

## REFERENCES

- Abrantes, K., & Sheaves, M. (2009). Food web structure in a near-pristine mangrove area of the Australian Wet Tropics. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 82, 597-607.
- Aksnes, D.L., & Giske, J. (1990). Habitat profitability in pelagic environments. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 64, 209-215.
- Albaina, A., Villate, F., & Uriarte, I. (2009). Zooplankton communities in two contrasting Basque estuaries (1999-2001): Reporting changes associated with ecosystem health. *Journal of Plankton Research*, 31, 739-752.
- Alldredge, A.L., & King, J.M. (1980). Effects of moonlight on the vertical migration patterns of demersal zooplankton. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 44, 133-156.
- Alongi, D.M. (1990). Abundances of benthic microfauna in relation to outwelling of mangrove detritus in a tropical coastal region. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 63, 53-63.
- Alongi, D.M. (2002). Present state and future of the world's mangrove forests. *Environmental Conservation*, 29, 331-349.
- Alongi, D.M. (2007). The contribution of mangrove ecosystems to global carbon cycling and greenhouse gas emissions. In Tateda, Y., Upstill-Goddard, R., Goreau, T., Alongi, D., Nose, E., Kristensen, E., & Wattayakorn, G. (Eds.), *Greenhouse Gas and Carbon Balances in Mangrove Coastal Ecosystems* (pp. 1–10). Tokyo: Maruzen.
- Alongi, D.M., Boto, K.G., & Tirendi, F. (1989). Effect of exported mangrove litter on bacterial productivity and dissolved organic carbon fluxes in adjacent tropical nearshore sediments. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 56, 133-144.
- Alongi, D.M., Chong, V.C., Dixon, P., Sasekumar, A., & Tirendi, F. (2003). The influence of fish cage aquaculture on pelagic carbon flow and water chemistry in tidally dominated mangrove estuaries of peninsular Malaysia. *Marine Environmental Research*, 55, 313-333.
- Alongi, D.M., Sasekumar, A., Chong, V.C., Pfitzner, J., Trott, L.A., Tirendi, F., Dixon, P., & Brunskill, G.J. (2004). Sediment accumulation and organic material flux in a managed mangrove ecosystem: estimates of land-ocean-atmosphere exchange in Peninsular Malaysia. *Marine Geology*, 208, 383-402.
- Ambler, J.W. (2002). Zooplankton swarms: characteristics, proximal cues and proposed advantages. *Hydrobiologia*, 480, 155-164.
- Ambler, J.W., Cloern, J.E., & Hutchinson, A. (1985). Seasonal cycles of zooplankton from San Francisco Bay. *Hydrobiologia*, 129, 177-197.
- Ambler, J.W., Ferrari, F.D., & Fornshell, J.A. (1991). Population structure and swarm formation of the cyclopoid copepod *Dioithona oculata* near mangrove cays. *Journal of Plankton Research*, 13, 1257-1272.
- Ambler, J.W., & Miller, C.B. (1987). Vertical habitat-partitioning by copepodites and adults of subtropical oceanic copepods. *Marine Biology*, 94, 561-577.

Ambrose, W.G. (1986). Experimental analysis of density dependent emigration of the amphipod *Rhepoxygnus abronius*. *Marine Behaviour and Physiology*, 12, 209 - 216.

Andreu, P., & Duarte, C.M. (1996). Zooplankton Seasonality in Blanes Bay (northwest Mediterranean). *Publicaciones Especiales, Instituto Espanol de Oceanografia*, 22, 47-54.

Anger, K.C., & Valentin, C. (1976). In situ studies on the diurnal activity pattern of *Diastylis rathkei* (Cumacea, Crustacea) and its importance for the 'hyperbenthos'. *Helgolander wiss. Meeresunters*, 28, 138-144.

Ara, K. (2004). Temporal variability and production of the planktonic copepod community in the Cananéia Lagoon estuarine system, São Paulo, Brazil. *Zoological Studies*, 43, 179-186.

Atkinson, A. (1998). Life cycle strategies of epipelagic copepods in the Southern Ocean. *Journal of Marine Systems*, 15, 289-311.

Atkinson, A., Ward, P., Williams, R., & Poulet, S.A. (1992). Diel vertical migration and feeding of copepods at an oceanic site near South Georgia. *Marine Biology*, 113, 583-593.

Banse, K. (1964). On the vertical distribution of zooplankton in the Sea. *Prog Oceanogr*, 2, 53-125.

Banse, K. (1995). Zooplankton: pivotal role in the control of ocean production. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 52, 265-277.

Beaugrand, G., Reid, P.C., Ibanez, F., Lindley, J.A., & Edwards, M. (2002). Reorganization of North Atlantic marine copepod biodiversity and climate. *Science*, 296, 1692-1694.

Blaber, S.J.M. (1997). *Fish and fisheries of tropical estuaries*. London: Chapman & Hall.

Blaber, S.J.M. (2007). Mangroves and fishes: issues of diversity, dependence, and dogma. *Bulletin of Marine Science*, 80, 457-472.

Blaber, S.J.M., & Blaber, T.G. (1980). Factors affecting the distribution of juvenile estuarine and inshore fish. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 17, 143-162.

Bollens, S.M., & Frost, B.W. (1989). Predator-induced diel vertical migration in a planktonic copepod. *Journal of Plankton Research*, 11, 1047-1065.

Bollens, S.M., & Frost, B.W. (1991a). Ovigerity, selective predation, and variable diel vertical migration in *Euchaeta elongata* (Copepoda: Calanoida). *Oecologia*, 87, 155-161.

Bollens, S.M., & Frost, B.W. (1991b). Diel vertical migration in zooplankton: rapid individual response to predators. *Journal of Plankton Research*, 13, 1359-1365.

Bollens, S., Frost, B.W., Thoreson, D., & Watts, S. (1992). Diel vertical migration in zooplankton: field evidence in support of the predator avoidance hypothesis. *Hydrobiologia*, 234, 33-39.

- Bollens, S.M., Osgood, K., Frost, B.W., & Watts, S. (1993). Vertical distributions and susceptibilities to vertebrate predation of the marine copepods *Metridia lucens* and *Calanus pacificus*. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 38, 1827-1837.
- Boltovskoy, D., Gibbons, M.J., Hutchings, L., & Binet, D. (1999). General biological features of the South Atlantic. In Boltovskoy, D. (Ed.), *South Atlantic zooplankton* (pp. 1-42). Leiden: Backhuys.
- Boon, P.I., & Bunn, S.E. (1994). Variations in the stable isotope composition of aquatic plants and their implications for food web analysis. *Aquatic Botany*, 48, 99-108.
- Boscarino, B.T., Rudstam, L.G., Mata, S., Gal, G., Johannsson, O.E., & Mills, E.L. (2007). The effects of temperature and predator-prey interactions on the migration behavior and vertical distribution of *Mysis relicta*. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 52, 1599-1613.
- Boto, K.G. (1982). Nutrient and organic fluxes in mangroves. In Clough, B.F. (Ed.), *Mangrove ecosystem in Australia* (pp. 239-257). Canberra: ANU Press.
- Boto, K.G., & Bunt, J.S. (1981). Dissolved oxygen and pH relationships in northern Australian mangrove waterways. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 26, 1176-1178.
- Bouillon, S., Connolly, R.M., & Lee, S.Y. (2008). Organic matter exchange and cycling in mangrove ecosystems: Recent insights from stable isotope studies. *Journal of Sea Research*, 59, 44-58.
- Bouillon, S., Koedam, N., Baeyens, W., Satyanarayana, B., & Dehairs, F. (2004). Selectivity of subtidal benthic invertebrate communities for local microalgal production in an estuarine mangrove ecosystem during the post-monsoon period. *Journal of Sea Research*, 51, 133-144.
- Bouillon, S., Koedam, N., Raman, A., & Dehairs, F. (2002). Primary producers sustaining macro-invertebrate communities in intertidal mangrove forests. *Oecologia*, 130, 441-448.
- Bouillon, S., Mohan, P.C., Sreenivas, N., & Dehairs, F. (2000). Sources of suspended organic matter and selective feeding by zooplankton in an estuarine mangrove ecosystem as traced by stable isotopes. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 208, 79-92.
- Boxshall, G. A., & Halsey, S.H. (2004). *An introduction to copepod diversity*. London: The Ray Society.
- Brower, J.E., Zar, J.H., & von Ende, C.N. (1998). *Field and laboratory methods for general ecology* (4th ed.). U.S.A: McGraw Hill.
- Buskey, E., Lesley, M., & Swift, E. (1983). The effects of dinoflagellate bioluminescence on the swimming behavior of a marine copepod. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 28, 575-579.
- Buskey, E.J., Peterson, J.O., & Ambler, J.W. (1996). The swarming behavior of the copepod *Dioithona oculata*: In situ and laboratory studies. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 41, 513-521.
- Calbet, A., Garrido, S., Saiz, E., Alcaraz, M., & Duarte, C.M. (2001). Annual zooplankton succession in coastal NW Mediterranean waters: the importance of the smaller size fractions. *Journal of Plankton Research*, 23, 319-331.

Castel, J., & Veiga, J. (1990). Distribution and retention of the copepod *Eurytemora affinis hirundoides* in a turbid estuary. *Marine Biology*, 107, 119–128.

Cervetto, G., Gaudy, R., & Pagano, M. (1999). Influence of salinity on the distribution of *Acartia tonsa* (Copepoda, Calanoida). *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 239, 33-45.

Chae, J., & Nishida, S. (1995). Vertical distribution and diel migration in the iridescent copepods of the family Sapphirinidae: a unique example of reverse migration? *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 119, 111-124.

Chai, S.Y., Chong, V.C., Aishah, S., & Tanaka, K. (2011). Dynamics and diel variability of microphytobenthos of an intertidal mudflat. In *JIRCAS working report on sustainable production system of aquatic animals in brackish mangrove areas* (in preparation).

Chan, B.K.K., Morritt, D., & Williams, G.A. (2001). The effect of salinity and recruitment on the distribution of *Tetraclita squamosa* and *Tetraclita japonica* (Cirripedia; Balanomorpha) in Hong Kong. *Marine Biology*, 138, 999-1009.

Cheang, B.K. (1988a). A summary of the results of studies conducted during 1972-1988 on northeast monsoon in Malaysia. *Malaysian Meteorological Service Technical Note*, No. 32.

Cheang, B.K. (1988b). A summary of the results of studies on southwest monsoon in Malaysia conducted during 1972-1988. *Malaysian Meteorological Service Technical Note*, No. 31.

Chen, Q.C., Wong, C.K., Tam, P.F., Lee, C.N.W., Yin, J.Q., Huang, L.M., et al. (2003). Variations in the abundance and structure of the planktonic copepod community in the Pearl River estuary, China. In Morton, B. (Ed.), *Perspective on marine environment change in Hong Kong and Southern China, 1977-2001: Proceedings of an International Workshop Reunion Conference held from 21-26 October 2001 in Hong Kong* (pp. 389-400). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Cheow, L.L., Chong, V.C., & Hanamura, Y. (2007). How zooplankton are important to juvenile fish nutrition in mangrove ecosystems. In Nakamura, K. (Ed.), *JIRCAS working report No. 56 on sustainable production system of aquatic animals in brackish mangrove areas* (pp. 7-18). Tsukuba, Japan: JIRCAS.

Cheow, L.L., & Chong, V.C. (2011). Copepod community structure and abundance in a tropical mangrove estuary, with comparisons to coastal waters. *Hydrobiologia*, 666, 127-143.

Cheow, L.L., Ooi, A.L., & Chong, V.C. (2008). Zooplankton of the Straits of Malacca, with emphasis on copepods and fish larvae in the vicinities of Jarak, Perak and Sembilan islands. *Malaysian Journal of Science*, 27, 83-103.

Chiou, W.D., Hwang, J.J., Cheng, L.Z., & Chen, C.T. (2005). Food and feeding habit of Taiwan mauxia shrimp *Acetes intermedius* in the coastal waters of Southwestern Taiwan. *Fisheries Science*, 71, 361-366.

Chong, B.J., & Chua, T.E. (1975). A preliminary study of the distribution of the cyclopoid copepods of the family Oithonidae in the Malaysian waters. In Anon. (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Pacific Science Association of Marine Science Symposium held from*

17-23 December 1973 in Hong Kong (pp. 32-36). Hong Kong: Pacific Science Association.

Chong, V.C. (1979). The biology of the white prawn *Penaeus merguiensis* demand in the Pulau Angsa. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.

Chong, V.C. (1993). Studies on the biology and taxonomy of prawn larvae of the genera *Penaeus*, *Metapenaeus*, *Parapenaeopsis*, *Trachypenaeus* and *Metapenaeopsis* (Crustacea: Decapoda: Penaeidae). Unpublished Ph. D.'s thesis, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.

Chong, V.C. (2005). Fifteen years of fisheries research in Matang Mangrove: What have we learnt? In Ismail, S.M., Muda, A., Ujang, R., Budin, K.A., Lim, K.L., Rosli, S., et al. (Eds.), In *Sustainable Management of Matang Mangroves: 100 Years and Beyond, 4<sup>th</sup> Forest Biodiversity Series* (pp. 411-429). Kuala Lumpur: Forestry Department Peninsular Malaysia.

Chong, V.C. (2007). Mangroves-fisheries linkages-the Malaysian perspective. *Bulletin of Marine Science*, 80, 755-772.

Chong, V.C., Alongi, D.M., Datin, P., Ooi, A.L., Sasekumar, A., & Wong, S.C. (2004). Effects of fish cage culture on water chemistry, plankton and macrobenthos abundance in Matang mangrove estuaries (Perak, peninsular Malaysia). In Phang, S.M., Chong, V.C., Ho, S.C., Mokhtar, N. & Ooi, J.L.S. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Asia-Pacific Conference on Marine Science and Technology held from 12-16 May 2002 in Kuala Lumpur* (pp. 307-324). Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya.

Chong, V.C., Low, C.B., & Ichikawa, T. (2001). Contribution of mangrove detritus to juvenile prawn nutrition: a dual stable isotope study in a Malaysian mangrove forest. *Marine Biology*, 138, 77-86.

Chong, V.C., Sasekumar, A., Leh, M.U.C., & D'Cruz, R. (1990). The fish and prawn communities of a Malaysian coastal mangrove system, with comparisons to adjacent mud flats and inshore waters. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 31, 703-722.

Chong, V.C., Sasekumar, A., Low, C.B., & Muhammad Ali, S.H. (1999). The physico-chemical environment of the Matang and Dinding Mangroves (Malaysia). In Katsuhiro, K. & Choo, P.Z. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 4<sup>th</sup> Seminar on Productivity and Sustainable Utilization of Brackish Water Mangrove Ecosystem held from 8-9 December 1998 in Penang, Malaysia* (pp. 115-136). Penang, Malaysia: JIRCAS & Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries.

Chong, V.C., Teoh, H.W., Ooi, A.L., Jamizan, A.R., & Tanaka, K. (2011). Ingression and Feeding Habits of Fish in Matang Coastal Mudflats, Malaysia. In *JIRCAS working report on sustainable production system of aquatic animals in brackish mangrove areas* (in preparation).

Christy, J.H. (1982). Adaptive significance of semilunar cycles of larval release in fiddler crabs (genus *Uca*): test of an hypothesis. *Bio. Bull.*, 161, 251-263.

Christy, J.H. (1986). Timing of larval release by intertidal crabs on an exposed shore. *Bulletin Marine of Science*, 39, 176-191.

Chua, T.E., & Chong, B.J. (1975). Plankton distribution in the Straits of Malacca and its adjacent waters, In Anon. (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Pacific Science Association of*

*Marine Science Symposium held from 17-23 December 1973 in Hong Kong* (pp. 17-23). Hong Kong: Pacific Science Association.

Cifuentes, L.A., Coffin, R.B., Solorzano, L., Cardenas, W., Espinoza, J. & Twilley, R.R. (1996). Isotopic and elemental variations of carbon and nitrogen in a mangrove estuary. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 43, 781-800.

Cifuentes, L.A., Sharp, J.H. & Fogel, M.L. (1988). Stable carbon and nitrogen isotopebiogeochemistry in the Delaware estuary. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 33, 1102-1115.

Clarke, G.L. (1930). Change of phototropic and geotropic signs in *Daphnia* induced by changes of light intensity. *The Journal of Experimental Biology*, 7, 109-131.

Clarke, K.R., & Warwick, R.M. (2001). *Change in marine communities: an approach to statistical analysis and interpretation*. Plymouth: Plymouth Marine Laboratory.

Cohen, J., & Forward, R.B.Jr. (2005). Diel vertical migration of the marine copepod *Calanopia americana*. I. Twilight DVM and its relationship to the diel light cycle. *Marine Biology*, 147, 387-398.

Cohen, J.H., & Forward, R.B.Jr. (2009). Zooplankton diel vertical migration - a review of proximate control. *Oceanography and Marine Biology - an Annual Review*, 47, 77-109.

Coull, B.C., Greenwood, J.G., Fielder, D.R., & Coull, B.A. (1995). Subtropical Australian juvenile fish eat meiofauna: experiments with winter whiting *Sillago maculata* and observations on other species. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 125, 13-19.

Cronin, T.W., Daiber, J.C., & Hulbert, E.M. (1962). Quantitative aspects of zooplankton in the Delaware River Estuary. *Chesapeake Science*, 3, 63-93.

Cronin, T.W., & Forward, R.B.Jr. (1979). Tidal vertical migration: An endogenous rhythm in estuarine crab larvae. *Science*, 205, 1020-1022.

Cura, J. J. (1987). Phytoplankton. In Backus, R.H. & Bourne, D.W. (Eds.), *Georges Bank*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Currin, C.A., Newell, S.Y., & Paerl, H.W. (1995). The role of standing dead *Spartina alterniflora* and benthic microalgae in salt marsh food webs: considerations based on multiple stable isotope analysis. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 121, 99-116.

Cushing, D.H. (1951). The vertical migration of planktonic Crustacea. *Biological Reviews*, 26, 158-192.

Cushing, D.H. (1976). *Marine ecology and fisheries*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Cushing, D.H., Blaxter, J.H.S., & Southward, A.J. (1990). Plankton production and year-class strength in fish populations: an update of the match/mismatch hypothesis. *Advances in Marine Biology*, 26, 249-293.

Cyrus, D.P., & Blaber, S.J.M. (1982). Mouthpart structure and function and the feeding mechanisms of *Gerres* (Teleostei). *South African Journal of Zoology*, 17, 117-121.

- Dahdouh-Guebas, F., Jayatissa, L.P., Di Nitto, D., Bosire, J.O., Lo Seen, D., & Koedam, N. (2005). How effective were mangroves as a defence against the recent tsunami? *Current Biology*, 15, 443-447.
- Dalal, S.G., & Goswami, S.C. (2001). Temporal and ephemeral variations in copepod community in the estuaries of Mandovi and Zuari-west coast of India. *Journal of Plankton Research*, 23, 19-26.
- Daro, M.H. (1988). Migratory and grazing behavior of copepods and vertical distribution of phytoplankton. *Bulletin Marine of Science*, 43, 710-729.
- Davenport, J., Smith, R.J.J.W., & Packer, M. (2000). Mussels *Mytilus edulis*: significant consumers and destroyers of mesozooplankton. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 198, 131-137.
- Dehairs, F., Rao, R.G., Chandra Mohan, P., Raman, A.V., Marguillier, S., & Hellings, L., (2000). Tracing mangrove carbon in suspended matter and aquatic fauna of the Gautami–Godavari Delta, Bay of Bengal (India). *Hydrobiologia*, 431, 225-241.
- del Giorgio, P.A., & France, R.L. (1996). Ecosystem-specific patterns in the relationship between zooplankton and POM or microplankton  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ . *Limnology and Oceanography*, 41, 359–365.
- Demopoulos, A., Fry, B., & Smith, C. (2007). Food web structure in exotic and native mangroves: a Hawaii–Puerto Rico comparison. *Oecologia*, 153, 675-686.
- Demott, W.R. (1988). Descrimination between algae and detritus by freshwater and marine zooplankton. *Bulletin Marine of Science*, 43, 486-499.
- Demott, W.R. (1995). Food selection by calanoid copepods in response to between-lake variation in food abundance. *Freshwater Biology*, 33, 171-180.
- DeNiro, M.J., & Epstein, S. (1977). Mechanism of carbon isotope fractionation associated with lipid synthesis. *Science*, 197, 261–263.
- De Pauw, N. (1973). On the distribution of *Eurytemora affinis* (Poppe) (Copepoda) in the Western Scheldt Estuary. *Verh. int. Verein. theor. angew. Limnol.*, 18, 1462-1472.
- Dittmar, T., & Lara, R. J. (2001). Do mangroves rather than rivers provide nutrients to coastal environments south of the Amazon River? Evidence from long-term flux measurements. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 213, 67-77.
- Dittel, A.I., & Epifanio, C.E. (1990). Seasonal and tidal abundance of crab larvae in a tropical mangrove system, Gulf of Nicoya, Costa Rica. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 65, 25-34.
- Dittel, A.I., Epifanio, C.E., & Lizano, O. (1991). Flux of crab larvae in a mangrove creek in the Gulf of Nicoya, Costa Rica. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 32, 129-140.
- Dittel, A.I., Epifanio, C.E., Schwalm, S.M., Fantle, M.S., & Fogel, M.L. (2000). Carbon and nitrogen sources for juvenile blue crabs *Callinectes sapidus* in coastal wetlands. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 194, 103-112.

- Drake, P., & Arias, A.M. (1991). Ichthyoplankton of a shallow coastal inlet in south-west Spain: Factors contributing to colonization and retention. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 32, 347-364.
- Drake, P., Arias, A.M., & Rodríguez, A. (1998). Seasonal and tidal abundance patterns of decapod crustacean larvae in a shallow inlet (SW Spain). *Journal of Plankton Research*, 20, 585-601.
- Duggan, S., McKinnon, A., & Carleton, J. (2008). Zooplankton in an Australian tropical estuary. *Estuaries and Coasts*, 31, 455-467.
- Duke, N.C., Meynecke, J.-O., Dittmann, S., Ellison, A.M., Anger, K., Berger, U., et al. (2007). A world without mangroves? *Science*, 317, 41-42.
- Edgar, G.J., & Shaw, C. (1995). The production and trophic ecology of shallow-water fish assemblages in southern Australia. II. Diets of fishes and trophic relationships between fishes and benthos at Western Port, Victoria. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 194, 83-106.
- Edwards, M., & Richardson, A.J. (2004). Impact of climate change on marine pelagic phenology and trophic mismatch. *Nature*, 430, 881-884.
- Emery, A.R. (1968). Preliminary observations on coral reef plankton. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 13, 293-303.
- Enright, J.T. (1977). Diurnal vertical migration: Adaptive significance and timing. Part I. Selective advantage : a metabolic model. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 22, 856-872.
- Epifanio, C.E. (1987). The role of tidal fronts in maintaining patches of brachyuran zoeae in estuarine waters. *J. Crustac. Biol.*, 7, 513–517.
- Faganeli, J., Malej, A., Pezdic, J., & Malacic, V. (1988). C-N-P ratios and stable C isotopic ratios as indicators of sources of organic matter in the Gulf of Trieste (Northern Adriatic). *Oceanol Acta*, 11, 377–382.
- Fancett, M.S., & Kimmerer, W.J. (1985). Vertical migration of the demersal copepod *Pseudodiaptomus* as a means of predator avoidance. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 88, 31-43.
- Fantle, M.S., Dittel, A.I., Schwalm, S.M., Epifanio, C.E., & Fogel, M.L. (1999). A food web analysis of the juvenile blue crab, *Callinectes sapidus*, using stable isotopes in whole animals and individual amino acids. *Oecologia*, 120, 416-426.
- Fiksen, Ø., & Giske, J. (1995). Vertical distribution and population dynamics of copepods by dynamic optimization. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 52, 483-503.
- Fleming, M., Lin, G., & da Siveira, L., 1990. Influence of mangrove detritus in an estuarine ecosystem. *Bulletin of Marine Science*, 47, 663-669.
- Fortier, L., & Leggett, W.C. (1983). Vertical migrations and transport of larval fish in a partially mixed estuary. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.*, 40, 1543-1555.
- Forward, R.B.Jr. (1987). Larval release rhythms of decapod crustaceans: An overview. *Bulletin Marine of Science*, 41, 165-176.
- Forward, R.B.Jr. (1988). Diel vertical migration: Zooplankton photobiology and behavior. *Oceanography and Marine Biology - an Annual Review*, 26, 361-393.

Foxon, G.E.H. (1936). Notes on the natural history of certain sand-dwelling Cumacea. *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.*, 10, 377-393.

France, R.L. (1995). Carbon-13 enrichment in benthic compared to planktonic algae: foodweb implications. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 124, 307-312.

Froneman, P.W. (2004). Zooplankton community structure and biomass in a southern African temporarily open/closed estuary. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 60, 125-132.

Froneman, P.W., Pakhomov, E.A., Perissinotto, R., & Meaton, V. (1998). Feeding and predation impact of two chaetognath species, *Eukrohnia hamata* and *Sagitta gazellae*, in the vicinity of Marion Island (southern ocean). *Marine Biology*, 131, 95-101.

Fry, B., & Sherr, E.B. (1984).  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  measurements as indicators of carbon flow in marine and freshwater ecosystems. *Contrib Mar Sci*, 27, 13-47.

Fry, B., & Wainright, S.C. (1991). Diatom sources of  $^{13}\text{C}$ -rich carbon in marine food webs. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 76, 149-157.

Fulton, R.S.I. (1984). Distribution and community structure of estuarine copepods. *Estuaries*, 7, 38-50.

Gan, B.K. (1995). *A working plan for the Matang Mangrove Forest Reserve, Perak, 1990-1999*. Peninsular Malaysia: State Forestry Department of Perak.

Gal, G., Loew, E.R., Rudstam, L.G., & Mohammadian, A.M. (1999). Light and diel vertical migration: spectral sensitivity and light avoidance by *Mysis relicta*. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.*, 56, 311-322.

Gaudy, R., Cervetto, G., & Pagano, M. (2000). Comparison of the metabolism of *Acartia clausi* and *A. tonsa*: influence of temperature and salinity. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 247, 51-65.

Glé, C., del Amo, Y., Sautour, B., Laborde, P., & Chardy, P. (2008). Variability of nutrients and phytoplankton primary production in a shallow macrotidal coastal ecosystem (Arcachon Bay, France). *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 76, 642-656.

Gleason, D.F. (1986). Utilization of salt marsh plants by postlarval brown shrimp: carbon assimilation rates and food preferences. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 31, 151-158.

Gliwicz, M.Z. (1986). Predation and the evolution of vertical migration in zooplankton. *Nature*, 320, 746-748.

Gonçalves, F., Ribeiro, R., & Soares, A.M.V.M. (2003). Comparison between two lunar situations on emission and larval transport of decapod larvae in the Mondego estuary (Portugal). *Acta Oecologica*, 24, 183-190.

Goswami, S.C. (1984). Zooplankton of the mangroves ecosystem. In *The Report of 2<sup>nd</sup> Introductory Training Courses on Mangrove Ecosystems, UNDP/UNESCO regional project, 1-25 November* (pp. 77-79).

Gouda, R., & Panigrahy, R.C. (1995). Zooplankton ecology of the Rushikulya Estuary, East Coast of India. *Journal of Aquaculture Tropical*, 10, 201-211.

