

Geconcerteerde Akties Oceanografie  
Technisch Rapport Benthos 81/07

---

This paper not to be cited without prior reference to the authors

---

The systematics and ecology of marine free-living nematodes

C. Heip, M. Vincx, N. Smol & G. Vranken  
Marine Biology Section, Zoology Institute  
State University of Ghent, Belgium

THE SYSTEMATICS AND ECOLOGY OF MARINE FREE-LIVING NEMATODES

C. Heip, M. Vincx, N. Smol & G. Vranken

Marine Biology Section, Zoology Institute, State University of Gent,  
Belgium

Authors' address:

Laboratorium voor Morfologie en Systematiek der Dieren

Ledeganckstraat 35

B-9000 Gent

Belgium

Foot-note to authors:

Ranking of authors is at random.

## INTRODUCTION

Nematodes are the most abundant metazoans in littoral, estuarine, coastal and oceanic sediments, extending from the high-water mark into the deepest oceanic trenches (Nicholas, 1975). All marine free-living nematodes are considered to be members of the meiobenthos, small organisms, mainly metazoans, which are separated from the larger macrobenthos either on a methodological basis (i.e. as all animals passing a 1 mm or a 0.5 mm sieve) or a taxonomic basis (i.e. particular animal groups such as Nematoda, Harpacticoida, Gastrotricha, Kinorhyncha, Tardigrada, Foraminifera etc. which have exclusively or mainly small species living in sediments). In most circumstances, nematodes are numerically the dominant group of the meiofauna. In fact, they usually comprise more than 90 % of the metazoan fauna (McIntyre, 1971).

That nematodes are ecologically a very successful group is also demonstrated by their high species diversity. The number of species present in any one habitat is usually an order of magnitude greater than for any other major taxon (Platt & Warwick, 1980). In all, about 4000 species of free-living marine nematodes, belonging to some 450 genera, have been described to date, but many more remain to be discovered.

The ecology of marine meiofauna has been reviewed by Swedmark (1964), McIntyre (1969), Coull (1973) and Fenchel (1978). Nicholas (1975) and Platt & Warwick (1980) consider some general aspects of the biology of marine free-living nematodes.

Ecological research involving nematodes was restricted at first to treating nematodes as one taxonomic unit of the meiofauna and they were considered to be a functional unit as well. We know now that nematodes are ecologically very heterogeneous and that they occupy different trophic positions in benthic food webs. These differences may be as large between families of marine nematodes as they are between orders in macrobenthic groups. This trophic diversity was first examined by Wieser (1953a) who divided nematodes into four groups according to the structure of the buccal cavity, by postulating that morphological differences are linked to different feeding mechanisms : selective deposit-feeders (group 1A), non-selective deposit-feeders (group 1B), epigrowth feeders (group 2A) and predators and omnivores (group 2B). The validity of this classification has been questioned since several important exceptions exist (Wieser, 1960, Boucher; 1972; Ward, 1975), but Wieser's proposition has remained an important tool in the interpretation of nematode assemblages. However, more direct methods have

become available and in the last decade important advances have been made both in ecology and systematics of marine nematodes. Experimental work involving the cultivation of species in the laboratory started in the late sixties and has permitted much new information to be obtained on different aspects of nematode ecology. Field work has progressed both in methodology and in the number of habitats and geographical areas which have been investigated. In systematics, the number of people involved was higher in the seventies than ever before and about 42 papers were published each year in the pentad 1971-1975 by about 50 marine nematologists, describing about 111 taxa yearly (Gerlach, 1980).

In this paper we attempt to synthesize research on the systematics and ecology of marine free-living nematodes. It is not our aim to evaluate all papers published in the last decades but rather to give some overview of current research and problems.

## SYSTEMATICS

At the Second Symposium on Aquatic Nematodes, Gerlach (1980) mentioned that about 4,000 marine nematode species are known and estimated that more than 20,000 remain undescribed.

A review of the development and current status of the systematics of this group thus seems appropriate, especially for novice nematologists. Problems faced by the latter are elegantly discussed by Hope (1971) who stressed the need for proper study.

Although a historical review of the systematic discussions involving nematodes has to go back to Rudolphi (1819), free-living nematodes were first treated as a separate group by Bastian (1865), who stimulated further work in the field. Only from 1876 on, marine nematodes became the target of a series of nematologists.

The Dutch-born de Man (1876-1928) was a pioneer in this field and he laid down the basis of modern generic and specific descriptions. His detailed descriptions and fine illustrations, which are still of great value to-day, gave evidence of his clear perceptive sight. Among his contemporaries, only the Australian-American Cobb (1920), considered as one of the greatest nematologists, is comparable to him. Cobb's precise descriptions and figures remain often unsurpassed.

The first classification of all the marine free-living nematode species known at that time is the work of the Russian Filipjev (1918/21; English translation in 1968/70). He constructed a system based on observations of the total morphology, rather than on a single character as others before him had done. Significant new visions of this basic classification were forwarded by Cobb (1919), Schuurmans-Stekhoven & De Coninck (1933), Maggenti (1963, 1970), Gadea (1972, 1973), Andrassy (1976) and most recently by Lorenzen (1981). A comparison of systematic schemes of the Nematoda down to ordines, worked out by the most outstanding authors, is given in table 1 (compared with the classification of the Bremerhaven Checklist, Gerlach & Riemann, 1973/74.). Besides these major classifications, other authors also made very useful contributions, but they restricted themselves to taxa found in particular geographic regions such as : the North Sea : Schuurmans Stekhoven (1935); the Baltic Sea : Schneider (1939); North America : Cobb (1920), Chitwood (1951); the Chilean coast : Wieser (1953b, 1954, 1956); the East coast of

