



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## Deep-Sea Research II

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/dsr2](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/dsr2)

# A comparison of mesopelagic mesozooplankton community structure in the subtropical and subarctic North Pacific Ocean

Deborah K. Steinberg<sup>a,\*</sup>, Joseph S. Cope<sup>a</sup>, Stephanie E. Wilson<sup>a</sup>, T. Kobari<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Virginia Institute of Marine Science, 1208 Greates Road, Gloucester Point, VA 23062, USA

<sup>b</sup> Faculty of Fisheries, Kagoshima University, 4-50-20 Shimoarata, Kagoshima 890-0056, Japan

## ARTICLE INFO

### Article history:

Accepted 15 April 2008

Available online 28 May 2008

### Keywords:

Mesopelagic zone

Zooplankton

Diel vertical migration

Particle flux

Carnivore

Gelatinous

## ABSTRACT

Mesopelagic mesozooplankton communities of an oligotrophic (Hawaii Ocean Time series-HOT station ALOHA) and a mesotrophic (Japanese time-series station K2) environment in the North Pacific Ocean are compared as part of a research program investigating the factors that control the efficiency of particle export to the deep sea (VERTical Transport In the Global Ocean—VERTIGO). We analyzed zooplankton (> 350 µm) collected from net tows taken between 0 and 1000 m at each site to investigate the biomass size structure and the abundance of the major taxonomic groups in discrete depth intervals throughout the water column. Biomass of zooplankton at K2 over all depths was approximately an order of a magnitude higher than at ALOHA, with a significantly higher proportion of the biomass at K2 in the larger (> 2 mm) size classes. This difference was mostly due to the abundance at K2 of the large calanoid copepods *Neocalanus* spp. and *Eucalanus bungii*, which undergo ontogenetic (seasonal) vertical migration. The overall strength of diel vertical migration was higher at K2, with a mean night:day biomass ratio in the upper 150 m of 2.5, vs. a ratio of 1.7 at ALOHA. However, the amplitude of the diel migration (change in weighted mean depth between day and night) was higher at ALOHA for all biomass size classes, perhaps due to deeper light penetration causing deeper migration to avoid visual predators. A number of taxa known to feed on suspended or sinking detritus showed distinct peaks in the mesopelagic zone, which affects particle transport efficiency at both sites. These taxa include calanoid and poecilostomatoid (e.g., *Oncaea* spp.) copepods, salps, polychaetes, and phaeodarian radiolarians at K2, harpacticoid copepods at ALOHA, and ostracods at both sites. We found distinct layers of carnivores (mainly gelatinous zooplankton) in the mesopelagic at K2 including chaetognaths, hydrozoan medusae, polychaetes, and gymnosome pteropods, and, in the upper mesopelagic zone, of ctenophores and siphonophores; at both sites a mesopelagic layer of hyperiid amphipods was found. The large population of ontogenetically migrating calanoid copepods is likely supporting large carnivorous populations at depth at K2. The contrasting zooplankton taxonomic structure at the two sites helps explain the higher efficiency of the biological pump at K2. Factors responsible for increased transport efficiency at K2 include rapid transport of POC via larger fecal pellets produced by zooplankton at K2, and enhanced active carbon export at K2 vs. ALOHA, due to the greater strength of diel vertical migration and to additional ontogenetic migration at K2.

© 2008 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

The structure of zooplankton communities plays a crucial role in determining the fate of primary production, the composition and sedimentation rate of sinking particles, and thus the flux of organic matter to the deep ocean. The majority of prior studies on the role of zooplankton in the ocean's biological pump have focused on carbon transfers and processes in the epipelagic zone, such as grazing and fecal pellet production (e.g., Dam et al., 1995;

Roman et al., 2000, 2001). However, mid-water processes in the mesopelagic zone (the base of the euphotic zone to 1000 m) also determine the efficiency by which particulate organic carbon (POC) is transported to the deep sea (Angel, 1989a; Banse, 1990; Steinberg et al., 2008). Despite the presumed importance of this mid-water zooplankton community, we know comparatively little about its role in carbon cycling through mesopelagic food webs. This is partly due to the limited basic information available on the abundance, biomass, vertical structure, and behavior of the various component taxa in the mesopelagic zone (Robison, 2004), the stratum where sinking particle flux is rapidly attenuated (Martin et al., 1987; Berelson, 2001; Buesseler et al., 2007). Furthermore, while some detailed studies of multiple taxa

\* Corresponding author. Tel.: +1804 684 7838; fax: +1804 684 7293.

E-mail address: [debbies@vims.edu](mailto:debbies@vims.edu) (D.K. Steinberg).

in mesopelagic communities exist (Angel and Baker, 1982; Angel, 1989b; Andersen et al., 2001, 2004; Yamaguchi et al., 2002a), direct comparisons of mesopelagic zooplankton community structure between contrasting oceanic environments are scarce (Andersen et al., 1997; Yamaguchi et al., 2004).

The mesopelagic zooplankton community affects carbon flux in a variety of ways, including consuming (Gowing and Wishner, 1986, 1992; Uttal and Buck, 1996; Lampitt et al., 1993; Steinberg, 1995; Dilling et al., 1998; Schnetzer and Steinberg, 2002b) and metabolizing sinking detritus, fragmenting larger particles into smaller, non-sinking aggregates via their feeding and swimming activities (Dilling and Alldredge, 2000; Goldthwait et al., 2004), and producing new fecal pellet classes at depth as a result of feeding on detritus or on other animals (carnivory) (Wilson et al., 2008). Diel vertical migrators may also affect POC flux by defecating surface-ingested POC after their descent to daytime mesopelagic residence depths (Flint et al., 1991; Atkinson et al., 1996; Morales, 1999; Schnetzer and Steinberg, 2002a) or by respiring and excreting this C in a dissolved form at depth (e.g., Longhurst et al., 1990; Zhang and Dam, 1997; Steinberg et al., 2000). Similarly, seasonal or ontogenetic vertical migrators may also contribute to C export (Longhurst and Williams, 1992; Kobari et al., 2003, 2008). This active transport by diel or seasonal migrators is a C flux that would bypass sediment traps, so it is not included in sediment trap-derived C export measurements.

Knowing the distribution and abundance of the various taxa involved in these processes and behaviors provides a basis by which C transfers can be inferred. For example, some taxa, such as oncaeid copepods, are known to feed on detritus (Ohtsuka et al., 1996) and may affect POC flux where they occur. Filter feeders such as salps or larvaceans may repackaged suspended particles at depth into sinking particles (i.e., fecal pellets, or the abandoned mucous houses of larvaceans), and carnivores, by repackaging their prey into fecal pellets, inject new particle types into the mesopelagic zone (Wilson et al., 2008). Finally, taxa undergoing marked diel or ontogenetic vertical migrations may have a significant impact on the 'active' C flux in a given environment. When these types of data on zooplankton community structure are coupled with feeding or metabolic rates and incorporated into mathematical models, C fluxes mediated by different components of the mesopelagic food web can then be quantified (Angel, 1989b).

In this study we compare mesopelagic zooplankton communities between the subtropical and the subarctic North Pacific Ocean as part of a research program investigating what controls the efficiency of particle export to the deep sea (VERTical Transport In the Global Ocean—VERTIGO) (Buesseler et al., 2007, 2008). We analyzed meso- and macrozooplankton collected from net tows taken between 0 and 1000 m at each site to investigate the biomass size structure and the abundance of the major taxonomic groups in discrete depth intervals throughout the water column. The magnitude and extent of diel vertical migration for various size fractions and taxa is also examined. We then discuss the implications of the contrasting zooplankton taxonomic structure at the two sites for carbon cycling and energy transfer in mesopelagic food webs, and on the efficiency of the biological pump.

## 2. Methods

### 2.1. Study sites

Zooplankton samples were collected from 0 to 1000 m at two contrasting sites in the North Pacific Ocean. The first collections were made at the Hawaii Ocean Time series (HOT) station ALOHA

in the oligotrophic subtropical gyre (22°45'N, 158°W) aboard the R/V *Kilo Moana* from June 22 to July 9, 2004. The second collections were made at the Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology (JAMSTEC) time-series site K2, in a high nutrient, variable chlorophyll region of the subarctic gyre (47°N, 160°E) aboard the R/V *Roger Revelle* from July 22 to August 11, 2005. An overview, plus detailed information on physical and particle properties, primary production, and particle flux at each site is presented in Buesseler et al. (2007, 2008) and in other papers in this issue (Boyd et al., 2008; Lamborg et al., 2008). During our study period ALOHA was characterized by warm waters (26 °C at surface), mixed-layer nutrients at nanomolar concentrations, low Chl *a* (~0.1 mg m<sup>-3</sup> at surface), and a phytoplankton assemblage consisting of small diatoms, coccolithophorids, picoplankton, and cyanobacteria. K2 was characterized by colder waters (10 °C at surface), higher surface nutrients (12 μM mixed-layer DIN), variable but higher Chl *a* (~0.8 mg m<sup>-3</sup> at surface), and a phytoplankton assemblage consisting of picoplankton and large diatoms.

### 2.2. Zooplankton collection

Meso- and macrozooplankton biomass and taxonomic composition were determined using a 1-m<sup>2</sup>, 335-μm mesh Multiple Opening/Closing Net and Environmental Sensing System (MOCNESS) (Wiebe et al., 1985) at ALOHA and Intelligent Operative Net Sampling System (IONESS) at K2. The following discrete depth intervals were sampled on the upcast: 0–50, 50–100, 100–150, 150–200, 200–300, 300–400, 400–500, 500–750, and 750–1000 m. We define 150 m as the boundary between the epipelagic and mesopelagic zones in this study (as 150 m was the depth of our shallowest sediment trap used for companion studies of mesozooplankton effects on POC flux: Steinberg et al., 2008; Kobari et al., 2008; Wilson et al., 2008). The total duration of the net deployment was ~3.25–4 h at ALOHA, and 3.5–4.5 h at K2 where a short second cast was required for the three shallowest depths as the IONESS was equipped with six sampling nets. The average volume of water filtered by the net in a single depth interval was 928 m<sup>3</sup> (range 266–3045 m<sup>3</sup>). Paired tows during day (9:30–15:00 local time) and night (21:30–03:00) were performed. A total of 4 day–night pairs of tows were performed at each site (1 day–night pair at the beginning and end of each of two sediment trap deployment periods per site). Sensors on the net systems included a pressure sensor, Sea-Bird temperature and conductivity probes, a flow meter, and an inclinometer. A GPS was available on the ship, and environmental and flight data were available in real-time.

Upon recovery, nets were rinsed with seawater and the cod-ends were removed. Net tow samples were then split using a Folsom plankton splitter and processed using protocols similar to Landry et al. (2001) and Madin et al. (2001). Half of the sample was size fractionated using nested sieves of 0.35-, 0.5-, 1-, 2-, and 5-mm mesh. Zooplankton in each size class were transferred onto pre-weighed 0.2-mm nitex mesh filters, rinsed with deionized water, and frozen at –20 °C for biomass analysis. The other half sample was further split for additional analyses of zooplankton lipid and gut content (Wilson et al., in prep.), and at K2, community structure of ontogenetic migrating copepods (Kobari et al., 2008). The remainder was preserved in sodium borate-buffered 4% formaldehyde for enumeration of major taxa. Larger gelatinous zooplankton (especially at K2) and micronekton were removed from the tow prior to splitting and were enumerated immediately. Biovolume of gelatinous zooplankton (e.g., ctenophores) was determined by displacement in graduated cylinders (see below). While larger scyphozoan medusae were collected at

both sites, they were usually rare and we excluded them from our analysis as they were damaged and likely not sampled quantitatively. Similarly, a variety of nekton such as myctophids, stomiiforms (*Cyclothone* spp. and hatchet fishes), *Bathylagus* sp., and juvenile squids were caught, but we do not quantify them here. We do, however, include crustacean micronekton such as mysids and shrimps in our analyses, as they were sampled in reasonable numbers and were relatively undamaged by the nets. Other larger crustacea such as euphausiids are included as well, although they are likely also undersampled by our nets.

