

## **Mesozooplankton community in the Bay of Bengal (India): spatial variability during the summer monsoon**

\*Veronica Fernandes and N. Ramaiah

National Institute of Oceanography (CSIR), Dona Paula Goa 403 004, India

\* Corresponding author, Fax: +91-832-2450602

E-mail: [veronica@nio.org](mailto:veronica@nio.org); [vferns1@yahoo.co.in](mailto:vferns1@yahoo.co.in)

### **Abstract**

This study addresses the spatial variability in mesozooplankton biomass and composition in the Central and Western Bay of Bengal (India) during the summer monsoon season of 2001. Perennially warmer sea-surface temperatures ( $> 28^{\circ}\text{C}$ ), stratified top layer (sea-surface salinity, 28-33 psu), high turbidity, and low nutrient concentrations due to weak/null upwelling and light limitation make the Bay of Bengal a region of low primary productivity. Despite this, mesozooplankton biomass values i.e. 2.9-104 mg C m<sup>-3</sup> in the Central Bay and 1.3-31 mg C m<sup>-3</sup> in the Western Bay observed in the mixed layer (2-51 m) during the summer monsoon were in the same range as reported from the more productive Arabian Sea. Mesozooplankton biomass was five times and density 18 times greater at stations with signatures of cold-core eddies, causing a higher spatial heterogeneity in zooplankton distribution. Among the 27 taxonomic groups recorded during the season, Copepoda was the most abundant group in all samples followed by Chaetognatha. The dominant order of Copepoda, Calanoida, was represented by 132 species in a total of 163 species recorded. *Oncaea venusta* was the key copepod species in the Bay. In the Central Bay, the predominant copepod species were carnivorous/omnivorous *vis a vis* most herbivores in the Western Bay. *Pleuromamma indica* increased to its maximum abundance at 18°N in the Central Bay, coinciding with the lowest dissolved oxygen concentrations. The Central Bay had higher mesozooplankton biomass, copepod species richness and diversity than in the Western Bay. Although zooplankton biomass and densities were greater at the eddy stations, correlation between zooplankton and chl *a* was not statistically significant. It appears that the grazer mesozooplankton rapidly utilize the enhanced phytoplankton production in cold-core eddies.

**Keywords** mesozooplankton biomass, density, composition, copepods, diversity and cold-core eddies

## Introduction

Temperature, salinity, and food supply are some of the important factors that are known to cause spatial changes in zooplankton populations (Lawrence et al 2004). Warming of surface waters and fresh water input are both significant factors in the stratification in semi-enclosed water bodies (Rabalais et al.2002). These environmental parameters have an impact on the breeding and hence affect the density and composition of zooplankton (Greenwood et al. 2001).

The Bay of Bengal (BoB) receives voluminous riverine inflow ( $\sim 1.62 \times 10^{12} \text{ m}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ ; UNESCO 1988) and the precipitation exceeds evaporation (Han and Webster 2002). A strong and stable stratification results from the warmer sea surface temperature that mostly exceeds 28°C, lower surface-water salinity (28-32 psu) and weaker winds ( $< 10 \text{ m s}^{-1}$ ) (Shenoi et al. 2002). Consequently, nutrient-rich subsurface waters are prevented to come up and mix with the surface (Prasanna Kumar et al. 2002). Perennial cloud cover and the high-suspended terrigenous matter brought in by rivers limit irradiance light, and reduce primary production in shallow euphotic waters in the Bay (Madhupratap et al. 2003). The continental shelf on the eastern margin of India being narrow, the sporadic mild upwelling (Shetye et al. 1991) is restricted to a narrow band in the Western Bay. However, mesoscale processes such as cold-core eddies are reported to increase production in this generally low productive region (Prasanna Kumar et al. 2004). Since primary production can significantly increase within eddies (Falkowski et al. 1991), such processes can greatly determine the spatial distribution of the grazer populations of mesozooplankton. However, effects of such cold-core eddies have not yet been studied in the Bay.

Data on distribution of zooplankton in the Atlantic Ocean (Deevey and Brooks 1977; Madin et al. 2001; Gaudy et al. 2003; Alcaraz et al. 2007) and the Pacific Ocean (Roman et al. 1995; White et al. 1995; Saltzman and Wishner 1997; Kang et al. 2004) are considerable. From the Indian Ocean, such studies have been carried out mostly in the Arabian Sea (Madhupratap and Haridas 1990; Smith et al 1998; Hitchcock et al. 2002; Smith and Madhupratap 2005). Unlike in the Bay of Bengal, the high zooplankton biomass in the central and eastern Arabian Sea during summer monsoon is sustained by high primary productivity induced mainly by open ocean- and coastal upwelling (Smith and Madhupratap 2005).

Studies on the zooplankton distributions in the Bay of Bengal during and after the International Indian Ocean Expedition (1960-1965) are scarce and those available are mostly from the coastal areas (Achuthankutty et al. 1980; Nair et al. 1981; Rakesh et al. 2006). Of the total marine fish catch in

Indian waters, ~ 31.5% comes from the Bay of Bengal (CMFRI 1970). Understanding zooplankton distribution is essential because they play a pivotal role in the trophic link between primary production and predators such as macrozooplankton, fishes, and marine mammals.

As a part of the Bay of Bengal Process Studies (BOBPS) programme, mesozooplankton were collected from the open ocean and shelf/slope waters of the Bay of Bengal during the summer monsoon. BOBPS was a national programme aimed at understanding the biogeochemical processes with a view to investigate the carbon flux potential in this oligotrophic and uniquely located basin (see for example in Madhupratap et al. 2003; Gauns et al. 2005;). An important goal of this investigation was to understand the zooplankton dynamics in the open ocean and the near-coastal waters of this sparsely-studied area. In addition to measuring the biomass and abundance in the upper 1000 m, we also analyzed the composition of the mesozooplankton community at group level, and copepods to generic/species level. The general hypotheses that were tested during this study are: 1) mesozooplankton abundance differs in coastal and offshore waters; 2) species diversity is high in warm, less productive region of the Bay; and 3) zooplankton distribution is closely related to hydrography of the region. In order to test the hypotheses, measurements of biological and hydrographical parameters were carried out in the Central and Western Bay. Upon taxonomic identification of the copepod species, various diversity indices were computed.