North America : Wieser & Hopper (1967). Except for the last and Cobb (1920), these works are characterized by an extensive collection of dichotomous keys, which are of incomparable help as long as they remain up to date. A third group of taxonomic works are catalogues or checklists. They reflect the taxonomic hierarchy and provide a list of known genera or even species but not necessarily a diagnosis of the taxa : the catalogues of Stiles & Hassall (1905, 1920), Baylis & Daubney (1926), the checklist of Hope & Murphy (1972) and the comprehensive Bremerhaven checklist of Gerlach & Riemann (1973/1974). Whereas the former checklist reflects the hierarchy from the top of the Adenophorea down to the generic level, the latter is based on the then generally accepted six marine ordines down to family, subfamily, genus and species level. To each taxon created is added a nearly complete chronological outline of the pertinent literature, with special reference to nomenclatorial changes, synonymisations and reviews. From a practical point of view this checklist can be regarded as a milestone, though changes in classification have been made which unfortunately have not been justified.

A new development in marine nematology is the use of pictorial keys in the Illustrated Guide of Tarjan (1980), which offers a lot of information for beginning nematologists. Unfortunately it is incomplete, several genera being omitted. Also, it is based on the classification of Andrassy (1976), which has already been subject to severe criticism (Coomans, 1977 and Lorenzen, 1981). Special reference is made to the books of Chitwood & Chitwood (1950) and De Coninck (1965) for their comprehensive study of the external and internal morphology, histology and systematics, provided with many superb illustrations.

Evaluation of the different classifications and their characteristics (table 1).

Filipjev (1918/21) distinguished five families based on the structure of the cuticle, the amphids, pharynx, somatic musculature, female gonads and tail. In 1934 he raised these families to the rank of ordines (table 1) and included parasitic forms.

The system of Filipjev was adopted by Schuurmans Stekhoven & De Coninck (1933), who rejected the structure of the buccal cavity "which can be greatly influenced by the environment" and the gonads "which only differ in secondary characteristics" as diagnostic characters. The structure of the amphids and the symmetric relationships of the anterior end seemed to be more conservative.

Schuermans Stekhoven (1935) recognised five orders in the Nematoda errantia, with the Araeolaimoidea as new ordo.

Two classes, the Aphasmeida and Phasmeida, differentiated primarily by the presence or absence of phasmids were established by Chitwood (1933, 1937) and by Chitwood & Chitwood (1950). This nomenclature has later been replaced by the terms Adenophorea and Secernentea to prevent confusion with Insects. About twelve characters were used in differentiating the two classes, but gonads were not considered.

De Coninck (1965) recognized these divisions, as well as the categories Chromadoria and Enoplia first erected by Pearse (1942). His classification was based primarily on the amphidial form (especially in the Chromadoria) and secondly on the position and structure of the cephalic sense organs. The position of the pharyngeal glands outlet is an important systematic character within the Enoplia. The classification of De Coninck is considered by most marine nematologists to be one of the most authoritative.

The division Adenophorea-Secernentea was first rejected by Goodey (1963) because phasmids are difficult to distinguish; moreover, he found that primary division on that basis is unacceptable with *Eute ratocephalus crassidens* a species which is clearly Aphasmidian in most respects, but has phasmids. He was followed by Maggenti (1963, 1970) and Gadea (1972, 1973). As these authors did not score a great success with marine nematologists, we abstain ourselves from further discussion.

Andrassy (1976) subdivided the nematodes into three subclasses : Torquentia (=Chromadoria), Secernentia (=Secernentea) and Penetrantia (=Enoplia). This division was made after comparison of a set of characters in the Adenophorea and Secernentea, which revealed that the Adenophorea is a very heterogeneous group. But, although the subdivision between Adenophorea and Secernentea is unbalanced and artificial, it continues to be used by several nematologists for the sake of convenience.

Lorenzen (1981) agreed with the subclasses Adenophorea and Secernentea, the latter being a homogeneous group always characterized by the presence of only one anterior testis and the reduction of the caudal glands. Within the Adenophorea, the Enoplia were differentiated from the Chromadoria only by possessing an untwisted spiral amphid. Within the Chromadoria, the Monhysterida were separated by possessing outstretched ovaries. This scheme was based on a careful examination of the phylogenetical impact of twelve characteristics, of which two are completely new : the position of the gonads in relation to the intestine and a new organ-system, the metanemes (sense organs).

Characters often used in marine nematode systematics are listed in table 2.

We only will discuss the Adenophorea (excluding Dorylaimida) down to family level. Although Lorenzen's classification is the most recent, we have used the presently generally accepted categories as proposed by Gerlach & Riemann (1973/74). To each order, a table reflecting the evolutionary trend as pointed out by the classifications used by marine nematologists

is added : see

tables 3 to 8.

To prevent confusion, we consistently use the terminology as suggested in the Round Table Discussions at the First Workshop on the Systematics of Marine Free-living Nematodes (summarized by Coomans, De Coninck & Heip, 1979), i.e.: we change the terminology of Lorenzen (1981) concerning the cephalic sense organs and we follow De Coninck (1942, 1965). For the terminology of the body regions, Coomans (1979) is taken into account.

#### ARAEOLAIMIDA (table 3)

The order Araeolaimida was erected by De Coninck & Schuurmans Stekhoven (1933) on the basis of its primitive characters : the amphids are simple spiral and three separate circles of cephalic sense organs (6+6+4) are present.

According to the position and structure of the cephalic sense organs and the structure of the pharynx, this order is further split up by De Coninck (1965) in two suborders, six superfamilies and ten families.

Members of the Tripyloidina were transferred to the order Enoplida by Gerlach & Riemann (1973/74) and retransferred to their original position by Andrassy (1976). The suborders established by the latter are based on differences in the number of cephalic sense organs, the structure of the buccal cavity, pharynx and male genital supplements. The latter two characters also served to distinguish the four superfamilies in the Araeolaimina.