- Govoni, J.J., & Grimes, C.B. (1992). The surface accumulation of larval fishes by hydrodynamic convergence within the Mississippi River plume front. *Continental Shelf Research*, 12, 1265–1276.
- Grindley, J.R. (1984). The zooplankton of mangrove estuaries, In Por, F.D. & Dor, I. (Eds.), *Hydrobiology of the mangal* (pp. 79-88). The Hague: Dr W. Junk Publishers.
- Gupta, S., Lonsdale, D.J., & Wang, D.P. (1994). The recruitment patterns of an estuarine copepod: a biological-physical model. *Journal of Marine Research*, 52, 687-710.
- Hajisamae, S., Chou, L.M., & Ibrahim, S. (2003). Feeding habits and trophic organization of the fish community in shallow waters of an impacted tropical habitat. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 58, 89-98.
- Hajisamae, S., Yeesin, P., & Chaimongkol, S. (2006). Habitat utilization by fishes in a shallow, semi-enclosed estuarine bay in southern Gulf of Thailand. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 68, 647-655.
- Hamner, W.M., & Carleton, J.H. (1979). Copepod swarms: Attributes and role in coral reef ecosystems. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 24, 1-14.
- Hanamura, Y., Siow, R., & Chee, P.E. (2007). Abundance and spatio-temporal distribution of *Acetes* shrimp (Crustacea, Decapoda, Sergestidae) in the Merbok and Matang mangrove estuaries, Peninsular Malaysia. *Malaysian Fisheries Journal*, 6, 16-25.
- Hanamura, Y., Siow, R., & Chee, P.E. (2008). Reproductive biology and seasonality of the Indo-Australasian mysid *Mesopodopsis orientalis* (Crustacea: Mysida) in a tropical mangrove estuary, Malaysia. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 77, 467-474.
- Harrison, T.D., & Whitfield, A.K. (1990). Composition, distribution and abundance of ichthyoplankton in the Sundays River estuary. *South Afr. J. Zool.*, 25, 161–168.
- Hart, R.C., & Allanson, B.R. (1976). The distribution and diel vertical migration of *Pseudodiaptomus hessei* (Mrázek) (Calanoida: Copepoda) in a subtropical lake in southern Africa. *Freshwater Biology*, 6, 183-198.
- Hatcher, B.G., Johannes, R.E., & Robertson, A.I. (1989). Review of research relevant to the conservation of shallow tropical marine ecosystems. *Oceanography and Marine Biology - an Annual Review*, 27, 337-414.
- Hattori, H., & Motoda, S. (1983). Regional difference in zooplankton communities in the western North Pacific Ocean (CSK data). *Bulletin of Plankton Society of Japan*, 30, 53-63.
- Hayase, S., Ichikawa, T., & Tanaka, K. (1999). Preliminary report on stable isotope ratio analysis for samples from Matang mangrove brackish water ecosystems. *JARQ*, 33, 215-221.
- Hays, G.C. (1994). Zooplankton avoidance activity. *Nature*, 376, 650.
- Hays, G.C. (2003). A review of the adaptive significance and ecosystem consequences of zooplankton diel vertical migrations. *Hydrobiologia*, 503, 163-170.

Hays, G.C. (1995). Ontogenetic and seasonal variation in the diel vertical migration of the copepods *Metridia lucens* and *Metridia longa*. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 40, 1461-1465.

Hays, G.C., Kennedy, H., & Frost, B.W. (2001). Individual variability in diel vertical migration of a marine copepod: Why some individuals remain at depth when others migrate. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 46, 2050-2054.

Hays, G.C., Proctor, C.A., John, A.W.G., & Warner, A.J. (1994). Interspecific differences in the diel vertical migration of marine copepods: The implications of size, color, and morphology. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 39, 1621-1629.

Heip, C.H.R., Goosen, N.K., Herman, P.M.J., Kromkamp, J., Middelburg, J.J., & Soetaert, K. (1995). Production and consumption of biological particles in temperate tidal estuaries. *Oceanography and Marine Biology - an Annual Review*, 33, 1-149.

Highfield, J.M., Eloire, D., Conway, D.V.P., Lindeque, P.K., Attrill, M.J., & Somerfield, P.J. (2010). Seasonal dynamics of meroplankton assemblages at station L4. *Journal of Plankton Research*, 32, 681-691.

Hobson, E.S., & Chess, J.R. (1976). Trophic interactions among fishes and zooplankters near shore at Santa Catalina Island, California. *Bull. U.S.*, 74, 567-598.

Hoffmeyer, M.S. (2004). Decadal change in zooplankton seasonal succession in the Bahía Blanca estuary, Argentina, following introduction of two zooplankton species. *Journal of Plankton Research*, 26, 181-189.

Hopcroft, R.R., Roff, J.C., & Lombard, D. (1998). Production of tropical copepods in Kingston Harbour, Jamaica: the importance of small species. *Marine Biology*, 130, 593-604.

Hough, A.R., & Naylor, E. (1991). Field studies on retention of the planktonic copepod *Eurytemora affinis* in a mixed estuary. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 76, 115-122.

Hough, A.R., & Naylor, E. (1992). Endogenous rhythms of circatidal swimming activity in the estuarine copepod *Eurytemora affinis* (Poppe). *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 161, 27-32.

Hsieh, C.H., & Chiu, T.S. (1997). Copepod abundance and species composition of Tanshui river estuary and adjacent waters. *Acta Zoologica Taiwanica*, 8, 75-83.

Hsu, P.K., Lo, W.T., & Shih, C.T. (2008). The Coupling of Copepod Assemblages and Hydrography in a Eutrophic Lagoon in Taiwan: Seasonal and Spatial Variations. *Zoological Studies*, 47, 172-184.

Humes, A.G. (1994). How many copepods? *Hydrobiologia*, 292-293, 1-7.

Huntley, M., & Brooks, E.R. (1982). Effects of age and food availability on diel vertical migration of *Calanus pacificus*. *Marine Biology*, 71, 23-31.

Hurlbert, S.H. (1971). The non-concept of species diversity: A critique and alternative parameters. *Ecology*, 52, 577-586.

Hwang, J.S., Dahms, H.U., Tseng, L.C., & Chen, Q.C. (2007). Intrusions of the Kuroshio Current in the northern South China Sea affect copepod assemblages of the Luzon Strait. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 352, 12-27.

Irigoién, X., Huisman, J., & Harris, R.P. (2004). Global biodiversity patterns of marine phytoplankton and zooplankton. *Nature*, 429, 863-867.

Itoh, H. (2006). Parasitic and commensal copepods occurring as planktonic organisms with special reference to Saphirella-like copepods. *Bulletin of Plankton Society of Japan*, 53, 53-63.

Itoh, H., & Nishida, S. (2007). Life history of the copepod *Hemicyclops gomsoensis* (Poecilostomatoida, Clausidiidae) associated with decapod burrows in the Tama-River estuary, central Japan. *Plankton & Benthos Research*, 2, 134-146.

Jacoby, C.A., & Greenwood, J.G. (1989). Emergent zooplankton in Moreton Bay, Queensland, Australia: seasonal, lunar, and diel patterns in emergence and distribution with respect to substrata. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 51, 131-154.

Johan, I., Idris, A.G., Norlita, I., & Hishamuddin, O. (2002). Distribution of planktonic calanoid copepods in the Straits of Malacca. In Yusoff, F.M., Shariff, M., Ibrahim, H.M., Tan, S.G. & Tai, S.Y. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on the Straits of Malacca on Tropical Marine Environment: Charting Strategies for the Millennium held from 15-18 October 2001 in Penang, Malaysia* (pp. 393-404). Serdang, Malaysia: MASDEC-UPM.

Johnson, W.H. (1938). The effect of light on the vertical movements of *Acartia clausi* (Giesbrecht). *Biol. Bull. mar. biol Lab, Woods Hole*, 75, 106-118.

Johnson, W.S., Allen, D.M., Ogburn, M.V., & Stancyk, S.E. (1990). Short-term predation responses of adult bay anchovies *Anchoa mitchilli* to estuarine zooplankton availability. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 64, 55-68.

Jolliffe, I.T. (2002). *Principal component analysis* (2nd ed.). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Katajisto, T., Viitasalo, M., & Koski, M. (1998). Seasonal occurrence and hatching of calanoid eggs in sediments of the northern Baltic Sea. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 163, 133-143.

Kennish, M.J. (1990). *Ecology of estuaries: biological aspect* (vol. 2). Boca Raton, Florida: CRC Press.

Ketchum, B.H. (1954). Relation between circulation and planktonic populations in estuaries. *Ecology*, 35, 191-200.

Kibirige, I., & Perissinotto, R. (2003). The zooplankton community of the Mpenjati Estuary, a South African temporarily open/closed system. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 58, 727-741.

Kibirige, I., Perissinotto, R., & Thwala, X. (2006). A comparative study of zooplankton dynamics in two subtropical temporarily open/closed estuaries, South Africa. *Marine Biology*, 148, 1307-1324.

Kimmerer, W. (1993). Distribution patterns of zooplankton in Tomales Bay, California. *Estuaries and Coasts*, 16, 264-272.

Kimmerer, W.J., Burau, J.R., & Bennett, W.A. (1998). Tidally-oriented vertical migration and position maintenance of zooplankton in a temperate estuary. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 43, 1697-1709.

- Kimmerer, W.J., & McKinnon, A.D. (1987). Zooplankton in a marine bay II. Vertical migration to maintain horizontal distributions. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 41, 53-60.
- Kiørboe, T. (1997). Population regulation and role of mesozooplankton in shaping marine pelagic food webs. *Hydrobiologia*, 363, 13-27.
- Kiso, K., & Mahyam, M.I. (2003). Distribution and feeding habits of juvenile and young John's snapper *Lutjanus johnii* in the Matang mangrove estuary, west coast of Peninsular Malaysia. *Fisheries Science*, 69, 563-568.
- Kleppel, G.S. (1993). On the diets of calanoid copepods. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 99, 183-195.
- Kouassi, E., Pagano, M., Saint-Jean, L., Arfi, R., & Bouvy, M. (2001). Vertical migrations and feeding rhythms of *Acartia clausi* and *Pseudodiaptomus hessei* (Copepoda: Calanoida) in a tropical lagoon (Ebrié, Côte d'Ivoire). *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 52, 715-728.
- Kouassi, E., Pagano, M., Saint-Jean, L., & Sorbe, J.C. (2006). Diel vertical migrations and feeding behavior of the mysid *Rhopalophthalmus africana* (Crustacea: Mysidacea) in a tropical lagoon (Ebrié, Côte d'Ivoire). *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 67, 355-368.
- Krumme, U., & Liang, T. H. (2004). Tidal-induced changes in a copepod-dominated zooplankton community in a macrotidal mangrove channel in Northern Brazil. *Zoological Studies*, 43, 404-414.
- Laegdsgaard, P., & Johnson, C. (2001). Why do juvenile fish utilise mangrove habitats? *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 257, 229-253.
- Lambshead, P.J.D., Platt, H.M., & Shaw, K.M. (1983). The detection of differences among assemblages of marine benthic species based on an assessment of dominance and diversity. *Journal of Natural History*, 17, 859 - 874.
- Lampert, W. (1989). The adaptive significance of diel vertical migration of zooplankton. *Functional Ecology*, 3, 21-27.
- Lang, W.H., & Ackenhuisen-Johns, A. (1981). Seasonal species composition of barnacle larvae (Cirripedia: Thoracica) in Rhode Island waters. *Journal of Plankton Research*, 3, 567-575.
- Lara-Lopez, A., & Neira, F.J. (2008). Synchronicity between zooplankton biomass and larval fish concentrations along a highly flushed Tasmanian estuary: Assessment using net and acoustic methods. *Journal of Plankton Research*, 30, 1061-1073.
- Lawson, T.J., & Grice, G.D. (1973). The developmental stages of *Paracalanus crassirostris* Dahl, 1894 (Copepoda, Calanoida). *Crustaceana*, 24, 43-56.
- Leakey, R.J.G., Burkhill, P.H., & Sleigh, M.A. (1994). A comparison of fixatives for the estimation of abundance and biovolume of marine planktonic ciliate populations. *Journal of Plankton Research*, 16, 375-389.
- Lee, C.N.W., & Chen, Q.C. (2003). A historical and biogeographical analysis of the marine planktonic copepod community in Hong Kong: a record of change. In Morton, B. (Ed.), *Perspective on marine environment change in Hong Kong and Southern China*,

1977-2001: Proceedings of an International Workshop Reunion Conference held from 21-26 October 2001 in Hong Kong (pp. 433-457). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Lee, C.W., & Bong, C.W. (2008). Bacterial abundance and production, and their relation to primary production in tropical coastal waters of Peninsular Malaysia. *Marine and Freshwater Research*, 59, 10-21.

Lee, S.Y. (2000). Carbon dynamics of Deep Bay, eastern Pearl River estuary, China. II: Trophic relationship based on carbon- and nitrogen-stable isotopes. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 205, 1-10.

Lee, S.Y. (2005). Exchange of organic matter and nutrients between mangroves and estuaries: myths methodological issue and missing links. *International Journal of Ecology and Environmental sciences*, 31, 163-175.

Lee, W.-J., O'Riordan, R.M., & Koh, L.L. (2006). Spatial and temporal patterns in the recruitment of the intertidal barnacle *Chthamalus malayensis* Pilsbry (Crustacea: Cirripedia) on the equatorial shores of Peninsular Malaysia and Singapore. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 333, 296-305.

Levins, R. (1968). *Evolution in changing environments*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Leyu, C.H., & Ling, L.K. (1988). Diurnal and seasonal rainfall variations in the Klang Valley and the adjacent sea. *Malaysian Meteorological Service Technical Note*, No. 35.

Li, K.Z., Yin, J.Q., Huang, L.M., & Tan, Y.H. (2006). Spatial and temporal variations of mesozooplankton in the Pearl River estuary, China. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 67, 543-552.

Lillebo, A.I., Flindt, M.R., Pardal, M.A., & Marques, J.C. (1999). The effect of macrofauna, meiofauna and microfauna on the degradation of *Spartina maritima* detritus from a salt marsh area. *Acta Oecol*, 20, 249–258.

Loneragan, N.R., Bunn, S.E., & Kellaway, D.M. (1997). Are mangroves and seagrasses sources of organic carbon for penaeid prawns in a tropical Australian estuary? A multiple stable-isotope study. *Marine Biology*, 130, 289-300.

Longhurst, A.R. (1985). The structure and evolution of plankton communities. *Prog. Oceanogr.*, 15, 1-35.

Lonsdale, D.J., Heinle, D.R., & Siegfried, C. (1979). Carnivorous feeding behavior of the adult calanoid copepod *Acartia tonsa* Dana. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 36, 235-248.

Luckens, P.A. (1970). Breeding, settlement and survival of barnacles at artificially modified shore levels at Leigh, New Zealand. *N. Z. J. Mar. Freshw. Res.*, 4, 497-514.

Macho, G., Molares, J., & Vázquez, E. (2005). Timing of larval release by three barnacles from the NW Iberian Peninsula. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 298, 251-260.

Macintosh, D.J. (1979). The ecology and energetics of mangrove fiddler crabs (*Uca* spp.) on the west coast of the Malay Peninsula. Unpublished Ph. D.'s thesis, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.

- Macintosh, D.J. (1984). Ecology and productivity of Malaysian mangrove crab populations (Decapoda: Brachyura). In Soepadmo, E., Rao, A.N. & Macintosh, D.J. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Asian Symposium on Mangrove Environment - Research and Management held from 25-29 August 1980 at the University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur* (pp. 354-377). Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya & UNESCO.
- Mackas, D., & Bohrer, R. (1976). Fluorescence analysis of zooplankton gut contents and an investigation of diel feeding patterns. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 25, 77-85.
- Madhupratap, M. (1987). Status and strategy of zooplankton of tropical Indian estuaries: A review. *Bulletin of Plankton Society of Japan*, 34, 65-81.
- Madin, J. (2010). Biofouling and short-term dynamics on fish cage netting in relation to fish rearing and environmental factors. Unpublished Ph. D.'s thesis, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.
- Madin, J., Chong, V.C., & Basri, B. (2009). Development and short-term dynamics of macrofouling assemblages on fish-cage nettings in a tropical estuary. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 83, 19-29.
- Manning, C.A., & Bucklin, A. (2005). Multivariate analysis of the copepod community of near-shore waters in the western Gulf of Maine. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 292, 233-249.
- Marcus, N. (2004). An overview of the impacts of eutrophication and chemical pollutants on copepods of the coastal zone. *Zoological Studies*, 43, 211-217.
- Marguillier, S., van der Velde, G., Dehairs, F., Hemminga, M.A., & Rajagopal, S. (1997). Trophic relationships in an interlinked mangrove-seagrass ecosystem as traced by  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ . *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 151, 115-121.
- Mariana, A. (1993). The biology of *Acetes* in the Klang Straits waters, Straits of Malacca. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.
- Mariotti, A., Lancelot, C., & Billen, G. (1984). Natural isotopic composition of nitrogen as a tracer of origin for suspended organic matter in the Scheldt estuary. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta*, 48, 549-555.
- Marques, S., Azeiteiro, U., Leandro, S., Queiroga, H., Primo, A., Martinho, F., Viegas, I., & Pardal, M. (2008). Predicting zooplankton response to environmental changes in a temperate estuarine ecosystem. *Marine Biology*, 155, 531-541.
- Marques, S.C., Azeiteiro, U.M., Marques, J.C., Neto, J.M., & Pardal, M.A. (2006). Zooplankton and ichthyoplankton communities in a temperate estuary: spatial and temporal patterns. *Journal of Plankton Research*, 28, 297-312.
- Mauchline, J. (1998). *The biology of calanoid copepods*. London: Academic Press.
- McConaughey, T., & McRoy, C.P. (1979). Food-web structure and the fractionation of carbon isotopes in the Bering Sea. *Marine Biology*, 53, 257-262.
- McHugh, J. L. (1940). Food of the Rocky Mountain whitefish (*Prosopium williamsoni*) (Girard). *J. Fish. Res. Bd Can.*, 5, 131—137.

- McKinnon, A., & Klumpp, D. (1998a). Mangrove zooplankton of North Queensland, Australia. I. Plankton community structure and environment. *Hydrobiologia*, 362, 127-143.
- McKinnon, A., & Klumpp, D. (1998b). Mangrove zooplankton of North Queensland, Australia. II. Copepod egg production and diet. *Hydrobiologia*, 362, 145-160.
- McKinnon, A. (2000). Two new species of *Oithona* (Copepoda: Cyclopoida) from mangrove waters of North Queensland, Australia. *Plankton Biology and Ecology*, 47, 100-113.
- McKee, T.B., Doesken, N.J., & Kleist, J. (1993). The relationship of drought frequency and duration to time scales. In *Eighth Conference on Applied Climatology held on 17-23 January 1993 in Anaheim CA* (pp. 179-186). Boston, MA: American Meteorological Society.
- Miller, C.B. (1983). The zooplankton of estuaries. In B.H. Ketchum (Ed.), *Estuaries and enclosed seas* (pp. 103-149). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Mills, E.L. (1967). The biology of an Ampeliscid amphipod crustacean sibling species pair. *J. Fish. Res. Bd Can.*, 24, 305-355.
- Miyashita, L.K., de Melo Junior, M., & Lopes, R.M. (2009). Estuarine and oceanic influences on copepod abundance and production of a subtropical coastal area. *Journal of Plankton Research*, 31, 815-826.
- Montagna, P.A. (1995). Rates of metazoan meiofaunal microbivory: A review. *Vie Milieu*, 45, 1-9.
- Morgan, C.A., Cordell, J.R., & Simenstad, C.A. (1997). Sink or swim? Copepod population maintenance in the Columbia River estuarine turbidity-maxima region. *Marine Biology*, 129, 309-317.
- Morgan, C.A., Robertis, A.D., & Zabel, R.W. (2005). Columbia River plume fronts. I. Hydrography, zooplankton distribution, and community composition. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 299, 19-31.
- Morgan, S.G. (1986). The impact of planktivorous fishes on the life histories of estuarine crabs. Unpublished Ph. D.'s thesis, University of Maryland, Maryland.
- Muhammad Ali, S.H. (2004). Diversity and abundance of macrobenthos in the mangrove estuaries of Matang and Dinding, Peninsular Malaysia. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.
- Muxagata, E., Williams, J.A., & Shearer, M. (2004). Composition and temporal distribution of cirripede larvae in Southampton Water, England, with particular reference to the secondary production of *Elminius modestus*. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 61, 585-595.
- Mwashote, B., Ohowa, B., & Wawiye, P. (2005). Spatial and temporal distribution of dissolved inorganic nutrients and phytoplankton in Mida Creek, Kenya. *Wetlands Ecology and Management*, 13, 599-614.
- Nagelkerken, I., van der Velde, G., Gorissen, M.W., Meijer, G.J., Van't Hof, T., & den Hartog, C. (2000). Importance of mangroves, seagrass beds and the shallow coral reef

as a nursery for important coral reef fishes, using a visual census technique. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 51, 31-44.

Nakajima, R., Yoshida, T., Othman, B.H.R., & Toda, T. (2008). Diel variation in abundance, biomass and size composition of zooplankton community over a coral-reef in Redang Island, Malaysia. *Plankton and Benthos Research*, 3, 216-226.

Nakajima, R., Yoshida, T., Othman, B.H.R., & Toda, T. (2009). Diel variation of zooplankton in the tropical coral-reef water of Tioman Island, Malaysia. *Aquatic Ecology*, 43, 965-975.

Natin, P. (2001). Effects of fish cage culture on macrobenthos diversity and abundance in the Matang mangrove estuary (Malaysia). Unpublished master's thesis, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.

Nelson, B., Sasekumar, A., & Ibrahim, Z. (1994). Neap-spring tidal effects on dissolved oxygen in two Malaysian estuaries. *Hydrobiologia*, 285, 7-17.

Newell, R.I.E., Marshall, N., Sasekumar, A., & Chong, V.C. (1995). Relative importance of benthic microalgae, phytoplankton, and mangroves as sources of nutrition for penaeid prawns and other coastal invertebrates from Malaysia. *Marine Biology*, 123, 595-606.

Nishibe, Y., Kobari, T., & Ota, T. (2010). Feeding by the cyclopoid copepod *Oithona similis* on the microplankton assemblage in the Oyashio region during spring. *Plankton Benthos Res*, 5, 74–78.

Odum, W.E., & Heald, E.J. (1975). The detritus-based food web of an esutarine mangrove community. In Cronin, L.E. (Ed.), *Estuarine research: chemistry, biology and the estuarine system* (pp. 265-286). New York: Academic Press Inc..

Ohlhorst, S.L. (1982). Diel migration patterns of demersal reef zooplankton. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 60, 1-15.

Ohman, M.D. (1990). The demographic benefits of diel vertical migration by zooplankton. *Ecological Monographs*, 60, 257-281.

Ohman, M.D., Frost, B.W., & Cohen, E.B. (1983). Reverse diel vertical migration: An escape from invertebrate predators. *Science*, 220, 1404-1407.

Ohman, M.D., & Hirche, H.J. (2001). Density-dependent mortality in an oceanic copepod population. *Nature*, 412, 638-641.

Ohtsuka, S., Fukuura, Y., & Go, A. (1987). Description of a new species of *Tortanus* (Copepoda: Calanoida) from Kuchinoerabu Island, Kyushu, with notes on its possible feeding mechanism and in-situ feeding habits. *Bulletin of Plankton Society of Japan*, 34, 53-63.

Oka, S. (2000). Composition and distribution of zooplankton in the tropical brackish waters in Matang, Perak, Malaysia. In *JIRCAS International Workshop on Brackish Water Mangrove Ecosystems, Productivity and Sustainable Utilization* (pp. 83-85).

Okamura, K., Tanaka, K., Siow, R., Man, A., Kodama, M., & Ichikawa, T. (2010). Spring tide hypoxia with relation to chemical properties of the sediments in the Matang mangrove estuary, Malaysia. *JARQ*, 44, 325-333.

- Omori, M., & Hamner, W.M. (1982). Patchy distribution of zooplankton: Behavior, population assessment and sampling problems. *Marine Biology*, 72, 193-200.
- Ong, J.E., & Gong, W.K. (2004). Mangrove as sinks for atmospheric carbon. In Phang, S.M., Chong, V.C., Ho, S.C., Mokhtar, N. & Ooi, J.L.S. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Asia-Pacific Conference on Marine Science and Technology held from 12-16 May 2002 in Kuala Lumpur* (pp. 307-324). Kuala Lumpur: University of Malaya.
- Ooi, A.L. (2002). Effects of fish cage aquaculture on the zooplankton in a Malaysian mangrove estuary. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.
- Ooi, A.L., & Chong, V.C. (2011). Larval fish assemblages in a tropical mangrove estuary and adjacent coastal waters: Offshore-inshore flux of marine and estuarine species. *Continental Shelf Research*, 31, 1599-1610.
- Orsi, J.J. (1986). Interaction between diel vertical migration of a mysidacean shrimp and two-layered estuarine flow. *Hydrobiologia*, 137, 79-87.
- Osore, M.K.W. (1992). A note on the zooplankton distribution and diversity in a tropical mangrove creek system, Gazi, Kenya. *Hydrobiologia*, 247, 119-120.
- Osore, M.K.W., Mwaluma, J.M., Fiers, F., & Daro, M.H. (2004). Zooplankton composition and abundance in Mida Creek, Kenya. *Zoological Studies*, 43, 415-424.
- Owens, N.J.P., Blaxter, J.H.S., & Southward, A.J. (1988). Natural Variations in <sup>15</sup>N in the Marine Environment. *Advances in Marine Biology*, 24, 389-451.
- Paffenhöfer, G.-A. (1993). On the ecology of marine cyclopoid copepods (Crustacea, Copepoda). *Journal of Plankton Research*, 15, 37-55.
- Pagano, M., Champalbert, G., Aka, M., Kouassi, E., Arfi, R., Got, P., et al. (2006). Herbivorous and microbial grazing pathways of metazooplankton in the Senegal River Estuary (West Africa). *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 67, 369-381.
- Pagano, M., Kouassi, E., Arfi, R., Bouvy, M., & Saint-Jean, L. (2004). In situ spawning rate of the calanoid copepod *Acartia clausi* in a tropical lagoon. *Zoological Studies*, 43, 244-254.
- Park, G.S., & Marshall, H.G. (2000). Estuarine relationships between zooplankton community structure and trophic gradients. *Journal of Plankton Research*, 22, 121-136.
- Parsons, T. R., Maita, Y., & Lalli, C. (1984). *Manual of chemical and biological methods for seawater analysis*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Pearre, S.J. (2003). Eat and run? The hunger/satiation hypothesis in vertical migration: history, evidence and consequences. *Biol Rev*, 78, 1-79.
- Peterson, B.J., & Fry, B. (1987). Stable isotopes in ecosystem studies. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 18, 293-320.
- Peterson, B.J., & Howarth, R.W. (1987). Sulfur, carbon and nitrogen stable isotopic tracers of organic matter flow in the salt marsh estuaries of Sapelo Island, Georgia. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 32, 1195-1213.
- Pielou, E. C. (1969). *An introduction to mathematical ecology*. New York: Wiley.

Pienkowski, M.W., Watkinson, A.R., Kerby, G., Clarke, K.R., & Warwick, R.M. (1998). A taxonomic distinctness index and its statistical properties. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 35, 523-531.

Pillay, T. V. R. (1953). Studies on the food, feeding habits and alimentary tract of the grey mullet, *Mugil tade* Forskal. *Pror. natn. Inst. Sci. India*, 4, 185-200

Platell, M.E., & Potter, I.C. (2001). Partitioning of food resources amongst 18 abundant benthic carnivorous fish species in marine waters on the lower west coast of Australia. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 261, 31-54.

Plourde, S., Dodson, J.J., Runge, J.A., & Therriault, J.C. (2002). Spatial and temporal variations in copepod community structure in the lower St. Lawrence Estuary, Canada. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 230, 211-224.

Prasad, K.M.B., & Ramanathan, A.L. (2008). Sedimentary nutrient dynamics in a tropical estuarine mangrove ecosystem. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 80, 60-66.

Primavera, H.J. (1996). Stable carbon and nitrogen isotope ratios of penaeid juveniles and primary producers in a riverine mangrove in Guimaras, Philippines. *Bulletine of Marine Science*, 58, 675-683.

Primo, A.L., Azeiteiro, U.M., Marques, S.C., Martinho, F., & Pardal, M.Â. (2009). Changes in zooplankton diversity and distribution pattern under varying precipitation regimes in a southern temperate estuary. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 82, 341-347.

Purcell, J.E., & Decker, M.B. (2005). Effects of climate on relative predation by scyphomedusae and ctenophores on copepods in Chesapeake Bay during 1987-2000. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 50, 376-387.

Qasim, S.Z., Wellerhaus, S., Bhattachari, P.M.A., & Abidi, S.A.H. (1969). Organic production in a tropical estuary. *Proceedings of the Indian Academy of Science*, 69, 51-94.

Queiroga, H. (1998). Vertical migration and selective tidal stream transport in the megalopa of the crab *Carcinus maenas*. *Hydrobiologia*, 375-376, 137-149.

Queiroga, H., & Blanton, J. (2004). Interactions between behaviour and physical forcing in the control of horizontal transport of decapod crustacean larvae. *Advances of Marine Biology*, 47, 107-214.

Queiroga, H., Costlow, J.D., & Moreira, M.H. (1994). Larval abundance patterns of *Carcinus maenas* (Decapoda, Brachyura) in Canal de Mira (Ria de Aveiro, Portugal). *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 111, 63-72.

Queiroga, H., Costlow, J.D., & Moreira, M.H. (1997). Vertical migration of the crab *Carcinus maenas* first zoea in an estuary: Implications for tidal stream transport. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 149, 121-132.