## **Materials and methods**

Sampling was carried out during the cruise 166 of ORV “*Sagar Kanya*” from the Central Bay of Bengal between 9°N and 20°N along 88°E and the Western Bay between 12°N and 19°N, 81°E and 85°E (Fig. 1) from July 6 to August 2, 2001. The central transect in the Bay of Bengal represented an open ocean environment, with a lesser/no influence of boundary currents and upwelling events. In contrast, the WB that comprises the shelf/slope waters, is influenced by the northward-moving East Indian Coastal Current/Summer Monsoon Current during this season, and receives inflows from the rivers Mahanadi, Godavari, Krishna and Pennar and continental runoff from terrestrial precipitation.

One litre water sample was collected for chlorophyll *a* (chl *a*) measurements from each of the eight depths (surface, 10, 20, 40, 60, 80, 100 and 120 m) in the upper 120 m at eight stations (Fig. 1). Chl *a* was measured fluorometrically (Turner Designs 10 AU, USA) following standard JGOFS Protocols (UNESCO 1994).

Mesozooplankton samples were collected around noon and midnight from the same eight stations. Using a pressure-sensor fitted, multiple plankton net (MPN, Hydro-Bios, mouth area  $0.25 \text{ m}^2$ , mesh size  $200 \text{ }\mu\text{m}$ ), vertical hauls were made from five discrete depths in the upper 1000 m. The thickness of sampling strata was based on temperature profiles obtained from Conductivity, Temperature, Depth profiler. The samples were collected from five strata: mixed layer, top of thermocline (TT) to base of thermocline (BT), BT to 300 m, 300 – 500 m, and 500 – 1000 m. The net was hauled up at a speed of  $0.8 \text{ m s}^{-1}$  and the volume of water filtered was calculated by multiplying the sampling depth with mouth area of the net.

Zooplankton biovolume (ml) was estimated by the standard displacement volume method (ICES 2000). Large gelatinous plankton such as salps, medusae and siphonophores were separated from the rest of the sample and biovolume measured by the same method. This was done to calculate the carbon values separately for non-gelatinous (*sensu*, crustacean ICES 2000) and gelatinous (cnidarians) forms. The biomass was expressed per unit volume of water filtered by the net. Thereafter, the samples were fixed with 4% buffered formaldehyde-seawater solution and brought to the laboratory for further analyses. When the sample size was large, as usually in the first and second strata, it was split using a Folsom splitter and, in general, 25% aliquot was used for density measurement and identification of taxa. Often, when the densities in the deeper layers were low, we analyzed the entire sample for counting and species identification.

Conversion factors for deriving zooplankton carbon biomass from the displacement volume of zooplankton used were: 1)  $1 \text{ ml zooplankton} = 0.075 \text{ g dry wt}$ , and 2)  $1 \text{ g dry wt zooplankton} = 0.342 \text{ g carbon of zooplankton}$  (Madhupratap et al. 1981). All the samples were sorted using broad taxonomic groupings from Phylum to Family level (UNESCO 1968; ICES 2000). Only the copepods were identified to genus/species level (Tanaka 1956; Bradford and Jillett 1980) using a stereo zoom microscope (Zeiss, Germany) with 90X magnification

Species diversity index ( $H'$ ; Omori and Ikeda 1984), species number ( $S$ ), species richness ( $d$ ; Margalef 1968) and evenness ( $J'$ ; Heip 1974) were calculated for examining spatial differences in the abundance of copepod species in the upper 1000 m depth.

Biomass, abundance and taxonomical data were subjected to Wilcoxon matched pairs test to detect any variability arising due to day and night differences. ANOVA was performed to test spatio-temporal

variability of various parameters. Spearman Correlation between zooplankton biovolume and abundance versus environmental parameters was tested to understand which factor influences the zooplankton biovolume, abundance and distribution.

## **Results**

### **Hydrography**

Results on hydrography published in Prasanna Kumar et al. (2004) and Sardessai et al. (2007) are briefly described here.

#### *Temperature*

In the Central Bay (88°E), the sea surface temperature (SST) was 29°C between 9°N and 15°N and, was 28.5°C until 20°N. The mixed layer depth (MLD) was ~15 m at 9°N, and 51 m at 12°N but decreased markedly to <4 m at 20°N. The vertical thermal structure in the upper 300 m showed oscillations within the thermocline. Isotherms were tilted upwards around 9°N and 20°N, lowering the temperature at 60 m by at least 5°C, indicating signature of subsurface cold-core eddies.

In the Western Bay, SST averaged 30°C and was higher than in the Central Bay. MLD shoaled from 25 m at 12°N to ~2 m at 19°N. The doming of isotherms was around 17°N, where a cold-core eddy was evident. For the details on the occurrences of cold-core eddies during this season in the Bay of Bengal, see Prasanna Kumar et al. (2004) and for satellite image of these eddies, see Sardessai et al. (2007).

#### *Salinity*

Sea surface salinity (SSS) in the Central Bay was 33.5 psu. between 9°N and 15°N and it decreased to 28 psu at 20°N. The salinity gradient in the upper 50 m at 9°N was about 0.02 psu m<sup>-1</sup> while that at 20°N it was about 0.14 psu m<sup>-1</sup>, indicating a strong signal of freshwater influx in the northern region. In the Western Bay, the SSS was 34 psu at 12°N; decreased northward to reach 24 psu at 19°N. The salinity gradient of 0.2 psu m<sup>-1</sup> in the upper 50 m was stronger at 19°N 85°E.

### *Dissolved Oxygen*

Dissolved oxygen (DO) depletion was observed at 150 m in the Central Bay. This oxygen minimum zone ( $5\mu\text{M}$ ) extended to greater depths north of  $15^\circ\text{N}$  (up to 700 m at  $20^\circ\text{N}$ ). Below 700 m, the oxygen levels gradually increased. The subsurface DO concentrations decreased significantly towards the north in the CB. In the Western Bay, the oxygen minimum zone (OMZ) was observed at all stations at depths between 150 and 500 m.

