global ocean: An
- 40 examination of profile data and a profile-based climatology. *J. Geophys. Res. C Ocean.* 109, 1–20.
- 41 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2004JC002378>
- 42 de Boyer Montégut, C., Mignot, J., Lazar, A., Cravatte, S., 2007. Control of salinity on the mixed layer depth in the world
- 43 ocean: 1. General description. *J. Geophys. Res. Ocean.* 112, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2006JC003953>
- 44 Dengler, M., Schott, F.A., Eden, C., Brandt, P., Fischer, J., Zantopp, R.J., 2004. Break-up of the Atlantic deep western
- 45 boundary current into eddies at 8° S. *Nature* 432, 1018–1020. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature03134>
- 46 Domingues, E. de C., Schettini, C.A.F., Truccolo, E.C., Oliveira Filho, J.C. de, 2017. Hydrography and currents on the
- 47 Pernambuco Continental Shelf. *RBRH* 22, e43. <https://doi.org/10.1590/2318-0331.0217170027>
- 48 Dommenges, D., Latif, M., 2000. Interannual to Decadal Variability in the Tropical Atlantic. *J. Clim.* 13, 777–792.
- 49 [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442\(2000\)013<0777:ITDVIT>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0442(2000)013<0777:ITDVIT>2.0.CO;2)
- 50 Dossa, A.N., Costa, A., Morel, Y., Chaigneau, A., Eldin, G., Araujo, M., Bertrand, A., Under review. Western boundary
- 51 circulation off Northeast Brazil. *Prog. Oceanogr.*