At K2, high numbers of phaeodarian radiolarians also were caught in the nets. These large protozoans were clumped together and removed from the “biomass split” for separate determination of their biomass (i.e., they are not included in the size-fractionated metazoan biomass data).

### 2.3. Biomass analysis

Wet and dry weights for each size fraction were measured on a Sartorius BP211D or Mettler AE 160 balance. Wet weights were determined after sample filters were thawed on paper towels to remove excess water (~20 min). Samples were then dried for 24 h at 60 °C and re-weighed. Wet and dry biomass ( $\text{mg m}^{-3}$ ) were determined by dividing the biomass by the volume filtered through the net. Biomass of ctenophores was determined based on our own measurements on beroid ctenophores (Condon and Steinberg, unpublished) and on previously established relationships of ctenophore biovolume vs. wet and dry weight (Purcell et al., 2001), assuming a specific gravity of 1 ml (biovolume) = 1 g (wet weight), and dry weight (g) =  $0.01 \times$  wet weight (g).

### 2.4. Taxonomic community structure analysis

Preserved samples were analyzed using an Olympus SZX12 stereo dissecting microscope under dark and light field illumination. Zooplankton were identified to major taxa (e.g., chaetognath, siphonophore, the four major orders of copepods) with abundant or conspicuous genera or species noted. The sample was rinsed through a series of nested sieves (200, 500, 1000, 2000, and 5000  $\mu\text{m}$ ). All animals collected on the 2000 and 5000- $\mu\text{m}$  sieves were identified. Animals in the remaining fractions were subsampled with a Stempel pipette (5–15 ml) before identification. A minimum of 100 animals were identified from each of the smaller size fractions, resulting in examination of 1/1200–1/2 of each size fraction. We did not discriminate between copepod carcasses and those that were sampled live, as copepod carcasses were found to be a minor fraction (<5%) of total copepods above depths of 1000 m in the North Pacific (Yamaguchi et al., 2002a, b).

### 2.5. Vertical structure

In order to quantify the presence and extent of vertical migration in the various size classes and taxa at each site, we calculated both night:day (N:D) ratios in the upper 150 m and weighted mean depth for zooplankton biomass and for abundance of major taxa. N:D ratio was calculated by integrating zooplankton biomass (or abundance of a given taxon) over the upper 150 m ( $\text{mg dry weight or number m}^{-2}$ ), and dividing the integrated night value by the day value for each pair of tows. Weighted mean depth (m) was calculated as

$$\text{WMD} = \sum (n_i \times z_i \times d_i) / \sum (n_i \times z_i)$$

where  $d_i$  is the depth of a sample  $i$  (center of the depth interval, m),  $z_i$  the thickness of the depth interval (m), and  $n_i$  the biomass or abundance of individuals in the depth interval ( $\text{mg}$  or  $\text{no. m}^{-3}$ )

(Andersen et al., 2001, 2004). The amplitude of the migration ( $\Delta\text{WMD}$ ) was calculated as day WMD minus night WMD (m). We did not determine WMD for taxa exhibiting a pronounced bimodal vertical distribution.

### 2.6. Statistical analyses

WMD data were analyzed by paired  $t$ -tests. Biomass data were analyzed by 2- or 3-factor repeated measures ANOVAs (see Section 3 and table captions for individual factors used for each ANOVA). Where data did not conform to the assumptions of the ANOVA (normality and homogeneity of variance), data were either log- or inverse-square-root transformed. Comparisons of interest were tested with specific contrasts using a Tukey adjustment (Neter et al., 1996). We assumed a level of significance of  $\alpha = 0.05$  for all comparisons.


## 3. Results

### 3.1. Size-fractionated biomass

Depth profiles of size-fractionated biomass at ALOHA and K2 illustrate some fundamental differences between the two sites (Fig. 1). First, the biomass of zooplankton at K2 at all depths is approximately an order of a magnitude higher than at ALOHA. At ALOHA, biomass of all size fractions combined (day or night) ranges from 1.3 to  $9.2 \text{ mg m}^{-3}$  in the surface 150 m, and 0.2 to  $2.0 \text{ mg m}^{-3}$  at mesopelagic depths (> 150 m). At K2 in comparison, biomass ranges from 3.1 to  $96.9 \text{ mg m}^{-3}$  in the surface 150 m, and 2.9 to  $20.2 \text{ mg m}^{-3}$  at mesopelagic depths. Both sites exhibit surface peaks in biomass, with a secondary biomass peak in the mesopelagic zone. At ALOHA this secondary biomass peak occurs between ~400 and 750 m, while at K2 it lies shallower, between ~200 and 500 m.

The distribution of the size classes is also different between the two sites, with a significantly higher proportion of the 0–1000 m biomass in the larger (> 2 mm) size classes at K2 (~48%) than at ALOHA (35%) (Figs. 1 and 2, Table 1). The difference is most pronounced in the surface 150 m, where at ALOHA, 14–21% (mean of 4 day and night tows, respectively) of the biomass is in the larger size classes, and at K2 the proportion of larger-sized organisms increases significantly to 33–52%. At both sites, the proportion of biomass > 2 mm generally increases with depth. The difference between the two sites is less pronounced in the mesopelagic zone, where approximately half to two-thirds of the biomass is > 2 mm (Table 1, Fig. 2), with the exception of the daytime upper mesopelagic (150–500 m) at ALOHA, where a smaller proportion (33%) of the biomass is > 2 mm (Table 1, Fig. 2).

At both sites, diel vertical migration of zooplankton was pronounced. This is indicated by the nighttime increase in zooplankton biomass in the surface 150 m, with a corresponding decrease in the mesopelagic zone (Fig. 1, Table 1). This was particularly evident at ALOHA, where the lower mesopelagic daytime biomass peak diminished at night as organisms moved upwards (Fig. 1A, B, Table 1). Movement of larger size classes from mesopelagic residence depths into the surface waters at night was also evidenced by increasing proportions of these larger classes in the surface 150 m at night (Table 1, Fig. 2) at both sites. Increases in the proportion of larger size classes at night were also evident between 150 and 500 m at ALOHA (Table 1, Fig. 2), suggesting migration from deeper waters into the upper mesopelagic zone. This relative increase in strength of diel migration in the larger size classes vs. the smaller is also indicated by the higher N:D



**Fig. 1.** Day and night size-fractionated zooplankton biomass ( $\text{mg m}^{-3}$ ) at stations ALOHA and K2 (redrawn from Steinberg et al., 2008). Day or night biomass values are the mean of  $n = 2$  tows taken at the beginning and end of each of 2 sediment trap deployments (D1 and D2) at each station: (A) ALOHA D1, mean of tows taken 24 and 28 June 2004; (B) ALOHA D2, mean of tows taken 3 and 8 July 2004; (C) K2 D1, mean of tows taken 1 and 5 August 2005; (D) K2 D2, mean of tows taken 12 and 16 August 2005. Note the biomass scale for K2 is an order of magnitude larger than for ALOHA, and the irregular depth intervals reflecting the actual sampling intervals.

ratios of  $>2$ -mm size classes in the upper 150 m as compared to  $<2$ -mm size classes, and the steadily increasing amplitude of vertical migration (as indicated by  $\Delta\text{WMD}$ ) with increasing animal size at both sites (Table 2). The mean N:D ratio in the upper 150 m at ALOHA for all size classes combined was 1.7, while at K2 it was 2.5 (driven by the high N:D ratio in the 2–5-mm size class); however, the amplitude of vertical migration was higher at ALOHA than K2 (Table 2). The 0–1000 m integrated biomass at both sites increased by  $\sim 20\%$  at night at both sites (Table 1). The increase, although not statistically significant for either site (ANOVA, site  $\times$  day/night  $\times$  depth interval,  $p > 0.05$ ), is possibly due to daytime net avoidance, or vertical migration of deeper ( $> 1000$  m) zooplankton into the mesopelagic zone at night (see Section 4).

### 3.2. Community structure


#### 3.2.1. Copepods

As expected, copepods were the most abundant taxa of zooplankton and constituted  $72 \pm 3\%$  and  $74 \pm 0.5\%$  of the total abundance of zooplankton in the epipelagic (0–150 m) and mesopelagic (150–1000 m) zones, respectively, at ALOHA, and  $86 \pm 4\%$  and  $70 \pm 4\%$  at K2 (mean  $\pm$  standard deviation of day

and night samples combined). Calanoids were the most abundant order at both sites (Figs. 3 and 4), constituting 62–76% of the total copepod abundance in the epipelagic and 66–88% in the mesopelagic zone at ALOHA, and 98–99% (epipelagic) and 75–99% (mesopelagic) at K2 (Fig. 4). Calanoid copepods were an order of magnitude more abundant at K2 than ALOHA, and as a broad taxonomic category exhibited diel vertical migration, with N:D abundance ratios of 1.4 (ALOHA) and 1.8 (K2) (Fig. 3, Table 3). A number of individual calanoid taxa, such as *Pleuromamma* spp., exhibited very strong migration and were not present at all in the surface 150 m during the day at either site. Subsurface mesopelagic peaks in calanoid copepod abundance were present at both sites, occurring between 300 and 750 m at ALOHA, and 200–400 m at K2, mirroring the mesopelagic peaks in total zooplankton biomass (Section 3.1, Fig. 1). Calanoid diversity at ALOHA was high, as is typical for the North Pacific subtropical gyre (McGowan and Walker, 1979; Landry et al., 2001). The calanoid copepods at K2 were dominated by *Neocalanus* spp. and *Eucalanus bungii*. These ontogenetic vertical migrators were still in the surface waters and just beginning their seasonal descent to depth at the time of our sampling in August (Kobari et al., 2008).

The next most abundant order of copepods was the poecilostomatoids. This order consists of many small species that would usually not be sampled by our relatively large mesh





**Fig. 2.** Percent dry weight of zooplankton in different size fractions during day and night at stations ALOHA and K2. Day or night values are each the mean of  $n = 4$  casts taken at each station.

**Table 1**

Total (all size fractions combined) integrated dry weight biomass during day and night at ALOHA and K2, and the percentage of biomass in the larger ( $>2$ -mm) fractions

Site and depth (m)	Day ( $\text{mg m}^{-2}$ )	Night ( $\text{mg m}^{-2}$ )	Day $>2$ mm (%)	Night $>2$ mm (%)
<b>ALOHA</b>				
0–150	507 (148)	814 (185)	14 (1)	21 (4)
150–500	214 (34)	284 (66)	33 (9)	57 (10)
500–1000	326 (112)	165 (23)	65 (7)	60 (11)
0–1000	1047 (134)	1264 (173)	35 (5)	35 (5)
<b>K2</b>				
0–150	1952 (572)	4972 (2355)	33 (9)	52 (21)
150–500	4929 (572)	3986 (363)	45 (7)	41 (3)
500–1000	1924 (344)	1896 (288)	66 (7)	62 (10)
0–1000	8805 (754)	10853 (1896)	47 (3)	48 (12)

Values are mean ( $\pm 1$  s.d.) of  $n = 4$ . For all depth zones, day and night biomass was significantly higher at K2 than ALOHA (ANOVA, site  $\times$  day/night  $\times$  depth interval,  $p < 0.05$ ). The % biomass in the  $>2$ -mm fraction was significantly higher at K2 for the 0–150 m (ANOVA, site  $\times$  day/night  $\times$  depth interval,  $p < 0.05$ ), and 0–1000 m (ANOVA, site  $\times$  day/night,  $p < 0.05$ ) depth intervals.