### *Zooplankton biomass and density*

Mesozooplankton biomass and density did not vary significantly between day and night ( $p>0.05$ ) in both transects. However, both decreased significantly with increasing depth ( $p<0.05$ ). At some stations, biomass was high in the surface layers in both transects due to huge *Pyrosoma* swarms. The higher biomass in MLD in the Central Bay was found at  $9^\circ\text{N}$  and  $20^\circ\text{N}$ , with lesser values at stations in between (Fig.2a). It ranged from 0.05 to  $104\text{ mg C m}^{-3}$  in the upper 1000 m. The density ranging from 0.008 to  $963\text{ ind. m}^{-3}$  was the highest in MLD at  $9^\circ\text{N}$  and was moderate at  $12^\circ\text{N}$  and  $20^\circ\text{N}$ . In the Western Bay, they ranged from 0.08- $31\text{ mg C m}^{-3}$  and, from 0.008 to  $4621\text{ ind. m}^{-3}$ , respectively, with their highest values at  $17^\circ\text{N } 83^\circ\text{E}$  (Fig. 2 b).

### *Chlorophyll a and 0-1000 m depth integrated zooplankton carbon biomass and abundance*

In the Central Bay, chlorophyll *a* (chl *a*) varied from  $0.07\pm 0.04$  to  $0.12\pm 0.11\text{ mg m}^{-3}$  in upper 120 m (Fig. 3 a), with higher values at  $9^\circ\text{N}$  and  $20^\circ\text{N}$ . In the Western Bay, chl *a* concentrations were higher and varied from  $0.09\pm 0.11$  to  $0.16\pm 0.11\text{ mg m}^{-3}$ . However, the concentrations did not significantly differ between the stations along both transects ( $p>0.05$ ). The satellite pictures of cold-core eddies during this study period (Sardessai et al. 2007), clearly show that our sampling was mostly in the peripheries of these eddies.

In the Central Bay, zooplankton carbon biomass and densities in the upper 1000 m ranged from 492 to  $1332\text{ mg C m}^{-2}$ , and from 0.59 to  $3.7\text{ (x } 10^4\text{ ind. m}^{-2}\text{)}$ , respectively. Both were nearly two times higher at the eddy-influenced stations ( $9^\circ\text{N}$  and  $20^\circ\text{N}$ ) compared with the stations away from these eddies ( $15^\circ\text{N}$ ; Fig. 3b). Similarly in the Western Bay, the column biomass (range,  $185\text{-}1110\text{ mg C m}^{-2}$ ) and density (range,  $0.16\text{-}5.31\text{ (x } 10^4\text{ ind. m}^{-2}\text{)}$ ) were the greatest at  $17^\circ\text{N } 83^\circ\text{E}$  by 5 and 18 times, respectively (Fig. 3 b). The average biomass in the CB was twice that in the WB due to the frequent swarms and higher

biovolumes of pyrosomes in Central Bay. Because the individuals in pyrosome swarms could not be counted, they are not considered in the overall numerical abundance. Excluding the pyrosomes, the mesozooplankton density, did not vary significantly between transects.

#### *Mesozooplankton composition and spatial distribution*

Among the twenty-seven groups of mesozooplankton that we identified (Table 1), copepods were the most abundant taxon at all depths (Fig. 4). They contributed to the total zooplankton density 76- 89% in the Central Bay and 80-99% in the Western Bay. The **next** important taxa in decreasing order of abundance were: chaetognaths, ostracods, polychaetes, appendicularia and euphausiids. While the density maxima of Copepoda were observed above (87.2-87.3%) and below (84.1-88.5%) the 200-300 m stratum (76.3%) in the Central Bay, they accounted for 99% of the total individuals in the thermocline stratum in the Western Bay. Chaetognaths, polychaetes and ostracods were found in all the sampled strata. Appendicularia were found mostly above 300 m and euphausiids below 200 m. Remaining groups, such as siphonophores, medusae and salps were rare in the thermocline in both transects.

#### *Composition and spatial distribution of copepods*

**Orders:** Calanoids were the predominant copepods in the Bay of Bengal (Fig. 5), with their maximum in the 200-300 m stratum (range, 18-68 %) in the Central Bay and in the deepest stratum (range, 33-89%) in the Western Bay. Poecilostomatoids were significant above and below the thermocline in both transects. Mormonilloida were more abundant in the thermocline in the Central Bay (70%) and Cyclopoida (32 %) in the Western Bay. Harpacticoida ranged from 1 to 18 % among the Copepoda below 200 m in both transects.

**Families:** The abundance of copepod families in the Bay of Bengal varied with depth. In the Central Bay, Oncaeidae were found dominant at all depths (Table 2) except in the thermocline where only Mormonillidae predominated (70 %). In addition, herbivorous Clausocalanidae were found dominant in the MLD, members of Metridinidae and Lucicutiidae between 200 and 500 m and Miraciidae were important in the deepest stratum.

In the Western Bay, Paracalanidae dominated in the top 300 m, Oncaeidae were found mostly in the MLD and between 300 and 500 m. Oithonidae were found important in the thermocline and Corycaeidae

in the 200-300 m stratum. Metridinidae and Lucicutiidae were the only dominant families in the deepest stratum.

#### *Vertical distribution of the dominant copepods*

Vertical distribution patterns in the Central and Western Bay of the most abundant copepod species (species contributed  $\geq 2\%$  of the total copepod densities in Central and Western Bay; Fig. 6). In the Central Bay, *Clausocalanus arcuicornis* was abundant in the MLD, with a small peak in the deep stratum. *Mormonilla minor* was encountered mostly in the thermocline and *Eucalanus monachus* in the upper 300 m. *Oncaea venusta* and *Oithona similis* were distributed throughout the water column, and *Eucalanus elongatus*, *Lucicutia flavicornis*, *Pleuromamma indica*, *Macrosetella gracilis* and *Conaea gracilis* increased in abundance below 200 m (Fig. 6 a).

In the Western Bay, *Paracalanus aculeatus* was mostly observed in the MLD. *Paracalanus indicus* and *Eucalanus monachus* were abundant in upper 300 m; *Oithona similis* though was present throughout the column, showed a prominent peak in the thermocline. *Mormonilla minor* and *Lucicutia flavicornis* were abundant in near-surface layers as well as the deepest stratum. *Corycaeus danae*, *Euterpina acutifrons* and *Lucicutia maxima* were most abundant in the 200-300 m stratum. *Oncaea venusta*, *Macrosetella gracilis* and *Paracandacia truncata* were more abundant in the 300-500 m stratum; and *Pleuromamma indica* was most abundant in the deepest stratum (Fig. 6 b).

