

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

V. Mikhalevich

Received and published: 10 May 2008

The respected editor affirms that Zoogeography CANNOT BE CONSIDERED as separate by ecology. Of course, the two disciplines are interrelated. Nevertheless at the same time these are two separate and independent branches of biology, areas of knowledge. As English is not my native language I prefer not to translate Russian text but to take original English. Let us consult Webster dictionary: ecology the branch of biology which deals with the mutual relationships between organisms and their environment. Zoogeography the study or description of the geographical distribution of animals; the determination of land and marine areas characterized by special groups of animals ...Recent zoogeographers divide the land areas of the world into regions. And the occurrence of the species in these different geographical regions, the limits and the borders of the GEOGRAPHICAL

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



distribution of the foraminiferal species discovered 8211; is just the subject of my article. While the subject of Jorissen8217;s works is MAINLY ecology 8211; he studies in detail the foraminiferal communities, their relationship with the sediment, depth, water masses differing in their temperature, oxygen content, pollution, so on. They only slightly touch zoogeography 8211; only defining the geographical region of investigation. While my subject of study is MAINLY zoogeography 8211; the definition of the borders of the regions of natural habitats of the studied species ALL ROUND THE WORLD. I touch ecology only slightly 8211; analyzing only species of the shelf (depth character, if I8217;ll analyze slope or bathyal materials 8211; the results would differ). Would you ever find in Jorissen8217;s works such zoogeographical terms as 8220;tropical 8211; boreal8221;, 8220;tropical-law- boreal8221;, so on.. Such characters were given by me for each of these foraminiferal species for the first time (though for the multicellular sea animals such work was done long ago). Their distribution in the World Ocean (not local, not in the limited areas) was not studied in detail and their separate occurrences were not previously generalized. To give to the species studied their zoogeographic characteristic was just the purpose of this my work (may be I need to stress it more in the article). Though the lists of species names of different zoogeographical regions (realms, zones)are rather 8220;long8221; 8211;they reflect the reality. The author is not guilty that these species are multiple. And as all these species were attributed to the definite zoogeographical groups for the first time 8211; it has (at list some!) significance. Placement of these lists into tables occupies much more place. My first monograph of 1983 (cited in references and by the way as far as I know not mentioned in later Jorissen8217;s works on the African region) served as the base for the present study as the descriptions and thorough taxonomic revision of each of the species occurred was made. The zoogeographical and some ecological (not included here) conclusions based on this revision are planned for the future big publication and are briefly given in the present article. I8217;ve also shown in it that these new knowledge can be also of use in the analysis of the species composition of some separate stations when the detailed hydrological and other environmental data for them are ab-

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

Interactive
Comment

sent (thus, the higher percent of the species characterized as pan-oceanic and widely spread tropical-boreal ones in the tropical shelf area indicates upwelling). In spite of the form of my brief presentation 8211; its results on the geographic attribution of the studied species are new and characterize the material from the other point of view than it is done in Jorissen8217;s works which I value as perfect ecological studies. I wonder why the both approaches to the study of material could not be represented but only one of them?

P.S. I8217;m rather surprised with the following editor8217;s statement: 8220;I completely disagree when she says that the suggested article of Jorissen are not relevant with her contribution.8221; May be my English is not good enough and I was wrong in my phrase of my last comments (8220;I know perfect and valuable works of Jorissen and his collective, some additional works were kindly send to me by the editor. But it seems that there is misunderstanding of the substance of the subject 8211; Jorissen8217;s works are devoted to ecology but not to the zoogeography.8221;). But I realize the significance of these perfect works and of course will consider them much more in my future ecologic studies than in this short study devoted to zoogeography where I was able to cite only two of his works. And I8217;ve no doubt that his studies would be essential to give some value also to my future publication. V.I. Mikhalevich

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

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