(350  $\mu\text{m}$ ) net (Böttger-Schnack, 1996a; Nishibe and Ikeda, 2007); thus we undersampled many of the smaller poecilostomatoid genera and life stages. These copepods exhibited remarkably different depth distributions at each site, peaking in abundance in the surface waters at ALOHA, vs. throughout the mesopelagic at K2 (Fig. 3). Abundance of poecilostomatoids was also considerably higher in surface waters at ALOHA than at K2, but similar between the two sites in the mesopelagic zone ( $\sim 0.1$ – $5 \text{ m}^{-3}$  at both sites).

**Table 2**

Diel vertical migration indices for size-fractionated dry weight biomass at ALOHA and K2

Site and size fraction	N:D ratio in surface 150 m	WMD day (m)	WMD night (m)	$\Delta\text{WMD}$ (m)
<b>ALOHA</b>				
0.35–0.5	1.5	201	181	20
0.5–1.0	1.1	182	136	46
1.0–2.0	2.1	260	131	129*
2.0–5.0	2.7	419	245	174*
$>5.0$	2.6	542	361	181*
Total	1.7	311	197	114*
<b>K2</b>				
0.35–0.5	1.3	293	304	–11
0.5–1.0	1.4	315	284	31
1.0–2.0	2.1	306	261	45
2.0–5.0	4.2	382	294	88*
$>5.0$	2.5	440	294	146*
Total	2.5	348	270	78

Values are mean of  $n = 4$ , calculated separately for each of the five size classes, and for all size classes combined (total). N:D ratio, ratio of night:day biomass integrated over the surface 0–150 m. Ratio was computed separately for each day/night pair and then averaged. WMD, weighted mean depth for day and night (see Section 2).  $\Delta\text{WMD}$ , amplitude of the migration, calculated as day WMD minus night WMD. Asterisks (\*) indicate a significant difference between WMD day and WMD night (ANOVA, site  $\times$  day/night  $\times$  individual size fractions; or paired  $t$ -test for total, i.e. all size fractions combined,  $p < 0.05$ ).

Poecilostomatoids were mostly from the families Oncaeidae and Corycaidae at ALOHA (Oncaeidae:  $1.1$ – $15.7 \text{ m}^{-3}$  in epipelagic, and  $0.1$ – $2.5 \text{ m}^{-3}$  in mesopelagic; Corycaidae:  $3.8$ – $18.7 \text{ m}^{-3}$  and

$<0.01\text{--}3.1\text{ m}^{-3}$ ), and Oncaeidae at K2 ( $0\text{--}0.4\text{ m}^{-3}$  in epipelagic, and  $0.2\text{--}4.0\text{ m}^{-3}$  in mesopelagic). Smaller numbers of the genera *Copilla* and *Sapphirina* ( $<2.5\text{ m}^{-3}$ ) also occurred within the surface 200 m at ALOHA. As a major group, the poecilostomatoids did not exhibit pronounced diel vertical migration, with 0–150 m N:D ratios of 1.0 at ALOHA, but higher (1.4) at K2 (Fig. 3, Table 3).

The cyclopoid copepods were almost exclusively from the family Oithonidae at both sites. Harpacticoid copepod abundance peaked both in the surface 50 m and in the mesopelagic below 200 m at ALOHA, and in the mesopelagic 400–500 m at K2 (although their abundance at K2 was low) (Fig. 3). The mesopelagic harpacticoid copepods at ALOHA were dominated by *Aegisthus* spp. As a group the harpacticoid copepods did not exhibit a strong diel migration. Cyclopoid and harpacticoid copepods made up 0–25% of the copepod abundance at both sites (Fig. 4). However, for reasons noted for the poecilostomatoids, our net under samples the cyclopoid and harpacticoid copepods.

### 3.2.2. Other crustacea


After copepods, ostracods were the next most abundant taxa (Figs. 5 and 8), constituting 0–47% of the epipelagic and 21–59% of the mesopelagic non-copepod taxa (Fig. 8). Ostracods exhibited pronounced diel vertical migration with N:D ratios in the upper 150 m of 2.5 (ALOHA) and 48.9 (K2), and  $\Delta\text{WMD}$  of 77 m at ALOHA ( $p < 0.05$ ) and 38 m at K2 (Fig. 5, Table 3). Thus, K2 ostracods were almost exclusively at mesopelagic depths during the day. The

diverse genus *Metaconchoecia* constituted 51% (ALOHA) and 22% (K2) of the mesopelagic ostracod population. Strong diel vertical migrators such as *Mikroconchoecia* spp. were relatively abundant in surface waters at ALOHA at night (up to  $2.7\text{ m}^{-3}$  in top 50 m).

Euphausiids were the next most abundant crustacean and also exhibited diel migration, with N:D ratios in the upper 150 m of 1.4 (ALOHA) and 16.9 (K2), and similar  $\Delta\text{WMD}$  of 73 m at ALOHA ( $p < 0.05$ ) and 77 m at K2 (Fig. 5, Table 3).

Hyperiid and gammarid amphipods were also strong diel migrators, with hyperiid N:D ratios in the upper 150 m of 2.4 (ALOHA) and 3.6 (K2) (Table 3). Migrating hyperiid amphipods at ALOHA included members of the family Scinidae and *Phronima* spp. Hyperiids in the genera *Phrosina* and *Primno* were almost exclusively found only in the mesopelagic ( $>96\%$ ) at both sites. Gammarids were mostly found in low abundance in the surface waters during day and night at ALOHA, but were relatively abundant at K2, where they resided solely in the mesopelagic between 200 and 400 m during the day and moved up into surface waters at night (Fig. 5). These gammarids at K2 were almost exclusively *Cyphocaris* cf. *challengeri*; this species underwent a pronounced diel vertical migration with a  $\Delta\text{WMD}$  of 199 m.

The larger decapods and mysids were rarer than the other crustacean groups (Figs. 5 and 8) but were significant contributors to biomass peaks, as seen in the large size classes (Figs. 1 and 2). At both sites, the abundance of decapods was highest in the surface waters. At ALOHA this was dominated by decapod larvae and by *Lucifer* sp., and at K2 by decapod larvae and sergestids. The



**Fig. 3.** (A) Day/night profiles of the four major orders of copepods at ALOHA. Values are mean of  $n = 2$ , with error bars indicating the range. Note abundance scales vary, and the irregular depth intervals reflecting the actual sampling intervals. (B) Day/night profiles of the four major orders of copepods at K2. Figure is as described in (A).




Fig. 3. (Continued)

large, red, caridean shrimp *Hymenodora cf. frontalis* also occurred solely in the mesopelagic at K2. Mysids occurred in surface waters with lower abundances deeper at ALOHA, and almost exclusively in the mesopelagic between 400 and 1000 m at K2. While we did catch reasonable numbers of mysids and decapods, our nets likely undersampled adult stages of these micronekton.


### 3.2.3. Gelatinous zooplankton

Chaetognaths were the third most abundant taxon overall, and the most abundant of the gelatinous taxa (Figs. 6–8). The vertical distribution of chaetognaths was different at the two sites, with highest abundances in the surface waters at ALOHA (up to 11.2 m<sup>-3</sup>) (Fig. 6A), and a bimodal distribution at K2 (up to 28.5 m<sup>-3</sup> in epipelagic, and 34.1 m<sup>-3</sup> in mesopelagic) (Fig. 6B). This distinct mesopelagic peak in chaetognaths at K2 occurred between 150 and 500 m. Diel vertical migration in chaetognaths as a broad group was evident at K2 but not at ALOHA (Fig. 6, Table 3). Several individual species of chaetognaths at ALOHA, however, showed diel vertical migration, such as *Pseudosagitta lyra*, which was only found in the surface 150 m at night and had a day and night WMD of 359 and 223 m, respectively. Strong chaetognath migrators at K2 included *Flaccisagitta enflata*, with a day and night WMD of 127 and 74 m, respectively.

Cnidarians such as siphonophores and hydrozoan medusae were relatively common in the tows. Siphonophores were most

abundant in surface waters at ALOHA, but interestingly did not occur in the top 50 m at K2 (Fig. 6). At K2 a subsurface peak in siphonophores occurred between 50 and 200 m, and some animals were found deeper in the mesopelagic as well (Fig. 6B). Most siphonophores sampled at ALOHA were calyphoran (families Abylidae and Diphyidae). As a broad taxonomic group siphonophores did not exhibit diel vertical migration (Fig. 6, Table 3). Hydrozoan medusae were most common at ALOHA in the surface 0–50 m at night, and good evidence for their diel vertical migration includes a N:D ratio of 3, and a day to night change in WMD of 177 m (Fig. 6A, Table 3). A bimodal distribution of hydrozoan medusae occurred at K2, with a population within the upper 150 m, and between 200 and 500 m (Fig. 6B). Diel migration of hydrozoan medusae was not as evident at K2 (Table 3).

Pelagic tunicates (salps, doliolids, and larvaceans) were an important component of the zooplankton community at both sites. While abundances of salps were comparable between the two sites (on the order of <1 up to 3 m<sup>-3</sup>), vertical distribution of salps was distinct. At ALOHA salps occurred largely in the upper 150 m, while at K2 a mesopelagic peak in salps occurred between 200 and 500 m (Fig. 6). There is possible evidence for diel vertical migration of lower mesopelagic or bathypelagic salps into the upper mesopelagic (200–300 m) layer at night at K2, although the standard deviation is high (Fig. 6B). Distribution of doliolids paralleled that of the salps, with peaks in the epipelagic at ALOHA, and in the mesopelagic at K2. Larvacean (appendicularian)



**Fig. 4.** Percent abundance of the four major orders of copepods during day and night at stations ALOHA and K2. Day or night values are each the mean of  $n = 2$  casts analyzed for taxonomic composition at each station.

abundance was higher in the epipelagic zone at K2 than ALOHA, with no discernable day/night differences at either site (Fig. 6). Although larvaceans were the second most abundant gelatinous zooplankton in surface waters at the two sites (after chaetognaths), we found few recognizable larvaceans in samples from  $> 150$  m. Presumably larvaceans were present in the mesopelagic zone, as we found mesopelagic peaks in larvacean fecal pellets in sediment traps (Wilson et al., 2008), but they became damaged beyond recognition in our net tows. Therefore we only report data from depths  $< 150$  m.

The thecosome (shelled) pteropods mostly occurred in the epipelagic zone and decreased with depth at ALOHA (Fig. 7A). Abundance of thecosome pteropods was about an order of magnitude lower at K2, with abundance peaking in the lower mesopelagic zone between 400 and 1000 m (Fig. 7B). The gymnosome (shell-less) pteropods were very rare in our tows at ALOHA, but were more abundant at K2 where they occurred mostly in the upper 300 m (opposite to the K2 thecosome distribution) at abundances up to  $0.5 \text{ m}^{-3}$ . As a broad taxonomic grouping the pteropods exhibited weak diel migration at ALOHA, and none at K2 (Fig. 7, Table 3). Heteropods (families Atlantidae and Pterotracheidae) were only sampled at ALOHA, and mostly occurred in the top 200 m in low abundances (Fig. 7A).

Ctenophores did not occur in our tows at ALOHA, and at K2 were almost exclusively *Beroe abyssicola*. These relatively large (up to 12 cm long), red/purple-tinged ctenophores were conspicuous in tows between 50 and 300 m in the day, and then spread out more throughout the water column at night (Fig. 7B). Although they did move into the upper 50 m at night (where they

were absent in the day) (Fig. 7B), there was not a discernable diel migration (Table 3). Although we enumerated fresh, unpreserved ctenophores immediately after tows, we cannot rule out that the more delicate lobate or cydippid ctenophores also occurred at either site, but became damaged beyond recognition.

Polychaetes occurred in similar abundances ( $\sim 1 \text{ m}^{-3}$ ) between the two sites in the epipelagic zone; however, while at ALOHA abundance of polychaetes was reduced considerably below 200 m, at K2 their abundances remained at  $\sim 0.3\text{--}0.75 \text{ m}^{-3}$  throughout much of the mesopelagic zone (Fig. 7). The majority of the polychaetes in the epipelagic zone at the two sites were phyllodocids—especially *Tomopteris* spp., and larval forms of benthic polychaetes. At K2 *Poeobius* sp. was also present and occurred exclusively in the mesopelagic zone.