#### *Diversity indices of copepods*

Of 163 copepod species observed, 132 were calanoids, 17 poecilostomatoids, 6 cyclopoids, 6 harpacticoids, and 2 were mormonilloids. Remarkably, of 163 copepods species, 153 species were present in the Central Bay but only 57 were found in the Western Bay. In general, species diversity and richness were greater in the MLD and the deepest stratum sampled (500-1000 m); also evenness was the highest in the deepest stratum.

Both the number of species (S) and species richness ( $d$ ) were the highest at 9°N (S= 91). Their numbers decreased northwards (S, 34 at 20°N) in the Central Bay (Table 3). In contrast, evenness increased northwards and reached its maximum at 20°N. Species diversity ( $H'$ ) was high at 9°N (3.86), decreasing northwards (at 20°N: 2.72). The number of species found in the Western Bay was relatively



low (range, 25-33), with a low variability between the stations. The  $H'$  was much lower in the Western Bay (2.65-2.95), however  $J'$  was relatively higher (range, 0.73 to 0.85).

*Oncaea venusta* was the dominant copepod species at all stations in the Central Bay except at 18°N where *Mormonilla minor* and *Pleuromamma indica* were dominant. At 15°N, *M. minor* and *Macrosetella gracilis* and *O. venusta* were dominant. In the Western Bay too *O. venusta* was dominant at all the three stations; in addition, *Oithona similis* and *Paracalanus indicus* dominated at 12°N 81°E and 19°N 85°E respectively.

#### *Correlation analyses*

Mesozooplankton biomass and densities correlated positively and significantly with temperature and dissolved oxygen and, negatively with salinity in the upper 200 m (Table 4). However, the mesozooplankton biomass and density from the MLD did not show any correlation with integrated chl *a* ( $p>0.05$ ) in the upper 120 m.

#### **Discussion**

Our results show that mesozooplankton biomass and densities are highly enhanced in the MLD at stations influenced by cold-core eddies, i.e. at two locations in the Central Bay (9°N and 20°N) and one in the Western Bay (17°N, 83°E). The zooplankton biomass and the physico-chemical features seem to be closely related in the Bay of Bengal. The biomass values in the open ocean areas during this study are higher than those reported by Muraleedharan et al. (2007) during July 2003. Also, in the location influenced by cold-core eddy in the Western Bay, the biomass is much higher than that reported earlier (Nair et al. 1981). This latter may be attributed to the absence earlier of the eddies. In the central and eastern Arabian Sea, high biomass of zooplankton are reportedly sustained by nutrient upwelling and higher primary production rates caused by physical processes such as open ocean- and coastal upwelling (Smith and Madhupratap 2005). Though higher nutrient concentrations were observed at the eddy-influenced locations during this season in both transects in the Bay of Bengal (Sardessai et al. 2007), the chl *a* concentrations at various stations were similar, irrespective of the eddy influence. Thus in MLD, a lack of correlation of mesozooplankton biomass and density with chl *a* ( $p>0.05$ ) is mostly attributable to grazing by herbivorous zooplankton on phytoplankton (Gasparini and Castel 1999). As Banse (1994) also suggests that such a steady state of chl *a* concentrations, despite regional differences in subsurface nutrient

input, is achieved due to zooplankton grazing. Thus, the phytoplankton increase in eddy-influenced regions seems to be rapidly decimated by its grazing by herbivorous/omnivorous zooplankton.

Also carnivorous zooplankton increase in such areas, as they feed on the herbivorous microzooplankton. In fact, during this study, the carnivorous/omnivorous Oncaeidae (Kattner et al. 2003) were the dominant copepods in the MLD apart from herbivorous Clausocalanidae and Paracalanidae. Madhupratap et al. (1996) reported that high zooplankton biomass in Arabian Sea was sustained by microzooplankton and bacteria, during the low chl *a* periods. Mean bacterial biomass is reportedly higher in the Bay of Bengal, compared with the Arabian Sea (Gauns et al. 2005). Also, alternative food sources such as detritus brought in by the rivers in the northern and Western Bay (Khodse et al. 2007) could be additional nutrition for the omnivorous/detritivorous zooplankton (see also Heinle et al. 1977). The warmer SSTs (>28°C) and low sea-surface salinities (23-33 psu) that keep the upper 50 m stratified, could increase the residence time of the available particulate organic matter and increasing its availability for the zooplankton in the upper water column.

Zooplankton are known to vertically migrate even in presence of a weak oxygen minimum zone. In this study, the subsurface DO concentration in the Central Bay varied from suboxic (10µM) levels in the south to hypoxic (5µM) in the north between 150 and 700 m, however a thick hypoxic zone of 150-300 m was lying between suboxic waters in the WB. Since there was no significant diel difference in density of zooplankton in any stratum, it appears that the OMZ hindered the vertically migrating organisms in both transects. While zooplankton groups did not seem to be affected by the OMZ in the Central Bay, a prevalence of only copepods was seen at the upper boundary of the OMZ in the Western Bay. As Childress (1975) suggest some crustaceans can adapt to survive in low oxygen environment. It is also thought that chaetognaths found in the OMZ may switch to anaerobic metabolism (Childress and Thuesen 1992). Similar to observations in the equatorial Pacific (Saltzman and Wishner 1997), the organisms unable to adapt to the low oxygen may be excluded from this zone as evidenced from the reduction of biomass and density below the MLD in our study. This could also be inferred from the very poor occurrence of siphonophores, medusae and salps from the thermocline and below up to the 300 m strata. These gelatinous forms are known to lack physiological adaptations for low oxygen tolerance (Childress and Thuesen 1992). Also the vertical distribution patterns of the dominant groups in this study indicate their differential tolerance to the DO levels.