After comparing the system of De Coninck (1965) and Gerlach & Riemann (1973/74), Vitiello (1974) considered the systematics of this order as unsatisfactory and suggested some new families.

Recently, this order has been split by Lorenzen (1981), basically on the structure of the ovaries. Taxa with outstretched ovaries are transferred to the Monhysterida and taxa with antidromous reflexed ovaries to the Chromadorida. A new suborder Leptolaimina was created in the Chromadorida to gather all taxa not belonging to the Chromadorina. The former is composed of 18

families which previously belonged mainly to the Araeolaimida. Characters by which members within a family are related are presented by numbers (corresponding with characters listed in table 2).

The Axonolaimoidea, characterized by a spiral or loop-shaped amphid, comprise the Axonolaimidae (six tooth-like structures at anterior end of the buccal cavity), the Comesomatidae (amphids with at least 2 1/2 turns), the Diplopelidae (four cephalic setae dominant and amphid with only one turn) and the Coninckidae raised to family level for its unique combination of characters.

The position of the Comesomatidae seems rather outstanding : they were placed within the Axonolaimoidea because of their spiral amphid but are exceptional by the punctated cuticle and the position of the cephalic sense organs; the amphids, spiral with at least 2 1/2 turns are unique within the Monhysterida !

#### DESMOSCOLECIDA (table 4)

These aberrant marine nematodes with short fusiform bodies and well developed annules were raised to order level by Filipjev (1929). He also differentiated two families : Desmoscolecidae (cuticle coarsely annulated, no hairy coat) and Greeffiellidae (cuticle not coarsely annulated, hairy coat). The superfamily Desmoscolecoida was established by Schuurmans Stekhoven (1935) and the Greeffielloidea by De Coninck (1965). The latter author added a new family Meyliidae, with spiral amphids, to accomodate the genus Meylia.

In a revision of the order, Timm (1970) presented a general introduction to the biology and anatomy of the Desmoscolecida, with an exposé on evolutionary trends and keys for all genera. According to him a distinction between the Desmoscolecidae and Greeffiellidae is useless as he considers Progreeffiella and Hapalomus as transitional forms. Meyliidae was excluded from the group because it lacks typical characters. There remained only one family : Desmoscolecidae (with one subfamily).

In 1975, this order was again revised by Freudenhammer, in a comprehensive and detailed study on the morphology and terminology within that group. The systematics was based mainly on two characteristics : 1° structure and position of the somatic setae and 2° structure of the cuticle, desmen and appendages. He also considered but one family (with three subfamilies). That same year, a revision of the Greeffiellinae by Schrage & Gerlach (1975) appeared.

The view of Andrassy (1976) resembles that of the De Coninck (1965), although he raised the Meyliidae to superfamily level.

An extensive review and personal comments on the origin and evolution of this order, next to recent work on generic level is given by Decraemer (1974a, b, c, d; 1976 a, b; 1977a, b, c; 1978a, b, c, d). Taxonomic divisions were based upon the type of setal pattern, according to Lorenzen (1969), and upon the male reproductive system.

A quite different view was presented by Lorenzen (1981), who rejected the order and placed the Desmoscolecoida in the Monhysterida because of their outstretched ovaries. The Meyliidae are reintroduced within this group because of the presence of cephalic setae on socles.

#### MONHYSTERIDA (table 5)

According to Filipjev (1918/21, 1934) outstretched ovaries are characteristic for nematodes within the Monhysterida. The amphids are always distinctly spiral, horseshoe shaped or circular. Two families were distinguished by the presence or absence of an apophysis on the gubernaculum : Linhomoeidae (with) and Monhysteridae (without).

Members of this order are found in Chitwood & Chitwood (1950) in the suborder Monhysterina (Monhysteroidea) of the Chromadorida, characterized by circular amphids, outstretched ovaries and convergent ends of the pharyngeal radii. They recognized three families : Monhysteridae, Linhomoeidae and Siphonolaimidae; the latter differentiated by its styletiform buccal cavity.

De Coninck (1965) distinguished four families by the structure of the buccal cavity : variable (Linhomoeidae), barrel shaped or cylindrical (Sphaerolaimidae, Monhysteridae), small, tubulose or with spear (Siphonolaimidae), and the structure of the amphids, following Filipjev in this character. It is clear that the Linhomoeidae constitute a very heterogeneous group.

Andrassy (1976) recognized eight families. The most important difference is the female genital system being paired in the Linhomoeidae and unpaired in the remaining ones. The latter were further distinguished on the structure of the buccal cavity, as previous authors did, and on the presence (Diplolaimellidae) or absence of a bursa. Except for some shifts within the order, no significant changes were made.

The order Monhysterida was extended by Lorenzen (1981) and unites ten families from different orders with outstretched ovaries. On that basis, all members of the Desmoscolecida were incorporated. The Monhysteroidea, previously revised by Lorenzen (1978c), were characterized by only one (anterior) ovary and divided into three families based on the position (in relation to intestine) and number of the gonads and the length of the cephalic setae :

Monhysteridae (one testis (anterior), testis and ovary on the right), Xyalidae (two testes and two ovaries; anterior gonad on the left, posterior gonad on the right), Sphaerolaimidae (cephalic setae longer than the outer labial setae). New observations within the Xyalidae were discussed in Lorenzen (1977).

The close relationship of the Linhomoeidae with the Siphonolaimidae was adopted from Riemann (1977a) : both possess subventral gland ducts in the stomatal region.

#### DESMODORIDA (table 6)

Species of this group were placed by Filipjev (1934) in the subfamilies Richtersiinae, Desmodorinae, Monoposthiinae, Epsilonematinae and Draconematinae of the order Chromadorata.