- 1 Febrero-Bande, M., Fuente, M.O. de la, 2012. Statistical Computing in Functional Data Analysis: The R Package fda.usc. *J.*  
2 *Stat. Softw.* 51, 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v051.i04>
- 3 Foltz, G.R., Brandt, P., Richter, I., Rodríguez-Fonseca, B., Hernandez, F., Dengler, M., Rodrigues, R.R., Schmidt, J.O., Yu,  
4 L., Lefevre, N., Da Cunha, L.C., McPhaden, M.J., Araujo, M., Karstensen, J., Hahn, J., Martín-Rey, M., Patricola,  
5 C.M., Poli, P., Zuidema, P., Hummels, R., Perez, R.C., Hatje, V., Lübbecke, J.F., Polo, I., Lumpkin, R., Bourlès, B.,  
6 Asuquo, F.E., Lehodey, P., Conchon, A., Chang, P., Dandin, P., Schmid, C., Sutton, A., Giordani, H., Xue, Y., Illig, S.,  
7 Losada, T., Grodsky, S.A., Gasparin, F., Lee, T., Mohino, E., Nobre, P., Wanninkhof, R., Keenlyside, N., Garcon, V.,  
8 Sánchez-Gómez, E., Nnamchi, H.C., Drévilion, M., Storto, A., Remy, E., Lazar, A., Speich, S., Goes, M., Dorrington,  
9 T., Johns, W.E., Moum, J.N., Robinson, C., Perruche, C., de Souza, R.B., Gaye, A.T., López-Parages, J., Monerie, P.-  
10 A., Castellanos, P., Benson, N.U., Hounkonnou, M.N., Duhá, J.T., Laxenaire, R., Reul, N., 2019. The Tropical Atlantic  
11 Observing System. *Front. Mar. Sci.* 6. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2019.00206>
- 12 Gasparin, F., Maes, C., Sudre, J., Garcon, V., Ganachaud, A., 2014. Water mass analysis of the Coral Sea through an  
13 Optimum Multiparameter method. *J. Geophys. Res. Ocean.* 119, 7229–7244. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JC010246>
- 14 Giraldo, R., Delicado Useros, P.F., Mateu, J., 2007. Geostatistics for functional data: an ordinary kriging approach.
- 15 Goes, M., Molinari, R., Da Silveira, I., Wainer, I., 2005. Retroreflections of the North Brazil Current during February 2002.  
16 *Deep. Res. Part I Oceanogr. Res. Pap.* 52, 647–667. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr.2004.10.010>
- 17 Grados, D., Bertrand, A., Colas, F., Echevin, V., Chaigneau, A., Gutiérrez, D., Vargas, G., Fablet, R., 2016. Spatial and  
18 seasonal patterns of fine-scale to mesoscale upper ocean dynamics in an Eastern Boundary Current System. *Prog.*  
19 *Oceanogr.* 142, 105–116. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pocean.2016.02.002>
- 20 Hadjipantelis, P.Z., Müller, H.-G., 2018. Functional Data Analysis for Big Data: A Case Study on California Temperature  
21 Trends, in: *Springer Handbooks of Computational Statistics*. pp. 457–483. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-18284-](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-18284-1_18)  
22 [1\\_18](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-18284-1_18)
- 23 Halpern, D., 2002. Offshore Ekman transport and Ekman pumping off Peru during the 1997-1998 El Niño. *Geophys. Res.*  
24 *Lett.* 29, 19-1-19–4. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2001GL014097>
- 25 Holte, J., Talley, L., 2009. A new algorithm for finding mixed layer depths with applications to argo data and subantarctic  
26 mode water formation. *J. Atmos. Ocean. Technol.* 26, 1920–1939. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2009JTECHO543.1>
- 27 Hounsou-gbo, G.A., Araujo, M., Bourlès, B., Veleda, D., Servain, J., 2015. Tropical Atlantic Contributions to Strong Rainfall  
28 Variability Along the Northeast Brazilian Coast. *Adv. Meteorol.* 2015, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/902084>
- 29 Hummels, R., Brandt, P., Dengler, M., Fischer, J., Araujo, M., Veleda, D., Durgadoo, J. V., 2015. Interannual to decadal  
30 changes in the western boundary circulation in the Atlantic at 11°S. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 42, 7615–7622.  
31 <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015GL065254>
- 32 Hüttl, S., Böning, C.W., 2006. Mechanisms of decadal variability in the shallow subtropical-tropical circulation of the  
33 Atlantic Ocean: A model study. *J. Geophys. Res.* 111, C07011. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005JC003414>
- 34 Jales, M.C., Feitosa, F.A. do N., Koenig, M.L., Montes, M. de J.F., Araújo Filho, M.C. de, Silva, R.A. da, 2015.  
35 Phytoplankton biomass dynamics and environmental variables around the Rocas Atoll Biological Reserve, South  
36 Atlantic. *Brazilian J. Oceanogr.* 63, 443–454. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1679-87592015093906304>
- 37 Jamshidi, S., 2017. Assessment of thermal stratification, stability and characteristics of deep water zone of the southern  
38 Caspian Sea. *J. Ocean Eng. Sci.* 2, 203–216. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joes.2017.08.005>
- 39 Jang, C.J., Park, J., Park, T., Yoo, S., 2011. Response of the ocean mixed layer depth to global warming and its impact on  
40 primary production: a case for the North Pacific Ocean. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* 68, 996–1007.  
41 <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsr064>
- 42 Johnston, T.M.S., Rudnick, D.L., 2009. Observations of the Transition Layer. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.* 39, 780–797.  
43 <https://doi.org/10.1175/2008JPO3824.1>
- 44 Kara, A.B., 2003. Mixed layer depth variability over the global ocean. *J. Geophys. Res.* 108, 3079.  
45 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2000JC000736>
- 46 Ker, S., Le Gonidec, Y., Marié, L., 2016. Multifrequency seismic detectability of seasonal thermoclines assessed from ARGO  
47 data. *J. Geophys. Res. Ocean.* 3741–3756. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2015JC011228>.Received
- 48 Ker, S., Le Gonidec, Y., Marié, L., Thomas, Y., Gibert, D., 2015. Multiscale seismic reflectivity of shallow thermoclines. *J.*  
49 *Geophys. Res. Ocean.* 120, 1872–1886. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2014JC010478>
- 50 Kim, H.-J., Miller, A.J., 2007. Did the Thermocline Deepen in the California Current after the 1976/77 Climate Regime  
51 Shift? *J. Phys. Oceanogr.* 37, 1733–1739. <https://doi.org/10.1175/jpo3058.1>

1 Kraus, E.B. (Eric B., Businger, J.A., 1994. Atmosphere-ocean interaction. Oxford University Press.

2 Lambert, R.B., Sturges, W., 1977. A thermohaline staircase and vertical mixing in the thermocline. *Deep Sea Res.* 24, 211–

3 222. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0146-6291\(77\)80001-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0146-6291(77)80001-5)

4 Lazar, A., 2002. Seasonality of the ventilation of the tropical Atlantic thermocline in an ocean general circulation model. *J.*

5 *Geophys. Res.* 107, 3104. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2000JC000667>

6 Liu, C., Köhl, A., Liu, Z., Wang, F., Stammer, D., 2016. Deep-reaching thermocline mixing in the equatorial Pacific cold

7 tongue. *Nat. Commun.* 7. <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms11576>