Twenty-seven taxonomic groups of zooplankton were observed in this tropical Bay: copepods forming the bulk of abundance followed by chaetognaths, as also reported by many authors previously (Madhupratap and Haridas 1990; Padmavati et al. 1998; Koppelman and Weikert 2000). The proportions of various taxa recorded in this study corroborate well with other regions of prominent oxygen minimum zone such as the northern Arabian Sea (Madhupratap et al. 2001) and Equatorial Pacific (Saltzman and Wishner 1997). Similar to earlier reports, Calanoida was the dominant order among the copepods followed by Poecilostomatoida (Deevey and Brooks 1977; Madhupratap and Haridas 1990). The copepod species richness reported in this study is much higher than in the temperate waters (Berasategui et al. 2005). Hwang et al. (2007) also observed higher copepod species richness in lower latitudes of the northern South China Sea. From these observations, it is believed that higher species richness in the tropics is strongly coupled to temperature (Rutherford et al. 1999). From the total of 163 copepod species that we recorded in the Bay of Bengal, 153 are from the Central Bay, and only 57 from the Western Bay. This clearly indicates that copepod species richness is much higher in the oceanic compared to the coastal waters. Lower species richness and diversity in the northern Central Bay and throughout the Western Bay appears to be a manifestation of the OMZ. However, the higher diversity and evenness in the deepest stratum could be because of the stable environment there as suggested by Padmavati et al. (1998).

Generally, *Oncaea venusta* predominated at most stations and depths. Its food ranges from toxic dinoflagellates (Turner and Tester 1997, Wu et al. 2004) to marine snow (Alldredge 1972). Turner (1986) considers it to be an omnivore while Yamaguchi et al. (2002), considers it as a detritivore. According to Go et al. (1998), it also feeds on much larger zooplankton, such as chaetognaths and appendicularians. It is known to go into a pseudopelagic mode i.e. reduce swimming speeds in an attempt to reduce respiratory losses (Nishibe and Ikeda 2008). The diverse feeding habits as well as respiratory adaptation of *O. venusta* seem particularly in the successful colonization of this species in food limited conditions as well over a wide latitudinal range and, hydrographical regime including the OMZ.

*Mormonilla minor*, the meso-bathypelagic particle feeder (Boxshall 1985) that occurred in large numbers in the thermocline at 15°N and 18°N (88°E) seems to feed on the partially decomposed particles and reside at the upper boundary of oxycline. It may shift vertically upwards to avoid the anoxic layers (Bottger-Schnack 1996; Saltzman and Wishner 1997). *Pleuromamma indica*, the indicator of OMZ (Saraswathy and Iyer 1986; Goswami et al. 1992) increased to its maximum abundance at 18°N 88°E

where oxygen minimum water was brought in the shallower depths by cold-core eddies. A large number of individuals of herbivorous species such as *Eucalanus monachus*, *Paracalanus indicus* and *Clausocalanus arcuicornis* were found to be dominant at stations in the Western Bay probably due to the higher availability of phytoplankton biomass. Their predominance in the upper 300 m in the Bay corroborates many earlier findings (Kouwenberg 1994; Saltzman and Wishner 1997).

*Oncaea venusta*, *Oithona similis*, *Lucicutia flavicornis* and *Macrosetella gracilis* were generally distributed throughout the water column as also reported earlier (Bottger-Schnack 1994; Weikert 1982). *Pleuromamma indica*, *Eucalanus elongatus*, *Lucicutia maxima* and *Conaea gracilis* were abundant below 200 m as also observed by Madhupratap et al. (2001). The stations influenced by cold-core eddy differed from the stations without eddy in having higher mesozooplankton biomass and densities. Though the mesozooplankton density in the two transects did not greatly differ, the copepod species assemblages varied considerably.

In conclusion, the oceanic Central Bay supports higher mesozooplankton biomass, copepod species richness and diversity than the coastal Western Bay during the summer monsoon. Mesozooplankton biomass, abundance and copepod diversity seems to be strongly coupled to hydrography, dissolved oxygen in particular. In the stratified waters of the Bay of Bengal, cold-core eddy mediated phytoplankton biomass seem to elevate and sustain the zooplankton biomasses and abundances, which in turn are indicative of sustaining the fisheries resources.

### **Acknowledgements**

We thank Dr. S. R. Shetye, Director NIO for facilities and encouragement. This work was supported by the grants from Department of Ocean Development, New Delhi under the BOBPS Programme. VF thanks CSIR for the SRF fellowship for carrying out this work and Drs K. Altaff, New, Chennai and, R. Stephen, Regional Centre of NIO, Kochi for their help in identification and confirmation of copepod species. Drs S. Prasanna Kumar and S. Sardesai are acknowledged for the published data on physical and chemical parameters.

## References

- Achuthankutty CT, Madhupratap M, Nair VR, Nair SRS, Rao TSS (1980). Zooplankton biomass and composition in the western Bay of Bengal during late Southwest monsoon. *Indian J Mar Sci* 9: 201–206
- Alcaraz M, Calbet A, Estrada M, Marrase C, Saiz E, Trepas I (2007) Physical control of zooplankton communities in the Catalan Sea. *Prog Oceanogr* 74: 294–312
- Berasategui AD, Ramirez FC, Schiariti A (2005) Patterns in diversity and community structure of epipelagic copepods from the Brazil–Malvinas Confluence area, southwestern Atlantic. *J Mar Syst* 56: 309–316
- Bottger-Schnack R (1994) The microcopepod fauna in the Eastern Mediterranean and Arabian Seas: a comparison with the Red Sea fauna. *Hydrobiologia* 292/293: 271-282
- Bottger-Schnack (1996) Vertical structure of small metazoan plankton, especially non-calanoïd copepods .1. Deep Arabian Sea. *J Plankton Res* 18: 1073–1101
- Boxshall GA (1985) The comparative anatomy of two copepods, a predatory calanoïd and a particle-feeding mormonilloïd. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B* 311 (1150): 303-377
- Bradford JM, Jillett JB (1980) The marine fauna of New Zealand: pelagic calanoïd copepods: Family Aetideidae. *New Zealand Oceanographic Institute Memoirs*: 86:1-102
- Childress JJ (1975) The respiratory rates of midwater crustaceans as a function of depth of occurrence and relation to the oxygen minimum layer off southern California. *Comp Biochem Physiol* 50 A: 787-799
- Childress JJ, Thuesen EV (1992) Metabolic potential of deep-sea animals: regional and global scales. In: Rowe GT and Pariente V (eds) *Deep-sea food chains and the global carbon cycle*. NATO ASI Series, Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, pp 217-236
- CMFRI (1970) Annual report of central marine fisheries research institute, ICAR
- Deevey GB, Brooks AL (1977) Copepods of the Sargasso Sea off Bermuda: species composition, and vertical and seasonal distribution between the surface and 2000 m. *Bull Mar Sci* 27: 256-291
- Falkowski PG, Ziemann D, Kolber D, Biefalg PK (1991) Role of eddy pumping in enhancing primary production in the ocean. *Nature* 352: 55–58
- Gasparini S, Castel J (1999) Autotrophic and heterotrophic nanoplankton in the diet of the estuarine copepods *Eurytemora affinis* and *Acartia bifilosa*. *J Plankton Res* 19: 877–890