Chitwood & Chitwood (1950) gathered them within the superfamily Desmodoroidea of the Chromadorina. They differentiated three families by body form and presence or absence of ambulatory and glandular setae : Desmodoridae, Epsilonematidae and Draconematidae.

De Coninck (1965) erected the Desmodorida to accommodate species which differ from the Chromadorida by the head capsule and cuticle without punctations. Presence or absence of adhesion tubes put them respectively into Draconematina and Desmodorina. The latter is subdivided into seven families on the basis of a set of characters such as : cuticle with or without ridges, presence or absence of the cephalic capsule, structure of the cephalic sense organs, the ovaries, the number and size of the annulations.

Andrassy (1976) did not separate the Desmodorina and Draconematina from the Chromadorida. Species with widely coiled amphids, prominent helmet end reflexed ovaries could belong either to the Metachromadoridae, Desmodoridae or Ceramonematidae; whereas species with narrowly coiled amphids, less prominent helmet and outstretched ovaries could belong either to Microlaimidae, Richtersiidae or Xenellidae. Species with peculiar body form could belong either to the Epsilonematidae or Draconematidae.

Lorenzen (1981) rejected the ornamentation of the cuticle as a criterium to differentiate between the Desmodorida and Chromadorida and kept the members of this order in the Chromadorida, Chromadorina. The latter are characterized by the twelvefolded vestibulum and a dorsal tooth which is bigger or as large as the two ventrosublateral teeth. The Desmodoridae were put together with the Epsilonematidae and Draconematidae as they possess only one (anterior) testis.

In his revision of the Microlaimidae, Jensen (1978) erected a new family : Molgolaimidae, based on the structure of the head region, the shape of the pharynx, the position of the ventral pore, the shape of the tail, the structure of the gonads and the ornamentation of the cuticle.

Lorenzen (1981) lowered the rank of the Molgolaimidae to a subfamily in the Desmodoridae, because of the structure of the gonads and the impossibility to be coloured with cottonblue.

The superfamily Ceramonematoidea, a restricted and homogeneous group, was erected by De Coninck (1965). Haspelslagh (1972, 1973, 1978) considered the very thick cuticle with prominent annulations and longitudinal crests, and the well developed head capsule as important taxonomic characters. According to these, the family Dasynemellidae of De Coninck (1965) was suppressed and the Xenellinae were raised to the family rank.

Andrassy (1976) lowered the rank of the Ceramonematoidea and placed them within the Desmodoroidea.

Lorenzen (1981) did not agree with the system of Haspelslagh (1972, 1973) which was based on only two characters. The whole group is transferred : the Xenellidae to the Trefusiida, because of the similar shape of the amphid and the presence of only one posterior ovary; the Ceramonematidae did no longer suit in the Desmodoroidea because the vestibulum is not twelvefolded and were put in the Leptolaimina.

In 1978 a comprehensive monograph of the superfamily Draconematoidea was published by Allen & Noffsinger (1978). The most profound taxonomic characters of this group are the ventral adhesion tubes, responsible for the leech-like movement. Number and size vary between species within different genera and between immature forms and adults. A new family was created : Prochaetosomatidae, closely related with Draconematidae.

In the absence of own observations, Lorenzen (1981) lowered the rank of the Prochaetosomatidae to<sup>a</sup> subfamily of the Draconematidae. Differences between Draconematidae and Epsilonematidae had been mentioned earlier (Lorenzen, 1974). Whereas the earlier taxonomy of Steiner (1931) was based only on the exoskeleton, Lorenzen (1973) studied the total morphology and postembryonic development of the Epsilonematidae.

#### CHROMADORIDA (table 7)

Filipjev (1934) and Chitwood & Chitwood (1950) included respectively taxa of the Araeolaimida and of all other taxa except the Enoplida among the Chromadorida. He characterized the Chromadoridae by an annulated cuticle and a twelvefolded vestibulum.

Chitwood & Chitwood (1950) had classified them into four families, gathered within the superfamily Chromadoroidea. The families were distinguished mainly by the shape of the amphid and the cardia : Chromadoridae (amphids kidney to spiral shaped, cardia small), Microlaimidae (amphids spiral with one or two turns, cardia elongate), Cyatholaimidae (amphids uni-to multi-spiral, cardia well developed, triradiate) and Tripyloididae (amphids spiral with one or two turns, cardia well developed, triradiate). Remarkable is the unique position of the latter family within the Chromadoroidea.

According to De Coninck (1965), the position of the cephalic sense organs and the shape of the amphids were definitely different between the Cyatholaimidae and the Chromadoridae and both gave rise to the creation of two suborders. The whole order consisted of five families : Comesomatidae, Chromadoridae, Cyatholaimidae, Choanolaimidae and Selachinematidae, differentiated from each other by features as the cuticle, amphid, cephalic sense organs, buccal cavity, pharynx and male supplements.

This order was again extended by Andrassy (1976), who included the species of the Desmodorida (within two suborders). Referring to the current taxa of the Chromadorida, the general idea of De Coninck (1965) is adapted (also two suborders); four of the five families were raised to superfamily level, but the Comesomatidae were transferred within the Cyatholaimina because of their multispiral prominent amphid. This marked the Chromadorina as a more homogeneous group.

The conventional species of the order Chromadorida were classified by Lorenzen (1981) within the superfamily Chromadoroidea (with annulated cuticle), the latter were placed together with the Desmodroidea and Microlaimoidea in the Chromadorina, Chromadorida. The Chromadorina united species with a twelvefolded vestibulum and corresponded mostly with the Chromadoridae of Filipjev (1934). New is the incorporation of the Richtersiidae (synonymized with Selachinematidae) within the Chromadoroidea, whereas the Comesomatidae are transferred to the Monhysterida. The classification of the latter family among the Chromadorida was generally accepted since the work of De Coninck (1965).

