

Methods note · Sea ice and ocean

How many independent comparisons cross an ice margin?

Eirik Solheim · 7 October 2026

Fictional author and institute · Editorial demonstration, not peer reviewed

ABSTRACT

An ice-margin transect can contain many samples but only one independent environmental contrast. This methods note combines published principles of replication with Arctic bloom observations to examine how a limited station budget can support a defensible regional question. A hypothetical allocation of eighteen casts compares a dense single crossing with three repeated crossings, distinguishing technical replication, local gradient resolution, and variation among contrasts. The note also separates distance from the present ice edge from time since local retreat and examines sampling order, depth integration, water masses, and access-related missingness. It offers neither a cruise plan nor a power calculation. The useful conclusion is an explicitly bounded association whose claimed replication matches the field design rather than the number of bottles collected.

Keywords: sampling design · ice margin · replication · chlorophyll · bloom timing

A source-based editorial text, not a report of original Still North research. Examples and imagery are illustrative.

A ship can collect many bottles while crossing an ice margin and still have only one convincing spatial comparison. The difficulty is not insufficient activity. It is that distance from ice, water mass, sampling time, depth, and bloom development can change together. A long row of samples may trace one transition without showing which part of that transition explains an ecological response.

This methods note asks how a limited station budget can distinguish an ice-margin association from the peculiarities of one crossing. It combines published work on replication and Arctic bloom dynamics with a hypothetical sampling design. It is not a cruise proposal, a power calculation for a named region, or a report of collected data. The design principles apply to a clearly defined response, such as depth-integrated chlorophyll, rather than to an undefined promise to measure ecosystem health.

Choose the estimand before counting stations

One possible estimand is the average difference in depth-integrated chlorophyll between recently ice-free and more persistently open water within a particular shelf region and fortnight. Another is the change in chlorophyll with days since local ice retreat, after accounting for water-mass differences. These are not interchangeable. The first is a regional contrast; the second is a process-oriented gradient with additional assumptions. State the spatial, seasonal, and depth boundaries before deciding which observations constitute replication.

Hurlbert's analysis of pseudoreplication concerns experiments, where treatment allocation and independence are central. An observational ice-margin survey is not a controlled experiment, and the margin is not a randomly assigned treatment. Nevertheless, the distinction between repeated measurements and independent contrasts remains essential. Three bottles from the same cast can

quantify analytical or small-scale variability. They cannot create three independent realisations of the environmental history that produced that cast.

Define a margin that moves

Distance to an ice contour is convenient but incomplete. The contour depends on the chosen concentration threshold, product resolution, and observation time. Ice drift can move it without the same local melt history. A station 20 km from today's edge may have been open for a day or several weeks. Retain both Earth-fixed coordinates and a documented ice-relative description, including uncertainty and the timing of the ice observation.

Perrette and colleagues found that ice-edge bloom timing and spatial form vary, with many observed peaks close to retreat but others stationary or moving behind the edge. Their remote-sensing analysis also shows how cloud, fog, ice contamination, and uneven coverage affect apparent bloom timing. This supports recording days since a defined local retreat as a distinct covariate. It does not justify assuming every chlorophyll maximum occurs at a universal distance or age.

A worked allocation of eighteen casts

Imagine eighteen available casts in a fictional accessible shelf sector. Design A places six closely spaced casts in each of three distance bands along a single crossing completed in sequence. Design B uses three separated crossings, each visiting the same three broad ice-relative bands, with two casts per band. Both collect eighteen casts. Design B sacrifices some local detail but gains repeated contrasts across crossings. Its independence still depends on the separation, water circulation, and temporal overlap, not merely the label 'three transects'.

Neither allocation is automatically optimal. If the actual goal is resolving a narrow front's internal structure, the

Design feature	Single dense crossing	Three repeated crossings
Total casts	18	18
Crossing-level contrasts	1	3
Casts per crossing and band	6	2
Main strength	Local gradient detail	Variation among contrasts
Main unresolved risk	One water-mass transition	Shared regional history

dense crossing may be appropriate. If the goal is a regional margin association, additional crossings are more directly aligned with that claim. A third design might repeat a subset after several days, trading spatial replication for temporal information. The choice should follow the question, instrument precision, expected variability, access constraints, and a pilot assessment, not a general rule that more dispersed sampling is always superior.