- Gaudy R, Youssara F, Diaz F, Raimbault P (2003) Biomass, metabolism and nutrition of zooplankton in the Gulf of Lions (NW Mediterranean). *Oceanol Acta* 26: 357–372
- Gauns M, Madhupratap M, Ramaiah N, Jyothibabu R, Fernandes V, Paul JT, Prasanna Kumar S (2005) Comparative accounts of biological productivity characteristics and estimates of carbon fluxes in the Arabian Sea and the Bay of Bengal. *Deep-Sea Res II* 52:2003-2017
- Go YB, Oh BC, Terazaki M (1998) Feeding behavior of the poecilostomatoid copepods *Oncaea* sp. on chaetognaths. *J Mar Syst* 15: 475-482
- Goswami SC, Gajbhiye SN, Padmavati G (1992) Distribution of *Pleuromamma* (Copepoda: Metridinidae) in the Western Indian Ocean. In: Desai BN (ed) *Oceanography of the Indian Ocean*. Oxford/IBH, New Delhi, pp 157-166
- Greenwood A, O’Riordan RM, Barnes DKA (2001) Seasonality and vertical zonation of zooplankton in a semi-enclosed sea lough. *J Mar Biol Ass UK* 81: 213-220
- Han W, Webster PJ (2002) Forcing mechanisms of sea level interannual variability in the Bay of Bengal. *J Phys Oceanogr* 32: 216-239
- Heinle DR, Harris RP, Ustach JF, Flemer DA (1977) Detritus as food for estuarine copepods. *Mar Biol* 40: 341–353
- Hitchcock GL, Lane P, Smith S, Luo J, Ortner PB (2002) Zooplankton spatial distributions in coastal waters of the northern Arabian Sea, August, 1995. *Deep-Sea Res II* 49 (12): 2403-2423
- Hwang JS, Dahms HU, Tseng LC, Chen QC (2007) Intrusions of the Kuroshio Current in the northern South China Sea affect copepod assemblages of the Luzon Strait. *J Expt Mar Biol Ecol* 352: 12–27
- ICES (2000) *Zooplankton methodology manual* (684 pp) Harris RP, Wiebe PH, Lenz J, Skjoldal HR, Huntley M (eds), California, USA, Academic Press
- Kang JH, Kim WS, Chang KII, Noh JH (2004) Distribution of plankton related to the mesoscale physical structure within the surface mixed layer in the southwestern East Sea, Korea. *J Plankton Res* 26: 1515-1528; doi: 10.1093/plankt/fbh140
- Kattner G, Albers C, Graeve M, Schnack-Schiel SB (2003) Fatty acid and alcohol composition of the small polar copepods, *Oithona* and *Oncaea*: indication on feeding modes *Polar Biol* 26: 666–671; doi: 10.1007/s00300-003-0540-x
- Khodse VB, Fernandes L, Gopalkrishna VV, Bhosle NB, Fernandes V, Prabhu Matondkar SG, Bhushan R, (2007) Distribution and seasonal variation of concentrations of particulate carbohydrates and uronic acids in the northern Indian Ocean. *Mar Chem* 103:327-346

- Kouwenberg JHM (1994) Copepod distribution in relation to seasonal hydrographics and spatial structure in the northwestern Mediterranean [Golfe du Lion]. *Est Coast Shelf Sci* 38: 69-90
- Lawrence D, Valiela I, Tomasky G (2004) Estuarine calanoid copepod abundance in relation to season, salinity, and land-derived nitrogen loading, Waquoit Bay, MA. *Est Coast Shelf Sci* 61: 547–557
- Madhupratap M, Nair VR, Nair SRS, Achuthankutty CT (1981) Zooplankton abundance of the Andaman Sea. *Indian J Mar Sci* 10: 258-261
- Madhupratap M, Haridas P (1990) Zooplankton, especially calanoid copepods, in the upper 1000 m of the southeast Arabian Sea. *J Plankton Res* 12: 305-321
- Madhupratap M, Gopalakrishnan TC, Haridas P, Nair KKC, Aravindakshan PN, Padmavati G, Shiney P (1996) Lack of seasonal and geographical variation in mesozooplankton biomass in the Arabian Sea and its structure in the mixed layer. *Curr Sci* 71: 863-868
- Madhupratap M, Gopalakrishnan TC, Haridas P, Nair KKC (2001) Mesozooplankton biomass, composition and distribution in the Arabian Sea during the fall intermonsoon: implications of oxygen gradients. *Deep-Sea Res II* 48: 1345-1368
- Madhupratap M, Gauns M, Ramaiah N, Prasanna Kumar S, Muraleedharan PM, De Sousa SN, Sardesai S, Muraleedharan U (2003) Biogeochemistry of the Bay of Bengal: Physical, chemical and primary productivity characteristics of the central and western Bay of Bengal during summer monsoon 2001. *Deep-Sea Res II* 50: 881–896
- Madin LP, Erich FH, Steinberg DK (2001) Zooplankton at the Bermuda Atlantic time-series Study (BATS) station: diel, seasonal and interannual variation in biomass, 1994-1998. *Deep-Sea Res II* 48: 2063-2082
- Muraleedharan KR, Jasmine P, Achuthankutty CT, Revichandran C, Dinesh Kumar PK, Anand P, Rejomon G (2007) Influence of basin-scale and mesoscale physical processes on biological productivity in the Bay of Bengal during the summer monsoon. *Prog Oceanogr* 72 (4): 364- 383
- Nair SR, Nair VR, Achuthankutty CT, Madhupratap M (1981) Zooplankton composition and diversity in western Bay of Bengal. *J Plankton Res* 3: 493–508
- Nishibe Y, Ikeda T (2008) Metabolism and elemental composition of four oncaeid copepods in the western Subarctic Pacific. *Mar Biol* 153 (3) 397-404
- Omori M, Ikeda T (1984) Distribution and community structure. In: *Methods in marine zooplankton ecology*. Wiley-Interscience Publication, pp 253–279