The Comesomatidae were first treated by Wieser (1954), who established a key to the genera based on the structure of the spicules. Vitiello (1969) added two differential characteristics : the presence or absence of lateral differentiation in the cuticle and the structure of the buccal cavity.

In the revision of Jensen (1979), the family is characterized within the Chromadorida by a copulatory apparatus provided with an apophysis, females

with outstretched ovaries, presence of marginal tubes in the pharynx and a non sclerotized and enlarged tail tip. The genera were arranged in three subfamilies : Sabarieriinae, Dorylaimopsinae and Comesomatinae, in agreement with Lorenzen (1981).

The family Chromadoridae was classified by Wieser (1954) primarily on the shape of the amphids, the nature of the dorsal tooth (solid or hollow) and the cuticle (homogeneous or heterogeneous) and its associated lateral differentiations. The difficulty of distinguishing between solid and hollow teeth has led to much confusion (Inglis, 1970).

Wieser (1954) provided a key for the subfamily Cyatholaiminae based on the structure of the male genital apparatus, and particularly of the supplements. In recent papers, emphasis is placed on the position and structure of special body "pores" as a valuable taxonomic character (Hopper, 1972; Sharma *et al.*, 1978). The morphology of the pores has been examined by Inglis (1964) and by Wright & Hope (1968).

#### ENOPLIDA (table 8)

Members of this large order were classified as family Enoplidae consisting of nine subfamilies, within the Enoplata and were characterized by a duplicated head cuticle (Filipjev, 1934).

According to Chitwood & Chitwood (1950) the distinction between the primarily aquatic forms (Enoplina) and primarily soil or parasitic forms is based on the presence of cephalic setae of the former. The aquatic species were grouped into six families, belonging to two main groups in which the cuticle of the head is duplicated (Enoplidae, Oncholaimidae) or not (Tripulidae, Mononchidae, Ironidae).

Clark (1962) reclassified the order into seven suborders utilizing a character proposed already by Chitwood : the arrangement of the pharyngeal glands and their ducts. On this basis the Mononchidae were removed from the Tripyloidea in the Dorylaimina. The Alaimidae were transferred to a newly created suborder : Alaimina, possessing a number of Dorylaimoid and Tripyloid characters as well as some special ones of their own.

The distinction between primarily aquatic and primarily soil or parasitic species was made on a higher level by De Coninck (1965), and from then on the order Enoplida referred mainly to aquatic species. He made a clear distinction between the Enoplidae and the Oncholaimidae on the basis of the buccal cavity respectively being surrounded or not by pharyngeal tissue: he revised both groups to two subordinal rank.

According to Andrassy (1976) the lack of a duplicated head cuticle is important enough to remove the Tripylidae from the Enoplina and to create a new suborder : Tripylina. The order Enoplida comprised then 19 families, which can be defined by the typical structure of the head, the buccal cavity, the cephalic sense organs, the pharynx, male supplements and the position of the vulva. The Oxystominidae and Lauratonematidae were transferred from the Enoploidea to the Tripylina without proper justification.

The order Enoplida is characterized according to Lorenzen (1981) primarily by the presence of a new characteristic : metanemes. This character caused a restriction of the Enoplida as the families Trefusiidae, Onchulidae and Lauratonematidae were transferred to a new order : Trefusiida (without metanemes). Two other new taxa were created based on the position of the ventral gland (which was also a new criterion) : the Enoplacea (in the pharyngeal region) and the Oncholaimacea (postpharyngeal). The Enoploidea comprised forms with gonads at the left of the intestine and with males possessing a preanal tubus. Within the Enoplida, 16 families were grouped, their particular characteristics are noted by numbers in table 8.

In a revision published by Platonova (1970), a new superfamily the Leptosolatoidea was distinguished from the Enoploidea by a cylindrical pharynx without crenate walls, buccal cavity indistinct or without obvious division, if teeth are present they are situated in front, the muscles nearly reaching the teeth. This superfamily comprised five families : Leptosomatidae, Anticomidae, Ironidae, Oxystominidae and Triodontolaimidae. Lorenzen (1978) rediscovered the only species of the Triodontolaimidae and concluded that this family stands out from the remaining families of the Enoplida by the unique structure of the buccal cavity.

Wieser (1953) provided a short monographic account of the family Enoplidae. He constructed an evolutionary trend within the family with regard to the structure of the buccal cavity.

In his revision of the Enchelidiidae, Wieser (1953) added as distinct character of the subfamilies Eurystominae and Enchelidiinae : the sexual dimorphism which only occurs within the latter. Exceptionally in marine nematode taxonomy, the female characters become more important than those of the males.

Among the order Enoplida, the family Oncholaimidae was most extensively studied. The first monograph on the Oncholaiminae (Kreis, 1934) is a comprehensive study on the morphology of this group, with a summary of the knowledge on the demanian system. This system is later studied in detail by Rachor (1970)

for different genera. He considered it as a receptaculum seminis and evaluated it as a taxonomic character proper to the group. A system based on this character is worked out by Belogurov & Belogurova (1977) and a recent key to the genera of the Oncholaimina is presented by Belogurova (1977).

New Characters in description of species.