For an invented numerical illustration, suppose the three crossing-level near-minus-far contrasts are +2, +3, and -1 units of the stated chlorophyll measure. Their mean is +1.33 units. Reporting all three immediately reveals heterogeneity hidden by pooling every bottle. A model that treats crossings as groups can separate within-crossing and between-crossing variation, but three groups provide a weak basis for estimating the latter. The example demonstrates an honest unit of comparison, not adequate power or a statistically established effect.

Break avoidable confounding in the field

Completing every near-edge station at dawn and every far station in the afternoon makes time inseparable from position. Where operations and safety permit, vary or reverse visiting order across crossings, keep elapsed time short relative to the process of interest, and record exact sampling times. Randomising every station is rarely feasible at sea; documenting an intentional balanced order is better than implying randomisation that did not occur. Safety and local access requirements remain constraints, not inconvenient data to delete.

Depth must receive equal attention. Surface samples alone may confuse vertical redistribution with a change in total phytoplankton biomass. Use a consistent vertical integration scheme, supported by temperature, salinity, light, and fluorescence profiles where appropriate. Preserve actual sampled depths and distinguish fluorescence from laboratory chlorophyll measurements. If integration depths follow the mixed layer at some stations and a fixed depth at others, define why and show how that changes the estimand.

Access can select the sample. A vessel may visit loose ice but not consolidated pack, or abandon a crossing during rough conditions. Those missing stations cannot be treated as a random subset of the planned design. Record the intended station, reason for non-sampling, environmental context, and any replacement rule. A transparent accessible-domain conclusion is stronger than an apparently complete regional map whose difficult conditions were silently excluded.

Keep the biological mechanism open

Arrigo and colleagues' Chukchi Sea observations documented a substantial bloom beneath consolidated pack

ice. That finding is a specific warning against setting the study boundary at open water and assuming the unvisited ice-covered side contains no relevant production. It does not mean every ice-covered station hosts a bloom. Sampling should leave room to observe the condition that would contradict the proposed open-water-only explanation.

Include measurements that distinguish plausible mechanisms. A chlorophyll gradient may accompany nutrient depletion, changes in light exposure, different water masses, grazing, or horizontal transport. A temperature-salinity profile and nutrient samples do not resolve every alternative, but they can prevent interpreting a water-mass boundary as a universal ice effect. If the design cannot separate two mechanisms, report a joint association rather than giving the more appealing mechanism exclusive credit.

Analysis, limitations, and the useful claim

Plot profiles and crossing-level contrasts before fitting a pooled curve. Use a model consistent with nesting, spatial dependence, and the response distribution, and keep the uncertainty attached to the level at which generalisation is attempted. Do not report a narrow confidence interval obtained solely from technical replicates. A sensitivity analysis can compare distance-to-edge and retreat-age descriptions, but choosing whichever produces significance would turn an honest alternative into an undisclosed selection procedure.

The proposed design cannot remove unmeasured confounding, make inaccessible pack representative, or turn a fortnight into an annual estimate of production. Chlorophyll is not itself a carbon-fixation rate, and associations with ice do not establish the direction of causation. The meaningful outcome is a bounded statement about repeated environmental contrasts, with enough metadata to understand where they failed to agree. The best use of eighteen casts may be fewer rhetorical claims and a clearer account of which comparison was actually replicated.

References

1. Hurlbert, S. H. (1984). Pseudoreplication and the design of ecological field experiments. *Ecological Monographs*, 54, 187–211.

2. Perrette, M., Yool, A., Quartly, G. D., and Popova, E. E. (2011). Near-ubiquity of ice-edge blooms in the Arctic. *Biogeosciences*, 8, 515–524.

3. Arrigo, K. R., et al. (2012). Massive phytoplankton blooms under Arctic sea ice. *Science*, 336, 1408.