

Interactive comment on “Zoogeography of the bottom Foraminifera of the West-African coast” by V. Mikhalevich

V. Mikhalevich

Received and published: 1 May 2008

1. It is usually a case that the results of a monograph are published previously in a short papers. Publication of the basic data and figures for about two hundreds of species is impossible here. Full data obtained for even one-two species would occupy this 4 page volume and no space for the final results for the whole fauna of the region would remain. Meanwhile these new data (character of the zoogeographic distribution ,not only ecologic data) seems to be new and important and the description of the zoogeographical limits of the species studied could be already used and considered by the other specialists in the case of their publication. If the reviewer doubts in the basic material – it is possible to see it in my work of 1983 cited in references. In this work the morphology of all the species discovered in the material is described with some new taxonomic notes along with the coordinates of their presence at the

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Interactive
Comment

stations studied and of their occurrences in the World Ocean. The detailed description of the perfoart method is also published in this work. In the species descriptions the revision of the species was made, as a result a lot of a new species was described (see Zoological Record) and only these revised species were later considered in the further zoogeographic study (These species and genera were considered by Loeblich & Tappan and the new genera based on the study of this material were included in their classic monograph of 1987.) But the detailed parts on the zoogeography and ecology based on these material were not included in this work. The present article represents an attempt to show the final results. I fully understand the will of the honored reviewer to see the basis of this work to make conclusions. If I have the post address of the reviewer; it would be my pleasure to send him this work. Though it is in Russian. And may be this circumstance along with the fact that our country of that period was not an open country is just the reason of his doubt if the basis of the material previously studied by me is solid enough. 2. As to the reviewer; advise to place the species of different zoogeographic character in the tables; I tried to do it as the advice of the editor was the same. But it enlarges the volume several times. Their situation in lines turned out to be more compact. I can also place the tables of pictures for the rest zoogeographic groups; but they will occupy more than 4 pages. Nevertheless it seems that the technical way of the presentation does not influence the conclusions of the work.

Interactive comment on eEarth Discuss., 3, 1, 2008.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)