Quinn, G.P., & Keough, M.J. (2002). *Experimental design and data analysis for biologist*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rajasilta, M., & Vuorinen, I. (1983). A field study of prey selection in planktivorous fish larvae. *Oecologia*, 59, 65-68.

Ramos, S., Cowen, R.K., Re, P., & Bordalo, A.A. (2006). Temporal and spatial distributions of larval fish assemblages in the Lima estuary (Portugal). *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 66, 303-314.

Rau, G.H., Teyssie, J.L., Rassoulzadegan, F., & Fowler, S.W. (1990).  $^{13}\text{C}/^{12}\text{C}$  and  $^{15}\text{N}/^{14}\text{N}$  variations among size-fractionated marine particles: implications for their origin and trophic relationships. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 59, 33-38

Raymont, J.E.G. (1983). *Plankton productivity in the oceans, vol. 2, Zooplankton*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Redfield, A.C., Ketchum, B.H., & Richards, F.A. (1963). The influence of organisms on the composition of seawater (pp. 26–77). In Hill, M.N. (Ed.), *vol. 2, The sea*. New York: Wiley.

Reeve, M.R. (1975). The ecological significance of the zooplankton in the shallow subtropical waters of South Florida. In Cronin, L.E. (Ed.), *Estuarine research: chemistry, biology and the estuarine system* (pp. 352-371). New York: Academic Press.

Rezai, H., Yusoff, F.M., Arshad, A. & Othman, B.H.R. (2005). Spatial and temporal variations in calanoid copepod distribution in the Straits of Malacca. *Hydrobiologia*, 537, 157-167.

Rezai, H., Yusoff, F.M., Arshad, A., Kawamura, A., Nishida, S., & Othman, B.H.R. (2004). Spatial and temporal distribution of copepods in the Straits of Malacca. *Zoological Studies*, 43, 486-497.

Richoux, N.B., & Froneman, P.W. (2009). Plankton trophodynamics at the subtropical convergence, Southern Ocean. *Journal of Plankton Research*, 31, 1059-1073.

Ringelberg, J. (1995). Changes in light intensity and diel vertical migration: a comparison of marine and freshwater environments. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom*, 75, 15-25.

Robertson, A.I., Alongi, D.M., & Boto, K.G. (1992). Food chains and carbon fluxes. In Robertson, A.I. & Alongi, D.M. (Eds.), *Coastal and estuarine studies 41, tropical mangrove ecosystems* (pp. 293-326). Washington, DC: American Geophysical Union.

Robertson, A.I., & Blaber, S.J.M. (1992). Plankton, epibenthos and fish communities. In Robertson, A.I. & Alongi, D.M. (Eds.), *Coastal and estuarine studies 41, tropical mangrove ecosystems* (pp. 173-224). Washington, DC: American Geophysical Union.

Robertson, A.I., Dixon, P., & Daniel, P.A. (1988). Zooplankton dynamics in mangrove and other nearshore habitats in tropical Australia. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 43, 139-150.

Robertson, A., & Duke, N. (1987). Mangroves as nursery sites: Comparisons of the abundance and species composition of fish and crustaceans in mangroves and other nearshore habitats in tropical Australia. *Marine Biology*, 96, 193-205.

Robertson, A.I., & Howard, R.K. (1978). Diel trophic interactions between vertically-migrating zooplankton and their fish predators in an eelgrass community. *Marine Biology*, 48, 207-213.

Roddie, B.D., Leakey, R.J.G., & Berry, A.J. (1984). Salinity-temperature tolerance and osmoregulation in *Eurytemora affinis* (Poppe) (Copepoda : Calanoida) in relation to its

distribution in the zooplankton of the upper reaches of the Forth estuary. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 79, 191-211.

Rodelli, M.R., Gearing, J.N., Gearing, P.J., Marshall, N., & Sasekumar, A. (1984). Stable isotope ratio as a tracer of mangrove carbon in Malaysian ecosystems. *Oecologia*, 61, 326-333.

Roman, M.R. (1984). Utilization of detritus by the copepod, *Acartia tonsa*. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 29, 949-959.

Roman, M.R., Holliday, D.V., & Sanford, L.P. (2001). Temporal and spatial patterns of zooplankton in the Chesapeake Bay turbidity maximum. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 213, 215-227.

Roman, M.R., & Rublee, P.A. (1981). A method to determine in situ zooplankton grazing rates on natural particle assemblages. *Marine Biology*, 65, 303-309.

Ross, P.M. (2001). Larval supply, settlement and survival of barnacles in a temperate mangrove forest. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 215, 237-249.

Russell, R.W., Harrison, N.M., & Hunt, G.L. (1999). Foraging at a front: hydrography, zooplankton, and avian planktivory in the northern Bering Sea. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 182, 77-93.

Rutherford, S., D'Hondt, S., & Prell, W. (1999). Environmental controls on the geographic distribution of zooplankton diversity. *Nature*, 400, 749-753.

Sasekumar, A. (1994). Meiofauna of a mangrove shore on the west coast of Peninsular Malaysia. *Raffles Bulletin of Zoology*, 42, 901-915.

Sasekumar, A., Chong, V.C., Leh, M.U., & D'Cruz, R. (1992). Mangroves as a habitat for fish and prawns. *Hydrobiologia*, 247, 195-207.

Sasekumar, A., Chong, V.C., Lim, K.H., & Singh, H. R. (1994). The fish community of Matang mangrove waters. In Sudara, S., Wilkinson, C.R. & Chou, L.M. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 3<sup>rd</sup> ASEAN-Australian Symposium on Living Coastal Resources, vol. 2: Research Papers held from 16-20 May 1994 at the Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok* (pp. 457-464). Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University.

Sarpedonti, V. (2000). Ontogeny, reproduction and population dynamics of *Stolephorus baganensis* and *Thryssa kammalensis* (Pisces: Engraulidae) in a Malaysian estuary. Unpublished Ph. D.'s thesis, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.

Sautour, B., & Castel, J. (1993). Distribution of zooplankton population in Marennes-Oléron Bay (France), structure and grazing impact of copepod communities. *Oceanologica Acta*, 16, 279-290.

Schafer, L.N., Platell, M.E., Valesini, F.J., & Potter, I.C. (2002). Comparisons between the influence of habitat type, season and body size on the dietary compositions of fish species in nearshore marine waters. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 278, 67-92.

Schwamborn, R., & Criales, M.M. (2000). Feeding strategy and daily ration of juvenile pink shrimp (*Farfantepenaeus duorarum*) in a South Florida seagrass bed. *Marine Biology*, 137, 139-147.

Schwamborn, R., Ekau, W., Voss, M., & Saint-Paul, U. (2002). How important are mangroves as a carbon source for decapod crustacean larvae in a tropical estuary? *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 229, 195-205.

Schwamborn, R., Ekau, W., Silva, A., Schwamborn, S., Silva, T., Neumann-Leitão, S., & Saint-Paul, U. (2006). Ingestion of large centric diatoms, mangrove detritus and zooplankton by zoeae of *Aratus pisonii* (Crustacea: Brachyura: Grapsidae). *Hydrobiologia*, 560, 1-13.

Sewell, S.R.B. (1933). Note on a small collection of marine copepods from the Malay states. *Bulletin of Raffles Museum*, 8, 25-31.

Shanks, A.L. (1986). Tidal periodicity in the daily settlement of intertidal barnacle larvae and an hypothesized mechanism for the cross-shelf transport of cyprids. *Bio. Bull.*, 170, 429-440.

Shannon, C. E. (1948). A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27, 379-423, 623-656.

Singh, H.R. (2003). The biology of the estuarine Ariid catfishes (FAM: Ariidae) of the Matang mangrove ecosystem (Perak, Malaysia). Unpublished Ph. D.'s thesis, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.

Singh, H.R., & Sasekumar, A. (1994). Distribution and abundance of marine catfish (Fam: Ariidae) in the Matang mangrove waters. In Sudara, S, Wilkinson, C.R. & Chou, L.M. (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 3<sup>rd</sup> ASEAN-Australian Symposium on Living Coastal Resources, vol. 2: Research Papers held from 16-20 May 1994 at the Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok* (pp. 471-477). Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University.

Soetaert, K., & Herman, P.M.J. (1994). One foot in the grave: zooplankton drift into the Westerschelde estuary (The Netherlands). *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 105, 19-29

Stearns, D.E., & Forward, R.B.Jr. (1984). Copepod photobehavior in a simulated natural light environment and its relation to nocturnal vertical migration. *Marine Biology*, 82, 91-100.

Stich, H.-B., & Lampert, W. (1981). Predator evasion as an explanation of diurnal vertical migration by zooplankton. *Nature*, 293, 396-398.

Strickland, J.D.H., & Parsons, T.R. (1968). A practical handbook of seawater analysis. *Fisheries Research Board of Canada Bulletin*, 167, 1-310.

Subbaraju, R.C., & Krishnamurthy, K. (1972). Ecological aspects of plankton production. *Marine Biology*, 14, 25-31.

Sullivan, B.K., Keuren, D.V., & Clancy, M. (2001). Timing and size of blooms of the ctenophore *Mnemiopsis leidyi* in relation to temperature in Narragansett Bay, RI. *Hydrobiologia*, 451, 113-120.

Sullivan, B.K., & McManus, L.T. (1986). Factors controlling seasonal succession of the copepods *Acartia hudsonica* and *A. tonsa* in Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island: temperature and resting egg production. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 28, 121-128.

Sunda, W.G., Tester, P.A., & Huntsman, S.A. (1987). Effects of cupric and zinc ion activities on the survival and reproduction of marine copepods. *Marine Biology*, 94, 203-210.

- Sunda, W.G., Tester, P.A., & Huntsman, S.A. (1990). Toxicity of trace metals to *Acartia tonsa* in the Elizabeth River and southern Chesapeake Bay. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 30, 207-221.
- Suratman, M.N. (2008). Carbon Sequestration Potential of Mangroves in Southeast Asia. In Bravo, F., Jandl, R., LeMay, V. & Gadow, K. (Eds.), *Managing forest ecosystems: the challenge of climate change* (pp. 297-315). Netherlands: Springer.
- Tackx, M.L.M., de Pauw, N., van Mieghem, R., Azémar, F., Hannouti, A., van Damme, S., Fiers, F., et al. (2004). Zooplankton in the Schelde estuary, Belgium and The Netherlands. Spatial and temporal patterns. *Journal of Plankton Research*, 26, 133-141.
- Tanaka, K., & Choo, P.S. (2000). Influences of nutrient outwelling from the mangrove swamp on the distribution of phytoplankton in the Matang mangrove estuary, Malaysia. *Journal of Oceanography*, 56, 69-78.
- Tanaka, K., Hanamura, Y., Chong, V., Watanabe, S., Man, A., Mohd Kassim, F., Kodama, M., & Ichikawa, T. (2011). Stable isotope analysis reveals ontogenetic migration and the importance of a large mangrove estuary as a feeding ground for juvenile John's snapper *Lutjanus johnii*. *Fisheries Science*, 77, 809-816.
- Tang, K.W., Chen, Q.C., & Wong, C.K. (1994). Diel vertical migration and gut pigment rhythm of *Paracalanus parvus*, *P. crassirostris*, *Acartia erythraea* and *Eucalanus subcrassus* (Copepoda, Calanoida) in Tolo Harbour, Hong Kong. *Hydrobiologia*, 292-293, 389-396.
- Tarutani, K., Ooi, A.L., Chew, L.L., Chong, V.C., Chee, P.E., & Hanamura, Y. (2007). Biomass and production rates of phytoplankton and zooplankton in the Matang mangrove estuaries of northwestern Peninsular Malaysia. In Nakamura, K. (Ed.), *JIRCAS working report No. 56 on sustainable production system of aquatic animals in brackish mangrove areas* (pp. 27-30). Tsukuba, Japan: JIRCAS.
- Ter Braak, C. J. F. (1994). Canonical community ordination. Part I: Basic theory and linear methods. *Ecoscience*, 1, 127-40.
- Ter Braak, C. J. F., & Prentice, I. C. (1988). A theory of gradient analysis. *Advances in Ecological Research*, 18, 93-138.
- Then, A.Y.H. (2008). The structure and trophodynamics of the fish community in estuaries of Matang mangrove forest reserve, Peninsular Malaysia. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.
- Tranter, D.J., & Abraham, S. (1971). Coexistence of species of Acartiidae (Copepoda) in the Cochin Backwater, a monsoonal estuarine lagoon. *Marine Biology*, 11, 222-241.
- Tranter, D.J., Bulleid, N.C., Campbell, R., Higgins, H.W., Rowe, F., Tranter, H.A., et al. (1981). Nocturnal movements of phototactic zooplankton in shallow waters. *Marine Biology*, 61, 317-326.
- Trinast, E.M. (1975). Tidal currents and *Acartia* distribution in Newport Bay, California. *Est. Coastal Mar. Sci.*, 3, 165-176.
- Trott, L.A., & Alongi, D.M. (1999). Variability in surface water chemistry and phytoplankton biomass in two tropical, tidally dominated mangrove creeks. *Marine and Freshwater Research*, 50, 451-457.

- Tönnesson, K., & Tisellius, P. (2005). Diet of the chaetognaths *Sagitta setosa* and *S. elegans* in relation to prey abundance and vertical distribution. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 289, 177-190.
- Turner, J.T. (1981). Latitudinal patterns of calanoid and cyclopoid copepod diversity in estuarine waters of eastern North America. *Journal of Biogeography*, 8, 369-382.
- Turner, J.T. (1984). The feeding ecology of some zooplankters that are important prey items of larval fish. *NOAA Tech. Rep. NMFS*, 7, 1-28.
- Turner, J.T. (2004). The importance of small planktonic copepods and their roles in pelagic marine food webs. *Zoological Studies*, 43, 255-266.
- Turner, J.T., Levinsen, H., Nielsen, T.G., & Hansen, B.W. (2001). Zooplankton feeding ecology: grazing on phytoplankton and predation on protozoans by copepod and barnacle nauplii in Disko Bay, West Greenland. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 221, 209-219.
- Turner, J.T., & Tester, P.A. (1989). Zooplankton feeding ecology: nonselective grazing by the copepods *Acartia tonsa* Dana, *Centropages velificatus* De Oliveira, and *Eucalanus pileatus* Giesbrecht in the plume of the Mississippi River. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 126, 21-43.
- Tyrrell, T. (1999). The relative influences of nitrogen and phosphorus on oceanic primary production. *Nature*, 400, 525-531.
- Ueda, H. (1987). Temporal and spatial distribution of the two closely related *Acartia* species *A. omorii* and *A. hudsonica* (Copepoda, Calanoida) in a small inlet water of Japan. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 24, 691-700.
- Ueda, H., Kuwahara, A., Tanaka, N., & Azeta, M. (1983). Underwater observations on copepod swarms in temperate and subtropical waters. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 11, 165-171.
- Ueda, H., Kuwatani, M., & Suzuki, K.W. (2010). Tidal vertical migration of two estuarine copepods: Naupliar migration and position-dependent migration. *Journal of Plankton Research*, 32, 1557-1572.
- Uncles, R.J., Gong, W.K., & Ong, J.E. (1992). Intratidal fluctuations in stratification within a mangrove estuary. *Hydrobiologia*, 247, 163-171.
- Uye, S. (1982). Length-weight relationships of important zooplankton from the Inland Sea of Japan. *J. Oceanogr. Soc. Jap.*, 38, 149-158.
- Uye, S. (1994). Replacement of large copepods by small ones with eutrophication of embayments: cause and consequence. *Hydrobiologia*, 292-293, 513-519.
- Vander Zanden, M.J., & Rasmussen, B. (1999). Primary consumer  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  and the trophic position of aquatic consumers. *Ecology*, 80, 1395-1401.
- Varadachari, V.V.R., & Kesava Das, V. (1984). Physical aspects of mangrove environment. In *The Report of 2<sup>nd</sup> Introductory Training Courses on Mangrove Ecosystems, UNDP/UNESCO regional project, 1-25 November 1984* (pp. 47-48).
- Vargas, C.A., Martínez, R.A., Escribano, R., & Lagos, N.A. (2010). Seasonal relative influence of food quantity, quality, and feeding behaviour on zooplankton growth

regulation in coastal food webs. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom*, 90, 1189-1201.

Vernberg, W.B., de Coursey, P.J., & O'Hara, J. (1974). *Multiple environmental factor effects on physiology and behavior of the fiddler crab, Uca pugilator* (pp. 381-426). New York: Academic Press.

Wainright, S.C., & Fry, B. (1994). Seasonal variation of the stable isotopic compositions of coastal marine plankton from Woods Hole, Massachusetts and Georges Bank. *Estuaries*, 17, 552-560.

Walter, T.C. (1987). Review of the taxonomy and distribution of the demersal copepod Genus *Pseudodiaptomus* (Calanoida: Pseudodiaptomidae) from Southern Indo-West Pacific Waters. *Aust. J. Mar. Freshw. Res.*, 38, 363-396.

Warwick, R.M., & Clarke, K.R. (1995). New 'biodiversity' measures reveal a decrease in taxonomic distinctness with increasing stress. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 129, 301-305.

Wehrtmann, I.S., & Dittel, A.I. (1990). Utilization of bathing mangrove leaves as a transport mechanism of estuarine organisms, with emphasis on decapod Crustacea. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 60, 67-73.

Whitfield, A.K., & Harrison, T.D. (1996). *Gilchristella aectuaria* (Pisces: Clupeidae) biomass and consumption of zooplankton in the Sunday Estuary. *South Afr. J. Mar. Sci.*, 17, 49-53.

Wickstead, J.H. (1961). A quantitative and qualitative study of some Indo-West Pacific plankton. *Colonial Office Fisheries Publication*, 16, 1-200.

Winkler, G., Martineau, C., Dodson, J.J., Vincent, W.F., & Johnson, L.E. (2007). Trophic dynamics of two sympatric mysid species in an estuarine transition zone. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 332, 171-187.

Wong, C.K., Chan, A.L.C., & Chen, Q.C. (1993). Planktonic copepods of Tolo Harbour, Hong Kong. *Crustaceana*, 64, 76-84.

Wong, S.C. (2003). Effects of fish cage culture on the water quality of the Matang mangrove estuaries, Peninsular Malaysia. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur.

Wolanski, E., Jones, M., & Bunt, J.S. (1980). Hydrodynamics of a tidal creek-mangrove swamp system. *Australian Journal of Marine and Freshwater Research*, 31, 667-688.

Wolanski, E., Mazda, Y., & Ridd, P. (1992). Mangrove hydrodynamics. In Robertson, A.I. & Alongi, D.M. (Eds.), *Coastal and estuarine studies 41, tropical mangrove ecosystems* (pp. 43-62). Washington, DC: American Geophysical Union.

Woodd-Walker, R.S., Ward, P., & Clarke, A. (2002). Large-scale patterns in diversity and community structure of surface water copepods from the Atlantic Ocean. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 236, 189-203.

Woodroffe, C.D. (1985a). Studies of a mangrove basin, Tuff Crater, New Zealand: II. Comparison of volumetric and velocity-area methods of estimating tidal flux. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 20, 431-445.

- Woodroffe, C.D. (1985b). Studies of a mangrove basin, Tuff Crater, New Zealand: III. The flux of organic and inorganic particulate matter. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, 20, 447-461.
- Wooldridge, T., & Erasmus, T. (1980). Utilization of tidal currents by estuarine zooplankton. *Estuarine and Coastal Marine Science*, 11, 107-114.
- Yamaguchi, A., Ikeda, T., Watanabe, Y., & Ishizaka, J. (2004). Vertical distribution patterns of pelagic copepods as viewed from the predation pressure hypothesis. *Zoological Studies*, 43, 475-485.
- Yoshida, T., Toda, T., Yusoff, F.M., & Othman, B.H.R. (2006). Seasonal variation of zooplankton community in the coastal waters of the Straits of Malacca. *Coastal Marine Science*, 30, 320-327.
- Zar , J.H. (1998). *Biostatistical analysis* (4th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Zaret, T.M., & Suffern, J.S. (1976). Vertical migration in zooplankton as a predator avoidance mechanism. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 21, 804-813.
- Zeng, C., & Naylor, E. (1996a). Endogenous tidal rhythms of vertical migration in field collected zoea-1 larvae of the shore crab *Carcinus maenas*: implications for ebb tide offshore dispersal. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 132, 71-82.
- Zeng, C., & Naylor, E. (1996b). Occurrence in coastal waters and endogenous tidal swimming rhythms of late megalopae of the shore crab *Carcinus maenas*: implications for onshore recruitment. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 136, 69-79.
- Zeng, C., & Naylor, E. (1996c). Synchronization of endogenous tidal vertical migration rhythms in laboratory-hatched larvae of the crab *Carcinus maenas*. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 198, 269-289.
- Zieman, J.C., Macko, S.A., & Mills, L. (1984). Role of seagrasses and mangroves in estuarine food webs: temporal and spatial changes in stable isotope composition and amino acid content during decomposition. *Bulletin Marine of Science*, 35, 380–392.

**Appendix I.** Total volume of water filtered during the routine monthly sampling.

<b>Date</b>	<b>F value</b>	<b>Station</b>									
		1A	1B	3A	3B	4A	4B	5A	5B	6A	6B
<b>May 02</b>	0.1062	120.16	116.24	103.80	104.07	66.75	95.40	123.95	104.31	102.96	94.50
<b>June 02</b>	0.1075	117.17	188.93	194.20	151.11	203.42	139.95	116.38	116.71	160.00	179.16
<b>July 02</b>	0.1103	101.05	117.11	101.87	105.68	111.68	109.76	153.44	111.02	105.20	112.66
<b>Aug 02</b>	0.1126	131.26	115.95	149.71	127.79	167.13	168.60	104.96	92.97		
<b>Sept 02</b>	0.1126	111.24	134.45	100.45	127.88	104.72	92.54	98.72	99.62	101.45	113.03
<b>Oct 02</b>	0.1107	149.80	159.96	140.78	158.60	139.86	124.24	157.73	117.28	168.73	124.87
<b>Nov 02</b>	0.1102	195.87	138.00	122.86	144.49	112.92	152.30	130.58	144.31	167.98	142.23
<b>Dec 02</b>	0.1102	121.54	137.10	122.86	127.93	128.27	117.14	121.26	117.89	118.67	121.21
<b>Jan 03</b>	0.1092	99.06	119.97	127.12	116.37	132.05	117.69	129.84	126.63	75.52	85.12
<b>Feb 03</b>	0.1087	142.66	160.75	136.72	167.99	144.29	139.48	112.78	108.72	129.27	123.87
<b>Mar 03</b>	0.1082	95.08	89.81	87.35	82.03	79.11	80.09	89.33	80.55	87.25	85.39
<b>Apr 03</b>	0.1091	166.70	122.54	137.53	117.82	141.99	152.23	131.94	136.66	116.84	127.87
<b>May 03</b>	0.1114	140.07	83.53	94.42	85.59	82.09	65.59	61.59	69.93	71.38	60.38
<b>June 03</b>	0.1117	114.19	112.45	103.23	105.99	114.50	123.20	114.55	122.83	104.22	104.22
<b>Jul 03</b>	0.1105	74.53	107.52	65.32	105.90	100.30	86.95	75.41	86.51		
<b>Aug 03</b>	0.1096	99.82	108.91	102.02	84.57	104.58	89.26	91.17	102.56	98.12	51.16
<b>Sept 03</b>	0.1115	152.76	127.90	130.16	106.12	111.46	112.31	107.24	96.52	104.97	82.43
<b>Oct 03</b>	0.1135	94.47	76.13	70.93	77.50	86.19	81.19	48.02	69.13	88.74	67.65

Appendix II. Total volume of water filtered during the 24-h sampling.

<b>Sample</b>	<b>Date</b>							
	7-Jul-03	14-Jul-03	21-Jul-03	28-Jul-03	2-Nov-03	9-Nov-03	17-Nov-03	24-Nov-03
<b>1a</b>	44.34	53.18	54.66	56.72	49.65	43.16	48.76	40.21
<b>1b</b>	31.07	48.76	54.66	53.48	38.15	47.88	42.57	40.51
<b>1c</b>	26.95	44.63	52.89	47.29	46.11	48.47	44.04	38.44
<b>1d</b>	31.66	50.83	49.06	51.12	52.59	49.06	44.93	41.98
<b>2a</b>	40.80	50.24	51.41	49.94	34.32	48.47	49.06	46.99
<b>2b</b>	31.66	52.89	57.90	51.41	54.95	55.54	50.24	46.70
<b>2c</b>	33.73	46.70	46.99	51.41	37.85	37.85	48.47	46.99
<b>2d</b>	37.85	48.17	49.06	54.07	41.69	49.06	29.01	43.75
<b>3a</b>	56.13	53.77	50.83	52.59	46.11	43.16	44.93	46.70
<b>3b</b>	41.10	53.18	53.77	49.65	46.70	49.65	49.65	47.88
<b>3c</b>	39.92	47.29	45.22	53.48	43.16	51.41	38.15	41.10
<b>3d</b>	40.51	47.58	47.29	47.58	46.99	48.17	48.76	47.88
<b>4a</b>	39.92	47.58	51.71	46.11	35.79	49.06	45.22	50.83
<b>4b</b>	43.75	54.66	55.54	49.65	47.58	45.52	47.29	47.29
<b>4c</b>	39.62	42.28	54.95	59.96	43.16	50.83	45.81	45.81
<b>4d</b>	36.67	44.93	42.87	46.11	45.52	44.63	51.71	41.10
<b>5a</b>	45.81	26.36	59.37	51.71	42.28	50.53	40.51	41.69
<b>5b</b>	44.93	54.95	52.30	47.88	41.10	47.58	40.21	37.26
<b>5c</b>	40.21	45.22	45.52	41.39	48.47	49.35	51.41	47.88
<b>5d</b>	42.28	46.99	46.11	58.49	56.13	47.88	41.98	44.63
<b>6a</b>	23.41	53.77	58.20	51.12	52.59	47.29	43.75	46.11
<b>6b</b>	40.21	48.76	67.33	54.95	52.00	47.88	49.06	49.94
<b>6c</b>	47.88	49.06	41.10	46.40	49.65	42.87	44.93	48.47
<b>6d</b>	40.80	46.11	48.17	48.47	46.11	47.29	45.52	47.29
<b>7a</b>	48.76	56.72	53.48	48.76	43.16	46.40	41.10	41.10
<b>7b</b>	45.81	48.17	49.06	46.11	44.63	48.76	34.91	47.29
<b>7c</b>	46.40	48.17	45.52	43.45	35.49	51.12	43.45	48.47
<b>7d</b>	37.56	49.35	50.83	43.16	52.59	49.94	40.51	45.81
<b>8a</b>	46.40	50.24	52.00	52.00	54.66	36.38	44.34	34.61
<b>8b</b>	46.70	49.94	54.07	53.18	37.56	40.21	49.65	45.81
<b>8c</b>	45.22	46.99	42.28	45.22	47.58	44.63	33.43	47.88
<b>8d</b>	42.28	53.18	51.12	47.58	50.83	49.94	42.57	43.75
<b>9a</b>	45.52	49.65	36.97	56.72	43.16	46.70	37.26	45.22
<b>9b</b>	44.34	48.47	53.18	44.63	43.16	51.41	47.29	38.15
<b>9c</b>	36.97	46.11	31.37	44.93	46.11	37.85	41.10	28.42
<b>9d</b>	34.02	46.70	46.99	42.87	51.71	44.63	47.88	34.32
<b>10a</b>	39.92	53.77	49.65	75.29	52.89	50.53	44.93	44.04
<b>10b</b>	44.34	57.02	54.95	44.34	52.30	43.45	53.77	47.58
<b>10c</b>	30.78	44.93	38.15	44.63	45.22	44.63	45.22	46.70
<b>10d</b>	31.07	47.58	47.58	44.04	43.16	48.76	44.34	39.33
<b>11a</b>	40.51	54.36	48.76	59.08	50.53	47.88	46.11	41.69
<b>11b</b>	41.98	56.13	50.83	55.54	59.67	41.98	47.29	44.04
<b>11c</b>	35.79	50.24	35.20	46.70	48.76	30.19	51.41	48.76
<b>11d</b>	35.20	42.57	41.39	44.34	46.99	49.35	42.87	40.21
<b>12a</b>	45.81	50.53	53.77	33.14	47.29	40.21	42.87	44.93
<b>12b</b>	45.22	45.52	46.70	52.89	46.99	48.47	49.65	41.39
<b>12c</b>	38.44	46.70	44.34	110.97	45.22	49.06	44.63	48.47
<b>12d</b>	36.38	49.65	44.63	54.07	48.47	47.29	39.92	46.99

### **Appendix III.**

Chew, L. L., & Chong, V.C. (2011). Copepod community structure and abundance in a tropical mangrove estuary, with comparisons to coastal waters. *Hydrobiologia*, 666, 127-143

Appendix IV. Details of RDA analysis on zooplankton assemblages for routine monthly sampling.