- Prasanna Kumar S, Muraleedharan PM, Prasad TG, Gauns M, Ramaiah N, DeSouza SN, Sardessai S, Madhupratap M (2002) Why is the Bay of Bengal less productive during the summer monsoon compared to the Arabian Sea. *Geophys Res Letts* 29(24): 2235,doi: 10.1029/2002GL016013
- Prasanna Kumar S, Nuncio M, Narvekar J, Kumar A, Sardessai S, DeSouza SN, Gauns M, Ramaiah N, Madhupratap M (2004) Are eddies nature's trigger to enhance biological productivity in the Bay of Bengal? *Geophys Res Letts* 31: L07309, doi: 10.1029/2003GL019274
- Rabalais NN; Turner E; Wiseman WJ (2002) "Gulf of Mexico Hypoxia, a.k.a. 'The Dead Zone.'" *Annu Rev Ecol Syst* 33:235-263.
- Rakshesh M, Raman AV, Sudarsan D (2006) Discriminating zooplankton assemblages in neritic and oceanic waters: A case for the Northeast coast of India, Bay of Bengal. *Mar Environ Res* 61: 93-109
- Roman MR, Dam HG, Gauzens AL, Urban-Rich J, Foley DG, Dickey TD (1995) Zooplankton variability on the equator at 140°W during the JGOFS EqPac study. *Deep-Sea Res II* 42(2-3): 673-693
- Rutherford S, D'Hondt S, Prell W (1999) Environmental controls on the geographic distribution of zooplankton diversity. *Nature* 400:749-753
- Saltzman J, Wishner KF (1997) Zooplankton ecology in the eastern tropical Pacific oxygen minimum zone above a seamount: 2. Vertical distribution of copepods. *Deep-Sea Res I* 44: 931-954
- Saraswathy M, Iyer KH (1986) Ecology of *Pleuromamma indica* Wolfenden (Copepoda-Calanoida) in the Indian Ocean. *Indian J Mar Sci* 15: 219-22
- Sardessai S, Ramaiah N, Prasannakumar S, DeSouza SN (2007) Influence of environmental forcings on the seasonality of dissolved oxygen and nutrients in the Bay of Bengal. *J Mar Res* 65(2): 301-316
- Shenoi SSC, Shankar D, Shetye SR (2002) Differences in heat budget of the near surface Arabian Sea and Bay of Bengal: Implications for the summer monsoon. *J Geophys Res* 107 (C6): 3052, doi: 10.1029/2000 JC000679
- Shetye SR, Shenoi SSC, Gouveia AD, Michael GS, Sundar D, Nampoothiri G (1991) Wind-driven coastal upwelling along the western boundary of the Bay of Bengal during the Southwest monsoon. *Cont Shelf Res* 11:1397-1408
- Smith S, Roman M, Prusova I, Wishner K, Gowing M, codispoti LA, Barber R, Marra J, Flagg C (1998) Seasonal response of zooplankton to monsoonal reversals in the Arabian Sea. *Deep-Sea Res II* 45:2369-2403



- Smith SL, Madhupratap M (2005) Mesozooplankton of the Arabian Sea: Patterns influenced by seasons, upwelling, and oxygen concentrations. *Prog Oceanogr* 65: 214-239
- Tanaka O (1956) The pelagic Copepods of the Izu Region, middle Japan systematic Account I. Families Calanidae and Eucalanidae. Publications of the Seto marine Biological Laboratory, Vol. V (2)
- Turner JT (1986) Zooplankton feeding ecology: Contents of fecal pellets of the cyclopoid copepods *Oncaea venusta*, *Corycaeus amazonicus*, *Oithona plumifera* and *O. simplex* from the northern Gulf of Mexico. *P.S.Z.N.I.: Mar Ecol* 7: 289–302
- Turner JT, Tester PA (1997) Toxic marine phytoplankton, zooplankton grazers, and pelagic food webs. *Limnol Oceanogr* 42: 1203-1214
- UNESCO (1968) Zooplankton sampling. Monographs on oceanographic methodology. UNESCO Publication, No 2, 174 pp
- UNESCO (1988) River inputs into Ocean systems: status and recommendations for research. UNESCO Technical papers in marine science, No 55, Final report of SCOR Working Group 46, Paris, 25 pp
- UNESCO (1994) Protocols for the Joint Global Ocean Flux Study (JGOFS). Manual and Guides 29, pp 170
- Weikert H (1982) The vertical distribution of zooplankton in relation to habitat zones in the area of the Atlantis II Deep, Central Red Sea. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 8: 129-143
- White JR, Zhang X, Welling LA, Roman MR, Dam HG (1995) Latitudinal gradients in zooplankton biomass in the tropical Pacific at 140°W during the JGOFS EqPac study: Effects of El Nino. *Deep-Sea Res II* 42 (2-3): 715-733
- Wu CH, Hwang JS, Yang JS (2004) Diets of three copepods (Poecilostomatoida) in the southern Taiwan Strait. *Zool Stud* 43(2): 388-392
- Yamaguchi A, Watanabe Y, Ishida H, Harimoto T, Furusawa K, Suzuki S, Ishizaka J, Ikeda T, Takahashi MM (2002) Community and trophic structures of pelagic copepods down to greater depths in the western Subarctic Pacific (WEST-COSMIC) *Deep-Sea Res I* 49: 1007–1025

## Legends to Figures

Fig. 1 Mesozooplankton sampling stations in the Bay of Bengal, India. Chlorophyll *a* was also measured at these stations.

Fig. 2 Mesozooplankton biomass ( $\text{mg C m}^{-3}$ ) and density (individuals  $\text{m}^{-3}$ ) in the upper 1000 m at different stations in the Bay of Bengal. On Y-axis, 0: surface, MLD: mixed layer depth; TT: top of thermocline, BT: base of thermocline. The sampling points are indicated by black dots.

