Specific comments:

Abstract

Need to start with a sentence giving broader scientific context for your study.

Macrobenthic – use a small 'm', not capital 'M' (many similar mistakes in ms with Macrofauna, Macro-nematoda, Dominance (!) etc…). I suggest do the same for oxic, microxic and dysoxic

Instead of Macro-Nematoda, just use 'nematodes' once you have established that you are looking at macrofauna.

Line 18: 'were present' not 'recorded abundances' (correct throughout ms)

Line 21: 'were absent', not 'no abundance'

There is no concluding sentence at end of Abstract

Introduction.

Reverse order of 1st and 2nd sentence.

Line 45: need references at end of sentence.

Line 56: need more details on OMZ communities and their function.

Line 57-61 – too basic, delete. Just define macrofauna by short sentence in brackets when first mentioning it.

Line 67 – need reference at end of this sentence

Nematodes are barely mentioned in the Introduction but they are main taxon of interest. Need info on nematodes in general and in OMZ in particular

Line 73: specify where Walvis Bay is

Line 77: need reference at end of this sentence.

Line 78 – are there any other studies that can be cited in context of Namibian shelf?

Line 82: you do not mention the focus on nematodes.

Methods

Line 95 – how low are the oxygen concentrations?

Table 1 – need to include number of replicates for macrofauna samples at each station

Line 114: why was 0.45 mm chosen for mesh size? Usually it is 500 or 300 microns. Not ideal for comparing with other studies.

Line 130 – this info needs to be in Table 1

Lines 130-134 – not easy to understand what you mean here. Just say what you did and why. How were correlations conducted? What do you mean by 'highest correlation'? what variable was chosen? Text in lines 169-174 needs to move from Results to Methods.

Line 138: need details of data treatment eg data transformation etc. Much too brief. What is anosim for? Simper?

Line 141: list the predictor variables in text or table. What is 'BUS'??? What selection criterion did you use for your stepwise regression? R2? Aikaike?

Line 142-144 – I don't understand what you mean. You matched biotic and abiotic data at scale of site for the correlation analyses?

Results

Line 149: these are huge TOM values

Line 167: give R2 values and P values in text.

Before giving results of correlation analyses, describe the microbenthic assemblages first (section 3.3. before 3.2)

Line 176: what statistical test was applied? P value? Of course they will be different because that's how you defined the groups to begin with.

Reorganise 3.3 to describe each group of stations – one paragraph per group.

Line 197: not 'taxa counts', just 'taxa'

Line 202: This sentence is much too vague. Dissimilar in what respect? Multivariate community structure? Statistically significant? P value? Pairwise comparisons? Show anosim table.

Lines 216-219: delete, sentence confusing.

Line 234: nee dto do multivariate community structure analyses, as per the macrofauna taxa data.

Line 235: why did you look at feeding guilds? There is nothing about this in the Methods or Introduction.

Discusssion

Line 257: clarify where the groupings come from. You use a scheme previously published?

Line 264: 'abundance', not 'quantities'

Line 273-275: I don't understand. If a group has highest relative abundance then it has highest absolute abundance too.

Line 275-278: confusing sentence. Delete.

Line 286: Vanreusel et al. make no such statement as far as I know. Indicate where in paper they say this?

Line 299: reference needed at end of this sentence Following sentence too vague. Why does patchiness 'call for more studies'?

Line 302: 'low', not 'meager'

Line 303: families are not italicised.

Line 309: "1234 ind. m-2 recorded per core" makes no sense.

Line 317: delete brackets and text within. This whole paragraph just repeats same things mentioned before.

Line 329: you cite a review paper, you need to cite papers providing actual data.

Line 331: nematodes may be larger in some areas because the species are different. Unlikely to be because conditions give them ability to grow bigger.

Line 336: why would meiofaunal nematodes ddiffer from macrofaunal nematodes?

Line 339: families are not italicised

Line 342: need reference for this sentence

Line 343: nematodes do not swim!

Line 360: so what? Did you record Anticoma in your samples?

Line 361: Wieser

Line 367: re-write this paragraph. Outline your main findings, how they compare with previous findings, and interpret their meaning.

Line 381-2: delete this sentence.

Line 387: did you identify species or just genera? Are you talking about nematodes?

Line 389: ok, so overall your findings confirm what we know already or is there anything different?