Spec: Species scores (adjusted for species variance)

N	NAME	AX1	AX2	AX3	AX4	WEIGHT	1
	EIG	0.2368	0.0315	0.0246	0.0179		
1	Aery	-0.5174	0.023	-0.255	-0.0141	1	1
2	Asp1	0.6231	0.005	0.0204	0.1817	1	1
3	Aspi	0.428	0.1072	0.1264	-0.1077	1	1
4	Capa u	-0.1623	-0.1421	-0.0785	0.1221	1	1
5	Cdor	-0.5942	-0.0805	0.0435	-0.1689	1	1
6	Cfur	-0.4456	0.0483	-0.2222	0.0126	1	1
7	Acgi b	-0.4186	0.0006	0.0051	0.0416	1	1
8	Bsim	-0.4408	0.3431	0.0117	-0.1472	1	1
9	Pacu	-0.5574	-0.0427	0.1105	-0.0232	1	1
10	Pcra s	0.1033	0.4135	0.1004	-0.1643	1	1
11	Psp1	0.103	0.3727	0.245	-0.141	1	1
12	Maur	-0.1844	0.2398	0.0705	0.2588	1	1
13	Pbow	-0.4787	0.2216	0.1159	0.0248	1	1
14	Tbar	-0.5026	-0.0178	0.0096	-0.0481	1	1
15	Tfor	-0.4343	0.0465	-0.0099	-0.0061	1	1
16	Oaru	0.5533	0.1866	-0.0114	-0.1246	1	1
17	Oatt e	-0.691	0.0243	0.055	-0.0816	1	1
18	Obre	-0.2855	-0.0516	-0.1698	0.0339	1	1
19	Odis s	0.7174	0.1788	-0.0579	-0.0423	1	1
20	Osim	-0.3665	0.3704	0.0499	0.1143	1	1
21	Cand	-0.6051	-0.1089	-0.3072	-0.0924	1	1
22	Cery	-0.352	-0.0686	0.0218	-0.1587	1	1
23	Pseu	-0.0248	0.0301	-0.1661	-0.0212	1	1
24	Hem	-0.251	0.0765	-0.2323	-0.2443	1	1
25	Eacu	-0.7028	-0.0928	-0.0294	-0.0559	1	1
26	Mnor	-0.4418	-0.0631	-0.0856	0.1321	1	1
27	Hsp1	0.0431	0.2497	-0.3291	0.1904	1	1
28	Bal	-0.0204	0.2416	0.1793	0.0654	1	1
29	Luci	-0.7113	0.0338	-0.2592	-0.067	1	1
30	Ser	-0.551	0.1745	-0.053	0.0174	1	1
31	Pena	-0.1729	0.1236	-0.2493	-0.0098	1	1
32	Bra	-0.0459	0.4048	0.0506	-0.1743	1	1
33	Dio	-0.6834	0.1042	0.0992	-0.0097	1	1
34	Xys	0.1296	0.1341	-0.1582	0.1232	1	1
35	Cod	-0.035	0.1143	-0.1443	0.3275	1	1
36	Noc	-0.0723	-0.1483	0.168	-0.011	1	1
37	Sag	0.0146	-0.1302	-0.3167	0.0123	1	1
38	Hyd	-0.0831	0.1844	-0.2652	0.0278	1	1
39	Sabe	-0.5002	-0.0886	0.3134	0.1548	1	1
40	Spio	-0.2973	-0.0169	-0.1702	0.2338	1	1

41	Tere	-0.4606	-0.006	-0.0634	-0.0176	1	1
42	Ga	-0.6026	0.1195	-0.0655	0.0301	1	1
43	Bv	-0.6513	0.0402	0.0499	0.101	1	1
44	Bry	-0.415	0.2129	0.1933	0.2452	1	1
45	Ophi o	-0.4723	0.3388	-0.081	-0.0072	1	1
46	Oiko	-0.6419	-0.234	0.0758	0.0063	1	1
47	Pho	-0.3257	0.0798	-0.0427	-0.1096	1	1

Samp: Sample scores

N	NAME	AX1	AX2	AX3	AX4	WEIGHT	1
	EIG	0.2368	0.0315	0.0246	0.0179		
1	M1	1.2533	-0.5856	-0.6411	-0.9552	1	1
2	M2	0.4681	1.1511	-0.4258	1.2399	1	1
3	M3	-0.5155	1.8601	-1.6753	3.4578	1	1
4	M4	-1.1938	0.813	-0.819	0.4737	1	1
5	M5	-1.0822	-2.2071	-2.5383	-2.343	1	1
6	J1	0.7777	-1.1221	0.1513	0.7053	1	1
7	J2	0.3709	-0.7818	1.0213	2.5846	1	1
8	J3	0.0022	-1.0279	1.5567	2.0699	1	1
9	J4	-1.6958	0.5712	0.2454	1.6343	1	1
10	J5	-1.3523	-1.2228	-0.7451	-1.5637	1	1
11	JY1	0.8286	-0.0062	0.5399	1.4719	1	1
12	JY2	0.2922	0.3874	0.4767	1.991	1	1
13	JY3	-0.7298	0.8695	1.4141	2.9721	1	1
14	JY4	-1.7674	0.7272	0.7279	-1.1582	1	1
15	JY5	-1.6825	-0.93	-0.9198	1.4481	1	1
16	A1	0.1847	-0.5518	0.044	2.4848	1	1
17	A2	0.2451	-1.1251	0.713	2.3208	1	1
18	A3	0.0235	-1.2971	0.7333	1.6017	1	1
19	A4	-1.7918	0.5993	1.4925	-0.0024	1	1
20	S1	0.9729	1.652	0.8202	-0.0119	1	1
21	S2	0.5965	0.9327	0.4986	2.41	1	1
22	S3	-0.2469	2.0571	0.2285	3.1147	1	1
23	S4	-1.6492	1.595	-0.3148	1.0409	1	1
24	S5	-1.2994	0.5079	0.8024	1.4298	1	1
25	O1	1.5836	-2.7026	0.2548	-1.5432	1	1
26	O2	1.485	-1.3783	-0.101	-1.0531	1	1
27	O3	-0.0907	0.4801	-0.1146	1.785	1	1
28	O4	-0.9165	-1.1854	0.1124	0.6839	1	1
29	O5	-1.4438	-0.1227	0.4584	-0.8783	1	1
30	N1	1.3155	-0.7773	1.0164	-1.4802	1	1
31	N2	1.3804	0.1225	0.4515	-0.8164	1	1
32	N3	0.7648	0.3681	0.4888	0.2062	1	1
33	N4	-1.0012	1.287	0.2826	1.0991	1	1
34	N5	-1.0437	-0.3752	0.6613	1.5495	1	1

35	D1	1.4221	0.8035	-0.3667	-1.6365	1	1
36	D2	1.4549	0.6422	-0.0412	-0.6451	1	1
37	D3	1.1884	0.3064	0.2379	-0.1278	1	1
38	D4	-0.9366	1.2512	-0.6277	0.0011	1	1
39	D5	-2.029	0.7637	-1.8498	0.4126	1	1
40	JA1	1.2017	1.5483	-0.3956	-0.9199	1	1
41	JA2	0.8437	2.3631	-1.094	1.0164	1	1
42	JA3	1.0298	2.2329	-1.4419	0.859	1	1
43	JA4	-1.2443	1.4386	-1.29	-0.0088	1	1
44	JA5	-1.8379	1.2107	-3.8009	1.579	1	1
45	F1	1.4961	-1.0688	0.2444	-1.5218	1	1
46	F2	1.4293	-0.8648	-0.7508	-0.9515	1	1
47	F3	0.7876	0.5325	-1.1135	-0.0475	1	1
48	F4	-1.6881	1.5824	-3.1861	0.2525	1	1
49	F5	-1.3165	-0.5819	-2.8645	-0.064	1	1
50	MR1	0.8319	2.1559	-1.5376	-0.5319	1	1
51	MR2	0.9081	1.5405	-0.9604	-0.6592	1	1
52	MR3	0.7343	2.9152	-1.8442	0.1682	1	1
53	MR4	-1.7061	1.604	-1.5729	0.4414	1	1
54	MR5	-0.8417	-0.1592	-1.7767	-2.2297	1	1
55	AP1	1.101	-1.8765	-0.0863	2.7909	1	1
56	AP2	0.6089	-1.2448	-1.8071	2.6309	1	1
57	AP3	0.3467	-0.6273	-1.2981	2.6665	1	1
58	AP4	-0.9434	0.2908	-1.8084	-3.9962	1	1
59	AP5	-0.6567	-3.2916	-1.5087	-2.5956	1	1
60	M1.	1.0116	-1.8303	-0.6939	2.3241	1	1
61	M2.	0.8702	-2.182	-1.2201	1.6218	1	1
62	M3.	0.1645	1.243	-2.7903	2.4637	1	1
63	M4.	-0.9949	0.5239	-0.4765	-2.0294	1	1
64	M5.	-0.6346	-3.0907	-0.5394	-3.7085	1	1
65	J1.	1.127	-1.9812	0.246	-0.0271	1	1
66	J2.	0.4055	-1.6468	1.1593	1.6038	1	1
67	J3.	0.0696	-1.4622	2.3901	2.2237	1	1
68	J4.	-0.4567	-2.1498	1.2688	-1.075	1	1
69	J5.	-0.7041	-2.5506	-1.8355	-1.2688	1	1
70	JL1.	0.8612	-0.4407	1.1028	-0.5698	1	1
71	JL2.	0.1476	-0.9756	1.6569	1.6165	1	1
72	JL3.	0.026	-0.7523	1.4041	2.1356	1	1
73	JL4.	-1.8832	1.1357	1.6845	-2.1433	1	1
74	A1.	1.385	-1.188	0.1383	-1.9108	1	1
75	A2.	1.0483	-0.6074	2.089	-0.746	1	1
76	A3.	0.2202	-0.2037	2.2943	0.5859	1	1
77	A4.	-1.7677	0.7445	2.1599	-2.1275	1	1
78	A5.	-1.6384	-0.1047	1.8978	-2.4069	1	1
79	S1.	1.5713	-1.0055	0.8871	-2.6126	1	1
80	S2.	1.909	-0.8788	0.3188	-1.4158	1	1
81	S3.	1.7137	0.5618	0.0202	-2.3516	1	1
82	S4.	-1.0192	0.7316	1.1922	-2.2123	1	1

83	S5.	-0.4403	-2.3277	0.6707	-2.354	1	1
84	O1.	1.5851	1.3981	2.185	-3.4687	1	1
85	O2.	1.6	1.7127	1.9502	-2.1389	1	1
86	O3.	0.5322	1.7185	1.8959	-1.1643	1	1
87	O4.	-0.7586	1.9405	1.8905	-1.0151	1	1
88	O5.	-1.1766	1.6186	2.6969	-2.681	1	1
89	ORIGIN	1.1649	-5.0713	-0.1028	-1.2666	0	0

CFit: Cumulative fit per species as fraction of variance of species

N	NAME	AX1	AX2	AX3	AX4	VAR(y)	% EXPL
	FR FITTED	0.2368	0.0315	0.0246	0.0179		
1	Aery	0.2677	0.2683	0.3333	0.3335	0.74	35.82
2	Asp1	0.3883	0.3883	0.3887	0.4217	1.97	45.7
3	Aspi	0.1832	0.1947	0.2107	0.2223	0.81	28.96
4	Capa u	0.0264	0.0465	0.0527	0.0676	0.05	13.09
5	Cdor	0.353	0.3595	0.3614	0.3899	1.33	41.33
6	Cfur	0.1986	0.2009	0.2503	0.2504	0.24	25.96
7	Acgi b	0.1752	0.1752	0.1752	0.177	0.47	27
8	Bsim	0.1943	0.3121	0.3122	0.3339	0.96	39.09
9	Pacu	0.3107	0.3125	0.3248	0.3253	0.88	33.58
10	Pcra s	0.0107	0.1816	0.1917	0.2187	0.36	28.78
11	Psp1	0.0106	0.1495	0.2095	0.2294	1.37	27.06
12	Maur	0.034	0.0915	0.0965	0.1634	0.59	24.35
13	Pbow	0.2291	0.2783	0.2917	0.2923	0.51	32.51
14	Tbar	0.2526	0.253	0.253	0.2554	0.85	31.39
15	Tfor	0.1886	0.1908	0.1909	0.1909	0.79	20.34
16	Oaru	0.3061	0.3409	0.3411	0.3566	1.46	41.71
17	Oatt e	0.4775	0.4781	0.4811	0.4878	1.81	50.46
18	Obre	0.0815	0.0842	0.113	0.1142	0.75	17.13
19	Odis s	0.5147	0.5467	0.5501	0.5519	2.01	56.21
20	Osim	0.1343	0.2715	0.274	0.2871	0.78	32.26
21	Cand	0.3661	0.378	0.4724	0.4809	1.17	50.47
22	Cery	0.1239	0.1286	0.1291	0.1542	0.24	19.56
23	Pseu	0.0006	0.0015	0.0291	0.0296	0.86	6.11
24	Hem	0.063	0.0689	0.1228	0.1825	0.64	21.02
25	Eacu	0.4939	0.5025	0.5034	0.5065	1.76	52.62
26	Mnor	0.1952	0.1991	0.2065	0.2239	0.88	25.77
27	Hsp1	0.0019	0.0642	0.1725	0.2088	0.77	22.12
28	Bal	0.0004	0.0588	0.0909	0.0952	1.09	12.36
29	Luci	0.5059	0.507	0.5743	0.5787	1	64.98
30	Ser	0.3036	0.334	0.3368	0.3371	1.04	34.47
31	Pena	0.0299	0.0452	0.1073	0.1074	0.59	14.98
32	Bra	0.0021	0.1659	0.1685	0.1989	0.98	22.51
33	Dio	0.467	0.4779	0.4877	0.4878	1.5	51.41
34	Xys	0.0168	0.0348	0.0598	0.075	1.43	20.45

35	Cod	0.0012	0.0143	0.0351	0.1424	1.92	15.24
36	Noc	0.0052	0.0272	0.0554	0.0556	0.54	8.6
37	Sag	0.0002	0.0172	0.1175	0.1176	0.38	16.98
38	Hyd	0.0069	0.0409	0.1112	0.112	0.69	14.95
39	Sabe	0.2502	0.258	0.3562	0.3802	2.39	39.36
40	Spio	0.0884	0.0887	0.1177	0.1723	0.94	22.53
41	Tere	0.2122	0.2122	0.2162	0.2165	0.71	30.14
42	Ga	0.3632	0.3775	0.3817	0.3826	1.05	42.3
43	Bv	0.4242	0.4258	0.4283	0.4385	1.09	47.25
44	Bry	0.1722	0.2175	0.2549	0.315	1.29	33.02
45	Ophi o	0.223	0.3378	0.3444	0.3444	1.61	37.68
46	Oiko	0.412	0.4668	0.4725	0.4726	1.2	52.54
47	Pho	0.1061	0.1124	0.1143	0.1263	0.5	17.4

SqRL: Squared residual length per sample with s axes (s=1...4)

N	NAME	AX1	AX2	AX3	AX4	SQLENG	% FIT
	FR FITTED	0.2368	0.0315	0.0246	0.0179		
1	M1	0.4112	0.4004	0.3916	0.43	0.77	44.26
2	M2	0.6667	0.7019	0.7033	0.6844	0.72	4.74
3	M3	0.9955	1.0573	0.9998	0.948	0.95	-0.09
4	M4	1.2209	1.2829	1.2747	1.273	1.55	17.69
5	M5	1.3522	1.2413	1.0947	1.0927	1.61	32.28
6	J1	0.2937	0.3063	0.3059	0.3008	0.44	31.12
7	J2	0.5809	0.5671	0.5571	0.5338	0.38	-41.04
8	J3	0.9167	0.9502	0.9313	0.9235	0.52	-78.8
9	J4	0.4288	0.4359	0.4344	0.4236	1.08	60.72
10	J5	0.9976	1.0285	1.0463	1.055	1.43	26.24
11	JY1	0.3808	0.4368	0.4298	0.4054	0.54	25.36
12	JY2	0.3703	0.4068	0.4102	0.3639	0.38	5.3
13	JY3	0.6846	0.6767	0.6328	0.5306	0.8	34.06
14	JY4	1.156	1.1456	1.1332	1.225	1.77	30.6
15	JY5	0.8639	0.8489	0.8589	0.8538	1.44	40.77
16	A1	0.35	0.3414	0.347	0.307	0.35	12.06
17	A2	0.5872	0.5487	0.5592	0.5138	0.51	-0.89
18	A3	0.4624	0.4669	0.4541	0.414	0.34	-22.39
19	A4	0.8504	0.8458	0.7911	0.7911	1.41	43.7
20	S1	0.4252	0.3505	0.3342	0.352	0.61	42.26
21	S2	0.4252	0.4042	0.3981	0.3073	0.49	36.65
22	S3	1.015	1.0199	1.0189	0.8496	0.84	-1.5
23	S4	1.008	0.9505	0.9976	1.0096	1.55	34.68
24	S5	0.6672	0.6621	0.6468	0.6666	1.07	37.42
25	O1	0.6547	0.5504	0.5631	0.5206	1.25	58.21
26	O2	0.5315	0.4898	0.492	0.4744	1	52.53
27	O3	1.1181	1.1734	1.1751	1.2054	1.04	-15.46
28	O4	1.4853	1.4427	1.4783	1.47	1.68	12.69

29	O5	0.6141	0.623	0.6301	0.6372	1.05	39.14
30	N1	0.4214	0.4143	0.3895	0.4351	0.82	46.86
31	N2	0.3897	0.3929	0.3963	0.4251	0.82	48.46
32	N3	0.6414	0.6413	0.6394	0.6506	0.78	16.41
33	N4	1.0696	1.1392	1.2536	1.2399	1.29	3.98
34	N5	0.6371	0.6784	0.6719	0.6399	0.82	22.33
35	D1	0.7274	0.7109	0.7077	0.6911	1.21	42.7
36	D2	0.2139	0.2029	0.2273	0.2199	0.72	69.25
37	D3	0.2698	0.2719	0.3138	0.3386	0.52	34.32
38	D4	0.683	0.6344	0.6248	0.6375	0.87	26.43
39	D5	0.9003	0.8819	0.8334	0.8844	1.67	47.18
40	JA1	0.4803	0.4303	0.4266	0.416	0.75	44.68
41	JA2	0.4955	0.3388	0.3111	0.293	0.66	55.36
42	JA3	0.6659	0.5089	0.4659	0.4579	0.77	40.5
43	JA4	0.9935	0.9344	0.9126	0.9163	1.28	28.34
44	JA5	1.3924	1.3807	1.283	1.324	2.04	35.19
45	F1	0.7878	0.7535	0.7521	0.7109	1.04	31.95
46	F2	0.2033	0.185	0.1712	0.1816	0.69	73.53
47	F3	0.6669	0.7268	0.6973	0.7227	0.79	8.24
48	F4	1.3721	1.4019	1.2503	1.2545	1.75	28.45
49	F5	1.0528	1.0452	0.9383	0.9686	1.43	32.36
50	MR1	0.6262	0.4993	0.4716	0.4705	0.71	33.75
51	MR2	0.4831	0.4118	0.3926	0.3895	0.68	42.57
52	MR3	0.7722	0.6455	0.57	0.5753	0.9	36.04
53	MR4	0.8699	0.7928	0.7321	0.7287	1.35	45.99
54	MR5	0.8726	0.8728	0.7958	0.7725	1.04	25.72
55	AP1	0.7311	0.6239	0.6253	0.4899	0.98	50
56	AP2	0.5909	0.5451	0.4924	0.3723	0.68	45.14
57	AP3	0.603	0.5932	0.5521	0.4755	0.58	18.57
58	AP4	1.0093	1.023	0.9437	0.8858	1.22	27.36
59	AP5	1.0276	0.7318	0.6759	0.6234	1.12	44.24
60	M1.	0.7229	0.6702	0.6709	0.6001	0.96	37.34
61	M2.	0.6764	0.5631	0.5307	0.5576	0.85	34.38
62	M3.	1.0203	1.0067	0.8566	1.011	1.03	1.45
63	M4.	0.8812	0.9249	0.9622	0.9206	1.09	15.54
64	M5.	1.159	0.8811	0.8745	0.7555	1.25	39.76
65	J1.	0.2998	0.1866	0.1868	0.1987	0.6	66.8
66	J.2	0.4083	0.3459	0.3645	0.3313	0.41	20.12
67	J3.	0.9043	0.8421	0.773	0.7451	0.77	2.97
68	J4.	0.8053	0.668	0.661	0.6507	0.77	15.98
69	J5.	0.9852	0.8256	0.7615	0.7484	1.06	29.44
70	JL1.	0.385	0.3826	0.3621	0.3565	0.49	26.66
71	JL2.	0.6883	0.6584	0.6049	0.5962	0.67	11.06
72	JL3.	0.8069	0.8656	0.8172	0.8343	0.74	-12.24
73	JL4.	1.0634	1.0306	0.9725	0.8906	1.85	51.93
74	A1.	0.3571	0.3249	0.363	0.3147	0.77	59.08
75	A2.	0.833	0.8217	0.8082	0.7995	1.09	26.45
76	A3.	1.3724	1.3717	1.3498	1.3627	1.36	-0.34

77	A4.	1.0388	1.063	1.0156	1.0399	1.7	38.86
78	A5.	0.8347	0.8353	0.7994	0.7491	1.45	48.2
79	S1.	0.6496	0.6463	0.6282	0.5857	1.22	51.89
80	S2.	0.7818	0.7979	0.8047	0.7712	1.23	37.17
81	S3.	1.0585	1.0491	1.1265	1.1386	1.2	4.89
82	S4.	0.7562	0.8292	0.8164	0.7641	0.97	21.4
83	S5.	0.7876	0.6201	0.6097	0.5712	0.77	25.97
84	O1.	0.8334	0.794	0.6779	0.4854	1.42	65.81
85	O2.	0.7943	0.7089	0.6209	0.575	1.19	51.71
86	O3.	0.9021	0.8248	0.7528	0.7926	0.94	15.29
87	O4.	1.0276	0.9499	0.8625	0.8462	1.16	26.97
88	O5.	1.1598	1.1266	0.9807	0.905	1.49	39.16

Regr: Regression/canonical coefficients for standardized variables

N	NAME	AX1	AX2	AX3	AX4
	EIG	0.2368	0.0315	0.0246	0.0179
1	pH	-0.5169	-0.3178	-0.619	0.4055
2	Temp	0.2172	0.0224	-1.0168	-0.0145
3	DO	0.0626	-0.0159	0.4876	0.1105
4	Sal	-0.481	0.4833	0.0253	-0.7908
5	Tur	-0.0535	0.9198	-0.2339	-0.1278
6	Chl a	0.1289	-0.1521	0.199	0.6515
7	NO2.NO3	-0.0826	0.3216	0.1143	-1.1481
8	PO4	-0.0886	-0.0066	0.2197	0.0413
9	NH3	0.0775	-0.3163	0.1697	-0.1801

tVal: t-values of regression coefficients

N	NAME	AX1	AX2	AX3	AX4
	FR EXPLAINED	0.6824	0.0908	0.0708	0.0514
1	pH	-3.3265	-1.1263	-2.2552	0.938
2	Temp	3.0828	0.1752	-8.1715	-0.0739
3	DO	0.6561	-0.092	2.8915	0.4159
4	Sal	-3.3166	1.8353	0.0989	-1.9597
5	Tur	-0.6689	6.3294	-1.6548	-0.5737
6	Chl a	1.6016	-1.0407	1.3996	2.9085
7	NO2.NO3	-0.9276	1.9887	0.7267	-4.6337
8	PO4	-1.3388	-0.0551	1.8782	0.224
9	NH3	1.1283	-2.5368	1.3989	-0.9427

StBi: Species coordinates for t-value biplot

N	NAME	AX1	AX2	AX3	AX4	VAR(y)	% EXPL
	EIG	0.2368	0.0315	0.0246	0.0179		
1	Aery	-0.3499	0.0155	0	0	0.74	35.82
2	Asp1	0.2678	0.0021	0	0	1.97	45.7
3	Aspi	0.4196	0.1051	0	0	0.81	28.96
4	Capa u	-0.7363	-0.6446	0	0	0.05	13.09
5	Cdor	-0.2867	-0.0388	0	0	1.33	41.33
6	Cfur	-0.4322	0.0469	0	0	0.24	25.96
7	Acgi b	-0.4622	0.0006	0	0	0.47	27
8	Bsim	-0.2497	0.1943	0	0	0.96	39.09
9	Pacu	-0.3292	-0.0252	0	0	0.88	33.58
10	Pcra s	0.1087	0.435	0	0	0.36	28.78
11	Psp1	0.1332	0.4821	0	0	1.37	27.06
12	Maur	-0.397	0.5162	0	0	0.59	24.35
13	Pbow	-0.32	0.1482	0	0	0.51	32.51
14	Tbar	-0.3727	-0.0132	0	0	0.85	31.39
15	Tfor	-0.4601	0.0492	0	0	0.79	20.34
16	Oaru	0.2806	0.0946	0	0	1.46	41.71
17	Oatt e	-0.2304	0.0081	0	0	1.81	50.46
18	Obre	-0.6991	-0.1264	0	0	0.75	17.13
19	Odis s	0.1967	0.049	0	0	2.01	56.21
20	Osim	-0.2516	0.2543	0	0	0.78	32.26
21	Cand	-0.2551	-0.0459	0	0	1.17	50.47
22	Cery	-0.5559	-0.1084	0	0	0.24	19.56
23	Pseu	-3.5777	4.3379	0	0	0.86	6.11
24	Hem	-0.7336	0.2236	0	0	0.64	21.02
25	Eacu	-0.218	-0.0288	0	0	1.76	52.62
26	Mnor	-0.4328	-0.0619	0	0	0.88	25.77
27	Hsp1	0.1341	0.7772	0	0	0.77	22.12
28	Bal	-0.0735	0.8712	0	0	1.09	12.36
29	Luci	-0.188	0.0089	0	0	1	64.98
30	Ser	-0.3024	0.0958	0	0	1.04	34.47
31	Pena	-0.7993	0.5716	0	0	0.59	14.98
32	Bra	-0.0552	0.4862	0	0	0.98	22.51
33	Dio	-0.2257	0.0344	0	0	1.5	51.41
34	Xys	0.7529	0.779	0	0	1.43	20.45
35	Cod	-0.5102	1.6679	0	0	1.92	15.24
36	Noc	-0.5751	-1.1793	0	0	0.54	8.6
37	Sag	0.1758	-1.5648	0	0	0.38	16.98
38	Hyd	-0.4241	0.9415	0	0	0.69	14.95
39	Sabe	-0.3418	-0.0606	0	0	2.39	39.36
40	Spio	-0.6682	-0.0379	0	0	0.94	22.53
41	Tere	-0.4109	-0.0053	0	0	0.71	30.14
42	Ga	-0.2746	0.0544	0	0	1.05	42.3
43	Bv	-0.2516	0.0155	0	0	1.09	47.25
44	Bry	-0.3536	0.1814	0	0	1.29	33.02

45	Ophi o	-0.2499	0.1793	0	0	1.61	37.68
46	Oiko	-0.2145	-0.0782	0	0	1.2	52.54
47	Pho	-0.5961	0.1461	0	0	0.5	17.4

EtBi: Environmental coordinates for t-value biplot

N	NAME	AX1	AX2	AX3	AX4
	EIG	0.2368	0.0315	0.0246	0.0179
1	pH	-0.2023	-0.1244	0	0
2	Temp	0.1875	0.0194	0	0
3	DO	0.0399	-0.0102	0	0
4	Sal	-0.2017	0.2027	0	0
5	Tur	-0.0407	0.6991	0	0
6	Chl a	0.0974	-0.1149	0	0
7	NO2.NO3	-0.0564	0.2196	0	0
8	PO4	-0.0814	-0.0061	0	0
9	NH3	0.0686	-0.2802	0	0