Fig. 3 Spatial distribution of chlorophyll *a* (average and standard deviation) in the top 120 m (a) and column integrated mesozooplankton biomass and abundance in the upper 1000 m (b) of the Central and Western Bay of Bengal

Fig. 4. Percent distribution of major zooplankton groups ( $\geq 2\%$  of the total zooplankton abundance) collected at various depths of the Central (a) and Western (b) Bay. "Others" include mostly siphonophores, salps, medusae, pteropods, foraminifers and invertebrate eggs

Fig. 5. Distribution of various Copepoda orders at different depths in the Central (a) and Western (b) Bay of Bengal

Fig. 6a. Vertical distribution of the average percent abundance of major copepod species ( $\geq 2\%$  of total copepods in a sample) in the Central Bay. Numerals on y-axis indicate the 5 sampled strata (1: surface-mixed layer depth; 2: top of thermocline-base of thermocline; 3: base of thermocline-300 m; 4: 300-500 m; 5: 500-1000 m). Average integrated copepod density for the transect in the upper 1000 m during day and night is indicated on top of the panel.

Fig. 6b. Vertical distribution of the average percent abundance of major copepod species ( $\geq 2\%$  of total copepods in a sample) in the Western Bay. Numerals on y-axis indicate the 5 sampled strata (1: surface-mixed layer depth; 2: top of thermocline-base of thermocline; 3: base of thermocline-300 m; 4: 300-500 m; 5: 500-1000 m). Average integrated copepod density for the transect in the upper 1000 m during day and night is indicated on top of the panel.




Fig. 1 Veronica et al.






Fig. 3 Veronica et al.




Fig. 4 Veronica et al.




Fig 5 Veronica et al.




Fig. 6a Veronica et al.






Fig. 6b Veronica et al.

Table 1: The percentage abundance of the various groups of zooplankton found in the Central and Western Bay of Bengal, India. *Pyrosoma* (Group Pyrosomida) swarms, found in both transects, could not be counted as individuals. 'A' indicate absent

Gr. No.	Groups	Central Bay %	Western Bay
1	Copepoda	84.69	87.66
2	Chaetognatha	5.29	2.97
3	Ostracoda	2.15	3.01
4	Polychaeta	1.93	2.00
5	Appendicularia	0.83	1.07
6	Euphausiacea	1.71	0.62
7	Decapoda	0.38	0.69
8	Mysidacea	0.03	A
9	Amphipoda	0.11	0.14
10	Isopoda	0.00	A
11	Cladocera	0.07	0.14
12	Siphonophora	0.20	0.54
13	Medusae	0.04	0.30
14	Doliolida	0.04	0.09
15	Salpida	0.14	0.03
16	Pyrosomida	swarm	swarm
17	Gastropoda	0.02	0.05
18	Pteropoda	0.42	0.15
19	Foraminiferida	0.10	0.03
20	Radiolaria	0.02	A
21	Sipunculida	1.37	A
22	Amphioxus	0.07	0.08
23	Halobates	0.00	A
24	Fish larvae	0.09	0.11
25	Fish eggs	0.10	0.08
26	Invertebrate eggs	0.09	0.03
27	Crustacean larvae	0.10	0.23
	Avg ind m <sup>-2</sup> , 1000 m	14278	14746

Table 2: Percent composition of the dominant copepod families at different depths of the Central and Western Bay of Bengal, India.

Depth Strata	Dominant Families (%)	
	Central Bay	Western Bay
Surface - mixed layer depth	Oncaeidae 27	Paracalanidae 24
	Clausocalanidae 13	Oncaeidae 17
Top of the thermocline-Base of the thermocline	Mormonillidae 70	Oithonidae 32
		Paracalanidae 20
200-300 m		Paracalanidae 33
	Metridinidae 22	Corycaeidae 19
	Oncaeidae 12	
300-500 m		Oncaeidae 33
	Oncaeidae 26	Oithonidae 22
	Metridinidae 13	
500-1000 m		Metridinidae 67
	Oncaeidae 18	Lucicutiidae 11
	Miraciidae 11	

Table 3: Copepod species diversity ( $H'$ ), richness ( $d$ ), evenness ( $J'$ ), total number of species (S) and the predominant species at each station in the Central and Western Bay of Bengal during summer monsoon 2001

Station	$H'$	$d$	$J'$	S	Predominant species (%)
Central Bay (88°E)					
9°N	3.86	8.89	0.59	91	<i>Oncaea venusta</i> (36)
12°N	3.30	7.28	0.36	69	<i>O. venusta</i> (37)
15°N	3.28	5.95	0.60	43	<i>Mormonilla minor</i> (22), <i>O. venusta</i> (20) <i>Macrosetella gracilis</i> (20)
18°N	3.60	3.58	0.65	47	<i>Mormonilla minor</i> (28) <i>Pleuromamma indica</i> (22), <i>Lucicutia flavicornis</i> (12)
20°N	2.72	3.99	0.82	34	<i>O. venusta</i> (30)
Western Bay					
19°N 85°E	2.95	3.18	0.85	25	<i>Oithona similis</i> (15), <i>O. venusta</i> (14), <i>Eucalanus monachus</i> (11), <i>Paracalanus indicus</i> (10)
17°N 83°E	2.70	3.35	0.73	33	<i>O. venusta</i> (18), <i>Clausocalanus arcuicornis</i> (14), <i>Eucalanus monachus</i> (13)
12°N 81°E	2.65	3.19	0.76	28	<i>Paracalanus indicus</i> (19), <i>Oncaea venusta</i> (15)

Diversity indices are calculated from copepod species density, depth-integrated over the 1000 m column

Table 4: Spearman correlation between mesozooplankton biomass and density and, various environmental parameters (temperature, salinity, dissolved oxygen, chlorophyll *a* [upper 120 m]) in the upper 200 m.

Parameter	N	Spearman R	<i>p</i>
Biomass vs			
temperature	16	*0.609	0.012
salinity	16	*-0.582	0.018
dissolved oxygen	16	*0.541	0.031
chlorophyll <i>a</i>	8	-0.381	0.352
Density vs			
biomass	16	*0.710	0.002
temperature	16	*0.658	0.006
salinity	16	*-0.592	0.016
dissolved oxygen	16	*0.543	0.030
chlorophyll <i>a</i>	8	-0.429	0.289

Spearman R-values marked \* are significant at  $p < 0.05$