### 3.2.4. Radiolaria

In addition to the metazoan zooplankton described above, we sampled large protozoan zooplankton at K2. These were mostly phaeodarian radiolarians, mainly in the order Phaeosphaeria (Aulosphaeridae and Sagosphaeridae) and in the families Aulacanthidae and Coelodendridae, that occurred in the mesopelagic zone at K2 (Fig. 9). Throughout the mesopelagic zone, these radiolarians were equal to a mean of 5.5% (range 2.7–13.7%) of the metazoan biomass (for 150–1000 m day and night samples combined). The peak biomass occurred between 200 and 300 m and ranged from  $1.0 \text{ mg m}^{-3}$  (day mean) to  $1.9 \text{ mg m}^{-3}$  (night mean). These radiolarians were also found in our sediment traps.



**Table 3**  
Diel vertical migration indices for major taxa of zooplankton at ALOHA and K2

Site and taxon	N:D ratio in surface 150 m	WMD day (m)	WMD night (m)	ΔWMD (m)
<b>ALOHA</b>				
Calanoid copepods	1.4	234	192	42
Poecilostomatoid copepods	1.0	125	107	18
Cyclopoid copepods	0.7	192	316	−124
Harpacticoid copepods	<0.1 <sup>a</sup>	473	439	34
Ostracods	2.5	246	169	77 *
Euphausiids	1.4	157	84	73 *
Hyperiid amphipods	2.4	172	108	64
Gammarid amphipods	<0.1 <sup>a</sup>	151	342	−191
Decapods	1.2	56	52	4
Mysids	— <sup>b</sup>	625 <sup>a</sup>	25 <sup>a</sup>	600 <sup>a</sup>
Chaetognaths	0.8	129	137	−8
Siphonophores	0.9	148	192	−44
Hydrozoan medusae	3.0	342	165	177
Salps	1.7	90	103	−13
Doliolids	1.3	96	106	−10 *
Larvaceans	0.8	— <sup>c</sup>	— <sup>c</sup>	— <sup>c</sup>
Polychaetes	1.0	120	115	5
Thecosome pteropods	1.2	181	299	−117
Heteropods	4.6	93	131	−38
<b>K2</b>				
Calanoid copepods	1.8	218	154	64
Poecilostomatoid copepods	1.4	541	498	43
Cyclopoid copepods	0.5	178	332	−154
Harpacticoid copepods	— <sup>b</sup>	450 <sup>a</sup>	— <sup>e</sup>	— <sup>e</sup>
Ostracods	48.9	351	313	38 *
Euphausiids	16.9	111	34	77
Hyperiid amphipods	3.6	194	134	60
Gammarid amphipods	— <sup>b</sup>	308	130	178
Decapods	0.7	356	410	−54
Mysids	— <sup>b</sup>	701	740	−39 *
Chaetognaths	1.6	— <sup>d</sup>	— <sup>d</sup>	— <sup>d</sup>
Siphonophores	1.1	205	261	−56
Hydrozoan medusae	0.8	— <sup>d</sup>	— <sup>d</sup>	— <sup>d</sup>
Pteropods	0.5	298	321	−23
Salps	— <sup>b</sup>	285	268	17
Doliolids	— <sup>b</sup>	426	431	−5
Larvaceans	1.4	— <sup>c</sup>	— <sup>c</sup>	— <sup>c</sup>
Polychaetes	2.5	480	429	51
Thecosome pteropods	0.7	— <sup>d</sup>	— <sup>d</sup>	— <sup>d</sup>
Gymnosome pteropods	<0.1	196	98	98
Ctenophores	0.4	114	403	9

Values are mean of  $n = 2$ , unless otherwise noted. N:D ratio—ratio of night:day taxon abundance integrated over the surface 0–150 m. The ratio was computed separately for each day/night pair and then averaged. WMD—weighted mean depth for day and night (see Section 2). ΔWMD—amplitude of the migration, calculated as day WMD minus night WMD. Dash (—) indicates not determined (see footnotes below for explanation). Asterisks (\*) indicate a significant difference between WMD day and WMD night (paired  $t$ -test,  $p < 0.05$ ).

<sup>a</sup>  $n = 1$  (for second replicate N:D undefined as abundance = 0 in 0–150 m layer during day).

<sup>b</sup> Each replicate either did not occur in 0–150 m layer in day (i.e., N:D undefined) or at night (i.e., N:D = 0).

<sup>c</sup> No data available below 150 m.

<sup>d</sup> Pronounced bimodal distribution, WMD not calculated.

<sup>e</sup> Did not occur.

## 4. Discussion

### 4.1. General vertical patterns in zooplankton biomass and community structure

A striking difference between the two sites was the order of magnitude higher biomass at K2 compared with ALOHA. This is perhaps not surprising in epipelagic waters, as K2 is a meso-

trophic site with higher primary production than the oligotrophic ALOHA site (Karl et al., 1996; Buesseler et al., 2008). However, the same order of magnitude higher biomass occurred in the mesopelagic zone at K2 as well, indicating higher production in surface waters is also fueling significant secondary production at depth at K2. This contrast in deep biomass has interesting implications for the mesopelagic food webs at these sites, which are supported by sinking particles, diel vertical migration, and carnivory, as discussed below. In a comparative study of plankton biomass at several stations from the subarctic to the subtropical western N. Pacific Ocean, Yamaguchi et al. (2004) also found zooplankton biomass decreased from north to south. In their study 0–1000 m integrated ‘metazooplankton’ biomass ( $> 90 \mu\text{m}$ ) was also an order of magnitude higher at  $44^\circ\text{N}$  (sampled in August) than at  $25^\circ\text{N}$  (sampled in September) (mean of day and night 0–1000 m integrated biomass, calculated from Table 4 in Yamaguchi et al., 2004). While the biomass was higher and animal size was significantly larger in the mesopelagic at K2, the percentage of biomass in the large size fractions ( $> 2 \text{ mm}$ ) was similar between the two sites in the mesopelagic zone. This suggests a more uniform community size structure in the mesopelagic between the two sites, as opposed to the larger disparity in both biomass and size structure of zooplankton in the epipelagic zone.


There were many other distinct differences in the communities at the two sites. The most conspicuous is the deep population of *Neocalanus* species copepods (*N. cristatus*, *N. plumchrus*, and *N. flemingeri*) and *E. bungii* at K2. These large copepods dominate the zooplankton community in the subarctic Pacific and its marginal seas (Miller et al., 1984; Vinogradov, 1997; Mackas and Tsuda, 1999), where they also undergo extensive ontogenetic (seasonal) vertical migration (Miller et al., 1984; Kobari and Ikeda, 1999, 2001a, b; Tsuda et al., 1999; Shoden et al., 2005). During our study period ontogenetic migrating copepods on average comprised 62% of the mean mesozooplankton biomass, and 31% of the mean mesozooplankton abundance, integrated between 150 and 1000 m (Kobari et al., 2008). Much of the *Neocalanus* population still resided in the epipelagic zone (i.e., 74% of the 0–1000 m integrated *Neocalanus* population, by number was in the upper 150 m); however, *N. flemingeri* was already in dormancy at depth (residing at 200–500 m) and *E. bungii* had begun its annual descent, forming a mesopelagic peak at 200–400 m (Kobari et al., 2008).

Along with the ontogenetic migrators, other species, most notably ostracods and chaetognaths, contributed significantly to the 200–500 m peak in zooplankton abundance and biomass at K2. The subsurface peak at ALOHA extended further, down to 750 m, and was also largely comprised of copepods, ostracods, and chaetognaths (Figs. 3 and 8). Although lower in abundance, larger crustacea such as euphausiids, mysids, amphipods, and decapods, as well as fish, also contributed to the mesopelagic biomass peak, particularly at ALOHA. Mesopelagic peaks in micronekton have been studied extensively in the mesopelagic boundary community off Hawaii, and are comprised mainly of myctophid fish, with shrimp being the second most abundant taxa (Benoit-Bird and Au, 2006). Mesopelagic peaks in biomass of micronekton have also been noted between 500 and 600 m during both day and night in the subarctic North Pacific Ocean (Nishikawa et al., 2001). Some of the taxa exhibited a bimodal distribution (e.g., calanoid copepods at both sites, chaetognaths and hydrozoan medusae at K2) with both a near-surface and a mesopelagic population, some of the latter of which underwent diel migration into surface waters at night.

Diel vertical migration was pronounced at both sites, but the strength of migration was higher overall at K2, as indicated by the overall N:D ratio of 2.5 for combined size classes and by the diel

migration indices for many of the major taxa. The N:D ratio at ALOHA of 1.7 for all size classes combined is the same as that reported for the HOT station ALOHA climatology (Al-Mutairi and Landry, 2001). Although the overall strength of migration was higher at K2, we found a greater migration amplitude for all

biomass size classes at ALOHA vs. K2. These results are similar to Andersen et al. (1997) who found higher migration amplitudes at an oligotrophic site than at meso- and eutrophic sites in the northeastern tropical Atlantic Ocean. They hypothesized this difference was due to sensitivity of migrators to different light



**Fig. 5.** (A) Day/night profiles of crustacean zooplankton taxa (other than copepods) at ALOHA. Values are mean of  $n = 2$ , with error bars indicating the range. Note abundance scales vary, and the irregular depth intervals reflecting the actual sampling intervals. (B) Day/night profiles of crustacean zooplankton taxa (other than copepods) at K2. Figure is as described in (A).




Fig. 5. (Continued)


environments, with increased light penetration in the oligotrophic site causing zooplankton to migrate deeper to avoid visual predators (Andersen et al., 1997).

There was a less consistent pattern between sites in migration amplitude of individual taxa, presumably due to the myriad of environmental factors, including light, that interact to affect diel vertical migrations (e.g., Sameoto, 1984; Pearre, 2003). For example, the depth of the chlorophyll maximum at K2 (50 m)

was shallower than at ALOHA (125 m), possibly leading to variations in depth distributions of different taxa at the two sites, such as the surface peak in calanoid copepods (day and night) which was shallower and confined to 0–50 m at K2, vs. ALOHA where it was distributed 0–150 m. A subsurface chlorophyll layer has been shown experimentally to control the depth of ascent of diel migrating copepods (Bohrer, 1980), and the abundance of many mesozooplankton taxa was enhanced at the depth of the

seasonal deep chlorophyll maximum in the northwestern Atlantic Ocean (Ortner et al., 1980). Shoaling of the vertical distribution of *E. bungii* and *N. cristatus* during a subarctic NE Pacific mesoscale iron-addition-induced diatom bloom also indicates these copepods can respond to changes in chlorophyll concentrations (Tsuda et al., 2006). In addition, a temperature minimum of  $<2^{\circ}\text{C}$

occurred at K2 near 100 m (Buesseler et al., 2008), which may have also acted as a boundary for the surface calanoid copepod peak, and affected vertical distributions of other taxa. Indeed, thermocline depth had the greatest influence of all physical factors on vertical distribution of copepods in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean (Sameoto, 1986). Low subsurface oxygen



**Fig. 6.** (A) Day/night profiles of gelatinous zooplankton (chaetognaths, hydrozoans, and pelagic tunicates) at ALOHA. Values are mean of  $n = 2$ , with error bars indicating the range. Note abundance scales vary, and the irregular depth intervals reflecting the actual sampling intervals. (B) Day/night profiles of gelatinous zooplankton (chaetognaths, hydrozoans, and pelagic tunicates) at K2. Figure is as described in (A). \*Note: Larvacean data only included for 0–150 m depth intervals (see text).