CorE: Inter set correlations of environmental variables with axes

N	NAME	AX1	AX2	AX3	AX4
	FR EXTRACTED	0.2099	0.0793	0.0413	0.0311
1	pH	-0.8177	-0.1382	-0.1211	0.0338
2	Temp	0.3567	-0.1963	-0.5654	-0.0096
3	DO	-0.4365	-0.2541	0.1207	0.1896
4	Sal	-0.825	-0.0278	-0.1035	-0.0073
5	Tur	0.1076	0.6719	0.0423	0.0635
6	Chl a	0.2623	0.2413	0.0373	0.039
7	NO2.NO3	0.3464	0.0521	0.0524	-0.3864
8	PO4	-0.0063	-0.0479	0.0136	0.0833
9	NH3	0.1473	-0.276	0.0755	-0.284

BipE: Biplot scores of environmental variables

N	NAME	AX1	AX2	AX3	AX4
	R(SPEC,ENV)	0.8809	0.7158	0.7254	0.5561
1	pH	-0.9282	-0.1931	-0.1669	0.0607
2	Temp	0.4049	-0.2742	-0.7794	-0.0173
3	DO	-0.4955	-0.355	0.1665	0.341
4	Sal	-0.9365	-0.0389	-0.1427	-0.0131
5	Tur	0.1222	0.9386	0.0584	0.1141

6	Chl a	0.2977	0.3371	0.0514	0.0701
7	NO2.NO3	0.3932	0.0728	0.0723	-0.6949
8	PO4	-0.0071	-0.067	0.0188	0.1498
9	NH3	0.1672	-0.3856	0.1041	-0.5108

CenE: Centroids of environmental variables (mean.gt.0) in ordination diagram

N	NAME	AX1	AX2	AX3	AX4
	R(SPEC,ENV)	0.8809	0.7158	0.7254	0.5561
1	pH	-0.0393	-0.0082	-0.0071	0.0026
2	Temp	0.0106	-0.0072	-0.0204	-0.0005
3	DO	-0.0894	-0.0641	0.03	0.0616
4	Sal	-0.165	-0.0069	-0.0251	-0.0023
5	Tur	0.034	0.2616	0.0163	0.0318
6	Chl a	0.1294	0.1465	0.0223	0.0305
7	NO2.NO3	0.2376	0.044	0.0436	-0.4198
8	PO4	0	0	0	0
9	NH3	1.0954	-2.5255	0.6815	-3.3457

SamE: Sample scores which are linear combinations of environmental variables


N	NAME	AX1	AX2	AX3	AX4	WEIGHT	% FIT
	EIG	0.2368	0.0315	0.0246	0.0179		
1	M1	1.4753	-0.5604	-0.8782	0.7946	1	44.26
2	M2	0.4894	-0.4118	-0.9153	0.547	1	4.74
3	M3	0.1703	-0.4681	-0.9947	0.4486	1	-0.09
4	M4	-0.9702	-0.8082	-1.3994	0.1127	1	17.69
5	M5	-1.3418	-1.043	-1.8492	-0.0244	1	32.28
6	J1	0.7498	0.1655	0.2447	0.2449	1	31.12
7	J2	-0.6253	-0.3651	0.2259	0.2653	1	-41.04
8	J3	-1.2977	0.4273	0.2699	0.1084	1	-78.8
9	J4	-1.3318	-0.1726	0.2366	0.1983	1	60.72
10	J5	-1.3911	0.3505	0.387	0.1489	1	26.24
11	JY1	0.8622	1.3261	0.6338	0.5766	1	25.36
12	JY2	0.1298	1.5314	1.0811	0.8201	1	5.3
13	JY3	-0.5689	1.5797	0.9513	1.2093	1	34.06
14	JY4	-1.0241	1.1703	0.5664	1.3877	1	30.6
15	JY5	-1.0569	-0.3063	0.1996	2.7949	1	40.77
16	A1	-0.0096	-0.7285	-0.4373	0.5011	1	12.06
17	A2	-0.3787	-0.9189	-0.2544	0.6343	1	-0.89
18	A3	-0.7009	0.0533	0.8758	1.0382	1	-22.39
19	A4	-0.8601	0.1369	1.4998	0.0176	1	43.7
20	S1	1.3827	1.0532	0.72	0.986	1	42.26

21	S2	0.9174	0.4809	0.5323	1.5609	1	36.65
22	S3	0.6545	-0.0377	0.3329	2.6464	1	-1.5
23	S4	-0.9783	0.748	1.1054	-0.2853	1	34.68
24	S5	-1.2099	0.8196	0.6677	-0.3463	1	37.42
25	O1	1.6957	-0.704	1.0162	-1.5879	1	58.21
26	O2	1.0056	-0.6193	0.2157	-0.7005	1	52.53
27	O3	0.4761	-0.9293	0.1722	-0.4243	1	-15.46
28	O4	-0.9689	-0.9539	1.322	0.7095	1	12.69
29	O5	-0.937	-0.6676	1.1653	0.2026	1	39.14
30	N1	1.0861	-0.1614	0.8665	0.6984	1	46.86
31	N2	1.119	-0.2195	1.0386	0.6929	1	48.46
32	N3	0.6825	0.0046	0.0885	1.026	1	16.41
33	N4	-0.7436	-0.6787	2.4596	0.4362	1	3.98
34	N5	-1.5921	0.829	0.2469	0.7701	1	22.33
35	D1	1.4648	0.4522	-0.4185	-0.3154	1	42.7
36	D2	1.4786	0.8984	-1.0384	-0.6104	1	69.25
37	D3	0.5763	0.7053	-1.0897	1.0584	1	34.32
38	D4	-0.6163	1.41	-0.5891	-0.8417	1	26.43
39	D5	-1.1077	0.7683	-0.6479	-1.3274	1	47.18
40	JA1	0.6566	2.4496	-0.4723	-0.4207	1	44.68
41	JA2	0.6626	1.5815	-0.8282	1.1572	1	55.36
42	JA3	0.2405	2.1673	-0.8689	0.3218	1	40.5
43	JA4	-0.6577	0.9975	-0.4084	-0.4637	1	28.34
44	JA5	-1.0429	0.1658	-0.565	-0.6091	1	35.19
45	F1	2.5703	-1.3011	0.2998	-1.4337	1	31.95
46	F2	1.5009	-0.4587	-0.6954	-2.1708	1	73.53
47	F3	1.1203	-0.9454	-1.3141	-1.2405	1	8.24
48	F4	-0.5746	-0.2749	-1.191	-0.2929	1	28.45
49	F5	-0.953	-0.27	-0.9019	-1.3687	1	32.36
50	MR1	1.4128	1.3669	-0.4258	-1.003	1	33.75
51	MR2	0.8853	1.2043	-1.3329	-0.1465	1	42.57
52	MR3	0.6876	0.7986	-1.2709	0.7343	1	36.04
53	MR4	-0.7643	1.2468	-1.5738	0.5146	1	45.99
54	MR5	-0.8005	0.0203	-1.6393	-0.3139	1	25.72
55	AP1	1.5042	-1.5277	0.1607	2.3361	1	50
56	AP2	0.5914	-0.9344	-0.7494	2.1875	1	45.14
57	AP3	-0.101	-0.9191	-1.3889	0.9855	1	18.57
58	AP4	-0.998	1.0105	-1.5981	-0.4288	1	27.36
59	AP5	-0.8777	-2.087	-1.4754	-0.6469	1	44.24
60	M1.	1.1898	-0.5354	0.0201	1.125	1	37.34
61	M2.	1.0299	-1.103	-0.8038	-0.4119	1	34.38
62	M3.	0.1056	0.1871	-1.4959	-1.3725	1	1.45
63	M4.	-0.6658	1.813	-1.7978	-0.6925	1	15.54
64	M5.	-0.6626	-2.2327	-0.3985	-1.0457	1	39.76
65	J1.	1.2244	-1.4035	0.5086	0.7899	1	66.8
66	J2	0.0349	-0.7912	-0.2896	0.7592	1	20.12
67	J3.	-0.6924	-1.8692	0.6868	0.3849	1	2.97
68	J4.	-1.0385	-1.6315	0.118	-0.3156	1	15.98

69	J5.	-1.1255	-1.3505	-0.9634	-0.3333	1	29.44
70	JL1.	0.3004	-0.0974	0.4841	-0.4597	1	26.66
71	JL2.	-0.1646	-1.0418	0.9038	0.1584	1	11.06
72	JL3.	-0.4927	0.8058	1.3458	-0.2135	1	-12.24
73	JL4.	-1.4207	0.6365	0.9965	-2.058	1	51.93
74	A1.	1.8077	-0.5636	1.3909	-0.9369	1	59.08
75	A2.	0.8852	-0.5019	0.1363	-1.0077	1	26.45
76	A3.	-0.1099	-0.3406	0.2038	-0.4471	1	-0.34
77	A4.	-1.1935	-0.405	0.5063	0.2992	1	38.86
78	A5.	-1.3181	0.0676	0.4357	-0.6812	1	48.2
79	S1.	1.3027	-0.054	0.662	-0.5043	1	51.89
80	S2.	0.5814	0.2537	-0.2957	-1.057	1	37.17
81	S3.	0.1804	0.6968	-1.7548	0.1403	1	4.89
82	S4.	-0.6623	-0.9565	0.2426	-0.8104	1	21.4
83	S5.	-0.952	-2.0038	0.5078	-0.5151	1	25.97
84	O1.	1.3902	0.5586	2.4065	-2.3516	1	65.81
85	O2.	0.6586	1.2386	1.4796	-0.7232	1	51.71
86	O3.	0.1561	1.011	1.0826	0.7296	1	15.29
87	O4.	-0.9066	0.7989	1.769	-1.3555	1	26.97
88	O5.	-1.2096	0.3672	1.5421	-0.9637	1	39.16


Appendix V. Results of Tukey HSD test for significant interaction effects on physical parameters and chl. *a* in the dry and wet periods (only selected interaction effects were shown).

a. Interaction between moon phase and depth on salinity in the dry period.




	moon phase	Depth	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	S							
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	B	0.210						
3	Full moon	S	0.026	0.990					
4	Full moon	B	0.010	0.936	1.000				
5	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	S	0.069	1.000	1.000	0.997			
6	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	B	0.000	0.001	0.018	0.046	0.006		
7	New moon	S	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.498	
8	New moon	B	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.204	0.999

b. Interaction between moon phase and depth on salinity in the wet period.




	moon phase	Depth	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	S							
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	B	0.000						
3	Full moon	S	0.909	0.000					
4	Full moon	B	0.709	0.000	0.080				
5	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	S	1.000	0.000	0.936	0.654			
6	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	B	0.000	0.989	0.000	0.000	0.000		
7	New moon	S	0.839	0.000	0.139	1.000	0.795	0.000	
8	New moon	B	0.131	0.014	0.004	0.963	0.107	0.001	0.899

c. Interaction between moon phase and depth on DO in the dry period.




	moon phase	Depth	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	S							
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	B	0.183						
3	Full moon	S	0.000	0.000					
4	Full moon	B	0.000	0.000	1.000				
5	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	S	0.020	0.000	0.000	0.000			
6	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	B	0.990	0.675	0.000	0.000	0.001		
7	New moon	S	0.000	0.186	0.012	0.018	0.000	0.001	
8	New moon	B	0.000	0.001	0.716	0.802	0.000	0.000	0.511

d. Interaction between moon phase and depth on DO in the wet period.




	moon phase	Depth	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	S							
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	B	0.036						
3	Full moon	S	0.974	0.340					
4	Full moon	B	0.679	0.793	0.996				
5	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	S	0.972	0.347	1.000	0.997			
6	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	B	0.000	0.137	0.000	0.002	0.000		
7	New moon	S	0.000	0.560	0.002	0.022	0.002	0.992	
8	New moon	B	0.000	0.463	0.001	0.014	0.001	0.998	1.000

e. Interaction between moon phase and diel on chl.  $a$  in the wet period.



	moon phase	Diel	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N							
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	1.000						
3	Full moon	N	1.000	1.000					
4	Full moon	N	1.000	1.000	1.000				
5	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	0.998	1.000	0.998	1.000			
6	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000		
7	New moon	D	0.017	0.042	0.017	0.028	0.039	0.194	
8	New moon	D	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.423

Appendix VI. Results of Tukey HSD test for significant interaction effects of total and size-fractionated biomass in the dry period (only selected interaction effects were shown). Shaded area indicates significance at  $p < 0.05$ .




a. Interaction between moon phase, diel and tide of total zooplankton biomass.

	moon phase	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}	{8}	{9}	{10}	{11}	{12}	{13}	{14}	{15}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	E															
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	F	0.853														
3	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	E	0.263	1.000													
4	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	F	0.997	1.000	0.933												
5	Full moon	N	E	0.005	0.857	0.975	0.101											
6	Full moon	N	F	0.005	0.949	0.997	0.131	1.000										
7	Full moon	D	E	0.000	0.195	0.356	0.000	1.000	0.996									
8	Full moon	D	F	0.000	0.018	0.035	0.000	0.969	0.643	0.999								
9	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	E	1.000	0.313	0.021	0.709	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000							
10	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	F	1.000	0.546	0.100	0.908	0.002	0.002	0.000	0.000	1.000						
11	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	E	0.993	1.000	0.989	1.000	0.244	0.335	0.003	0.000	0.663	0.870					
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	F	0.130	1.000	1.000	0.828	0.975	0.997	0.287	0.021	0.006	0.046	0.964				
13	New moon	N	E	0.000	0.004	0.007	0.000	0.703	0.248	0.905	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.004			
14	New moon	N	F	0.000	0.646	0.873	0.014	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.964	0.000	0.000	0.065	0.856	0.655		
15	New moon	D	E	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.505	0.073	0.732	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.389		
16	New moon	D	F	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.091	0.004	0.143	0.910	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.047	1.000	

b. Interaction between moon phase, diel and tide of large-sized zooplankton biomass.


	moon phase	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}	{8}	{9}	{10}	{11}	{12}	{13}	{14}	{15}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	E															
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	F	1.000														
3	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	E	0.000	0.000													
4	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	F	0.003	0.000	0.883												
5	Full moon	N	E	1.000	1.000	0.000	0.008											
6	Full moon	N	F	1.000	1.000	0.000	0.002	1.000										
7	Full moon	D	E	0.184	0.027	0.127	0.995	0.230	0.156									
8	Full moon	D	F	0.284	0.049	0.212	0.998	0.315	0.248	1.000								
9	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	E	0.000	0.018	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000							
10	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	F	0.001	0.117	0.000	0.000	0.015	0.002	0.000	0.000	1.000						
11	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	E	1.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	1.000	0.011	0.027	0.001	0.024					
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	F	0.791	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.975	0.830	0.000	0.000	0.035	0.263	0.999				
13	New moon	N	E	0.437	0.101	0.447	1.000	0.437	0.396	1.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.076	0.001			
14	New moon	N	F	1.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	1.000	0.011	0.026	0.001	0.025	1.000	0.999	0.073		
15	New moon	D	E	0.780	0.249	0.007	0.640	0.773	0.735	1.000	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.182	0.001	1.000	0.175	

c. Interaction between diel and depth of large-sized zooplankton biomass.




	Diel	Depth	{1}	{2}	{3}
1	N	S			
2	N	B	0.836		
3	D	S	0.000	0.000	
4	D	B	0.000	0.000	0.000

d. Interaction between tide and depth of large-sized zooplankton biomass.




	Tide	Depth	{1}	{2}	{3}
1	E	S			
2	E	B	0.000		
3	F	S	0.056	0.258	
4	F	B	0.002	0.886	0.688

e. Interaction between moon phase, diel and tide of medium-sized zooplankton biomass.




	moon phase	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}	{8}	{9}	{10}	{11}	{12}	{13}	{14}	{15}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	E															
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	F	0.002														
3	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	E	0.065	0.996													
4	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	F	0.989	0.087	0.738												
5	Full moon	N	E	0.000	1.000	0.903	0.012											
6	Full moon	N	F	0.000	1.000	0.995	0.033	1.000										
7	Full moon	D	E	0.000	1.000	0.997	0.023	1.000	1.000									
8	Full moon	D	F	0.000	1.000	0.776	0.001	1.000	1.000	1.000								
9	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	E	0.100	0.990	1.000	0.832	0.844	0.987	0.991	0.678							
10	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	F	0.550	0.944	1.000	0.997	0.685	0.927	0.942	0.505	1.000						
11	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	E	1.000	0.006	0.139	0.999	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.199	0.726					
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	F	0.000	1.000	1.000	0.050	1.000	1.000	0.998	0.999	0.979	0.002					
13	New moon	N	E	0.000	1.000	0.614	0.002	1.000	0.999	0.994	1.000	0.517	0.363	0.000	0.979			
14	New moon	N	F	0.000	0.995	0.210	0.000	1.000	0.970	0.892	1.000	0.147	0.101	0.000	0.778	1.000		
15	New moon	D	E	0.000	0.892	0.024	0.000	0.997	0.666	0.399	0.990	0.014	0.012	0.000	0.251	1.000	1.000	
16	New moon	D	F	0.000	0.985	0.135	0.000	1.000	0.927	0.795	1.000	0.091	0.063	0.000	0.648	1.000	1.000	

f. Interaction between moon phase, diel and tide of small-sized zooplankton biomass.



	moon phase	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}	{8}	{9}	{10}	{11}	{12}	{13}	{14}	{15}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	E															
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	F	0.410														
3	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	E	1.000	0.764													
4	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	F	1.000	0.082	0.998												
5	Full moon	N	E	0.000	0.002	0.000	0.000											
6	Full moon	N	F	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	1.000										
7	Full moon	D	E	0.000	0.125	0.000	0.000	0.896	0.900									
8	Full moon	D	F	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	1.000	1.000	0.942								
9	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	E	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.999	0.139	0.997							
10	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	F	0.000	0.199	0.000	0.000	0.993	0.996	1.000	0.999	0.612						
11	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	E	0.000	0.958	0.003	0.000	0.145	0.105	0.976	0.143	0.002	0.975					
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	F	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.000	1.000	0.237	1.000	1.000	0.789	0.003				
13	New moon	N	E	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.995	0.955	0.057	0.927	1.000	0.333	0.001	1.000			
14	New moon	N	F	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.329	0.082	0.000	0.058	0.758	0.003	0.000	0.339	0.997		
15	New moon	D	E	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.006	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.225	0.927		
16	New moon	D	F	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.049	0.005	0.000	0.003	0.200	0.000	0.032	0.835	1.000	1.000	

Appendix VII. Results of Tukey HSD test for significant interaction effects of total and size-fractionated density in the dry period (only selected interaction effects were shown). Shaded area indicates significance at  $p<0.05$ .




a. Interaction between moon phase, diel and tide of total zooplankton density.

	moon phase	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}	{8}	{9}	{10}	{11}	{12}	{13}	{14}	{15}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	E															
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	F	0.976														
3	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	E	1.000	0.800													
4	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	F	0.821	1.000	0.401												
5	Full moon	N	E	0.907	1.000	0.609	1.000											
6	Full moon	N	F	0.439	1.000	0.132	1.000	1.000										
7	Full moon	D	E	1.000	1.000	0.987	0.998	0.999	0.897									
8	Full moon	D	F	0.993	1.000	0.869	1.000	1.000	0.999	1.000								
9	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	E	1.000	1.000	0.969	1.000	1.000	0.983	1.000	1.000							
10	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	F	1.000	0.991	1.000	0.931	0.958	0.652	1.000	0.998	1.000						
11	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	E	0.788	0.055	0.981	0.003	0.022	0.000	0.140	0.050	0.126	0.894					
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	F	1.000	1.000	0.958	1.000	1.000	0.958	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.080				
13	New moon	N	E	1.000	1.000	0.985	1.000	1.000	0.996	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.251	1.000			
14	New moon	N	F	0.005	0.782	0.000	0.605	0.917	0.982	0.044	0.338	0.167	0.027	0.000	0.081	0.370		
15	New moon	D	E	0.103	0.999	0.015	0.997	1.000	1.000	0.467	0.940	0.788	0.270	0.000	0.630	0.926	0.999	
16	New moon	D	F	0.904	1.000	0.558	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.999	1.000	1.000	0.963	0.009	1.000	1.000	0.685	0.998

b. Interaction between moon phase, diel and tide of medium-sized zooplankton density.


	moon phase	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}	{8}	{9}	{10}	{11}	{12}	{13}	{14}	{15}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	E															
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	F	0.550														
3	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	E	1.000	0.242													
4	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	F	0.973	0.999	0.759												
5	Full moon	N	E	0.845	1.000	0.535	1.000											
6	Full moon	N	F	0.651	1.000	0.288	1.000	1.000										
7	Full moon	D	E	1.000	0.833	0.999	1.000	0.979	0.914									
8	Full moon	D	F	1.000	0.978	0.986	1.000	0.999	0.996	1.000								
9	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	E	1.000	0.973	0.990	1.000	0.999	0.994	1.000	1.000							
10	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	F	1.000	0.550	1.000	0.964	0.824	0.658	1.000	0.999	1.000						
11	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	E	0.077	0.000	0.279	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.004	0.002	0.003	0.323					
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	F	1.000	0.903	0.995	1.000	0.992	0.962	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.002				
13	New moon	N	E	1.000	0.966	1.000	1.000	0.998	0.991	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.032	1.000		
14	New moon	N	F	0.288	1.000	0.080	0.992	1.000	1.000	0.589	0.914	0.898	0.328	0.000	0.714	0.898		
15	New moon	D	E	0.926	1.000	0.614	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.997	1.000	1.000	0.915	0.000	1.000	1.000	0.999	
16	New moon	D	F	1.000	0.892	0.999	1.000	0.989	0.955	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.010	1.000	0.717	0.999	

c. Interaction between moon phase, diel and tide of large-sized zooplankton density.




	moon phase	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}	{8}	{9}	{10}	{11}	{12}	{13}	{14}	{15}	
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	E																
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	F	1.000															
3	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	E	0.015	0.039														
4	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	F	0.882	0.916	0.736													
5	Full moon	N	E	1.000	1.000	0.281	1.000												
6	Full moon	N	F	0.946	0.958	0.788	1.000	1.000											
7	Full moon	D	E	0.984	0.987	0.441	1.000	1.000	1.000										
8	Full moon	D	F	0.952	0.963	0.771	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000									
9	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	E	1.000	1.000	0.005	0.709	1.000	0.835	0.921	0.849								
10	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	F	1.000	1.000	0.162	0.996	1.000	0.999	1.000	0.999	1.000							
11	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	E	0.005	0.015	1.000	0.489	0.146	0.566	0.228	0.546	0.001	0.075						
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	F	1.000	1.000	0.000	0.287	0.998	0.471	0.593	0.493	1.000	1.000	0.000					
13	New moon	N	E	0.279	0.357	1.000	0.997	0.827	0.997	0.965	0.997	0.156	0.687	1.000	0.036				
14	New moon	N	F	0.254	0.358	1.000	0.999	0.861	0.999	0.979	0.999	0.129	0.718	0.997	0.020	1.000			
15	New moon	D	E	0.002	0.008	1.000	0.394	0.109	0.489	0.154	0.468	0.000	0.051	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.997		
16	New moon	D	F	0.005	0.017	1.000	0.521	0.159	0.596	0.251	0.576	0.002	0.083	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.998	1.000	

d. Interaction between diel and depth of large-sized zooplankton density.




Appendix VIII. Results of Tukey HSD test for significant interaction effects of total and size-fractionated biomass in the wet period (only selected interaction effects were shown). Shaded area indicates significance at  $p<0.05$ .

a. Interaction between diel and tide of medium-sized zooplankton biomass.



b. Interaction between moon phase and diel of small-sized zooplankton biomass.




	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}
1	N	E			
2	N	F	0.943		
3	D	E	0.005	0.001	
4	D	F	0.930	0.651	0.026


	moon phase	Diel	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N							
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	0.998						
3	Full moon	N	0.440	0.776					
4	Full moon	D	0.986	1.000	0.926				
5	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	0.555	0.861	1.000	0.961			
6	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	0.002	0.007	0.523	0.029	0.530		
7	New moon	N	0.001	0.003	0.326	0.013	0.338	1.000	
8	New moon	D	0.520	0.844	1.000	0.958	1.000	0.435	0.258

Appendix IX. Results of Tukey HSD test for significant interaction effects of total and size-fractionated density in the wet period (only selected interaction effects were shown). Shaded area indicates significance at  $p<0.05$ .

a. Interaction between diel and tide of medium-sized zooplankton density.




b. Interaction between moon phase, diel and tide of large-sized zooplankton density.



	moon phase	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}	{8}	{9}	{10}	{11}	{12}	{13}	{14}	{15}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	E															
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	F	0.826														
3	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	E	0.179	1.000													
4	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	F	0.854	1.000	0.998												
5	Full moon	N	E	0.983	0.065	0.001	0.033											
6	Full moon	N	F	0.989	0.078	0.001	0.042	1.000										
7	Full moon	D	E	0.799	0.012	0.000	0.004	1.000	1.000									
8	Full moon	D	F	0.800	0.012	0.000	0.004	1.000	1.000	1.000								
9	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	E	1.000	0.995	0.682	0.999	0.658	0.707	0.268	0.269							
10	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	F	1.000	0.970	0.542	0.988	0.969	0.979	0.775	0.776	1.000						
11	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	E	0.998	0.135	0.003	0.087	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.842	0.994					
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	F	1.000	0.765	0.106	0.769	0.967	0.978	0.701	0.702	1.000	1.000	0.996				
13	New moon	N	E	0.013	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.607	0.554	0.925	0.924	0.001	0.022	0.393	0.004			
14	New moon	N	F	0.133	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.970	0.957	1.000	1.000	0.012	0.160	0.887	0.071	1.000		
15	New moon	D	E	0.905	0.025	0.000	0.009	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.407	0.879	1.000	0.844	0.831	0.997	
16	New moon	D	F	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.033	0.002	0.000	

Appendix X. Results of Tukey HSD test for significant interaction effects of copepod density in the dry period (only selected interaction effects were shown). Shaded area indicates significance at  $p<0.05$ .




a. Interaction between moon phase, diel and tide of total copepod density.

	moon phase	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}	{8}	{9}	{10}	{11}	{12}	{13}	{14}	{15}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	E															
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	F	1.000														
3	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	E	0.999	0.934													
4	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	F	0.952	0.655	1.000												
5	Full moon	N	E	0.970	1.000	0.397	0.110											
6	Full moon	N	F	0.897	1.000	0.176	0.023	1.000										
7	Full moon	D	E	0.367	0.976	0.011	0.000	1.000	1.000									
8	Full moon	D	F	0.988	1.000	0.418	0.092	1.000	1.000	0.999								
9	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	E	0.302	0.942	0.010	0.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.996							
10	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	F	0.036	0.435	0.001	0.000	0.928	0.889	0.992	0.671	1.000						
11	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	E	0.982	1.000	0.373	0.076	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.998	0.711						
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	F	1.000	1.000	0.941	0.567	0.998	0.986	0.625	1.000	0.534	0.083	0.999				
13	New moon	N	E	0.482	0.969	0.040	0.004	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.998	1.000	1.000	0.999	0.722			
14	New moon	N	F	1.000	1.000	0.957	0.662	0.999	0.995	0.780	1.000	0.687	0.147	1.000	1.000	0.819		
15	New moon	D	E	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.978	0.875	0.671	0.119	0.917	0.101	0.008	0.892	1.000	0.242	1.000	
16	New moon	D	F	1.000	1.000	0.903	0.520	1.000	0.999	0.881	1.000	0.803	0.217	1.000	1.000	0.896	1.000	1.000

b. Interaction between moon phase, diel and tide of *Parvocalanus crassirostris* density.


	moon phase	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}	{8}	{9}	{10}	{11}	{12}	{13}	{14}	{15}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	E															
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	F	0.982														
3	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	E	0.934	0.141													
4	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	F	0.998	1.000	0.126												
5	Full moon	N	E	0.157	0.992	0.001	0.769											
6	Full moon	N	F	0.000	0.127	0.000	0.002	0.971										
7	Full moon	D	E	0.000	0.308	0.000	0.008	0.999	1.000									
8	Full moon	D	F	0.321	1.000	0.001	0.957	1.000	0.512	0.826								
9	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	E	0.035	0.958	0.000	0.448	1.000	0.963	0.999	1.000							
10	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	F	0.000	0.019	0.000	0.000	0.605	1.000	0.976	0.115	0.536						
11	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	E	1.000	1.000	0.295	1.000	0.749	0.003	0.013	0.946	0.454	0.000					
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	F	0.999	1.000	0.152	1.000	0.728	0.002	0.006	0.940	0.396	0.000	1.000				
13	New moon	N	E	0.015	0.779	0.000	0.220	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.994	1.000	0.962	0.224	0.189			
14	New moon	N	F	0.518	1.000	0.003	0.993	1.000	0.317	0.629	1.000	0.999	0.056	0.989	0.989	0.969		
15	New moon	D	E	0.821	1.000	0.010	1.000	0.990	0.038	0.122	1.000	0.928	0.004	1.000	1.000	0.686	1.000	
16	New moon	D	F	0.129	0.997	0.000	0.782	1.000	0.793	0.972	1.000	1.000	0.270	0.768	0.735	1.000	1.000	0.996

c. Interaction between moon phase and diel of *Bestiolina similis* density.




moon phase	Diel	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}
1 1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N							
2 1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	0.053						
3 Full moon	N	0.327	0.000					
4 Full moon	D	1.000	0.005	0.454				
5 3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	0.017	0.000	0.951	0.025			
6 3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	0.000	0.759	0.000	0.000			
7 New moon	N	0.402	0.000	1.000	0.544	0.918	0.000	
8 New moon	D	1.000	0.024	0.220	1.000	0.006	0.000	0.287

d. Interaction between moon phase and tide of *Oithona simplex* density.




moon phase	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}
1 1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	E							
2 1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	F	0.909						
3 Full moon	E	0.000	0.021					
4 Full moon	F	0.538	0.998	0.134				
5 3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	E	0.000	0.045	1.000	0.232			
6 3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	F	0.074	0.739	0.693	0.978	0.836		
7 New moon	E	0.341	0.982	0.259	1.000	0.402	0.998	
8 New moon	F	0.308	0.974	0.289	1.000	0.439	0.999	1.000

e. Interaction between diel and depth of *Acartia spinicauda* density.