8 Liu, Z., 1993. Thermocline Forced by Varying Ekman Pumping. Part II: Annual and Decadal Ekman Pumping. *J. Phys.*

9 *Oceanogr.* 23, 2523–2540. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0485\(1993\)023](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0485(1993)023)

10 Lorbacher, K., Dommenges, D., Niiler, P.P., Köhl, A., 2006. Ocean mixed layer depth: A subsurface proxy of ocean-

11 atmosphere variability. *J. Geophys. Res.* 111, C07010. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2003JC002157>

12 Lukas, R., Lindstrom, E., 1991. The mixed layer of the western equatorial Pacific Ocean. *J. Geophys. Res.* 96, 3343.

13 <https://doi.org/10.1029/90JC01951>

14 Lumpkin, R., Garzoli, S.L., 2005. Near-surface circulation in the Tropical Atlantic Ocean. *Deep Sea Res. Part I Oceanogr.*

15 *Res. Pap.* 52, 495–518. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr.2004.09.001>

16 Madhupratap, M., Nair, V.R., Sreekumaran Nair, S.R., Achuthankutty, C.T., 1981. Thermocline {&} zooplankton

17 distribution. *Indian J. Mar. Sci.* 10, 262–265.

18 Maes, C., O’Kane, T.J., 2014. Seasonal variations of the upper ocean salinity stratification in the Tropics. *J. Geophys. Res.*

19 *Ocean.* 119, 1706–1722. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2013JC009366>

20 Matheron, G., 1963. Principles of geostatistics. *Econ. Geol.* 58, 1246–1266. <https://doi.org/10.2113/gsecongeo.58.8.1246>

21 Melzer, B.A., Subrahmanyam, B., 2017. Decadal changes in salinity in the oceanic subtropical gyres. *J. Geophys. Res.*

22 *Ocean.* 122, 336–354. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2016JC012243>

23 Mémary, L., Arhan, M., Alvarez-Salgado, X.A., Messias, M.J., Mercier, H., Castro, C.G., Rios, A.F., 2000. The water

24 masses along the western boundary of the south and equatorial Atlantic. *Prog. Oceanogr.*

25 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-6611\(00\)00032-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0079-6611(00)00032-X)

26 Menafoglio, A., Grujic, O., Caers, J., 2016. Universal Kriging of functional data: Trace-variography vs cross-variography?

27 Application to gas forecasting in unconventional shales. *Spat. Stat.* 15, 39–55.

28 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spasta.2015.12.003>

29 Menafoglio, A., Secchi, P., Dalla Rosa, M., 2013. A Universal Kriging predictor for spatially dependent functional data of a

30 Hilbert Space. *Electron. J. Stat.* 7, 2209–2240. <https://doi.org/10.1214/13-EJS843>

31 Mignot, J., de Boyer Montégut, C., Tomczak, M., 2009. On the porosity of barrier layers. *Ocean Sci.* 5, 379–387.

32 <https://doi.org/10.5194/os-5-379-2009>

33 Mignot, J., Lazar, A., Lacarra, M., 2012. On the formation of barrier layers and associated vertical temperature inversions: A

34 focus on the northwestern tropical Atlantic. *J. Geophys. Res. Ocean.* 117, 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2011JC007435>

35 Molinari, R.L., 1983. Observations of near-surface currents and temperature in the central and western tropical Atlantic

36 Ocean. *J. Geophys. Res.* 88, 4433. <https://doi.org/10.1029/JC088iC07p04433>

37 Molinari, R.L., 1982. Observations of Eastward Currents in the Tropical South Atlantic Ocean: 1978-1980. *J. Geophys. Res.*

38 87, 9707–9714.

39 Nerini, D., Monestiez, P., Manté, C., 2010. Cokriging for spatial functional data. *J. Multivar. Anal.* 101, 409–418.

40 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2009.03.005>

41 Pailler, K., Bourlès, B., Gouriou, Y., 1999. The barrier layer in the western tropical Atlantic ocean. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 26,

42 2069–2072. <https://doi.org/10.1029/1999GL900492>

43 Pauthenet, E., Roquet, F., Madec, G., Nerini, D., 2017. A Linear Decomposition of the Southern Ocean Thermohaline

44 Structure. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.* 47, 29–47. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JPO-D-16-0083.1>

45 Pauthenet, E., Roquet, F., Madec, G., Sallée, J.-B., Nerini, D., 2019. The Thermohaline Modes of the Global Ocean. *J. Phys.*

46 *Oceanogr.* 49, 2535–2552. <https://doi.org/10.1175/jpo-d-19-0120.1>

47 Peterson, R.G., Stramma, L., 1991. Upper-level circulation in the South Atlantic Ocean. *Prog. Oceanogr.* 26, 1–73.

48 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0079-6611\(91\)90006-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0079-6611(91)90006-8)

49 Preusse, M., Peeters, F., Lorke, A., 2010. Internal waves and the generation of turbulence in the thermocline of a large lake.