Fig. 6. (Continued)

concentration also can act as a control on zooplankton vertical distribution, as seen in the oxygen minimum zone of the Arabian Sea where oxygen is  $<0.1 \text{ ml l}^{-1}$  (Smith et al., 1998; Wishner et al., 1998). Mesopelagic zone oxygen concentration never reached this suboxic level at either site in our study, but began to fall below  $1 \text{ ml l}^{-1}$  at  $\sim 300 \text{ m}$  at K2, and at  $\sim 600 \text{ m}$  at ALOHA (Buesseler et al., 2008), which may have served as a refuge or barrier

depending on taxon-specific differences in physiological tolerance to low oxygen; however our wide depth intervals make it difficult to correlate zooplankton vertical distributions with oxyclines (Wishner et al., 1998).


Some taxa were strong migrators, with a N:D ratio  $>2$  or a large migration amplitude (as indicated by diel change in WMD); some were even absent (or nearly so) in surface waters during the

day. These taxa included ostracods, hyperiid amphipods, and to some extent euphausiids at both sites, hydrozoan medusae at ALOHA, and gammarid amphipods (*Cyphocaris* sp.) at K2. We note that within some of the other migrating, or even apparently non-migrating, groups there were also a number of individual genera or species that were clearly strong migrators, but are not apparent because of the very broad taxonomic categories we present. For example, there are clearly a number of calanoid copepod genera at both sites, such as *Pleuromamma* and *Metridia* spp., that were absent in the epipelagic zone during the day, and migrated considerable distances into the surface at night. Many of the same strongly migrating copepods and other taxa that we found at ALOHA have been noted previously (Al-Mutairi and Landry, 2001). Thus, like interacting environmental factors discussed above, behavior at the species level is important in shaping vertical distribution patterns between the sites, but not always resolvable in our data set.

#### 4.2. Sampling considerations and limitations of the data set

The potential sources of error in estimating biomass and abundance of zooplankton and micronekton with nets, particularly

from deeper depths, are discussed in Angel and Pugh (2000), and include underestimation of fragile gelatinous zooplankton, net avoidance, vertical migration to depths deeper than the lowest sampling depth, and the inherent patchiness of plankton communities—due to passive or active aggregation and rapid reproduction and growth. While gelatinous taxa were well represented in our tows, some of the more delicate groups such as larvaceans were unrecognizable in deeper samples. Other gelatinous groups, such as lobate ctenophores, were not found in fresh samples, but have been observed in the mesopelagic with submersibles off Japan (Hunt and Lindsay, 1999) and other locations (Harbison et al., 2001). Some daytime net avoidance may have occurred at both sites, as illustrated by a ~20% increase in 0–1000 m integrated biomass at night. This may also be due to vertical migration of deeper (>1000 m) zooplankton into the mesopelagic zone at night. We may have evidence for the latter, as indicated by a slight increase in some larger taxa such as mysids between 750 and 1000 m at night at K2 (Fig. 5B). Finally, patchiness can be a higher source of error for taxa that tend to form aggregations or ‘swarms’ such as salps, pteropods, and medusae (Angel et al., 1982; Angel and Pugh, 2000). Thus abundances of these organisms can fluctuate over small spatial and temporal scales (Angel and Pugh, 2000).



**Fig. 7.** (A) Day/night profiles of gelatinous zooplankton (pelagic snails) and polychaete worms at ALOHA. Values are mean of  $n = 2$ , with error bars indicating the range. Note abundance scales vary, and the irregular depth intervals reflecting the actual sampling intervals. (B) Day/night profiles of gelatinous zooplankton (pelagic snails and ctenophores) and polychaete worms at K2. Figure is as described in (A). Note biomass of ctenophores is also given.





Fig. 7. (Continued)

#### 4.3. Trophic structure


##### 4.3.1. Mesopelagic particle feeders

A number of taxa that are known to feed on particles of either suspended or sinking detritus showed distinct peaks in the mesopelagic zone. These include calanoid and poecilostomatoid copepods, salps, polychaetes, and radiolaria at K2, harpacticoid copepods at ALOHA, and ostracods at both sites.

As noted previously, the mesopelagic peak in calanoid copepod abundance at K2 was due to the ontogenetically migrating copepods *Neocalanus* spp. and *E. bungii* (Kobari et al., 2008). These species may feed on sinking particles or on microzooplankton at depth (Dagg, 1993; Gifford, 1993; Kobari et al., 2003, 2008). A detailed study of calanoid copepods down to 4000 m in the western subarctic Pacific Ocean found that numerically, and in terms of biomass, suspension feeders dominated the surface



**Fig. 8.** Percent abundance of other zooplankton (non-copepod) during day and night at stations ALOHA and K2. Day or night values are each the mean of  $n = 2$  casts analyzed for taxonomic composition at each station. 'Other' category includes bivalve larvae, isopods, larval fish, and small squids. \*Note: Larvacean data only included for 0–150 m depth intervals (see text).



**Fig. 9.** Abundance and biomass of phaeodarian radiolaria during day and night at station K2. Day or night values are each the mean of  $n = 2$  (error bars indicate the range) for abundance, and the mean of  $n = 3$  (error bars are  $\pm 1$  s.d.) for biomass. Note the irregular depth intervals reflecting the actual sampling intervals.



waters (Yamaguchi et al., 2002b). However below 200 m, detritivores (70% by abundance, 15% by biomass) and carnivores (1% by abundance, 10% by biomass) increased, with suspension feeders in diapause making up most of the meso- and bathypelagic biomass (63%) (Yamaguchi et al., 2002b).

Mesopelagic peaks in poecilostomatoid copepod species, particularly the family Oncaidae, have been observed previously in a number of environments including the western subarctic Pacific Ocean (Nishibe and Ikeda, 2004), the Arctic Ocean (Richter, 1994), the Red Sea (Böttger-Schnack, 1990a, b), the Mediterranean Sea (Böttger-Schnack, 1996a), and the western Indian Ocean (Böttger-Schnack, 1996b). Although fewer studies have been carried out on the less abundant harpacticoid copepods, some genera, such as *Aegisthus* seen in the mesopelagic at ALOHA, concentrate in the meso- and bathypelagic zones (Böttger-Schnack, 1996a). Poecilostomatoid and harpacticoid copepods are known to associate with larvacean houses in epipelagic (Alldredge, 1972; Shanks and Edmondson, 1990) and mesopelagic (Steinberg et al., 1994) waters, and with other types of epipelagic marine snow aggregates (Shanks and Edmondson, 1990; Bochdansky and Herndl, 1992). Poecilostomatoids such as *Oncaea* feed on larvacean houses and other kinds of aggregates (Alldredge, 1972; Lampitt et al., 1993; Ohtsuka et al., 1993, 1996). The poecilostomatoids and harpacticoids are not strong vertical migrators at ALOHA and K2, as has been shown elsewhere (Böttger-Schnack, 1990a); thus sinking particles are likely an important food source for these taxa.

Ostracods showed peaks in the mesopelagic and were strong diel vertical migrators, as reported in other studies (Angel, 1979; Kaeriyama and Ikeda, 2002). Ostracods consume marine snow (Lampitt et al., 1993), thus it is likely some of the deep-living species also consume sinking or suspended particles of detritus, in addition to feeding in surface waters on phytoplankton or microzooplankton (Angel, 1972) during diel migrations. Some mesopelagic ostracods are also considered to be predators (although it is unknown if they are feeding on dead or live animals), thus, mesopelagic ostracods overall appear to be opportunistic, omnivore-detritivores (Vannier et al., 1998).

As salps are non-discriminate filter feeders (Madin and Deibel, 1998), their presence almost exclusively in the mesopelagic at K2 indicates they must be feeding on suspended or sinking particles. It is notable that at ALOHA we saw some salps in the epipelagic, but not in the mesopelagic. This could be a sampling artifact due to the inherent patchiness of salps that tend to be found in aggregations when they occur (i.e., we hit a patch at K2, but not at ALOHA) (Madin et al., 2006). Alternatively, this may simply be due to species-specific ecological/behavioral differences within the broad 'salp' taxonomic grouping between the two sites (which may also apply to differences seen between sites for some other broad taxonomic groupings). Another alternative is that the higher particle concentration in epipelagic waters at K2 may be enough to clog salp internal feeding filters (Harbison et al., 1986; Perissinotto and Pakhomov, 1997; Madin et al., 2006), thus at least some species of salps remain in deeper waters, while at ALOHA surface particle concentrations are lower and salps can continue to feed in the epipelagic. Although we were not able to sample them adequately at mesopelagic depths in this study, larvaceans are another particle-feeding pelagic tunicate (Alldredge and Madin, 1982) found at mesopelagic depths (Gorsky et al., 1991; Hamner and Robison, 1992; Hopcroft and Robison, 2005) that would also affect particle concentrations, and thus sinking particle flux (see below).

Polychaetes may also consume detritus in the mesopelagic zone, and are found associated with marine snow (Alldredge, 1972, 1976; Shanks and Edmondson, 1990; Bochdansky and Herndl, 1992; Steinberg et al., 1994). Taxa such as *Poeobius* sp.

that we found in the mesopelagic at K2 feed by passively collecting sinking particles on mucus attached to their tentacles (Uttal and Buck, 1996). Other polychaetes sampled such as *Tomopteris* sp. are carnivores (Fauchald and Jumars, 1979).

The abundance and relative importance of phaeodarian radiolarians in the mesopelagic zone at K2 indicates these protozoa are key components of the food web, and may be affecting flux. Phaeodarians have high abundances worldwide (Klaas, 2001; Okazaki et al., 2004), and have long been hypothesized to be generalist feeders whose diet also includes sinking detrital particles (Gowing, 1986, 1989). Phaeodarians store their food and wastes in their phaeodium (vacuoles within the animal); thus a record of their diet and feeding can be obtained (Gowing, 1986; Gowing and Benthams, 1994). Prey found in their phaeodium include bacteria, large virus-like particles, other protozoans, small crustaceans and organic aggregates (Gowing and Benthams, 1994). Some zooplankton species including gelatinous zooplankton have been observed with phaeodarian radiolarians in their guts (Gowing and Coale, 1989), and large concentrations of phaeodarians at depth may be a food source for omnivorous copepods (Vinogradov and Tseitlin, 1983). Living phaeodarians found in sediment traps can contribute a substantial amount of the organic carbon fluxes in oligotrophic regions (Gowing, 1986). Phaeodarians are prone to dissolution and thus mainly living cells are found in deep sediment traps (Gowing and Coale, 1989; Gowing and Wishner, 1992). The radiolaria found in our sediment traps, along with diatom frustules, may contribute to the high particulate silica flux at K2 (Lamborg et al., 2008).

#### 4.3.2. Carnivore layer

For mesopelagic fauna, the alternative to obtaining nutrition by diel vertical migration or by particle feeding at depth is carnivory. We found distinct carnivore layers in the mesopelagic, especially gelatinous zooplankton at K2. At K2 mesopelagic peaks were observed of chaetognaths, hydrozoan medusae, polychaetes, and gymnosome pteropods, and in the upper mesopelagic zone, layers of ctenophores and siphonophores. At both ALOHA and K2 a layer of hyperiid amphipods occurred in the mesopelagic as well. Peaks of chaetognaths in the mesopelagic also have been observed in the northeast Atlantic, with highest abundances between 200 and 300 m or 100 and 400 m, depending on location (Angel and Baker, 1982; Angel, 1989b). Siphonophore peaks have been reported as well in the mesopelagic northeast Atlantic and North Pacific oceans, with some migrating into the epipelagic at night (Angel and Baker, 1982; Pugh, 1984; Silguero and Robison, 2000). Mesopelagic ctenophores have been observed by submersibles in the Pacific Ocean (Hunt and Lindsay, 1999; Harbison et al., 2001). High biomass and abundance of mesopelagic gelatinous zooplankton has been reported previously for the subarctic Pacific Ocean, with cnidarians constituting 18–26% of the dry weight, and at some stations, more than half of the abundance of micronekton in the 0–1000 m water column (Nishikawa et al., 2001).