Diel	Depth	{1}	{2}	{3}
1	N	S		
2	N	B	0.604	
3	D	S	0.000	0.000
4	D	B	0.094	0.001




f. Interaction between moon phase, diel and depth of *Acartia spinicauda* density.

	moon phase	Diel	Depth	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}	{8}	{9}	{10}	{11}	{12}	{13}	{14}	{15}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	S															
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	B	1.000														
3	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	S	0.006	0.006													
4	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	B	0.600	0.601	0.893												
5	Full moon	N	S	1.000	1.000	0.020	0.824											
6	Full moon	N	B	1.000	1.000	0.006	0.600	1.000										
7	Full moon	D	S	0.000	0.000	0.929	0.026	0.000	0.000									
8	Full moon	D	B	1.000	1.000	0.005	0.680	1.000	1.000	0.000								
9	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	S	1.000	1.000	0.020	0.827	1.000	1.000	0.000	1.000							
10	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	B	0.937	0.937	0.000	0.003	0.803	0.937	0.000	0.713	0.799						
11	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	S	0.060	0.061	1.000	0.999	0.153	0.061	0.477	0.062	0.156	0.000					
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	B	0.707	0.708	0.814	1.000	0.894	0.708	0.015	0.788	0.897	0.005	0.996				
13	New moon	N	S	1.000	1.000	0.005	0.567	1.000	1.000	0.000	1.000	1.000	0.948	0.053	0.676			
14	New moon	N	B	1.000	1.000	0.003	0.466	1.000	1.000	0.000	1.000	1.000	0.973	0.034	0.576	1.000		
15	New moon	D	S	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.420	0.001	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.002	0.000	0.989	0.312	0.000	0.000	
16	New moon	D	B	1.000	1.000	0.008	0.782	1.000	1.000	0.000	1.000	1.000	0.613	0.097	0.869	1.000	1.000	0.000

g. Interaction between moon phase and diel of *Acartia* copepodid density.

	moon phase	Diel	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N							
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	0.999						
3	Full moon	N	0.418	0.672					
4	Full moon	D	0.962	0.640	0.019				
5	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	0.979	1.000	0.951	0.400			
6	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	0.171	0.016	0.000	0.736	0.008		
7	New moon	N	0.123	0.253	0.999	0.002	0.667	0.000	
8	New moon	D	0.037	0.086	0.989	0.000	0.426	0.000	1.000

Appendix XI. Results of Tukey HSD test for significant interaction effects of other zooplankton density in the dry period (only selected interaction effects were shown). Shaded area indicates significance at  $p < 0.05$ .




a. Interaction between moon phase, diel and tide of cirripede larva density.

1	moon phase	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}	{8}	{9}	{10}	{11}	{12}	{13}	{14}	{15}	
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	E																
3	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	F	0.180															
4	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	E	0.980	0.002														
5	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	F	1.000	0.517	0.537													
6	Full moon	N	E	0.663	1.000	0.027	0.953												
7	Full moon	N	F	0.000	0.984	0.000	0.001	0.690											
8	Full moon	D	E	0.910	0.979	0.047	0.999	1.000	0.038										
9	Full moon	D	F	0.962	0.982	0.112	1.000	1.000	0.063	1.000									
10	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	E	0.765	0.999	0.026	0.987	1.000	0.222	1.000	1.000								
11	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	F	0.479	1.000	0.011	0.862	1.000	0.843	1.000	1.000	1.000							
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	E	0.002	0.000	0.287	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000		
13	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	F	0.920	0.000	1.000	0.277	0.008	0.000	0.009	0.035	0.006	0.003	0.272					
14	New moon	N	E	0.995	0.982	0.342	1.000	1.000	0.118	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.000	0.180				
15	New moon	N	F	0.000	0.710	0.000	0.000	0.211	1.000	0.002	0.004	0.023	0.354	0.000	0.000	0.012			
16	New moon	D	E	1.000	0.568	0.480	1.000	0.967	0.001	1.000	1.000	0.992	0.892	0.000	0.232	1.000	0.000		
	New moon	D	F	1.000	0.069	0.999	0.998	0.401	0.000	0.671	0.812	0.479	0.247	0.009	0.993	0.955	0.000	0.997	

b. Interaction between moon phase, diel and tide of decapod density.

1	moon phase	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}	{8}	{9}	{10}	{11}	{12}	{13}	{14}	{15}
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	E															
3	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	F	1.000														
4	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	E	0.999	1.000													
5	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	F	0.967	0.679	0.227												
6	Full moon	N	E	0.117	0.719	0.777	0.000											
7	Full moon	N	F	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.932	0.161										
8	Full moon	D	E	0.061	0.723	0.765	0.000	1.000	0.093									
9	Full moon	D	F	0.007	0.277	0.278	0.000	1.000	0.012	1.000								
10	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	E	0.995	1.000	1.000	0.161	0.846	0.999	0.848	0.362							
11	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	F	0.721	0.997	0.999	0.019	1.000	0.799	1.000	0.992	1.000						
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	E	0.297	0.948	0.974	0.001	1.000	0.385	1.000	0.998	0.989	1.000					
13	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	F	0.994	1.000	1.000	0.096	0.759	0.998	0.721	0.224	1.000	0.999	0.971				
14	New moon	N	E	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.968	0.327	1.000	0.279	0.059	1.000	0.911	0.634	1.000			
15	New moon	N	F	0.396	0.133	0.014	0.999	0.000	0.306	0.000	0.000	0.009	0.001	0.000	0.004	0.468		
16	New moon	D	E	1.000	1.000	0.992	0.968	0.051	1.000	0.015	0.001	0.979	0.551	0.141	0.968	1.000	0.360	
	New moon	D	F	0.991	1.000	1.000	0.128	0.882	0.997	0.890	0.421	1.000	1.000	0.994	1.000	0.006	0.965	




c. Interaction between moon phase, diel and tide of polychaete density.

	moon phase	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}	{8}	{9}	{10}	{11}	{12}	{13}	{14}	{15}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	E															
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	F	0.994														
3	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	E	0.897	0.166													
4	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	F	1.000	1.000	0.225												
5	Full moon	N	E	0.999	1.000	0.264	1.000											
6	Full moon	N	F	0.000	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.001										
7	Full moon	D	E	0.110	0.993	0.000	0.515	0.973	0.049									
8	Full moon	D	F	0.168	0.995	0.000	0.616	0.979	0.108	1.000								
9	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	E	0.000	0.106	0.000	0.001	0.059	0.999	0.664	0.793							
10	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	F	0.008	0.574	0.000	0.061	0.437	0.973	0.993	0.997	1.000						
11	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	E	1.000	0.992	0.916	1.000	0.998	0.000	0.095	0.148	0.000	0.007					
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	F	0.517	1.000	0.001	0.956	1.000	0.003	1.000	1.000	0.183	0.824	0.477				
13	New moon	N	E	0.422	0.999	0.003	0.871	0.996	0.190	1.000	1.000	0.849	0.997	0.391	1.000			
14	New moon	N	F	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.889	0.000	0.000	0.176	0.086	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	
15	New moon	D	E	0.181	0.998	0.000	0.670	0.991	0.026	1.000	1.000	0.520	0.979	0.158	1.000	1.000	0.000	
16	New moon	D	F	0.024	0.873	0.000	0.171	0.762	0.451	1.000	1.000	0.990	1.000	0.020	0.987	1.000	0.001	1.000

d. Interaction between tide and depth of chaetognath density.

	Tide	Depth	{1}	{2}	{3}
1	E	S			
2	E	B	0.018		
3	F	S	0.094	0.930	
4	F	B	0.371	0.554	0.895

Appendix XII. Results of Tukey HSD test for significant interaction effects of copepod abundance in the wet period (only selected interaction effects were shown). Shaded area indicates significance at  $p < 0.05$ .




a. Interaction between moon phase, diel and tide of *Acartia spinicauda* abundance.

	moon phase	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}	{8}	{9}	{10}	{11}	{12}	{13}	{14}	{15}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	E															
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	F	0.509														
3	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	E	0.028	1.000													
4	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	F	0.813	1.000	0.905												
5	Full moon	N	E	1.000	0.960	0.326	1.000											
6	Full moon	N	F	1.000	0.754	0.090	0.964	1.000										
7	Full moon	D	E	1.000	0.112	0.001	0.233	0.951	0.999									
8	Full moon	D	F	1.000	0.850	0.148	0.989	1.000	1.000	0.994								
9	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	E	1.000	0.923	0.237	0.998	1.000	1.000	0.978	1.000							
10	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	F	1.000	0.937	0.345	0.998	1.000	1.000	0.997	1.000	1.000						
11	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	E	1.000	0.061	0.000	0.126	0.869	0.992	1.000	0.973	0.928	0.987					
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	F	1.000	0.607	0.032	0.891	1.000	1.000	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.992				
13	New moon	N	E	0.657	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.112	0.378	0.986	0.263	0.167	0.424	0.998	0.326			
14	New moon	N	F	0.301	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.024	0.124	0.848	0.074	0.040	0.167	0.940	0.090	1.000		
15	New moon	D	E	1.000	0.094	0.001	0.195	0.931	0.998	1.000	0.990	0.967	0.995	1.000	0.998	0.991	0.882	
16	New moon	D	F	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.004	0.000	0.210	0.534
																	0.002	

b. Interaction between diel and depth of *Acartia spinicauda* abundance.


	Diel	Depth	{1}	{2}	{3}
1	N	S			
2	N	B	0.311		
3	D	S	0.410	0.995	
4	D	B	0.997	0.382	0.495

c. Interaction between moon phase and diel of *P. crassirostris* abundance.




	moon phase	Diel	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N							
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	0.436						
3	Full moon	N	0.964	0.019					
4	Full moon	D	0.000	0.000	0.001				
5	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	0.187	0.000	0.770	0.295			
6	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	0.176	1.000	0.003	0.000	0.000		
7	New moon	N	0.076	0.000	0.544	0.387	1.000	0.000	
8	New moon	D	0.016	0.000	0.218	0.748	0.995	0.000	0.999

d. Interaction between diel and depth of *P. crassirostris* abundance.




	Diel	Depth	{1}	{2}	{3}
1	N	S			
2	N	B	0.430		
3	D	S	0.011	0.436	
4	D	B	0.551	0.994	0.256

e. Interaction between diel and tide of *P. crassirostris* abundance.



	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}
1	N	E			
2	N	F	0.974		
3	D	E	0.037	0.015	
4	D	F	1.000	0.979	0.024

f. Interaction between moon phase, diel and tide of *P. crassirostris* abundance.




continued

continued

	moon phase	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}	{8}	{9}	{10}	{11}	{12}	{13}	{14}	{15}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	E															
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	F	1.000														
3	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	E	0.999	0.764													
4	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	F	1.000	0.843	1.000												
5	Full moon	N	E	0.998	1.000	0.555	0.643											
6	Full moon	N	F	0.996	1.000	0.506	0.592	1.000										
7	Full moon	D	E	0.411	0.998	0.017	0.019	0.994	0.996									
8	Full moon	D	F	0.000	0.006	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.130								
9	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	E	0.239	0.985	0.006	0.006	0.966	0.976	1.000	0.251							
10	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	F	0.968	1.000	0.371	0.447	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.042	1.000						
11	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	E	0.000	0.000	0.022	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000				
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	F	0.994	1.000	0.415	0.487	1.000	1.000	0.990	0.000	0.945	1.000	0.000				
13	New moon	N	E	0.559	1.000	0.034	0.039	0.999	0.999	1.000	0.074	1.000	1.000	0.000	0.998			
14	New moon	N	F	0.241	0.985	0.006	0.006	0.966	0.976	1.000	0.250	1.000	1.000	0.000	0.946	1.000		
15	New moon	D	E	0.001	0.188	0.000	0.000	0.082	0.098	0.868	0.999	0.959	0.532	0.000	0.044	0.755	0.959	
16	New moon	D	F	0.983	1.000	0.362	0.431	1.000	1.000	0.999	0.003	0.994	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.994	0.168	


Appendix XIII. Results of Tukey HSD test for significant interaction effects of other zooplankton abundance in the wet period (only selected interaction effects were shown). Shaded area indicates significance at p<0.05.

a. Interaction between moon phase, diel and tide of cirripede larva abundance.



	moon phase	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}	{8}	{9}	{10}	{11}	{12}	{13}	{14}	{15}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	E															
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	F	1.000														
3	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	E	0.781	0.715													
4	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	F	0.975	0.943	1.000												
5	Full moon	N	E	1.000	1.000	0.160	0.452											
6	Full moon	N	F	0.854	0.990	0.006	0.034	1.000										
7	Full moon	D	E	1.000	1.000	0.994	1.000	0.955	0.349									
8	Full moon	D	F	0.007	0.092	0.000	0.000	0.162	0.818	0.000								
9	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	E	0.984	0.959	1.000	1.000	0.521	0.048	1.000	0.000							
10	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	F	1.000	1.000	0.771	0.963	1.000	0.982	1.000	0.072	0.974						
11	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	E	0.989	0.969	1.000	1.000	0.566	0.058	1.000	0.000	1.000	0.981					
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	F	0.460	0.431	1.000	1.000	0.036	0.000	0.936	0.000	1.000	0.497	1.000				
13	New moon	N	E	1.000	1.000	0.339	0.709	1.000	0.995	0.995	0.063	0.766	1.000	0.803	0.108			
14	New moon	N	F	0.719	0.965	0.002	0.015	0.998	1.000	0.218	0.920	0.023	0.946	0.028	0.000	0.975		
15	New moon	D	E	1.000	1.000	0.200	0.523	1.000	0.999	0.972	0.128	0.591	1.000	0.635	0.050	1.000	0.995	
16	New moon	D	F	0.003	0.052	0.000	0.000	0.092	0.681	0.000	1.000	0.000	0.040	0.000	0.032	0.825	0.070	


Appendix XIV. Results of Tukey HSD test for significant interaction effects of copepod biodiversity index in the dry period (only selected interaction effects were shown). Shaded area indicates significance at  $p < 0.05$ .




a. Interaction between moon phase, diel and tide of  $\Delta^*$ .

	moon phase	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}	{8}	{9}	{10}	{11}	{12}	{13}	{14}	{15}	
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	E																
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	F	0.172															
3	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	E	0.813	0.000														
4	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	F	1.000	0.011	0.994													
5	Full moon	N	E	0.885	1.000	0.021	0.335												
6	Full moon	N	F	0.003	1.000	0.000	0.000	0.880											
7	Full moon	D	E	1.000	0.285	0.401	0.994	0.969	0.005										
8	Full moon	D	F	1.000	0.353	0.556	0.998	0.976	0.011	1.000									
9	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	E	1.000	0.616	0.277	0.965	0.998	0.046	1.000	1.000								
10	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	F	0.411	1.000	0.001	0.049	1.000	0.998	0.594	0.658	0.877							
11	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	E	0.000	0.000	0.305	0.002	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000		
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	F	1.000	0.220	0.499	0.998	0.943	0.003	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.505	0.000					
13	New moon	N	E	1.000	0.692	0.561	0.995	0.998	0.099	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.905	0.000	1.000				
14	New moon	N	F	0.314	1.000	0.000	0.018	1.000	0.984	0.486	0.578	0.846	1.000	0.000	0.389	0.892			
15	New moon	D	E	1.000	0.037	0.934	1.000	0.587	0.000	1.000	1.000	0.998	0.135	0.000	1.000	1.000	0.068		
16	New moon	D	F	0.969	0.001	1.000	1.000	0.071	0.000	0.736	0.844	0.576	0.006	0.110	0.819	0.823	0.002	0.996	

b. Interaction between diel and tide  $\Delta^+$ .



	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}
1	N	E				
2	N	F	0.001			
3	D	E	0.001	0.000		
4	D	F	0.002	0.000	0.997	




c. Interaction between moon phase, diel and tide of J'.

	moon phase	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}	{8}	{9}	{10}	{11}	{12}	{13}	{14}	{15}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	E															
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	F	1.000														
3	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	E	0.802	0.246													
4	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	F	0.220	0.985	0.000												
5	Full moon	N	E	0.475	0.994	0.002	1.000											
6	Full moon	N	F	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.024	0.180										
7	Full moon	D	E	0.000	0.009	0.000	0.171	0.576	1.000									
8	Full moon	D	F	0.004	0.337	0.000	0.978	0.998	0.839	0.998								
9	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	E	0.994	1.000	0.055	0.988	0.996	0.000	0.003	0.276							
10	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	F	0.050	0.698	0.000	1.000	1.000	0.799	0.992	1.000	0.687						
11	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	E	0.534	0.999	0.001	1.000	1.000	0.020	0.138	0.941	1.000	0.997					
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	F	1.000	0.976	0.962	0.019	0.126	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.830	0.004	0.119				
13	New moon	N	E	0.059	0.730	0.000	1.000	1.000	0.768	0.989	1.000	0.723	1.000	0.998	0.005			
14	New moon	N	F	0.007	0.448	0.000	0.994	1.000	0.731	0.990	1.000	0.391	1.000	0.977	0.000	1.000		
15	New moon	D	E	0.707	1.000	0.001	1.000	1.000	0.001	0.016	0.668	1.000	0.952	1.000	0.190	0.964	0.796	
16	New moon	D	F	0.043	0.772	0.000	1.000	1.000	0.367	0.852	1.000	0.754	1.000	0.002	1.000	1.000	0.980	

d. Interaction between moon phase, diel and tide of H'.

	moon phase	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}	{8}	{9}	{10}	{11}	{12}	{13}	{14}	{15}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	E															
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	F	1.000														
3	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	E	0.973	1.000													
4	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	F	0.000	0.031	0.125												
5	Full moon	N	E	0.857	0.998	1.000	0.706											
6	Full moon	N	F	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.869	0.021										
7	Full moon	D	E	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.993	0.072	1.000									
8	Full moon	D	F	0.000	0.004	0.017	1.000	0.260	1.000	1.000								
9	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	E	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.009	0.998	0.000	0.000	0.001							
10	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	F	0.369	0.902	0.998	0.988	1.000	0.178	0.418	0.756	0.878						
11	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	E	0.001	0.048	0.184	1.000	0.752	0.936	0.998	1.000	0.019	0.990					
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	F	0.874	1.000	1.000	0.120	1.000	0.000	0.001	0.015	1.000	0.999	0.190				
13	New moon	N	E	0.712	0.990	1.000	0.859	1.000	0.048	0.145	0.414	0.989	1.000	0.884	1.000			
14	New moon	N	F	0.155	0.773	0.987	0.975	1.000	0.086	0.252	0.636	0.697	1.000	0.982	0.994	1.000		
15	New moon	D	E	0.010	0.287	0.697	1.000	0.992	0.252	0.576	0.917	0.171	1.000	1.000	0.738	0.999	1.000	
16	New moon	D	F	0.000	0.010	0.044	1.000	0.421	0.998	1.000	1.000	0.003	0.891	1.000	0.041	0.601	0.821	0.982




e. Interaction between moon phase and depth of  $\Delta^*$ .

moon phase Depth {1} {2} {3} {4} {5} {6} {7}

1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	S							
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	B	0.995						
3	Full moon	S	0.999	0.886					
4	Full moon	B	0.003	0.000	0.024				
5	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	S	0.996	1.000	0.901	0.000			
6	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	B	0.998	1.000	0.916	0.000	1.000		
7	New moon	S	0.930	1.000	0.634	0.000	1.000	1.000	
8	New moon	B	0.659	0.194	0.941	0.413	0.211	0.232	0.063


Appendix XV. Results of Tukey HSD test for significant interaction effects of copepod biodiversity index in the wet period (only selected interaction effects were shown). Shaded area indicates significance at  $p<0.05$ .



a. Interaction between moon phase, diel and tide of  $J'$ .

moon phase Diel Tide {1} {2} {3} {4} {5} {6} {7} {8} {9} {10} {11} {12} {13} {14} {15}

1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	E														
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	F	1.000													
3	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	E	0.003	0.239												
4	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	F	0.997	1.000	0.089											
5	Full moon	N	E	1.000	1.000	0.005	0.999										
6	Full moon	N	F	1.000	0.998	0.001	0.968	1.000									
7	Full moon	D	E	1.000	1.000	0.021	1.000	1.000	1.000								
8	Full moon	D	F	0.278	0.971	0.990	0.941	0.364	0.126	0.652							
9	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	E	0.998	1.000	0.167	1.000	1.000	0.980	1.000	0.970						
10	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	F	1.000	1.000	0.032	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.627	1.000					
11	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	E	1.000	0.999	0.001	0.986	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.174	0.991	1.000				
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	F	0.958	1.000	0.250	1.000	0.981	0.822	0.999	0.995	1.000	0.997	0.888			
13	New moon	N	E	0.931	1.000	0.514	1.000	0.965	0.776	0.998	1.000	1.000	0.993	0.848	1.000		
14	New moon	N	F	0.950	1.000	0.464	1.000	0.976	0.816	0.999	0.999	1.000	0.995	0.880	1.000	1.000	
15	New moon	D	E	0.531	0.997	0.924	0.995	0.634	0.299	0.877	1.000	0.998	0.842	0.381	1.000	1.000	
16	New moon	D	F	1.000	1.000	0.007	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.432	1.000	1.000	0.991	0.980	0.987	0.705



b. Interaction between moon phase, diel and tide of H'.

	moon phase	Diel	Tide	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}	{5}	{6}	{7}	{8}	{9}	{10}	{11}	{12}	{13}	{14}	{15}
1	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	E															
2	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	N	F	0.991														
3	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	E	0.000	0.002													
4	1 <sup>st</sup> quarter	D	F	0.029	0.952	0.082												
5	Full moon	N	E	0.987	1.000	0.000	0.807											
6	Full moon	N	F	0.999	1.000	0.000	0.601	1.000										
7	Full moon	D	E	0.188	0.998	0.045	1.000	0.983	0.925									
8	Full moon	D	F	0.000	0.064	0.999	0.768	0.011	0.004	0.575								
9	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	E	0.999	1.000	0.000	0.584	1.000	1.000	0.918	0.003							
10	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	N	F	1.000	1.000	0.000	0.673	1.000	1.000	0.931	0.010	1.000						
11	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	E	0.216	0.999	0.037	1.000	0.989	0.943	1.000	0.530	0.937	0.946					
12	3 <sup>rd</sup> quarter	D	F	0.026	0.945	0.090	1.000	0.789	0.578	1.000	0.787	0.561	0.653	1.000				
13	New moon	N	E	0.490	1.000	0.008	1.000	1.000	0.996	1.000	0.243	0.995	0.995	1.000	1.000			
14	New moon	N	F	0.014	0.831	0.391	1.000	0.591	0.384	1.000	0.981	0.370	0.461	1.000	1.000	0.995		
15	New moon	D	E	0.005	0.677	0.590	1.000	0.392	0.221	0.999	0.997	0.211	0.297	0.999	1.000	0.970	1.000	
16	New moon	D	F	0.881	1.000	0.001	0.973	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.049	1.000	1.000	0.968	1.000	0.871	0.713	

# Copepod community structure and abundance in a tropical mangrove estuary, with comparisons to coastal waters

Li-Lee Chew · V. C. Chong

Published online: 4 February 2010  
© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2010

**Abstract** Zooplankton, sampled at five stations from the upper Sangga estuary (7 km upstream) in Matang Mangrove Forest Reserve (MMFR), Malaysia, to 16 km offshore, comprised more than 47% copepod. Copepod abundance was highest at nearshore waters ( $20,311 \text{ ind m}^{-3}$ ), but decreased toward both upstream ( $15,572 \text{ ind m}^{-3}$ ) and offshore waters ( $12,330 \text{ ind m}^{-3}$ ). Copepod abundance was also higher during the wetter NE monsoon period as compared to the drier SW monsoon period, but vice versa for copepod species diversity. Redundancy analysis (RDA) shows that copepod community structure in the upper estuary, nearshore and offshore waters differed, being influenced by spatial and seasonal variations in environmental conditions. The copepods could generally be grouped into estuarine species (dominantly *Acartia spinicauda* Mori, *Acartia* sp1, *Oithona aruensis* Frücht, and *Oithona dissimilis* Lindberg), stenohaline species (*Acartia erythraea* Giesbrecht, *Acrocalanus gibber* Giesbrecht, *Paracalanus aculeatus* Giesbrecht, and *Corycaeus andrewsi* Farran) and euryhaline species (*Parvocalanus crassirostris* Dahl, *Oithona simplex*

Farran, and *Bestiolina similis* (Sewell)). Shifts in copepod community structure due to monsoonal effects on water parameters occurred at the lower estuary. Copepod peak abundance in mangrove waters could be associated with the peak chlorophyll *a* concentration prior to it. Evidence of copepod consumption by many species of young fish and shrimp larvae in the MMFR estuary implies the considerable impact of phytoplankton and microphytobenthos on mangrove trophodynamics.

**Keywords** Community structure · Abundance · Copepods · Mangrove estuary · Coastal waters

## Introduction

The mangrove habitat has been regarded as a zooplankton-rich area (Robertson & Blaber, 1992) serving as feeding and nursery ground for a variety of fishes and invertebrates (Robertson & Duke, 1987; Sasekumar et al., 1994; Laegdsgaard & Johnson, 2001; Chong, 2007). The high productivity of the mangrove ecosystem has always been linked to its largely detritus-based food web with mangrove supplying the main source of carbon to aquatic consumers (Lugo & Snedaker, 1974; Odum & Heald, 1975). However, this role of mangrove has recently been questioned and debated (e.g., Loneragan et al., 1997; Chong et al., 2001; Bouillon et al., 2003; Lee,

---

Guest editors: L. Sanoamuang & J. S. Hwang / Copepoda: Biology and Ecology

---

L.-L. Chew · V. C. Chong (✉)  
Institute of Biological Sciences, Faculty of Science,  
University of Malaya, 50603 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia  
e-mail: chong@um.edu.my

2005) with the advent of stable isotope (DeNiro & Epstein, 1978; Peterson & Fry, 1987) and fatty acid tracers (Meziane & Tsuchiya, 2000, 2002) techniques. Arguments for the importance of phytoplankton as a carbon source have alluded to the role of herbivorous zooplankton as intermediaries that are consumed directly or indirectly by juvenile fish or shrimps in the mangrove (Schwamborn, 1997; Bouillon et al., 2000; Chew et al., 2007).

Several studies have shown the dominance of zooplankton feeders among juvenile fish in the mangrove (Robertson & Duke, 1987; Blaber, 2000; Chew et al., 2007) where copepods are often the main food of small or young fishes (Robertson et al., 1988; Chew et al., 2007) and shrimps (Chong & Sasekumar, 1981). Copepod-dominated zooplankton are more abundant in mangrove estuaries than in adjacent coastal waters (Robertson et al., 1988). In many cases, the higher abundance is correlated with the higher chlorophyll *a* concentration and primary production in the mangrove estuary (Robertson & Blaber, 1992). It has been argued that while phytoplankton production is low in mangrove creeks, it could be substantial in the more open estuaries (Chong, 2007). This view is consistent with studies based on stable isotope analysis indicating that penaeid shrimps sampled upstream to offshore become increasingly more dependent on phytoplankton carbon (Rodelli et al., 1984; Chong et al., 2001).