Whereas the description of species became impoverished in quality and number of characters since the time of de Man and Cobb, recently a turn is observed and new characters were described such as :

- different types and position of body pores in the Cyatholaimidae (Inglis, 1964; Wright & Hope, 1968; Hopper, 1972; Sharma et al., 1978).
- pharyngeal glands opening in front of the nerve ring in the Linhomoeidae (Riemann, 1977) and the Desmoscolecida (Decraemer, 1976).
- two large ventrosublateral glands with long ducts, attached to the excretory ampulla of the ventral gland in Sabatieria (Riemann, 1977).
- male ejaculatory glands within the Xyalidae (Lorenzen, 1977).
- occurrence of additional cephalic setae being a sexual dimorphism or intraspecific variation in the Linhomoeidae (Hendelberg, 1977, 1979).
- position of the genital tract in relation to the intestine (Lorenzen, 1977, 1978<sup>c</sup>, 1981).
- stretch receptor organs (metanemes) in the Enoplida (Lorenzen, 1978<sup>b</sup>, 1981).
- different types of porids in the Microlaimidae and Molgolaimidae (Jensen, 1978).
- position of the ventral gland: pharyngeal or postpharyngeal (Lorenzen, 1981).
- description of juvenile stages (Lorenzen, 1973, 1974, 1978<sup>a</sup>, 1981 and Clasing, 1980).

More information is also given on intraspecific variability (Lorenzen, 1973, de Bovee, 1975).

Previously, too much of the classification and recognized groupings was based on improperly bibliographic information. An important aspect of future work appears to be the redescription of most species taking into account the newly described morphological characters. In addition, investigations on the variability of the diagnostic characters and description of the juvenile stages should be undertaken.

## Conclusion

The systematics of marine free-living nematodes is still not stabilized. New systems which try to reflect relationships between the different groups were proposed about every fifteen years. According to the number of new species described every year this is quite understandable.

Whereas systematics should be based on as many characters as possible, those used in nematode taxonomy are confined to morphology. Although there exist some examples of a numerical approach by nematologists (Moss & Webster, 1970 and Bird, 1971), only Lorenzen (1981) worked out the phylogenetic and cladistic system based on evolutionary principles. Because fossil records are lacking, this latter approach is more or less speculative. Observations on post-embryonic development provided arguments to the phylogeny.

Remarkable within marine nematode systematics is the unexpected trend to reduce the number of characters used in the phylogenetic approach from the period of Filipjev (1918/21) to De Coninck (1965). Reasonable criticism has been made by several authors on the fact that the system of De Coninck (1965) was mainly based on only two characters (which show nevertheless high validity). Empiricists propose the greatest feasible numbers of characters. This advice is on the whole sound; however, there should be a difference in characterizing species and higher taxa. What is important is not the number of characters but their taxonomic weight. Complexity of structures, synapomorphy, constancy and consistency of characters in a group a species, give a higher weight to characters important for taxonomy.

A significant value of the system of Lorenzen (1981) is the greater number of characters thoroughly analyzed and phylogenetically interpreted : three completely new characters, three known characters without hardly any systematic importance in the past and six known characters of high systematic importance in the past (to which some new aspects were added).

Although the validity of this system, many characters will remain "Diskussionspunkte".

## NEMATODE ASSOCIATIONS

## Estuaries and brackish waters

A distinct relationship exists between salinity and nematode assemblages in brackish water biotopes such as estuaries, coastal lagoons and salt marshes, which is reflected in species composition, density, biomass and species diversity. Average population densities of most species decrease towards the head of an estuary and there is usually a decrease in the number of species (Gerlach, 1953; Capstick, 1959; Biolio, 1966; Skoolmun & Gerlach, 1971; Warwick, 1971; Elmgren, 1976; Warwick & Gage, 1975; Saad & Arlt, 1977 and Van Damme *et al.*, 1980).

Capstick (1959) suggested that estuarine nematodes are mainly of marine origin. Down to about 30 ‰S nematodes are truly marine and they have a widespread distribution in offshore zones as well. This limit is also the lower boundary of occurrence of the Desmodorinae (Riemann, 1966). Gerlach (1953) and Brenning (1973) subdivided nematodes of brackish water areas (exemplified by the Baltic Sea and Kiel Bay) into six groups according to salinity: species which occur from the sea down to the polyhaline, the mesohaline and the oligohaline areas; species which occur in all brackish water areas or in mesohaline and oligohaline areas only; and euryhaline species originally from freshwater. The reality of this subdivision was confirmed by Bilio (1966), Skoolmun & Gerlach (1971), Warwick (1971) and Van Damme *et al.* (1980).

A more subtle division was made by Warwick (1971) who characterized six different habitats along the shore of the Exe estuary, determined by salinity, grain composition and the degree of water retention. Indeed, species distribution is not only related to salinity but to sediment texture, which requires morphological adaptation as well. Species from muddy sediments tend to be small with short setae and are mainly deposit feeders; species from sandy bottoms tend to be predators or epigrowth feeders with long bodies, long setae and a heavily sculptured cuticle.

There is a clear difference in the pattern of species richness along a salinity gradient between macro- and meiofauna. Within the meiofauna, some taxonomic groups may be absent as for instance in the Baltic, (e.g. some kinorhynchans and some ostracods)

but there is no obvious overall reduction in species richness. A very rich, truly brackish-water meiofauna exists. The reason for this is not only that estuaries can sustain larger populations (both macro- and meiofauna) but probably also that a well-developed brackish-water meiofauna exists in the coastal ground water along all marine coasts. There thus exists a large pool of species that can invade newly formed brackish water areas such as the Baltic (Fenchel, 1978).

Nematode density is high in estuaries and usually higher intertidally than in the sublittoral (McIntyre, 1969). Salt marshes with a high mud content have extremely high nematode densities : 16 300 ind./10 cm<sup>2</sup> in a Spartina salt-marsh in Georgia (Teal & Wieser, 1966) and a record figure of 22 860 ind./10 cm<sup>2</sup> (23 million per square meter!) on a mud flat in the Lynher estuary in England (Warwick & Price, 1979). In a detritus-rich salt marsh along the Western Scheldt river in the Netherlands (the Saaftinge land), Van Damme et al. (1980) found very high densities (6 000 ind./10 cm<sup>2</sup>), biomass (4.6 g dwt/m<sup>2</sup>) and diversity values (2.86 bits/ind.). The adjacent sites in the estuary were much poorer and a decline from the mouth towards the meso-oligohaline zone at the head was found in all parameters: density decreased from 2 160 to 164 ind./10 cm<sup>2</sup>, biomass from 980 to 24 mg dwt/m<sup>2</sup> and diversity from 3.01 to 1.63 bits/ind. In general, densities between 200 and 5 000 ind./10 cm<sup>2</sup> are recorded but many data from the literature have to be treated with caution as methodological bias has lead to severe underestimations in much earlier work.