50 *Limnol. Oceanogr.* 55, 2353–2365. <https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.2010.55.6.2353>

51 Rahter, B.A., 2010. Turbulent Dissipation in the Mid-Latitude Mixed Layer / Thermocline Transition Layer.

1 Ramsay, J.O., 2006. Functional Data Analysis, in: Encyclopedia of Statistical Sciences. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken,  
2 NJ, USA, pp. 675–678. <https://doi.org/10.1002/0471667196.ess3138>

3 Reyes, A., Giraldo, R., Mateu, J., 2015. Residual kriging for functional spatial prediction of salinity curves. *Commun. Stat. -*  
4 *Theory Methods* 44, 798–809. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03610926.2012.753087>

5 Rippert, N., Baumann, K.-H., Patzold, J., 2015. Thermocline fluctuations in the western tropical Indian Ocean during the past  
6 35 ka 30, 201–210. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jqs.2767>

7 Rodrigues, R.R., Rothstein, L.M., Wimbush, M., 2007. Seasonal Variability of the South Equatorial Current Bifurcation in  
8 the Atlantic Ocean: A Numerical Study. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.* 37, 16–30. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JPO2983.1>

9 Sato, K., Suga, T., Hanawa, K., 2006. Barrier layers in the subtropical gyres of the world’s oceans. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 33,  
10 8–11. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2005GL025631>

11 Sato, K., Suga, T., Hanawa, K., 2004. Barrier layer in the North Pacific subtropical gyre. *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 31, n/a-n/a.  
12 <https://doi.org/10.1029/2003GL018590>

13 Schott, F.A., Dengler, M., Zantopp, R., Stramma, L., Fischer, J., Brandt, P., 2005. The Shallow and Deep Western Boundary  
14 Circulation of the South Atlantic at 5°–11°S. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.* 35, 2031–2053. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JPO2813.1>

15 Schott, F.A., Fischer, J., Stramma, L., 1998. Transports and Pathways of the Upper-Layer Circulation in the Western Tropical  
16 Atlantic. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.* 28, 1904–1928. [https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0485\(1998\)028<1904:TAPOTU>2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1175/1520-0485(1998)028<1904:TAPOTU>2.0.CO;2)

17 Shang, H.L., 2014. A survey of functional principal component analysis. *AStA Adv. Stat. Anal.* 98, 121–142.  
18 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10182-013-0213-1>

19 Silva, A., Araujo, M., Medeiros, C., Silva, M., Bourlès, B., 2005. Seasonal changes in the mixed and barrier layers in the  
20 western Equatorial Atlantic. *Brazilian J. Oceanogr.* 53, 83–98. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1679-87592005000200001>

21 Silva, B.J., 2018. Caracterização Do Sistema Carbonato No Arquipélago De Fernando De Noronha. Universidade Federal de  
22 Pernambuco.

23 Silva, M., Araujo, M., Servain, J., Penven, P., Lentini, C.A.D., 2009. High-resolution regional ocean dynamics simulation in  
24 the southwestern tropical Atlantic. *Ocean Model.* 30, 256–269. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocemod.2009.07.002>

25 Sprintall, J., Cronin, M.F., 2010. Upper Ocean Vertical Structure. *Encycl. Ocean Sci.* 217–224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012374473-9.00627-5>

26 Sprintall, J., Tomczak, M., 1992. Evidence of the barrier layer in the surface layer of the tropics. *J. Geophys. Res.* 97, 7305.  
27 <https://doi.org/10.1029/92JC00407>

28 Stramma, L., England, M., 1999. On the water masses and mean circulation of the South Atlantic Ocean. *J. Geophys. Res.*  
29 *Ocean.* 104, 20863–20883. <https://doi.org/10.1029/1999JC900139>

30 Stramma, L., Fischer, J., Reppin, J., 1995. The North Brazil Undercurrent. *Deep Sea Res. Part I Oceanogr. Res. Pap.* 42, 773–  
31 795. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0967-0637\(95\)00014-W](https://doi.org/10.1016/0967-0637(95)00014-W)