In the view that copepods are an important food source for young mangrove fishes, it is necessary to study their community structure and abundance in relation with the environment, to evaluate their contribution to mangrove trophodynamics and thus to coastal fisheries (see Blaber, 2007; Chong, 2007). Moreover, there are few studies on zooplankton ecology in the mangrove ecosystem worldwide (e.g., Grindley, 1984; Madhupratap, 1987; Robertson et al., 1988; McKinnon & Klumpp, 1998; Krumme & Liang, 2004). In Malaysian waters, published works on marine zooplankton or copepods are depauperate and sporadic (Sewell, 1933; Chong & Chua, 1975; Chua & Chong, 1975; Johan et al., 2002; Rezai et al., 2004, 2005; Yoshida et al., 2006), with only one involving mangrove (Oka, 2000). The present study therefore intends to contribute further knowledge of the ecological role of copepods in turbid-water mangrove habitats. The objectives are to determine the copepod community structure and abundance of

mangrove and adjacent coastal waters, and to relate copepod community attributes to the environmental factors.

## Materials and methods

### Study site


The general study site was located at the Matang Mangrove Forest Reserve (MMFR) on the west coast of Peninsular Malaysia (4°50'N, 100°35'E; Fig. 1). The MMFR is dominated by silvicultured *Rhizophora apiculata* Blume. The upper, middle, and lower regions of the complex interconnected estuaries of the Sangga rivers that were sampled for zooplankton were located 7, 3.5, and 0 km from the river mouth of Sangga Kecil (Table 1). The adjacent coastal waters were sampled at their nearshore and offshore sites located 8 and 16 km from the mouth of Sangga Kecil, respectively. The water depths are relatively shallow, the deepest water not exceeding 8 m. The hydrology of the Matang estuaries is dominated by semidiurnal tidal circulation. The tidal levels at MHWS, MHWN, MLWN, and MLWS have been reported as 2.1, 1.5, 0.9, and 0.3 m above chart datum (Chong et al., 1999).

### Field collection

Routine monthly sampling of zooplankton was carried out from May 2002 to October 2003 from the upper estuary to offshore waters (Fig. 1). Samplings were conducted during neap tides when the water parameters were less fluctuating (Chong et al., 1999). At each sampling station, physical parameters (salinity, temperature, pH, dissolved oxygen, and turbidity) were measured by a metered multi-parameter sonde (Model YSI 3800 and Hydrolab 4a). All water parameters were taken at 0.5 m depth. Rainfall data during sampling periods were obtained from the Malaysian Meteorological Department based on measurements recorded at Taiping, a town located 10 km to the east of MMFR. Chlorophyll *a* concentrations were measured using the fluorometric method (Parson et al., 1984) from July 2002 to October 2003.

Duplicate zooplankton samples were taken by 45 cm-diameter bongo nets (363 and 180 µm) fitted with calibrated flow-meters. Two horizontal tows (0.5–1 m depth) were made at each station during

**Fig. 1** Location map of sampling stations in the Matang Mangrove Forest Reserve and adjacent coastal waters. *Station 1* upper estuary, *Station 2* mid-estuary, *Station 3* lower estuary, *Station 4* nearshore water, *Station 5* offshore water



**Table 1** Station location, water depth, number of species and composition of copepod population in Matang, Malaysia

Station	Location	Distance from river mouth (km)	Mean water depth (m)	Number of species identified	Percentage of copepod (%)	
					Adult	Juvenile
Upper estuary	4°50'N 100°36'E	-7	3.46	25	57.2	42.8
Mid-estuary	4°49'N 100°35'E	-3.5	7.25	29	49	51
Lower estuary	4°49'N 100°33'E	0	5.75	34	54.6	45.4
Nearshore	4°47'N 100°29'E	8	3.30	42	72.7	27.3
Offshore	4°45'N 100°25'E	16	7.04	39	66.4	33.6

Negative and positive distances indicate upstream and off shore directions, respectively

day, one on the seabound journey and the other on the return. Tow durations ranged between 3 and 10 min depending on net clogging. Collected zooplankton samples were preserved in 10% buffered formaldehyde in seawater and kept in 500 ml plastic bottles before subsequent analysis.

Only the 180 µm-net samples were analyzed and the results reported here. Samples were gently and quickly wet sieved through stacked 1,000, 500, 250, and 125 µm Endecott sieves using running tap water. The various fractions were immediately resuspended

in 80% alcohol in separate 100-ml vials. For enumeration, the samples were split between 1 and 8 times using a Folsom plankton splitter. Adult copepods were identified to species or the lowest possible level. Copepodids were identified to genus level. Juveniles that could not be identified were classified as unidentified copepodids or nauplii. Large copepods (>1 mm) were individually counted on a Petri dish. Small copepods (<1 mm) were subsampled using a 1 ml Stempel pipette before transferring them onto a 1 ml Sedgewick-Rafter cell for total counts.

Copepod abundance was calculated as number of individuals per  $\text{m}^3$  ( $\text{ind m}^{-3}$ ).

## Data analyses

### Univariate analysis

Species diversity was calculated for all adults and *Hemicyclops* copepodids using Shannon–Wiener diversity index ( $H'$ ) (Shannon, 1948) and Pielou's evenness ( $J'$ ) (Pielou, 1969). Two-way factorial ANOVA with unequal, but proportional replication was used to examine effects due to monsoon season (NE monsoon and SW monsoon) and station (upper estuary, mid-estuary, lower estuary, nearshore, and offshore) on the diversity index ( $H'$ ), evenness ( $J'$ ), copepod abundance [total, *Parvocalanus crassirostris* Dahl, *Acartia spinicauda* Mori, *Acartia* copepodid, *Oithona simplex* Farran, *Bestiolina similis* (Sewell), and *Euterpina acutifrons* (Dana)] and the various environmental variables (salinity, temperature, pH, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, and chlorophyll *a* concentration). If the ANOVA test was significant, Tukey HSD test was further conducted for multiple comparisons of the means. Data were first tested for normality and homogeneity of variance. Skewed data were either fourth rooted,  $\log_{10}(x)$  (environmental variable) or  $\log_{10}(x + 1)$  (copepod abundance) transformed. Kruskal–Wallis test was conducted if the variable (e.g., abundance of *Parvocalanus elegans* Andronov, *Metacalanus aurivilli* Cleve, and Harpacitoida sp1) did not fulfill parametric assumptions even after data transformation. Significance level at  $\alpha = 0.05$  was applied to determine significant difference. All statistical analyses were conducted using Statistica Version 8 software on a PC.

### Multivariate analysis

The relationships between copepod abundance and environmental variables were analyzed by RDA using the CANOCO 4 program. RDA is a constrained linear ordination method that assumes the species-environment relations are linear based on direct ordination (Ter Braak, 1994). We used RDA which is a short-gradient analysis because the copepod community variation in the study area was not wide,  $<2\text{SD}$  (Ter Braak & Prentice, 1988). Eighty-eight

samples containing 23 copepod species (those that accounted for at least 0.2% of the total abundance at each sampling station) were related to six environmental parameters (salinity, pH, temperature, dissolved oxygen, turbidity, and chlorophyll *a* concentration). Copepod abundance was  $\log_{10}(x + 1)$  transformed, while turbidity and chlorophyll *a* contents were  $\log_{10}(x)$  transformed due to skewed data.


## Results

### Environmental parameters

Monthly rainfall at Taiping during the sampling period ranged from 67 to 650 mm (Fig. 2). Mean total rainfall (221 mm) and mean number of rainy days (17 days) during the SW monsoon period were relatively lower than that (416 mm, 25 days) during the NE monsoon. The rainfall pattern, however, did not show a well-defined dry and wet seasons (Fig. 2).

Mean station salinity ranged from  $20.4 \pm 3.7$  ppt to  $30.5 \pm 1.2$  ppt from upper estuary to offshore waters (Fig. 3a; Table 2). Salinity was significantly higher ( $P < 0.01$ ) during the SW monsoon season than NE monsoon season, but there were no significant interaction effects between monsoon season and station. Mean pH values of near neutral (7.2) recorded at the upper estuary increased to 8.0 in offshore waters. Mean DO values also increased in the offshore direction (4.8–6.0  $\text{mg l}^{-1}$ ). Mean turbidity values were highest at the river mouth (35.6 NTU) generally decreased in both directions, but the clearest water was observed offshore (15.2 NTU). Mean water temperature of the five stations were generally similar ranging between 30 and 31°C, while mean monthly temperature at station was rather consistent at  $<1.5^\circ\text{C}$  fluctuation during the sampling period (Table 2). Water temperatures of both mangrove and adjacent coastal waters were not significantly different between the two monsoon seasons (Fig. 3b).

Phytoplankton biomass as indicated by mean chlorophyll *a* concentration was higher at the mangrove stations (21.0, 20.2, and 22.8  $\mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ ) than at the nearshore (12.3  $\mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ ) or offshore (9.2  $\mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ ) stations (see Table 2). After pooling the above data, the mean chlorophyll *a* concentration was found to be significantly higher ( $P < 0.01$ ) in the mangrove



**Fig. 2** Monthly total rainfall and number of rainy days recorded from May 2002 to October 2003 at Taiping, located 10 km east of the study site. Shaded region indicates SW monsoon period (April–September); unshaded region indicates NE monsoon period (October–March)

estuary ( $40.1 \pm 21.9 \mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ ) than adjacent coastal waters ( $26.8 \pm 7.7 \mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ ), and in the NE monsoon ( $21.3 \pm 21.7 \mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ ) than in the SW monsoon ( $14.1 \pm 8.5 \mu\text{g l}^{-1}$ ) period. Phytoplankton blooms apparently occurred in the mangrove estuary with a major peak in January 2003 (Fig. 3c), following heavy rainfall in December 2002.

### Spatial variation of copepod abundance and composition


Mean zooplankton density estimated for the mangrove estuary and adjacent coastal waters over the sampling period were  $26,533 \text{ ind m}^{-3}$  ( $\text{SD} \pm 23,089 \text{ ind m}^{-3}$ ) and  $30,945 \text{ ind m}^{-3}$  ( $\text{SD} \pm 56,643 \text{ ind m}^{-3}$ ), respectively. Copepods constituted at least 47% of the zooplankton at all stations. Density of copepods at the five stations ranged from  $3,030$  to  $62,650 \text{ ind m}^{-3}$  (mean =  $17,417 \text{ ind m}^{-3}$ ,  $\text{SD} \pm 13,223 \text{ ind m}^{-3}$ ), with the lowest density recorded at mid-estuary in May 2003 and the highest at upper estuary in December 2002 (Fig. 4a, b). However, mean density of total copepods increased from the upper estuary ( $15,572 \pm 20,171 \text{ ind m}^{-3}$ ) to nearshore waters ( $20,311 \pm 12,892 \text{ ind m}^{-3}$ ), and decreased toward offshore waters ( $12,330 \pm 11,046 \text{ ind m}^{-3}$ ; Fig. 5; Table 2).

A total of 48 species of copepods were recorded. The highest number of identified copepod taxa was

obtained from the nearshore station (42 taxa) followed by offshore (39 taxa) station. In mangrove waters, the lower estuary, mid-estuary, and upper estuary each recorded 34, 29, and 25 taxa, respectively (Table 1). Shannon–Wiener diversity index ( $H'$ ) and Pielou's evenness ( $J'$ ) were significantly lowest ( $P < 0.01$ ) at the upper estuary as compared to the other four stations (Table 2). Nearshore and offshore copepods were mainly adults, constituting 73 and 66% of the total copepod abundance, respectively. Juvenile copepods (copepodid and nauplius stages) of mainly *Acartia* copepodids constituted 43–51% of the total copepod abundance in mangrove waters (Table 1).

Dominant species that comprised at least 5% of the total abundance or present in at least one station were *P. crassirostris*, *A. spinicauda*, *O. simplex*, *B. similis*, and *E. acutifrons*. The small calanoid copepod, *P. crassirostris* comprised 20–32% of the copepod population and was present in all samples collected during the study (100% occurrence; Table 3). *P. crassirostris* was also the most abundant species at all sampling stations except in mid-estuary and nearshore waters which were dominated by *Acartia* copepodids and *O. simplex*, respectively (Fig. 5). Copepodids of *Parvocalanus* constituted 6–12% of the total abundance and were absent in only a few samples from the upper estuary. *P. crassirostris* abundance showed that no significant difference

**Fig. 3** Monthly mean and standard deviation (vertical bar) of (a) salinity, (b) temperature and (c) chlorophyll *a* concentrations recorded at five sampling stations. Filled diamond upper estuary; filled square mid-estuary; filled triangle lower estuary; filled circle nearshore; times offshore



among sampling stations suggesting that the euryhaline species could tolerate a wider range of salinity (Fig. 5). *Acartia* copepodid abundance was always higher than their adults at all stations (Table 3). Juvenile stages of *Acartia* were as dominant as *P. crassirostris*, but they were more confined inside mangrove waters ( $P < 0.01$ ; Table 2). Mean total abundance of *Acartia* copepodids ( $6,129 \pm 5,866 \text{ ind m}^{-3}$ ) exceeded *P. crassirostris* ( $4,211 \pm 4,196 \text{ ind m}^{-3}$ ) at mid-estuary (Table 3). A similar

distribution pattern was observed for *A. spinicauda* with higher abundance in mangrove than coastal waters (Fig. 5). In contrast, *O. simplex* showed preference for higher salinity water although it was sampled at all stations. The abundance of *O. simplex* was significantly higher at the river mouth to coastal stations ( $P < 0.01$ ) than at the upper and mid-estuary (Table 2). It was more abundant than even *P. crassirostris* in nearshore waters (Fig. 5; Table 3). A similar trend of distribution as *O. simplex* was also

**Table 2** Summary results of two-way ANOVA and post-hoc Tukey HSD tests on various environmental variables, biological indices and selected copepod abundance, with respect to station, season and their interaction

Variable	n	Source of variation									
		Station			Season				Station x Season P-level		
		Upper estuary 36 (32)	Mid-estuary 36 (32)	Lower estuary 36 (32)	Nearshore 36 (32)	Offshore 32 (28)	P-level	SW 106 (86)	NE 70	P-level	
Salinity (%)	Mean	20.4 <sup>a</sup>	23.2 <sup>b</sup>	25.2 <sup>c</sup>	29.1 <sup>d</sup>	30.5 <sup>d</sup>	<0.001**	26.6	24.1	<0.001**	0.198
pH	±SD	3.7	3.3	2.7	1.8	1.2	4.1	4.9			
	Mean	7.2 <sup>a</sup>	7.5 <sup>b</sup>	7.6 <sup>c</sup>	7.9 <sup>d</sup>	8.0 <sup>d</sup>	<0.001**	7.7	7.6	<0.001**	0.014*
±SD	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.4			
Dissolved oxygen (mg l <sup>-1</sup> )	Mean	4.8 <sup>a</sup>	5.2 <sup>a,b</sup>	5.6 <sup>b,c</sup>	6.0 <sup>c</sup>	6.0 <sup>c</sup>	<0.001**	5.8	5.1	<0.001**	0.011*
±SD	1.5	1.2	1.1	0.8	0.6	0.9	0.9	1.4			
Turbidity (NTU)	Mean	29.9 <sup>a</sup>	30.9 <sup>a</sup>	35.6 <sup>a</sup>	28.5 <sup>a</sup>	15.2 <sup>b</sup>	0.007**	20.0	40.7	<0.001**	0.508
±SD	38.5	43.9	71.2	22.5	14.3	15.9	64.2				
Temperature (°C)	Mean	30.8 <sup>a</sup>	30.9 <sup>a</sup>	30.8 <sup>a</sup>	30.3 <sup>a</sup>	30.5 <sup>a</sup>	0.025*	30.6	30.7	0.736	0.335
±SD	1.0	0.8	1.1	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.9	0.9			
Chlorophyll <i>a</i> (µg l <sup>-1</sup> )	Mean	21.0 <sup>a</sup>	20.2 <sup>a,b</sup>	22.8 <sup>a</sup>	12.3 <sup>b,c</sup>	9.2 <sup>c</sup>	<0.001**	14.1	21.3	0.009**	0.093
±SD	15.5	19.6	21.8	7.2	4.6	8.5	8.5	21.7			
Δ Diversity index (H')	Mean	1.17 <sup>a</sup>	1.39 <sup>b</sup>	1.55 <sup>b</sup>	1.53 <sup>b</sup>	1.49 <sup>b</sup>	<0.001**	1.52	1.28	<0.001**	0.088
±SD	0.35	0.34	0.28	0.36	0.29	0.31	0.31	0.36			
Evenness (J')	Mean	0.54 <sup>a</sup>	0.60 <sup>a,b</sup>	0.63 <sup>b</sup>	0.57 <sup>a,b</sup>	0.56 <sup>a</sup>	0.001**	0.62	0.53	<0.001**	0.120
±SD	0.15	0.12	0.10	0.11	0.10	0.11	0.11	0.12			
Copepod abundance											
Total copepods	Mean	15,572 <sup>a</sup>	18,796 <sup>a,b</sup>	19,759 <sup>a,b</sup>	20,311 <sup>b</sup>	12,330 <sup>a</sup>	0.003**	13,115	23,933	<0.001**	0.960
±SD	20,171	15,040	16,195	12,892	11,046	11,381	18,675				
<i>Parvocalanus crassirostris</i>	Mean	4,871	4,211	4,516	4,043	3,174	0.327	2,796	6,290	<0.001**	0.137
±SD	9,458	4,196	4,590	3,791	3,835	3,105	7,586				
<i>Acartia spinicauda</i>	Mean	1,103 <sup>a</sup>	1,374 <sup>a</sup>	1,157 <sup>a</sup>	300 <sup>a,b</sup>	112 <sup>b</sup>	<0.001**	505	1,310	0.001**	0.373
±SD	3,340	2,872	1,972	363	137	1,423	3,008				
<i>Acartia copepodid</i>	Mean	4,501 <sup>a</sup>	6,129 <sup>a</sup>	4,251 <sup>a</sup>	605 <sup>b</sup>	313 <sup>b</sup>	<0.001**	2,488	4,340	<0.001**	0.884
±SD	6,393	5,866	4,329	833	485	4,064	5,851				
<i>Oithona simplex</i>	Mean	843 <sup>a</sup>	1,251 <sup>a,b</sup>	2,462 <sup>c</sup>	5,720 <sup>d</sup>	1,701 <sup>b,c</sup>	<0.001**	1,575	3,678	<0.001**	0.420
±SD	1,973	2,268	3,431	6,993	2,707	2,473	5,880				

**Table 2** continued

Variable	n	Source of variation				Season	Station x Season P-level		
		Station		P-level					
		Upper estuary 36 (32)	Mid-estuary 36 (32)	Nearshore 36 (32)	Offshore 32 (28)				
<i>Bestiolina similis</i>	Mean	248 <sup>a</sup>	275 <sup>a,b</sup>	437 <sup>b,c</sup>	1,102 <sup>c</sup>	607 <sup>c</sup>	<0.001**	492	
	±SD	472	377	484	1,536	665		592	
<i>Euterpinia acutifrons</i>	Mean	12 <sup>a</sup>	63 <sup>b</sup>	221 <sup>b</sup>	1,865 <sup>c</sup>	1,037 <sup>c</sup>	<0.001**	1,165	
	±SD	37	140	333	3,362	1,255		988	
						677		0.321	
								2,631	

n = sample size for all parameters except chlorophyll *a* in parentheses; Δ diversity index (*H'*) computed on log-base e; homogenous groups indicated by superscripts a, b, c and d

\* Significance at  $P < 0.05$ , \*\* significance at  $P < 0.01$


observed for *B. similis* and its juveniles (Fig. 5). *E. acutifrons* preferred nearshore (9%) and offshore (8%) waters than mangrove waters (<1%; Fig. 5).

*Tortanus barbatus* (Brady) and *Tortanus forcipatus* (Giesbrecht) each constituted less than 1% of the overall copepod abundance, but copepodids of *Tortanus* comprised 5% of the total copepod abundance in nearshore waters (Fig. 5). *Tortanus* copepodids were frequently sampled in nearshore and offshore stations with >90% of occurrence (Table 3). Other copepods, such as *Oithona dissimilis* Lindberg, *Oithona aruenensis* Früchtl, *Acartia* sp1, copepodids of *Pseudodiaptomus*, *Oithona attenuata* Farran, and copepodids of Pontellidae, were also frequently collected. The former first four taxa were more abundant in estuarine waters whereas the Pontellidae mainly occurred in offshore waters (Table 3).

### Temporal variation of copepod abundance and composition

The abundance of copepods was significantly higher ( $P < 0.01$ ) during the NE monsoon period which experienced a higher rainfall (Table 2). Seasonal variation in copepod abundance was markedly observed at the upper estuary with two large peaks in December 2002 and October 2003 (Fig. 4a) that coincided with the period of heaviest rainfall. Upper estuary copepods sampled monthly rarely exceeded 20,000 ind  $m^{-3}$ , but densities in these months were much higher at ca. 60,000 ind  $m^{-3}$ . Peak abundance was also exhibited at mid-estuary to offshore stations during NE monsoon particularly in November 2002, February 2003, and October 2003 (Fig. 4b–e) concurrently the months of heavy rainfall (see Fig. 2). Copepod abundance was scarce in June and August 2002 and in May and June 2003 (Fig. 4). These were the months of lower rainfall (see Fig. 2). Although copepod abundance was relatively lower during SW monsoon, new copepod recruits first appeared in September 2002 and August 2003 (Fig. 4b–e), and their numbers soon increased thereafter with the arrival of heavier rain.

Variations in copepod abundance were generally influenced by the seasonal change of dominant species. The abundance of copepods in mangrove waters was strongly dependent on the dominant genera, *Acartia* and *Parvocalanus*. *P. crassirostris*




**Fig. 4** Monthly composition of major copepod taxa by station, from May 2002 to October, 2003. (a) upper estuary; (b) mid-estuary; (c) lower estuary; (d) nearshore water; (e) offshore

water. Only the five most abundant taxa of each station are shown. “Others” grouped the remainder species. Error bar indicates SD of total abundance

was significantly more abundant ( $P < 0.01$ ) during the NE monsoon than SW monsoon (Table 2). Similarly, the abundance of *A. spinicauda* and copepodids varied seasonally and were significantly more abundant ( $P < 0.01$ ) during the NE monsoon period (Fig. 4; Table 2). The coastal species, *O. simplex*, was also significantly more abundant ( $P < 0.01$ ) during the NE monsoon period particularly in November 2002 and February 2003 (Fig. 4;

Table 2). The abundance of *E. acutifrons* and *B. similis* was not seasonally affected. The higher densities of the dominant species had resulted in a significantly lower ( $P < 0.01$ ) diversity index and evenness during the NE monsoon than in the SW monsoon (see Fig. 6; Table 2). No significant interaction effects ( $P > 0.05$ ) between station and monsoon period were detected for copepod abundances and diversity indexes (Table 2).



**Fig. 5** Mean abundance of copepod species (those comprising >5% of total abundance) by sampling stations

### Species–environment relationships

The relationship between copepod species and environmental parameters is shown in the RDA ordination diagrams in Fig. 6. The first two axes explained 88.6% of the variance in the correlation of species–environmental parameters. Stations in mangrove water (1, 2, and 3) were generally positively correlated with higher turbidity values and chlorophyll *a* concentrations (positive direction on axis 1), but negatively correlated with lower salinity and pH values (negative direction on axis). Coastal stations (4 and 5), however, showed the exact opposite (Fig. 6a).

Although most of the copepod species samples were present at all stations, they can be generally classified into stenohaline, estuarine, and euryhaline species based on their relative abundance along the salinity gradient over spatial and temporal scales. The abundance of four estuarine species, *A. spinicauda*, *Acartia* sp1, *O. dissimilis*, and *O. aruenensis* were negatively correlated with salinity and pH indicating that these species preferred lower salinity although they were also found in nearshore and offshore waters (see Fig. 6b; Table 3). Nevertheless, 12 out of 23 species were closely associated with higher salinity and pH suggesting that these copepods were stenohaline species. The four major stenohaline species that were only present at the lower estuary and further

offshore stations were *Paracalanus aculeatus* Giesbrecht, *Acartia erythraea* Giesbrecht, *Corycaeus andrewsi* Farran, and *Acrocalanus gibber* Giesbrecht (see Table 3). Other stenohaline species that were sporadically found inside the estuary included the calanoids, *Centropages dorsispinatus* Thompson & Scott, *T. barbatus*, *T. forcipatus*, the cyclopoids, *Oithona attenuata* Farran, *Oithona brevicornis* Giesbrecht, *Hemicyclops* sp1, *Pseudomacrochiron* sp1, and the harpacticoids, *E. acutifrons*, and *Microsetella norvegica* Dana.

The euryhaline species were oriented closer to axis 2 in the positive direction. Within the group, the species that correlated with higher salinity were *O. simplex*, *B. similis*, and *M. aurivilli*. The arrow orientations of *P. crassirostris*, *P. elegans*, and Harpacticoida sp1 were almost perpendicular to the salinity gradient implying that salinity did not have significant effect on their abundance. However, these species seemed to be more associated with higher turbidity (Fig. 6b). Parametric and non-parametric tests further revealed that no significant difference in abundance among stations for euryhaline species except *O. simplex* and *B. similis* which were more abundant in the coastal stations (Table 3).