In general, the proportion of mesozooplankton biomass that is carnivorous increases with depth down to about 3000 m, and can be significant below the euphotic zone (Vinogradov and Tseitlin, 1983). In the northwestern subarctic Pacific Ocean carnivores (e.g., carnivorous copepods, chaetognaths, amphipods, mysids, and decapod shrimps) comprised ~25% of the mesozooplankton biomass between 200 and 500 m and over 50% of the biomass between 500 and 1000 m (Vinogradov and Tseitlin, 1983). Carnivorous zooplankton comprised 10–30% of the total zooplankton biomass between 0 and 300 m in the Southern Ocean (Pakhomov et al., 1999). And as noted above, carnivorous copepods in the subarctic Pacific Ocean constituted ~10% of the

total meso- and bathypelagic copepod biomass (Yamaguchi et al., 2002a).

We suggest that high food availability in the mesopelagic, i.e. the large population of ontogenetic migrators such as *Neocalanus* spp. and *E. bungii*, are supporting the large carnivorous populations at depth at K2. These copepods, while too large for other copepods to consume, are an important food source for small mesopelagic fishes such as myctophids (Moku et al., 2000), and presumably some of the micronektonic crustacea (e.g., decapod shrimp, mysids) (Nishida et al., 1988) and gelatinous zooplankton (Nishikawa et al., 2001). In fact, it is estimated that one-third of the life-time mortality of *N. plumchrus* could be explained by predation in the mesopelagic zone, most likely by micronekton and chaetognaths (Mackas and Tsuda, 1999).

#### 4.4. Implications for the biological pump and the efficiency of particle export

The different patterns in community structure of zooplankton at the two study sites has important implications for the functioning of mesopelagic food webs and the transport of particulate organic matter to depth, ultimately affecting the efficiency of organic carbon sequestration in the deep ocean. Buesseler et al. (2007) show a higher transfer efficiency (ratio of POC flux at 500–150 m) of 46–55% at K2 vs. 20% at ALOHA. Furthermore, Steinberg et al. (2008) show sinking POC flux is inadequate to meet the metabolic demands of the zooplankton and microbial communities at both sites, and suggest that diel vertical migration and carnivory are supporting mesopelagic metabolism. Ultimately we need to know more about mesopelagic food webs in order to fully reconcile the contrasting transfer efficiencies, given the high C demand of the biological community.

We can begin to analyze this issue. First, the disparity in the size classes of organisms between the two sites, with considerably larger animals at K2, likely expedites transfer of POC to depth at K2, due to the larger fecal pellets produced by animals there. These significantly larger fecal pellets (median POC content 2–5 times larger at K2 than ALOHA), most of which were produced by *Neocalanus* spp. copepods, were collected in our sediment traps in high numbers at K2 (Wilson et al., 2008). Sinking and suspended particle-feeders occurred at depth (with some exclusively in the mesopelagic zone) at both sites, indicating the importance of this community in intercepting flux. Clearly these zooplankton are also repackaging particles into new classes of fecal pellets (Wilson et al., 2008). Some taxa, such as the salps or larvaceans at K2, could expedite C flux to depth and increase transfer efficiency by repackaging suspended or slower sinking particles into fast-sinking fecal pellets (Bruland and Silver, 1981; Madin, 1982; Caron et al., 1989), and in the case of larvaceans, incorporating these particles into their mucous 'houses' which are subsequently discarded and sink (Alldredge, 1976; Gorsky and Fenaux, 1998). The layers of carnivores seen in the upper mesopelagic are likely the source of red fecal pellets injected into mesopelagic, as sampled by our sediment traps (Wilson et al., 2008).

Second, the higher degree of diel migration of zooplankton at K2 also may account for the increased transfer efficiency there. Active transport of CO<sub>2</sub> and DOC by migrator respiration and excretion, respectively, at depth was double to an order of magnitude higher at K2 (16–46 mg C m<sup>-2</sup> d<sup>-1</sup>; range of CO<sub>2</sub>+DOC transport for both deployments) than at ALOHA (2–8 mg C m<sup>-2</sup> d<sup>-1</sup>; within the range previously reported for ALOHA, Al-Mutairi and Landry, 2001) (see Table 1, Steinberg et al., 2008). This active transport is equal to 11–44% of the sinking POC flux across 150 m

measured by our sediment traps at ALOHA (18 mg C m<sup>-2</sup> d<sup>-1</sup> for both deployments), and 26–200% of the 150 m sinking POC flux at K2 (62 and 23 mg C m<sup>-2</sup> d<sup>-1</sup> for deployments 1 and 2, respectively). Furthermore, the active transport of respiratory CO<sub>2</sub> accounted for a higher proportion of mesopelagic zooplankton respiratory C demand between 150 and 1000 m at K2 (30–88%; for both deployments) than at ALOHA (15–59%), indicating that many of the mesopelagic zooplankton at K2 are relying on surface primary production to meet their nutritional needs, rather than on sinking particles (Steinberg et al., 2008). The large population of ontogenetic migrators at K2 presents a pathway of C flux that is considerably greater than at ALOHA. This large active seasonal flux of organic matter to depth in the subarctic Pacific Ocean can exceed the flux of sinking particles (Kobari et al., 2003). Seasonal differences in migratory active C flux generally follow patterns in total migrant biomass (Zhang and Dam, 1997; Steinberg et al., 2000; Al-Mutairi and Landry, 2001). Future studies will need to address how the large seasonality in biological productivity at K2 versus ALOHA affects the role of zooplankton in the biological pump, as our study took place during a season of relatively higher productivity (summer) in the subarctic Pacific Ocean compared to the remainder of the year.

In conclusion, our current understanding of vertical particle flux in marine ecosystems is dominated by studies that emphasize bottom-up control (i.e., nutrients regulate growth of phytoplankton, which eventually die, aggregate, and sink). While this is undoubtedly a crucial process, and phytoplankton community structure is a factor controlling transfer efficiency of carbon to depth (Boyd et al., 2008), less attention has been paid to the role of consumers and predators exerting top-down control on vertical particle flux through different trophic interactions (Verity and Smetacek, 1996; Wassmann, 1998). Studying the role of higher trophic levels in C flux is a challenging prospect, especially in the understudied mesopelagic zone, but is key to making future strides in our understanding of C transport and sequestration.

#### Acknowledgments

We thank Ken Buesseler for his leadership in the VERTIGO program and for helpful comments on the manuscript. We also thank the captains and crews of the R/V *Kilo Moana* and R/V *Roger Revelle* for their assistance at sea during the VERTIGO cruises. We are grateful to Minoru Kitamura, Tadashi Maruyama, and Dhugal Lindsay of the Japan Agency for Marine–Earth Science Technology (JAMSTEC) for their loan of, and assistance with, the IONESS net. We thank Rob Condon, Mary Silver, Sarah Smith, Friederike Ebersbach, Lisette Robertson, Clodagh Curran, Sara Tanner, Tilla Roy, and other VERTIGOians for their help with sample collections or processing. Thanks to Jeff Drazen, for the use of his laboratory, and to Cecelia Sheridan for post-cruise help, at the University of Hawaii. The detailed comments of three anonymous reviewers greatly improved the manuscript. This study was supported by grants from the US National Science Foundation NSF OCE-0324402 (Biological Oceanography) to Deborah Steinberg and OCE-0301139 (Chemical Oceanography) to Ken Buesseler. This paper is Contribution no. 2903 of the Virginia Institute of Marine Science, The College of William and Mary.

#### References

- Al-Mutairi, H., Landry, M.R., 2001. Active export of carbon and nitrogen at Station ALOHA by diel migrant zooplankton. *Deep-Sea Research II* 48 (8–9), 2083–2103.
- Alldredge, A.L., 1972. Abandoned larvacean houses: a unique food source in the pelagic environment. *Science* 117, 885–887.