Tietjen (1969) found marked seasonal changes in nematode species composition in two New England estuaries. Epigrowth feeders reached maximum densities in spring and summer, coincident with an observed increase in benthic microflora production, and deposit- and omnivorous feeders reached a maximum in fall and winter, coincident with increases in organic detritus concentrations.

In the Lynher estuary, where species composition remained rather stable over the year, numbers and biomass were lowest in late autumn and early winter and increased from February onwards to reach a peak in May, followed by a decline to the overwintering level (Warwick & Price, 1979). A similar pattern was observed by Skoolmun & Gerlach (1971) in the Weser-estuary in Germany, where nematodes were most abundant in the top layers of the sediment in summer but most abundant below 5 cm depth in winter.

## The littoral zone

The significance of free-living marine nematodes in the littoral zone has recently been reviewed by Platt & Warwick (1980). The coastal subsoil water is the environment of a special interstitial brackish-water fauna, which has been studied intensively along beaches of Europe and North America (Atlantic coast). The littoral zone can be considered as a transition zone between sublittoral truly marine bottoms and the continental subterranean waters with their phreatic freshwater fauna, and salinity influences on the nematode fauna are much the same as discussed in the previous chapter.

Densities of nematodes are highest in muddy salt marshes (cfr. Estuaries and brackish waters) and lowest in very exposed sandy shores (down to 100 ind./10 cm<sup>2</sup>) (Gray & Rieger, 1971). Nematodes numerically dominate the meiofauna of sheltered sandy beaches and muddy coastal areas, but in exposed sandy beaches (usually coarse bottoms) harpacticoid copepods form up 60 % of the meiofauna. However, nematode densities recorded in the literature could be underestimated as nematodes penetrate very deeply in these well oxygenated beaches (down to 105 cm, Munro et al., 1978), and usually only the first 20 cm are examined. Intertidal meiofaunal biomass is usually from one fifth to one half of the total animal biomass, depending upon substrate and beach stability, which is suggested to be a dominant controlling factor (Gray & Rieger, 1971).

Ott (1972) examined diversity of nematodes from an intertidal sandflat in North Carolina. He found three patterns: 1) diversity is higher on the sheltered than on the exposed beach in comparable stations in all cases; 2) diversity increased from high tidal level to low tidal level in both beaches; 3) diversity increased with depth into the sediment and even in the lower, anaerobic layers there was an astoundingly high diversity in spite of low density.

In algal communities diversity tends to be lower. Phytal nematode associations have received special attention from only a few authors (Wieser, 1951; 1952; 1959; Ott, 1967; Hopper & Meyers, 1967a & b; Moore, 1971 and Warwick, 1977). Faunal composition is related to the growth form and the texture of the weeds (Warwick, 1977), probably because this in turn influences the kind of epiflora and-fauna on which the nematodes feed. There exist annual

changes for each nematode species: in spring, carnivore/omnivore and deposit feeders without discrete visual organs predominate, whereas species present in the later part of the year are mainly epigrowth feeders with ocelli or visual pigments. Visual mechanisms may be necessary to maintain the worm's position near the front tips where the light intensity is higher and the epiflora consequently richer (Warwick, 1977).

In nematodes, vertical migration in response to tidal and diurnal cycles is widespread. Boaden & Platt (1971) noticed an overall downward migration of the fauna at periods when the tide crossed the sampling station. Dominant species were concentrated at different depths, with forms possessing strong caudal glands and a strong cuticle occurring in the upper layers. Some species seemed to be adapted to low oxygen tension (or absence of oxygen): Spirinia laevis, Stephanolaimus elegans and Leptonemella aphanothecae. The meiofauna from or under the redox discontinuity layer separating oxygenated and reduced layers in sediments, was called 'Thiobios' by Boaden & Platt (1971) and the existence of a typical reduced layer nematode fauna was demonstrated by Ott & Schiemer (1973). However, Reise & Ax (1979) dismissed the concept of a true 'Thiobios' and linked deep occurrence of meiobenthic taxa with the presence of burrows where oxygen penetrates much deeper into the sediment. They also remarked that longer nematodes are adapted to living in an environment where oxygen is available only at some distance from food sources in the sediment.

Well-defined vertical gradients exist in the meiofauna which appear to be mainly a response to chemical gradients in the interstitial water (McLachlan, 1978). Oxygen is considered to be the 'super parameter' responsible for these gradients. However, nematodes are less sensitive to decreased oxygen tensions than other meiofauna groups. Hulings & Gray (1976) postulated that biological factors may be important in controlling meiofauna of beaches in summer, whereas in winter physical and chemical factors would be more important. The reverse seems to be the rule in poorly oxygenated sediments (McLachlan, 1978). This is all still speculative, as is the discussion on the trophic importance of meiofauna populations in beaches in general. On exposed beaches, the meiofauna populations may be fuelled by soluble organic matter which is particularized by bacteria, without a significant transfer to higher trophic levels, so that meiofauna would be at the top of the food web (McIntyre & Murison, 1973).

### Shallow marine subtidal

McIntyre (1971) summarized published data on quantitative aspects of marine meiofauna from sediments below the low-water line. Most of the studies deal with nematodes.