32 Stramma, L., Rhein, M., Brandt, P., Dengler, M., Böning, C., Walter, M., 2005. Upper ocean circulation in the western  
33 tropical Atlantic in boreal fall 2000. *Deep Sea Res. Part I Oceanogr. Res. Pap.* 52, 221–240.  
34 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr.2004.07.021>

35 Stramma, L., Schott, F., 1999. The mean flow field of the tropical Atlantic Ocean. *Deep Sea Res. Part II Top. Stud.*  
36 *Oceanogr.* 46, 279–303. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0967-0645\(98\)00109-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0967-0645(98)00109-X)

37 Sun, O.M., Jayne, S.R., Polzin, K.L., Rahter, B.A., St. Laurent, L.C., 2013. Scaling Turbulent Dissipation in the Transition  
38 Layer. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.* 43, 2475–2489. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JPO-D-13-057.1>

39 Sverdrup, H.U., 1953. On Conditions for the Vernal Blooming of Phytoplankton. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* 18, 287–295.  
40 <https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/18.3.287>

41 Swenson, M.S., Hansen, D. V., 1999. Tropical Pacific Ocean Mixed Layer Heat Budget: The Pacific Cold Tongue MARK. *J.*  
42 *Phys. Oceanogr.* 29, 371–398. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-15129-8\\_16](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-15129-8_16)

43 Tanguy, Y., Arnault, S., Lattes, P., 2010. Isothermal, mixed, and barrier layers in the subtropical and tropical Atlantic Ocean  
44 during the ARAMIS experiment. *Deep Sea Res. Part I Oceanogr. Res. Pap.* 57, 501–517.  
45 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr.2009.12.012>

46 Tchamabi, C.C., Araujo, M., Silva, M., Bourlès, B., 2017. A study of the Brazilian Fernando de Noronha Island and Rocas  
47 Atoll wakes in the tropical Atlantic. *Ocean Model.* <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocemod.2016.12.009>

48 Thévenin, M.R., Pereira, J., Lessa, G.C., 2019. Shelf-break upwelling on a very narrow continental shelf adjacent to a  
49 western boundary current formation zone. *J. Mar. Syst.* 194, 52–65. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmarsys.2019.02.008>

50 Todd, R.E., Owens, W.B., Rudnick, D.L., 2016. Potential Vorticity Structure in the North Atlantic Western Boundary  
51

1 Current from Underwater Glider Observations. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.* 46, 327–348. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JPO-D-15->  
2 0112.1

3 Tomczak, M., Godfrey, J.S., 1994. *Regional Oceanography*, 1st ed, Regional Oceanography. Elsevier.  
4 <https://doi.org/10.1016/C2009-0-14825-0>

5 Tsuchiya, M., Talley, L.D., McCartney, M.S., 1994. Water-mass distributions in the western South Atlantic; A section from  
6 South Georgia Island (54S) northward across the equator. *J. Mar. Res.* 52, 55–81.  
7 <https://doi.org/10.1357/0022240943076759>

8 Urbano, D.F., De Almeida, R.A.F., Nobre, P., 2008. Equatorial Undercurrent and North Equatorial Countercurrent at 38°W:  
9 A new perspective from direct velocity data. *J. Geophys. Res.* 113, 4041. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2007JC004215>

10 Veneziani, M., Griffa, A., Garraffo, Z., Mensa, J.A., 2014. Barrier Layers in the Tropical South Atlantic: Mean Dynamics  
11 and Submesoscale Effects\*. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.* 44, 265–288. <https://doi.org/10.1175/JPO-D-13-064.1>

12 Wackernagel, H., 2003. *Multivariate Geostatistics : an Introduction with Applications*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.

13 Williams, B., Grotoli, A.G., 2010. Recent shoaling of the nutricline and thermocline in the western tropical Pacific.  
14 *Geophys. Res. Lett.* 37, 2–6. <https://doi.org/10.1029/2010GL044867>

15 Zeng, L., Wang, D., 2017. Seasonal variations in the barrier layer in the South China Sea: characteristics, mechanisms and  
16 impact of warming. *Clim. Dyn.* 48, 1911–1930. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00382-016-3182-8>

17 Zhang, D., McPhaden, M.J., Johns, W.E., 2003. Observational Evidence for Flow between the Subtropical and Tropical  
18 Atlantic: The Atlantic Subtropical Cells\*. *J. Phys. Oceanogr.* 33, 1783–1797. <https://doi.org/10.1175/2408.1>