- Aldredge, A., 1976. Discarded appendicularian houses as sources of food, surface habitats, and particulate organic matter in planktonic environments. *Limnology and Oceanography* 21, 14–23.
- Aldredge, A.L., Madin, L.P., 1982. Pelagic tunicates: unique herbivores in the marine plankton. *Bioscience* 32 (8), 655–663.
- Andersen, V., Sardou, J., Gasser, B., 1997. Macroplankton and micronekton in the northeast tropical Atlantic: abundance, community composition and vertical distribution in relation to different trophic environments. *Deep-Sea Research I* 44, 193–222.
- Andersen, V., Gubanov, A., Nival, P., Ruellet, T., 2001. Zooplankton community during the transition from spring bloom to oligotrophy in the open NW Mediterranean and effects of wind events. 2. Vertical distributions and migrations. *Journal of Plankton Research* 23 (3), 243–261.
- Andersen, V., Devev, C., Gubanov, A., Picheral, M., Melnikov, V., Tsarin, S., Prieur, L., 2004. Vertical distributions of zooplankton across the Almeria-Oran frontal zone (Mediterranean Sea). *Journal of Plankton Research* 26 (3), 275–293.
- Angel, M.V., 1972. Planktonic oceanic ostracods—historical, present, and future. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh (Section B)* 23, 213–228.
- Angel, M.V., 1979. Studies on Atlantic halocyprid ostracods: their vertical distributions and community structure in the central gyre region along latitude 30°N from off Africa to Bermuda. *Progress in Oceanography* 8, 3–124.
- Angel, M.V., 1989a. Does mesopelagic biology affect the vertical flux? In: Berger, W.H., Smetacek, V.S., Wefer, G. (Eds.), *Productivity of the Ocean: Present and Past*. Wiley, New York, pp. 155–173.
- Angel, M.V., 1989b. Vertical profiles of pelagic communities in the vicinity of the Azores Front and their implications to deep ocean ecology. *Progress in Oceanography* 22, 1–46.
- Angel, M.V., Baker, A.D.C., 1982. Vertical distribution of the standing crop of plankton and micronekton at three stations in the northeast Atlantic. *Biological Oceanography* 2 (1), 1–30.
- Angel, M.V., Pugh, P.R., 2000. Quantification of diel vertical migration by micronektonic taxa in the northeast Atlantic. *Hydrobiologia* 440, 161–179.
- Angel, M.V., Hargreaves, P., Kirpatrick, P., Domanski, P., 1982. Low variability in planktonic and micronektonic populations at 1,000 m depth in the vicinity of 42°N 17°W; evidence against diel migratory behavior in the majority of species. *Biological Oceanography* 1, 287–319.
- Atkinson, A., Ward, P., Murphy, E.J., 1996. Diel periodicity of subantarctic copepods: relationships between vertical migration, gut fullness and gut evacuation rate. *Journal of Plankton Research* 18, 1387–1405.
- Banase, K., 1990. New views on the degradation and disposition of organic particles as collected by sediment traps in the open sea. *Deep-Sea Research* 37 (7A), 1177–1195.
- Benoit-Bird, K.J., Au, W.W.L., 2006. Extreme diel horizontal migrations by a tropical nearshore resident micronekton community. *Marine Ecology-Progress Series* 319, 1–14.
- Berelson, W.M., 2001. The flux of particulate organic carbon into the ocean interior: a comparison of four US JGOFS regional studies. *Oceanography* 14 (4), 59–67.
- Bochdansky, A.B., Herndl, G.J., 1992. Ecology of amorphous aggregations (marine snow) in the Northern Adriatic Sea. 3. Zooplankton interactions with marine snow. *Marine Ecology-Progress Series* 87 (1–2), 135–146.
- Bohrer, R.N., 1980. Experimental studies on diel vertical migration. In: Kerfoot, W.C. (Ed.), *Evolution and Ecology of Zooplankton Communities*. University Press New England, Hanover, NH, pp. 111–121.
- Böttger-Schnack, R., 1990a. Community structure and vertical distribution of cyclopoid copepods in the Red Sea I. Central Red Sea, autumn 1980. *Marine Biology* 106, 473–485.
- Böttger-Schnack, R., 1990b. Community structure and vertical distribution of cyclopoid copepods in the Red Sea II. Aspects of seasonal and regional differences. *Marine Biology* 106, 487–501.
- Böttger-Schnack, R., 1996a. Vertical structure of small metazoan plankton, especially non-calanoid copepods. I. Deep Arabian Sea. *Journal of Plankton Research* 18 (7), 1073–1101.
- Böttger-Schnack, R., 1996b. Vertical structure of small metazoan plankton, especially non-calanoid copepods. II. Deep Eastern Mediterranean (Levantine Sea). *Oceanologica Acta* 20 (2), 399–419.
- Boyd, P.W., Gall, M.P., Silver, M.W., Bidigare, R.R., Bishop, J.K.B., 2008. Quantifying the surface–subsurface biogeochemical coupling during the VERTIGO ALOHA and K2 studies. *Deep-Sea Research II*, this issue [doi:10.1016/j.dsr2.2008.04.010].
- Bruland, K.W., Silver, M.W., 1981. Sinking rates of fecal pellets from gelatinous zooplankton (salps, pteropods, doliolids). *Marine Biology* 63, 295–300.
- Buesseler, K.O., Lamberg, C.H., Boyd, P.W., Lam, P.J., Trull, T.W., Bidigare, R.R., Bishop, J.K., Casciotti, K.L., Dehairs, F., Elskens, M., Honda, M., Karl, D.M., Siegel, D.A., Silver, M.W., Steinberg, D.K., Valdes, J., Van Mooy, B., Wilson, S.E., 2007. Revisiting carbon flux through the ocean's twilight zone. *Science* 316, 567–570.
- Buesseler, K.O., Trull, T.W., Steinberg, D.K., Silver, M.W., Siegel, D.A., Saitoh, S.-I., Lamberg, C.H., Lam, P.J., Karl, D.M., Jiao, N.Z., Honda, M.C., Elskens, M., Dehairs, F., Brown, S.L., Boyd, P.W., Bishop, J.K.B., Bidigare, R.R., 2008. VERTIGO (VERTICAL Transport In the Global Ocean): a study of particle sources and flux attenuation in the North Pacific. *Deep-Sea Research II*, this issue [doi:10.1016/j.dsr2.2008.04.024].
- Caron, D.A., Madin, L.P., Cole, J.J., 1989. Composition and degradation of salp fecal pellets: implications for vertical flux in oceanic environments. *Journal of Marine Research* 47, 829–850.
- Dagg, M., 1993. Sinking particles as a possible source of nutrition for the large calanoid copepod *Neocalanus cristatus* in the subarctic Pacific Ocean. *Deep-Sea Research I* 40 (7), 1431–1445.
- Dam, H.G., Zhang, X., Butler, M., Roman, M.R., 1995. Mesozooplankton grazing and metabolism at the equator in the central Pacific: implications for carbon and nitrogen fluxes. *Deep-Sea Research II* 42 (2–3), 735–756.
- Dilling, L., Aldredge, A.L., 2000. Fragmentation of marine snow by swimming macrozooplankton: a new process impacting carbon cycling in the sea. *Deep-Sea Research I* 47 (7), 1227–1245.
- Dilling, L., Wilson, J., Steinberg, D., Aldredge, A., 1998. Feeding by the euphausiid *Euphausia pacifica* and the copepod *Calanus pacificus* on marine snow. *Marine Ecology-Progress Series* 170, 189–201.
- Fauchald, K., Jumars, P., 1979. The diet of worms: a study of polychaete feeding guilds. *Oceanography and Marine Biology: An Annual Review* 17, 193–284.
- Flint, M.V., Drits, A.V., Pasternak, A.F., 1991. Characteristic features of body composition and metabolism in some interzonal copepods. *Marine Biology* 111, 199–205.
- Gifford, D.J., 1993. Protozoa in the diets of *Neocalanus* spp. in the oceanic subarctic Pacific Ocean. *Progress in Oceanography* 32, 223–237.
- Goldthwait, S., Yen, J., Brown, J., Aldredge, A., 2004. Quantification of marine snow fragmentation by swimming euphausiids. *Limnology and Oceanography* 49 (4), 940–952.
- Gorsky, G., Fenaux, R., 1998. The role of appendicularia in marine food webs. In: Bone, Q. (Ed.), *The Biology of Pelagic Tunicates*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 161–169.
- Gorsky, G., Silva, N.L.D., Dallot, S., Laval, P., Braconnot, J.C., Prieur, L., 1991. Midwater tunicates: are they related to the permanent front of the Lingurian Sea (NW Mediterranean)? *Marine Ecology-Progress Series* 74, 195–204.
- Gowing, M.M., 1986. Trophic biology of phaeodarian radiolarians and flux of living radiolarians in the upper 200 m of the North Pacific central gyre. *Deep-Sea Research* 33 (5), 655–674.
- Gowing, M.M., 1989. Abundance and feeding ecology of Antarctic phaeodarian radiolarians. *Marine Biology* 103, 107–118.
- Gowing, M.M., Wishner, K.F., 1986. Trophic relationships of deep-sea calanoid copepods from the benthic boundary layer of the Santa Catalina Basin, CA. *Deep-Sea Research I* 33, 939–961.
- Gowing, M.M., Coale, S.L., 1989. Fluxes of living radiolarians and their skeletons along a northeast Pacific transect from coastal upwelling to open ocean waters. *Deep-Sea Research* 36 (4), 561–576.
- Gowing, M.M., Wishner, K.F., 1992. Feeding ecology of benthopelagic zooplankton on an eastern tropical Pacific seamount. *Marine Biology* 112, 451–457.
- Gowing, M.M., Benthall, W.N., 1994. Feeding ecology of phaeodarian radiolarians at the VERTEX North Pacific time series site. *Journal of Plankton Research* 16 (6), 707–719.
- Hamner, W.M., Robison, B.H., 1992. In situ observations of giant appendicularians in Monterey Bay. *Deep-Sea Research I* 39 (7/8), 1299–1313.
- Harbison, G.R., McAllister, V.L., Gilmer, R.W., 1986. The response of the salp *Pegea confederata* to high levels of particulate matter: starvation in the midst of plenty. *Limnology and Oceanography* 31, 371–382.
- Harbison, G.R., Matsumoto, G.I., Robison, B.H., 2001. *Lampocteis Crueniventer* gen. nov., sp. nov.: a new mesopelagic lobate ctenophore, representing the type of a new family (class Tentaculata, order Lobata, family Lampoctenidae, fam. nov.). *Bulletin of Marine Science* 68 (2), 299–311.
- Hopcroft, R.R., Robison, B.H., 2005. New mesopelagic larvaceans in the genus *Fritillaria* from Monterey Bay, California. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom* 85, 665–678.
- Hunt, J.C., Lindsay, D.L., 1999. Methodology for creating an observational database of midwater fauna using submersibles: results from Sagami Bay, Japan. *Plankton Biology and Ecology* 46 (1), 75–87.
- Kaeriyama, H., Ikeda, T., 2002. Vertical distribution and population structure of the three dominant planktonic ostracods (*Discoconchoecia pseudodiscochorea*, *Orthoconchoecia haddoni* and *Metaconchoecia skogbergi*) in the Oyashio region, western North Pacific. *Plankton Biology and Ecology* 49, 66–74.
- Karl, D.M., Christian, J.R., Dore, J.E., Hebel, D.V., Letelier, R.M., Tupas, L.M., Winn, C.D., 1996. Seasonal and interannual variability in primary production and particle flux at Station ALOHA. *Deep-Sea Research II* 43 (2–3), 539–568.
- Klaas, C., 2001. Spring distribution of larger (<64 µm) protozoans in the Atlantic sector of the Southern Ocean. *Deep-Sea Research I* 48, 1627–1649.
- Kobari, T., Ikeda, T., 1999. Vertical distribution, population structure and life cycle of *Neocalanus cristatus* (Crustacea: Copepoda) in the Oyashio region, with notes on its regional variations. *Marine Biology* 134, 683–696.
- Kobari, T., Ikeda, T., 2001a. Life cycle of *Neocalanus flemingeri* (Crustacea: Copepoda) in the Oyashio region, western subarctic Pacific, with notes on its regional variations. *Marine Ecology-Progress Series* 209, 243–255.
- Kobari, T., Ikeda, T., 2001b. Ontogenetic vertical migration and life cycle of *Neocalanus plumchrus* (Crustacea: Copepoda) in the Oyashio region, western subarctic Pacific, with notes on regional variations in body size. *Journal of Plankton Research* 23, 287–302.
- Kobari, T., Shinada, A., Tsuda, A., 2003. Functional roles of interzonal migrating mesozooplankton in the western subarctic Pacific. *Progress in Oceanography* 57, 279–298.
- Kobari, T., Steinberg, D.K., Ueda, A., Tsuda, A., Silver, M.W., Kitamura, M., 2008. Impacts of ontogenetically migrating copepods on downward carbon flux in the western subarctic Pacific Ocean. *Deep-Sea Research II*, this issue [doi:10.1016/j.dsr2.2008.04.016].