Copepod community of the upper estuary (1) appeared quite distinct from those of the nearshore and offshore waters (4 and 5) (see Fig. 6b). The monsoon had an effect on the copepod community of

**Table 3** Mean abundance (ind m<sup>-3</sup>), relative abundance (% Rel), and occurrence (% Occ) of copepods recorded from the upper estuary to offshore waters

Taxon	Station		Upper estuary						Mid-estuary						Lower estuary						Nearshore			Offshore		
			Mean % Rel % Occ			Mean % Rel % Occ			Mean % Rel % Occ			Mean % Rel % Occ			Mean % Rel % Occ			Mean % Rel % Occ			Mean % Rel % Occ					
			Mean	% Rel	% Occ	Mean	% Rel	% Occ	Mean	% Rel	% Occ	Mean	% Rel	% Occ	Mean	% Rel	% Occ	Mean	% Rel	% Occ	Mean	% Rel	% Occ			
<b>Adult</b>																										
<i>Parvocalanus crassirostris</i> Dahl	4,871	31.8	100	4,211	22.4	100	4,516	22.9	100	4,043	19.9	100	3,174	25.7	100	3,174	25.7	100	3,174	25.7	100	3,174	25.7			
<i>Acartia spinicauda</i> Mori	1,103	7.2	100	1,374	7.3	94	1,157	5.9	97	300	1.5	100	112	0.9	88	112	0.9	88	112	0.9	88	112	0.9			
<i>Oithona simplex</i> Farran	843	5.5	92	1,251	6.7	92	2,462	12.5	100	5,720	28.2	100	1,701	13.8	100	1,701	13.8	100	1,701	13.8	100	1,701	13.8			
<i>Parvocalanus elegans</i> Andronov	618	4.0	33	229	1.2	14	151	0.8	31	73	0.4	36	106	0.9	13	106	0.9	13	106	0.9	13	106	0.9			
<i>Oithona dissimilis</i> Lindberg	569	3.7	100	568	3.0	100	484	2.4	86	60	0.3	19	+	+	3	+	+	3	+	+	3	+	+			
<i>Oithona arvensis</i> Früchtl	287	1.9	97	391	2.1	94	664	3.4	100	214	1.1	69	93	0.8	22	93	0.8	22	93	0.8	22	93	0.8			
<i>Bestiolina similis</i> (Sewell)	248	1.6	72	275	1.5	75	437	2.2	92	1,102	5.4	92	607	4.9	100	607	4.9	100	607	4.9	100	607	4.9			
<i>Acartia</i> sp1	175	1.1	89	774	4.1	97	394	2.0	97	+	+	8	+	+	6	+	+	6	+	+	6	+	+			
<i>Euterpina acutifrons</i> (Dana)	+	+	31	63	0.3	69	221	1.1	69	1,865	9.2	100	1,037	8.4	97	1,037	8.4	97	1,037	8.4	97	1,037	8.4			
<i>Oithona attenuata</i> Farran	+	+	11	+	+	14	56	0.3	25	300	1.5	78	392	3.2	91	392	3.2	91	392	3.2	91	392	3.2			
<i>Centropages dorsispinatus</i> Thompson & Scott	+	+	11	+	+	25	+	+	25	326	1.6	69	123	1.0	69	123	1.0	69	123	1.0	69	123	1.0			
<i>Paracalanus aculeatus</i> Giesbrecht							+	+	6	55	0.3	42	246	2.0	53	246	2.0	53	246	2.0	53	246	2.0			
<i>Oithona brevicornis</i> Giesbrecht	+	+	6	+	+	+	+	+	6	+	+	11	228	1.9	47	228	1.9	47	228	1.9	47	228	1.9			
<i>Microsetella norvegica</i> Dana	+	+	3	+	+	17	+	+	25	132	0.7	53	20	0.2	41	20	0.2	41	20	0.2	41	20	0.2			
<i>Corycaeus andrewsi</i> Farran							+	+	19	118	0.6	56	121	1.0	75	121	1.0	75	121	1.0	75	121	1.0			
<i>Pseudomacrochiron</i> sp1	+	+	6	+	+	17	45	0.2	36	52	0.3	33	+	+	13	+	+	13	+	+	13	+	+			
<i>Tortanus barbatus</i> (Brady)	+	+	31	+	+	56	+	+	61	84	0.4	86	30	0.2	66	30	0.2	66	30	0.2	66	30	0.2			
<i>Metacalanus aurivilli</i> Cleve	+	+	3	+	+	6	+	+	6	59	0.3	17	+	+	9	+	+	9	+	+	9	+	+			
<i>Tortanus forcipatus</i> (Giesbrecht)	+	+	6	+	+	25	+	+	39	57	0.3	69	22	0.2	59	22	0.2	59	22	0.2	59	22	0.2			
Harpacticoida sp1	+	+	14	+	+	22	84	0.4	33	+	+	22	+	+	6	+	+	6	+	+	6	+	+			
<i>Hemicyclops</i> sp1	+	+	6	+	+	8	+	+	11	35	0.2	36	21	0.2	19	21	0.2	19	21	0.2	19	21	0.2			
<i>Acartia erythraea</i> Giesbrecht							+	+	11	39	0.2	36	49	0.4	69	49	0.4	69	49	0.4	69	49	0.4			
<i>Acrocalanus gibber</i> Giesbrecht							+	+	6	31	0.2	28	+	+	41	+	+	41	+	+	41	+	+			
Other adults	(6)	+	3-25	+ (11)	+	3-28	+ (11)	+	3-39	54 (19)	0.3	3-56	70 (16)	0.6	3-66	70 (16)	0.6	3-66	70 (16)	0.6	3-66	70 (16)	0.6			
Nauplius and copepodid																										
<i>Acartia</i> spp.	4,501	29.4	100	6,129	32.6	100	4,251	21.5	100	605	3.0	97	313	2.5	97	313	2.5	97	313	2.5	97	313	2.5			
<i>Parvocalanus</i> spp.	881	5.8	97	1,828	9.7	100	2,272	11.5	100	1,629	8.0	100	1,129	9.2	100	1,129	9.2	100	1,129	9.2	100	1,129	9.2			
Unidentified nauplii	710	4.6	100	566	3.0	100	720	3.6	100	612	3.0	100	448	3.6	100	448	3.6	100	448	3.6	100	448	3.6			
<i>Bestiolina</i> sp.	172	1.1	69	497	2.6	83	778	3.9	92	922	4.5	92	573	4.6	91	573	4.6	91	573	4.6	91	573	4.6			

**Table 3** continued

Taxon	Station		Upper estuary				Mid-estuary				Lower estuary				Nearshore				Offshore			
			Mean	% Rel	% Occ		Mean	% Rel	% Occ		Mean	% Rel	% Occ		Mean	% Rel	% Occ		Mean	% Rel	% Occ	
<i>Pseudodiaptomus</i> spp.	172	1.1	86	278	1.5	97	279	1.4	86	110	0.5	69	86	0.7	72							
<i>Oithona</i> spp.	95	0.6	69	163	0.9	72	323	1.6	69	131	0.6	81	75	0.6	72							
<i>Tortanus</i> spp.	26	0.2	42	92	0.5	72	225	1.1	89	1,056	5.2	97	543	4.4	94							
Pontellidae spp.	+	+	19	29	0.2	47	59	0.3	53	256	1.3	89	495	4.0	100							
Other juveniles	+ (2)	+	3–6	+ (3)	+	3–6	55 (6)	0.3	6–19	227 (7)	1.1	3–36	478 (10)	3.9	3–72							

“+” indicates present but constituted <0.2% of relative abundance; number of taxa of grouped copepods in parentheses


the lower estuary (3) where a seasonal shift in community structure was evident. For instance, stenohaline and euryhaline species dominated in the lower estuary during the dry period from June to September (dotted line arrows joining station 3), but the community soon changed to one dominated by estuarine species with the onset of the wet period from October to January (dotted line arrows joining station 3 in boldface). Neritic copepods invaded the lower estuary and reached the upper estuary in the driest months of June to August (indicated by polygon enclosing stations 1 and 2) when high salinity water penetrated upstream.

## Discussion

### Copepod composition and community structure

Acartiidae, Paracalanidae, and Oithonidae were the predominant copepod taxa in the MMFR and adjacent waters, comprising 70–98% of total copepod population. The estuarine species, *A. spinicauda* and *Acartia* sp1, were mostly sampled at their copepodid stages. Low abundance of adults as compared to copepodids implied the recruitment of new generation and juvenile mortality. McKinnon & Klumpp (1998) found that the larger species, such as *Acartia*, were rare in a mangrove estuary in Queensland, Australia. The distribution of *Acartia* species is affected by salinity and temperature (Ueda, 1987; Cervetto et al., 1999; Gaudy et al., 2000). Yoshida et al. (2006) suggested that *Acartia pacifica* Steuer prefers water of higher salinity and lower temperature as opposed to *A. spinicauda*. In our study, *A. erythraea*, which was found in more saline and relatively lower temperature water, was not observed in the Matang estuary over the sampling period. On the other hand, *Acartia* sp.1 was more confined to mangrove waters, while *A. spinicauda* was more dispersed including to adjacent coastal waters. *A. spinicauda*, which is known to have a broad salinity tolerance, was the most abundant Acartiidae sampled from the MMFR and adjacent waters.

*Parvocalanus crassirostris* is widely distributed from the upper mangrove estuary to offshore waters. This species has been identified as a common species of Australian mangroves as well as the Great Barrier Reef lagoons (McKinnon & Klumpp, 1998). The



**Fig. 6** RDA ordination diagrams showing (a) biplots of environmental parameters (large arrow heads) and station samples (1–5), and (b) biplots of environmental parameters (large arrow heads) and copepod taxa (small arrow heads). Dotted line arrows in (a) show seasonal shift of environmental parameters and copepod community structure from June to August 2002 (dry period) and from October to January 2003 (wet period) in the lower estuary. Polygon enclosing upper stations (1 and 2) indicates dry period from June to August 2002/2003. Numbers indicate sampled stations at: 1 upper estuary, 2 mid-estuary, 3 lower estuary, 4 nearshore water, and 5 offshore water. **Bold face numbers** indicate sampling during NE monsoon, while **regular numbers** indicate sampling during

SW monsoon. Abbreviations used: Sal, salinity; DO, dissolved oxygen; Temp, temperature; Tur, turbidity; Chl a, chlorophyll a concentrations; Aery, *Acartia erythraea*; Aspi, *A. spinicauda*; Aspl, *Acartia* sp1; Pcrass, *Parvocalanus crassirostris*; Peleg, *P. elegans*; Agib, *Acrocalanus gibber*; Bsim, *Bestiolina similis*; Pacu, *Paracalanus aculeatus*; Mauri, *Metacalanus aurivilli*; Tbar, *Tortanus barbatus*; Tfor, *T. forcipatus*; Codor, *Centropages dorsispinatus*; Oarue, *Oithona aruensis*; Oatten, *O. attenuata*; Obre, *O. brevicornis*; Odiss, *O. dissimilis*; Osim, *O. simplex*; Coandre, *Corycaeus andrewsi*; Hemi, *Hemicyclops* sp1; Pdmacro, *Pseudomacrochiron* sp1; Eacu, *Euterpinia acutifrons*; Hsp1, *Harpacticoida* sp1; Mnrv, *Microsetella norvegica*

species is considered eurythermal and euryhaline species, since they are found to inhabit water of 3.4–55 ppt and 1–30°C (Lawson & Grice, 1973). Due to its ability to adapt to a wide range of salinity and temperature, *P. crassirostris* has successfully dominated the copepod community of MMFR and adjacent waters. The closely similar *P. elegans* is also, but sporadically present, while *B. similis* prefers more saline coastal waters. The three Paracalanidae species have been reported to be among the dominant species of copepod found in the Straits of Malacca (Rezai et al., 2005).

The cyclopoid, *Oithona* is commonly found in the Malaysian waters (Chong & Chua, 1975). *O. simplex*, *O. attenuata*, *Oithona plumifera* Baird, *Oithona rigida* Giesbrecht, and *Oithona nana* Giesbrecht are commonly encountered (Chua & Chong, 1975; Rezai et al., 2004). However, only the former two were

commonly collected in MMFR and its adjacent waters. As also reported by Oka (2000), the estuarine oithonids, *O. dissimilis*, and *O. aruensis* are also common in MMFR waterways, but have not been reported in the Straits of Malacca by Rezai et al. (2004) and Chua & Chong (1975). In the present study, *O. brevicornis* and *O. rigida* were both restricted to more saline waters. However, the latter was rare although this species was found to be abundant in the Straits of Malacca (Chua & Chong, 1975; Rezai et al., 2004).

Our samples were generally composed of planktonic copepods. The so-called “*Saphirella*-like” copepodids of *Hemicyclops* were occasionally collected in both mangrove and adjacent coastal waters, but were more abundant in the latter. The genus *Hemicyclops* with its first-stage copepodid occurring as plankton is closely associated with various benthic

borrowers that are normally found in the estuary, coastal inlet, and mudflat (Boxshall & Halsey, 2004; Itoh, 2006; Itoh & Nishida, 2007). Thus, as in our study, *Hemicyclops* copepodids were more abundant in nearshore waters close to coastal mudflats. Nevertheless, the ecology of this genus in the mudflat region of MMFR has not been documented before. Similarly, *Pseudomacrochiron* sp1 which is commonly associated with scyphozoans and hydrozoans (Boxshall & Halsey, 2004) was occasionally present in our samples.

#### Copepod abundance

Copepods dominate both mangrove and coastal waters in Matang, and they are numerically more abundant than in offshore waters. Previous studies in the Straits of Malacca show that copepod abundance was higher in coastal waters (Chong & Chua, 1975; Chua & Chong, 1975; Rezai et al., 2004) than in offshore waters. Similarly, copepod-dominated zooplanktons in mangrove estuaries of India and Australia have also been reported to be more abundant than in offshore waters (Madhupratap, 1987; Robertson et al., 1988; McKinnon & Klumpp, 1998). The abundance of copepod can be as high as 60,000 ind  $m^{-3}$  in Matang during the NE monsoon season. In comparison, the deeper waters of the Straits of Malacca yielded a mean total copepod abundance of only 3,000 ind  $m^{-3}$  (Rezai et al., 2004). In Cochin backwaters, India, a density of ca. 55,000 ind  $m^{-3}$  of copepods was recorded by Tranter & Abraham (1971), while an even higher abundance of 286,000 ind  $m^{-3}$  had been recorded from the Vellar estuary, India, by Subbaraju & Krishnamurthy (1972). However, the documented copepod abundance may not be comparable among studies since plankton nets of different mesh sizes were used (Robertson et al., 1988; McKinnon & Klumpp, 1998). We used a 180  $\mu m$  mesh size net, while others used nets of smaller mesh sizes.

The abundance of copepod nauplii, copepodids, and highly nocturnal copepods are likely to be underestimated in the present study, since a 180  $\mu m$  mesh size net was used to sample copepods at the surface during day time. We rarely observed *Pseudodiaptomus* spp. in our daytime samples although they were sampled at the surface during night (not

reported in this study). However, fish diet analysis showed that large numbers of *Pseudodiaptomus annandalei* Sewell were eaten by small or juvenile demersal fish during day time (Chew et al., 2007). This suggests that such markedly nocturnal behavior may be a response to predation.

The abundance of copepods is closely associated with the physical–chemical parameters of their habitats. Copepod abundance has been reported to vary seasonally in tropical mangrove and coastal waters with higher abundance in the wet season or after the monsoonal flush (Madhupratap, 1987; Robertson et al., 1988; Osore, 1992; McKinnon & Klumpp, 1998; Krumme & Liang, 2004). Similarly in MMFR waterways and shallow coastal waters, copepod abundance is affected by a rainfall pattern that is monsoon-dictated. The abundance of copepod appears to peak after heavy rainfall. However, in the deeper waters of the Straits of Malacca, there appears to be no significant difference in copepod abundance between the monsoon seasons (Rezai et al., 2004). This is attributable to the stable physical and chemical conditions of the deep water as compared to the variable estuarine and coastal conditions.

The abundance of zooplankton in the mangrove and nearshore waters may be related to primary production (see Robertson & Blaber, 1992) driven by phytoplankton, benthic microalgae, and mangrove. Phytoplankton biomass has been reported to be closely related to water nutrient level in a tropical mangrove swamp in Australia during the wet season (Trott & Alongi, 1999). Chlorophyll *a* concentrations in the Klang mangrove, Malaysia, increase following tidal or freshwater flushing (Thong et al., 1993). However, phytoplankton blooms may not only immediately respond to nutrient input but also only after a lag period during which the nutrient concentration gradually builds up. This is the case in the MMFR where heavy rainfall and subsequent salinity depression were observed in the month prior to the peak concentration of chlorophyll *a* in January 2003 (see Fig. 3). The peak recruitment (November 2002) of copepods in MMFR waterways seemed to occur prior to the phytoplankton bloom in January 2003, and can be explained as a reproductive strategy adopted by copepods in order that newly recruited young are timed to exploit the larger biomass of phytoplankton (see Fig. 3).

Notwithstanding the importance of phytoplankton carbon to zooplankton, the contribution of microphytobenthos may be significant in the lower estuary and shallow nearshore waters as shown by stable isotope studies (Newell et al., 1995; Chong et al., 2001; Chew et al., 2007).

#### Copepod as potential food in mangrove and nearshore waters

The MMFR waterways and adjacent mudflat are populated by juveniles of commercially important fish and shrimps (Chong, 2005). Our results showed that copepods are numerically abundant in MMFR waterways and nearshore waters. Considering that copepods are the major food items in pelagic food webs, their abundance in the estuary will have considerable impact on the trophodynamics of the mangrove ecosystem. Chew et al. (2007) reported that more than 50% of the examined 2,123 juvenile and small fish that belonged to 26 species in MMFR waterways fed on copepods. Predominant mangrove and mudflat fish species, such as ambassids, ariids, and engraulids (Sasekumar et al., 1994) consumed copepods that together comprised >50% of their stomach contents (Chew et al., 2007). Post-flexion engraulid larvae were reported to be very abundant at the time when copepods were also found to be abundant in the MMFR waterways (Ooi et al., 2005, 2007). *Pseudodiaptomus*, *Acartia*, *Parvocalanus*, and *Oithona* were the main copepods consumed by zooplanktivorous fish in MMFR (Chew et al., 2007).

#### Conclusion

The abundance and community structure of copepods in the Matang estuary and adjacent coastal waters showed that spatio-temporal variations related to the physical and chemical parameters that varied with the prevailing rainfall pattern. Copepod abundance and chlorophyll *a* concentrations were higher in mangrove and nearshore waters than in offshore waters. Both copepod and phytoplankton abundance peaked during the NE monsoon when rainfall was highest. The copepods in Matang waterways and adjacent coastal waters were dominated by *Acartia*, *Parvocalanus*, and *Oithona* spp. Salinity and chlorophyll *a*

concentrations appear to be the two major controlling factors of copepod diversity in the estuary.

**Acknowledgments** We thank JIRCAS and University of Malaya (UM) for funding this project, and UM for providing research facilities. We express our gratitude to the Fisheries Department, Malaysia for their cooperation, and provision of trawling permit. We are grateful to S. Nishida, B. H. R. Othman, C. Walter, and T. Yoshida for their assistance on copepod species identification. Special thanks to the following persons for field and laboratory assistance: Mr. Lee Chee Heng (boat man), Miss Ooi Ai Lin, Dr. A. Sasekumar, and members of the Mangrove Ecology Group, University of Malaya. This study forms part of a Ph.D. thesis undertaken by the first author.

#### References

- Blaber, S. J. M., 2000. Tropical Estuarine Fishes, Ecology, Exploitation and Conservation. Blackwell Science, London.
- Blaber, S. J. M., 2007. Mangroves and fishes: issues of diversity, dependence, and dogma. Bulletin of Marine Science 80: 457.
- Bouillon, S., P. C. Chandra, N. Sreenivas & F. Dehairs, 2000. Sources of suspended matter and selective feeding by zooplankton in an estuarine mangrove ecosystem, as traced by stable isotopes. Marine Ecology Progress Series 208: 79–92.
- Bouillon, S., F. Dahdouh-Guebas, A. V. V. S. Rao, N. Koedam & F. Dehairs, 2003. Sources of organic carbon in mangrove sediments: variability and possible ecological implications. Hydrobiologia 495: 33–39.
- Boxshall, G. A. & S. H. Halsey, 2004. An Introduction to Copepod Diversity. The Ray Society, London.
- Cervetto, G., R. Gaudy & M. Pagano, 1999. Influence of salinity on the distribution of *Acartia tonsa* (Copepoda, Calanoida). Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 239: 33–45.
- Chew, L. L., V. C. Chong & Y. Hanamura, 2007. How zooplankton are important to juvenile fish nutrition in mangrove ecosystems. In Nakamura, K. (ed.), JIRCAS Working Report No. 56 on Sustainable Production System of Aquatic Animals in Brackish Mangrove Areas: 7–18.
- Chong, V. C., 2005. Fifteen years of fisheries research in Matang mangrove: what have we learnt? In Mohamad Ismail, S., A. Muda, R. Ujang, K. Ali Budin, K. L. Lim, S. Rosli, J. M. Som & A. Latiff (eds), Sustainable Management of Matang Mangroves: 100 Years and Beyond, Forest Biodiversity Series. Forestry Department Peninsular Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur: 411–429.
- Chong, V. C., 2007. Mangroves-fisheries linkages-the Malaysian perspective. Bulletin of Marine Science 80: 755.
- Chong, B. J. & T. E. Chua, 1975. A preliminary study of the distribution of the cyclopoid copepods of the family Oithonidae in the Malaysian waters. In Anon. (ed.), Proceedings of the Pacific Science Association of Marine Science Symposium, Hong Kong: 32–36.

- Chong, V. C. & A. Sasekumar, 1981. Food and feeding habits of the white prawn *Penaeus merguiensis*. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 5: 185–191.
- Chong, V. C., A. Sasekumar, C. B. Low & B. S. H. Muhammad Ali, 1999. The physico-chemical environment of the Matang and Dinding mangroves (Malaysia). In Katsuhiro, K. & P. Z. Choo (eds), *Proceedings of the 4th Seminar on Productivity and Sustainable Utilization of Brackish Water Mangrove Ecosystem*, Fisheries Research Institute, Penang, Malaysia: 115–136.
- Chong, V. C., C. B. Low & T. Ichikawa, 2001. Contribution of mangrove detritus to juvenile prawn nutrition: a dual stable isotope study in a Malaysian mangrove forest. *Marine Biology* 138: 77–86.
- Chua, T. E. & B. J. Chong, 1975. Plankton distribution in the Straits of Malacca and its adjacent waters. In Anon. (ed.), *Proceedings of the Pacific Science Association of Marine Science Symposium*, Hong Kong: 17–22.
- DeNiro, M. J. & S. Epstein, 1978. Influence of diet on the distribution of carbon isotopes in animals. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* 42: 495–506.
- Gaudy, R., G. Cervetto & M. Pagano, 2000. Comparison of the metabolism of *Acartia clausi* and *A. tonsa*: influence of temperature and salinity. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 247: 51–65.
- Grindley, J. R., 1984. The zooplankton of mangrove estuaries. In Por, F. D. & I. Dor (eds), *Hydrobiology of the Mangal*. Dr. W. Junk Publishers, The Hague: 79–88.
- Itoh, H., 2006. Parasitic and commensal copepods occurring as planktonic organisms with special reference to *Saphirella*-like copepods. *Bulletin of Plankton Society of Japan* 53: 53–63.
- Itoh, H. & S. Nishida, 2007. Life history of the copepod *Hemicyclops gomsoensis* (Poecilostomatoida, Clausidiidae) associated with decapod burrows in the Tama-River estuary, central Japan. *Plankton and Benthos Research* 2: 134–146.
- Johan, I., B. A. G. Idris, A. Ismail & O. Hishamuddin, 2002. Distribution of planktonic calanoid copepods in the Straits of Malacca. In Yusoff, F. M., M. Shariff, H. M. Ibrahim, S. G. Tan & S. Y. Tai (eds), *Tropical Marine Environment: Charting Strategies for the Millennium*. MASDEC-UPM, Serdang, Malaysia: 393–404.
- Krumme, U. & T. H. Liang, 2004. Tidal-induced changes in a copepod-dominated zooplankton community in a macro-tidal mangrove channel in Northern Brazil. *Zoological Studies* 43: 404–414.
- Laegdsgaard, P. & C. Johnson, 2001. Why do juvenile fish utilise mangrove habitats? *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 257: 229–253.
- Lawson, T. J. & G. D. Grice, 1973. The developmental stages of *Paracalanus crassirostris* Dahl, 1894 (Copepoda, Calanoida). *Crustaceana* 24: 43–56.
- Lee, S. Y., 2005. Exchange of organic matter and nutrients between mangroves and estuaries: myths methodological issue and missing links. *International Journal of Ecology and Environmental Sciences* 31: 163–175.
- Loneragan, N. R., S. E. Bunn & D. M. Kellaway, 1997. Are mangroves and seagrasses sources of organic carbon for penaeid prawns in a tropical Australian estuary? A multiple stable-isotope study. *Marine Biology* 130: 289–300.
- Lugo, A. E. & S. C. Snedaker, 1974. The ecology of mangrove. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 5: 39–64.
- Madhupratap, M., 1987. Status and strategy of zooplankton of tropical Indian estuaries: a review. *Bulletin of Plankton Society of Japan* 34: 65–81.
- McKinnon, A. & D. Klumpp, 1998. Mangrove zooplankton of North Queensland, Australia. *Hydrobiologia* 362: 127–143.
- Meziane, T. & M. Tsuchiya, 2000. Fatty acids as tracers of organic matter in the sediment and food web of a mangrove/intertidal flat ecosystem, Okinawa, Japan. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 200: 49–57.
- Meziane, T. & M. Tsuchiya, 2002. Organic matter in a subtropical mangrove-estuary subjected to wastewater discharge: origin and utilisation by two macrozoobenthic species. *Journal of Sea Research* 47: 1–11.
- Newell, R. I. E., N. Marshall, A. Sasekumar & V. C. Chong, 1995. Relative importance of benthic microalgae, phytoplankton and mangroves as sources of nutrition for penaeid prawns and other coastal invertebrates from Malaysia. *Marine Biology* 123: 595–606.
- Odum, W. E. & E. J. Heald, 1975. The detritus-based food web of an estuarine mangrove community. In Cronin, L. E. (ed.), *Estuarine Research*. Academic Press Inc, New York: 265–286.
- Oka, S., 2000. Composition and distribution of zooplankton in the tropical brackish waters in Matang, Perak, Malaysia. *JIRCAS International Workshop on Brackish Water Mangrove Ecosystems, Productivity and Sustainable Utilization*: 83–85.
- Ooi, A. L., L. L. Chew, V. C. Chong & Y. Ogawa, 2005. Diel abundance of zooplankton particularly fish larvae in the Sangga Kecil estuary, Matang Mangrove Forest Reserve. In Mohamad Ismail, S., A. Muda, R. Ujang, K. Ali Budin, K. L. Lim, S. Rosli, J. M. Som & A. Latiff (eds), *Sustainable Management of Matang Mangroves: 100 Years and Beyond*, Forest Biodiversity Series. Forestry Department Peninsular Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur: 443–451.
- Ooi, A. L., V. C. Chong, Y. Hanamura & Y. Konishi, 2007. Occurrence and recruitment of fish larvae in Matang mangrove estuary, Malaysia. In Nakamura, K. (ed.), *JIRCAS Working Report No. 56 on Sustainable Production System of Aquatic Animals in Brackish Mangrove Areas*: 1–6.
- Osore, M. K. W., 1992. A note on the zooplankton distribution and diversity in a tropical mangrove creek system, Gazi, Kenya. *Hydrobiologia* 247: 119–120.
- Parson, T. R., Y. Maita & C. Lalli, 1984. *Manual of chemical and biological methods for sea water analysis*. Pergamon Press, Oxford.
- Peterson, B. J. & B. Fry, 1987. Stable isotopes in ecosystem studies. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* 18: 293–320.
- Pielou, E. C., 1969. *An Introduction to Mathematical Ecology*. Wiley, New York.
- Rezai, H., F. M. Yusoff, A. Arshad, A. Kawamura, S. Nishida & B. H. R. Othman, 2004. Spatial and temporal distribution of copepods in the Straits of Malacca. *Zoological Studies* 43: 486–497.
- Rezai, H., F. M. Yusoff, A. Arshad & B. H. R. Othman, 2005. Spatial and temporal variations in calanoid copepod

- distribution in the Straits of Malacca. *Hydrobiologia* 537: 157–167.
- Robertson, A. I. & S. J. M. Blaber, 1992. Plankton, epibenthos and fish communities. In Robertson, A. I. & D. M. Alongi (eds), *Coastal and Estuarine Studies 41, Tropical Mangrove Ecosystems*. American Geophysical Union, Washington: 173–224.
- Robertson, A. I. & N. Duke, 1987. Mangroves as nursery sites: comparisons of the abundance and species composition of fish and crustaceans in mangroves and other nearshore habitats in tropical Australia. *Marine Biology* 96: 193–205.
- Robertson, A. I., P. Dixon & P. A. Daniel, 1988. Zooplankton dynamics in mangrove and other nearshore habitats in tropical Australia. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 43: 139–150.
- Rodelli, M. R., J. N. Gearing, P. J. Gearing, N. Marshall & A. Sasekumar, 1984. Stable isotope ratio as a tracer of mangrove carbon in Malaysian ecosystems. *Oecologia* 61: 326–333.
- Sasekumar, A., V. C. Chong, K. H. Lim & H. R. Singh, 1994. The fish community of Matang mangrove waters. In Sudara, S., C. R. Wilkinson, L. M. Chou (eds), *Proceeding, Third-Asean-Australian Symposium on Living Coastal Resources*, Vol. 2, Research Papers. Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, Thailand: 457–464.
- Schwamborn, R., 1997. Influence of Mangroves on community structure and nutrition of macrozooplankton in Northeast Brazil. Ph.D. thesis. Bremen University, Bremen, Alemania.
- Sewell, S. R. B., 1933. Note on a small collection of marine copepods from the Malay states. *Bulletin of Raffles Museum* 8: 25–31.
- Shannon, C. E., 1948. A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal* 27(379–423): 623–656.
- Subbaraju, R. C. & K. Krishnamurthy, 1972. Ecological aspects of plankton production. *Marine Biology* 14: 25–31.
- Ter Braak, C. J. F., 1994. Canonical community ordination. Part I: Basic theory and linear methods. *Ecoscience* 1: 127–140.
- Ter Braak, C. J. F. & I. C. Prentice, 1988. A theory of gradient analysis. *Advances in Ecological Research* 18: 93–138.
- Thong, K. L., A. Sasekumar & N. Marshall, 1993. Nitrogen concentrations in a mangrove creek with a large tidal range, Peninsular Malaysia. *Hydrobiologia* 254: 125–132.
- Tranter, D. J. & S. Abraham, 1971. Coexistence of species of Acartiidae (Copepoda) in the Cochin Backwater, a monsoonal estuarine lagoon. *Marine Biology* 11: 222–241.
- Trott, L. A. & D. M. Alongi, 1999. Variability in surface water chemistry and phytoplankton biomass in two tropical, tidally dominated mangrove creeks. *Marine & Freshwater Research* 50: 451–457.
- Ueda, H., 1987. Temporal and spatial distribution of the two closely related *Acartia* species *A. omorii* and *A. hudsonica* (Copepoda, Calanoida) in a small inlet water of Japan. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* 24: 691–700.
- Yoshida, T., T. Toda, F. M. Yusoff & B. H. R. Othman, 2006. Seasonal variation of zooplankton community in the coastal waters of the Straits of Malacca. *Coastal Marine Science* 30: 320–327.