Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, C301–C302, 2013
www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/10/C301/2013/

Biogeosciences Discussions

Interactive comment on "Structural and functional responses of harpacticoid copepods to anoxia in the Northern Adriatic: an experimental approach" *by* M. De Troch et al.

E. Bonsdorff (Referee)

ebonsdor@abo.fi

Received and published: 13 March 2013

This is an interesting manuscript, based on well-performed experimental work, and analyzed using appropriate information. Figs and tables are clear and informative. Meiofauna are seldom included in studies such as this, and yet it is commonly accepted that meiofaunal organisms seem to withstand hypoxia (even anoxia for shorter periods), and also that recovery-rates are generally rapid (in part due to short life cycles, in part due to passive transport.

My minor comment to this valuable contribution is thus that there are numerous studies on meiofauna and hypoxia from the Norht Sea (Giere's seminal work on meiofauna

should be cited), and the Baltic Sea that could and should be included both in the general introduction and in the discussion-part. See e.g. papers by Elmgren & co (roles of meio- vs macro fauna), by Olafsson et al (meio/macrofauna, trophic status under environmental degradation - in press Mar Biol 2013), and Arroyo et al (J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 2012, vol. 420-421, and Hydrobiologia 2006, vol. 554). For a general reference to the spreading of coastal hypoxia, see (it is a comprehensive study) Conley et al 2011, Env Sci Technol. 45. The interesting issue of nematodes vs harpacticoids should attract more work!

I warmly recommend publication; an interesting manuscript well-suited for this special-issue on coastal hypoxia.

Interactive comment on Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, 2479, 2013.