- Lamborg, C.H., Buesseler, K.O., Valdes, J., Bertrand, C.H., Bidigare, R.R., Manganini, S., Pike, S., Steinberg, D.K., Trull, T., Wilson, S.E., 2008. The flux of bio- and lithogenic material associated with sinking particles in the mesopelagic "twilight zone" of the northwest and north central Pacific Ocean. *Deep-Sea Research II*, this issue [doi:10.1016/j.dsr2.2008.04.011].
- Lampitt, R.S., Wishner, K.F., Turley, C.M., Angel, M.V., 1993. Marine snow studies in the Northeast Atlantic Ocean: distribution, composition and role as a food source for migrating plankton. *Marine Biology* 116 (4), 689–702.
- Landry, M.R., Al-Mutairi, H., Selph, K.E., Christensen, S., Nunnery, S., 2001. Seasonal patterns of mesozooplankton abundance and biomass at Station ALOHA. *Deep-Sea Research II* 48 (8–9), 2037–2061.
- Longhurst, A., Williams, R., 1992. Carbon flux by seasonal vertical migrant copepods is a small number. *Journal of Plankton Research* 14 (11), 1495–1509.
- Longhurst, A.R., Bedo, A.W., Harrison, W.G., Head, E.J.H., Sameoto, D.D., 1990. Vertical flux of respiratory carbon by oceanic diel migrant biota. *Deep-Sea Research* 37 (4), 685–694.
- Mackas, D.L., Tsuda, A., 1999. Mesozooplankton in the eastern and western subarctic Pacific: community structure, seasonal life histories, and interannual variability. *Progress in Oceanography* 43, 335–363.
- Madin, L.P., 1982. Production, composition and sedimentation of salp pellets in oceanic waters. *Marine Biology* 67, 39–45.
- Madin, L.P., Deibel, D., 1998. Feeding and energetics of Thaliaceans. In: Bone, Q. (Ed.), *The Biology of Pelagic Tunicates*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 43–60.
- Madin, L.P., Horgan, E.F., Steinberg, D.K., 2001. Zooplankton at the Bermuda Atlantic Time-series Study (BATS) station: diel, seasonal and interannual variation in biomass, 1994–1998. *Deep-Sea Research II* 48 (8–9), 2063–2082.
- Madin, L.P., Kremer, P., Wiebe, P.H., Purcell, J.E., Horgan, E.H., Nemazie, D.A., 2006. Periodic swarms of the salp *Salpa aspera* in the Slope Water off the NE United States: biovolume, vertical migration, grazing, and vertical flux. *Deep-Sea Research I* 53 (5), 804–819.
- Martin, J.H., Knauer, G.A., Karl, D.M., Broenkow, W.W., 1987. VERTEX: carbon cycling in the NE Pacific. *Deep-Sea Research* 34, 267–285.
- McGowan, J.A., Walker, P.W., 1979. Structure in the copepod community of the North Pacific central gyre. *Ecological Monographs* 49, 195–226.
- Miller, C.B., Frost, B.W., Batchelder, H.P., Clemons, M.J., Conway, R.E., 1984. Life histories of large, grazing copepods in a subarctic ocean gyre: *Neocalanus plumchrus*, *Neocalanus cristatus*, and *Eucalanus bungii* in the northeast Pacific. *Progress in Oceanography* 13, 201–243.
- Moku, M., Kawaguchi, K., Watanabe, H., Ohno, A., 2000. Feeding habits of three dominant myctophid fishes, *Diaphus theta*, *Stenobrachius leucopsarus* and *S. nannochir*, in the subarctic and transitional waters of the western North Pacific. *Marine Ecology-Progress Series* 207, 129–140.
- Morales, C.E., 1999. Carbon and nitrogen fluxes in the oceans: the contribution by zooplankton migrants to active transport in the North Atlantic during the Joint Global Ocean Flux Study. *Journal of Plankton Research* 21, 1799–1808.
- Neter, J., Kutner, M.H., Nachtsheim, C.J., Wasserman, W., 1996. *Applied Linear Statistical Models*. Irwin, Chicago, IL.
- Nishibe, Y., Ikeda, T., 2004. Vertical distribution, abundance and community structure of oncaeid copepods in the Oyashio region, western subarctic Pacific. *Marine Biology* 145, 931–941.
- Nishibe, Y., Ikeda, T., 2007. Vertical distribution, population structure and life cycles of four oncaeid copepods in the Oyashio region, western subarctic Pacific. *Marine Biology* 150, 609–625.
- Nishida, S., Pearcy, W.G., Nemoto, T., 1988. Feeding habits of mesopelagic shrimps collected off Oregon. *Bulletin of the Ocean Research Institute, University of Tokyo* 26, 99–108.
- Nishikawa, J., Nishida, S., Moku, M., Hidaka, K., Kawaguchi, K., 2001. Biomass, abundance, and vertical distribution of micronekton and large gelatinous zooplankton in the subarctic Pacific and the Bering Sea during the summer of 1997. *Journal of Oceanography* 57, 361–375.
- Ohtsuka, S., Kubo, N., Okada, M., Gushima, K., 1993. Attachment and feeding of pelagic copepods on larvacean houses. *Journal of the Oceanography Society of Japan* 49, 115–120.
- Ohtsuka, S., Bottger-Schnack, R., Okada, M., Onbe, T., 1996. In situ feeding habits of *Oncaea* (Copepoda: Poecilostomatoida) from the upper 250 m of the central Red Sea, with special reference to consumption of appendicularian houses. *Bulletin of the Plankton Society of Japan* 43 (2), 89–105.
- Okazaki, Y., Takahashi, K., Itaki, T., Kawasaki, Y., 2004. Comparison of radiolarian vertical distributions in the Okhotsk Sea near the Kuril Islands and in the northwestern North Pacific off Hokkaido Island. *Marine Micropaleontology* 51, 257–284.
- Ortner, P.B., Wiebe, P.H., Cox, J.L., 1980. Relationships between oceanic epizooplankton distributions and the seasonal deep chlorophyll maximum in the northwestern Atlantic Ocean. *Journal of Marine Research* 38 (3), 507–531.
- Pakhomov, E.A., Perissinotto, R., Froneman, P.W., 1999. Predation impact of carnivorous macrozooplankton and micronekton in the Atlantic sector of the Southern Ocean. *Journal of Marine Systems* 19 (1–3), 47–64.
- Pearre, S., 2003. Eat and run? The hunger/satiation hypothesis in vertical migration: history, evidence and consequences. *Biological Reviews* 78, 1–79.
- Perissinotto, R., Pakhomov, E.A., 1997. Feeding association of the copepod *Rhincalanus gigas* with the tunicate salp *Salpa thompsoni* in the Southern Ocean. *Marine Biology* 127, 479–483.
- Pugh, P.R., 1984. The diel migrations and distributions within a mesopelagic community in the north east Atlantic. 7. Siphonophores. *Progress in Oceanography* 13, 461–489.
- Purcell, J.E., Shiganova, T.A., Decker, M.B., Houde, E.D., 2001. The ctenophore *Mnemiopsis* in native and exotic habitats: US estuaries versus the Black Sea basin. *Hydrobiologia* 451, 145–176.
- Richter, C., 1994. Regional and seasonal variability in the vertical distribution of mesozooplankton in the Greenland Sea. *Ber Polarforsch* 154, 1–90.
- Robison, B.H., 2004. Deep pelagic biology. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 300, 253–272.
- Roman, M., Smith, S., Wishner, K., Zhang, X., Gowing, M., 2000. Mesozooplankton production and grazing in the Arabian Sea. *Deep-Sea Research II* 47 (7–8), 1423–1450.
- Roman, M.R., Adolf, H.A., Landry, M.R., Madin, L.P., Steinberg, D.K., Zhang, X., 2001. Estimates of oceanic mesozooplankton production: a comparison using the Bermuda and Hawaii time-series data. *Deep-Sea Research II* 49 (1–3), 175–192.
- Sameoto, D.D., 1984. Environmental factors influencing diurnal distribution of zooplankton and ichthyoplankton. *Journal of Plankton Research* 6, 767–792.
- Sameoto, D.D., 1986. Influence of the biological and physical environment on the vertical distribution of mesozooplankton and micronekton in the eastern tropical Pacific. *Marine Biology* 93, 263–269.
- Schnetzer, A., Steinberg, D.K., 2002a. Active transport of particulate organic carbon and nitrogen by vertically migrating zooplankton in the Sargasso Sea. *Marine Ecology-Progress Series* 234, 71–84.
- Schnetzer, A., Steinberg, D.K., 2002b. Natural diets of vertically migrating zooplankton in the Sargasso Sea. *Marine Biology* 141, 89–99.
- Shanks, A.L., Edmondson, E.W., 1990. The vertical flux of metazoans (holoplankton, meiofauna, and larval invertebrates) due to their association with marine snow. *Limnology and Oceanography* 35, 455–463.
- Shoden, S., Ikeda, T., Yamaguchi, A., 2005. Vertical distribution, population structure and life cycle of *Eucalanus bungii* (Calanoida: Copepoda) in the Oyashio region, with notes on its regional variations. *Marine Biology* 146, 497–511.
- Silguero, J.M.B., Robison, B.H., 2000. Seasonal abundance and vertical distribution of mesopelagic calycophoran siphonophores in Monterey Bay, CA. *Journal of Plankton Research* 22 (6), 1139–1153.
- Smith, S., Roman, M., Prusova, I., Wishner, K., Codispoti, L.A., Barber, R., Marra, J., Flagg, C., 1998. Seasonal response of zooplankton to monsoonal reversals in the Arabian Sea. *Deep-Sea Research II* 45 (10–11), 2369–2403.
- Steinberg, D.K., 1995. Diet of copepods (*Scopelatum vorax*) associated with mesopelagic detritus (giant larvacean houses) in Monterey Bay, California. *Marine Biology* 122 (4), 571–584.
- Steinberg, D.K., Silver, M.W., Pilskaln, C.H., Coale, S.L., Paduan, J.B., 1994. Midwater zooplankton communities on pelagic detritus (giant larvacean houses) in Monterey Bay, California. *Limnology and Oceanography* 39 (7), 1606–1620.
- Steinberg, D.K., Carlson, C.A., Bates, N.R., Goldthwait, S.A., Madin, L.P., Michaels, A.F., 2000. Zooplankton vertical migration and the active transport of dissolved organic and inorganic carbon in the Sargasso Sea. *Deep-Sea Research I* 47 (1), 137–158.
- Steinberg, D.K., Van Mooy, B.A.S., Buesseler, K.O., Boyd, P.W., Kobari, T., Karl, D.M., 2008. Bacterial vs. zooplankton control of sinking particle flux in the ocean's twilight zone. *Limnology and Oceanography* 53, 1327–1338.
- Tsuda, A., Saito, H., Kasai, H., 1999. Life histories of *Neocalanus flemingeri* and *Neocalanus plumchrus* (Calanoida: Copepoda) in the western subarctic Pacific. *Marine Biology* 135, 533–544.
- Tsuda, A., Saito, H., Nishioka, J., Ono, T., Noiri, Y., Kudo, I., 2006. Mesozooplankton response to iron enrichment during the diatom bloom and bloom decline in SERIES (NE Pacific). *Deep-Sea Research II* 53, 2281–2296.
- Uttal, L., Buck, K.R., 1996. Dietary study of the midwater polychaete *Poecobius meseres* in Monterey Bay, California. *Marine Biology* 125 (2), 333–343.
- Vannier, K., Abe, K., Ikuta, K., 1998. Feeding in myodocopid ostracods: functional morphology and laboratory observations from videos. *Marine Biology* 132, 391–408.
- Verity, P.G., Smetacek, V., 1996. Organism life cycles, predation, and the structure of marine pelagic ecosystems. *Marine Ecology-Progress Series* 130, 277–293.
- Vinogradov, M.E., 1997. Some problems of vertical distribution of meso- and macrozooplankton in the ocean. *Advances in Marine Biology* 32, 1–92.
- Vinogradov, M.E., Tseitlin, V.B., 1983. 4. Deep-sea pelagic domain (aspects of bioenergetics). In: Rowe, G.T. (Ed.), *Deep-Sea Biology*. Wiley, Canada, pp. 123–165.
- Wassmann, P., 1998. Retention versus export food chains: processes controlling sinking loss from marine pelagic systems. *Hydrobiologia* 363, 29–57.
- Wiebe, P.H., Morton, A.W., Bradley, A.M., Backus, R.H., Craddock, J.E., Barber, V., Cowles, T.J., Flierl, G.R., 1985. New developments in the MOCNESS, an apparatus for sampling zooplankton and micronekton. *Marine Biology* 87, 313–323.
- Wilson, S.E., Steinberg, D.K., Buesseler, K.O., 2008. Changes in fecal pellet characteristics with depth as indicators of zooplankton repackaging of particles in the mesopelagic zone of the subtropical and subarctic North Pacific Ocean. *Deep-Sea Research II*, this issue [doi:10.1016/j.dsr2.2008.04.019].
- Wishner, K.F., Gowing, M.M., Gelfman, C., 1998. Mesozooplankton biomass in the upper 1000 m in the Arabian Sea: overall seasonal and geographic patterns, and relationship to oxygen gradients. *Deep-Sea Research II* 45 (10–11), 2405–2432.
- Yamaguchi, A., Watanabe, I., Ishida, H., Harimoto, T., Furusawa, K., Suzuki, S., Ishizaka, J., Ikeda, T., Takahashi, M.M., 2002a. Structure and size distribution of



- plankton communities down to the greater depths in the western North Pacific Ocean. *Deep-Sea Research II* 49, 5513–5529.
- Yamaguchi, A., Watanabe, Y., Ishida, H., Harimoto, T., Furusawa, K., Suzuki, S., Ishizaka, J., Ikeda, T., Takahashi, M.M., 2002b. Community and trophic structures of pelagic copepods down to greater depths in the western subarctic Pacific (WEST-COSMIC). *Deep-Sea Research I* 49 (6), 1007–1025.
- Yamaguchi, A., Watanabe, I., Ishida, H., Harimoto, T., Furusawa, K., Suzuki, S., Ishizaka, J., Ikeda, T., Takahashi, M.M., 2004. Latitudinal differences in the planktonic biomass and community structure down to the greater depths in the western North Pacific. *Journal of Oceanography* 60, 773–787.
- Zhang, X., Dam, H.G., 1997. Downward export of carbon by diel migrant mesozooplankton in the central equatorial Pacific. *Deep-Sea Research II* 44, 2191–2202.