Before 1960, quantitative data on nematode density had been given by Moore (1931), Krogh & Sparck (1936), Mare (1942) and Bougis (1946; 1950). In none of these studies were nematodes identified to species. Wieser (1953; 1959; 1960) made very important pioneering contributions to both ecology and systematics of marine nematodes.

Even more than on beaches, the small-scale gradients in sublittoral sediments are vertical, whereas variations in exposure to water turbulence, input of organic matter and grain size distribution (factors that are highly correlated) occur over greater horizontal distances and give rise to differences in faunal composition (Fenchel, 1978). Fine sands, muddy sands and sandy muds are the richest habitats in terms of nematode density, whereas coarse sands and gravels have especially low density values (Soyer, 1971; Lorenzen, 1974; Juario, 1975 and Willems *et al.*, in prep.). Average numbers vary from a few to 3 000 ind./10 cm<sup>2</sup> and biomass values from 100 to 1 500 ug dwt/10 cm<sup>2</sup>; this represents 90-99 % of the total meiofauna numbers and 50-90 % of the total meiofauna biomass in most circumstances. Extremely high values have been found in shallow muds in the North Sea off the Belgian coast, where on one station an average density of 42 000 ind./10 cm<sup>2</sup> was found (Herman, pers.comm.). In coastal terrigenous muds off Banyuls-sur-Mer (Mediterranean) very high densities were recorded (average of 4 300 ind./10 cm<sup>2</sup>, maximum of 7 600 ind./10 cm<sup>2</sup> in summer, lower in winter). These differences may be related to temperature. In medium well-sorted sands in South Africa, nematode numbers were related to the amounts of nitrogen in the sediment, assumed to indicate the amount of digestible food (McLachlan *et al.*, 1977).

Nematode diversity is correlated with sediment granulometry. Wieser (1960) and Hopper & Meyers (1967a) suggested that more species will be present in a habitat with a larger number of niches, and presumed that marine sediments become more heterogeneous when the silt-clay content decreases and the grain size increases. Diversity is higher in sands where an interstitial fauna exists, than in noncapillary sediments. Species numbers are also higher and sandy sediments contain more 'specialist' species than silty ones (Heip & Decraemer, 1974). That the number of niches is higher in sandy sediments

is indicated by the coexistence of closely related species in these sediments indicating the existence of microhabitats. An extreme example of this is the presence of eight species of Microloaimus on a sheltered beach found by McIntyre & Murison (1973).

As gradients in sediments occur over a small scale vertically, nematodes should be more sensitive to slight changes in sediment granulometry than e.g. the macrofauna. Nevertheless, it is possible to characterize different biotopes by means of nematode assemblages. It is even possible to demonstrate, on the family level, that similar sublittoral habitats from the North Atlantic, Mediterranean, North Sea and Baltic Sea are characterized by 'parallel' nematode communities. The first to deal with the community concept in marine nematodes was Wieser (1960) who distinguished two nematode communities in the benthos of Buzzards Bay: an Odontophora-Leptonemella community in sandy habitats and a Terschellingia longicaudata-Trachydemus mainensis (Kinorhynch) community in a silty habitat. Two basic faunal units have been found repeatedly: a mud unit characterized by high species dominance, low species diversity and low species endemism and a sand unit characterized by low species dominance, high species diversity and high species endemism (Tietjen, 1977).

The coastal muds of most regions are characterized by a few dominant genera showing vicariance, or even by the same species. All the dominant nematodes in these habitats are members of the Comesomatidae, Linhomoeidae and Spiriniidae, with the following genera important: Sabatieria, Dorylaimopsis, Terschellingia, Spirinia, etc. These abundant genera may be accompanied by different sub-dominant genera such as Paramesacanthion, Axonolaimus, Parironus, Longicyatholaimus, Daptonema, Sphaerolaimus and Desmolaimus.

Sandy bottoms are less studied and it is difficult to enumerate a few families or genera which are characteristic since the fauna is much more diverse (Boucher, 1980b). Tietjen (1977) gives habitat preferences on the family level which can be extended to nearly all coastal regions examined: 1) muds: Comesomatidae, Linhomoeidae; 2) muddy sands: Comesomatidae, Monhysteridae, Desmodoridae, Linhomoeidae; 3) fine sands: Monhysteridae, Comesomatidae, Desmodoridae, Axonolaimidae; 4) medium-coarse sands: Monhysteridae, Desmodoridae, Chromadoridae. We can add to this list for clean, coarse sands the family Epsilonematidae and superfamily Draconematoidea which are restricted to these biotopes.

## Deep Sea

The qualitative composition of the meiofauna of the deep-sea is rather stable: in poor as well as in rich areas nematodes comprise between 85-95% of the meiofauna, when the Foraminifera are excluded. Meiofaunal densities in the deep sea range from a few to 1 500 ind./10 m<sup>2</sup> and decrease with increasing depth. This decrease is relatively less than for the macrofauna so that the relative importance of the meiofauna in bottom communities increases with depth (Thiel, 1975). The availability of food is a major factor in explaining the quantitative distribution of meiofauna in the abyssal depths (Dinet, 1979) and highly significant correlations between meiofauna and the ratios C/proteins and N/proteins, which reflect the degree of decomposition, have been found. Similarly, Thiel (1979) explained the higher nematode densities from areas near the coast and from upwelling regions by an increase in food availability.

Only two studies exist in which species composition and diversity of nematodes from the deep sea are discussed (Tietjen, 1976 and Dinet & Vivier, 1979). Tietjen (1976) found that changes in species composition along transects from 50 to 2 500 m depth were correlated with changes in bottom water temperature and changing sediment type. In four sedimentary environments off North Carolina 209 species of nematodes were found, occurring in distinct associations. A sand zone (50-500 m) and a clayey-silt zone (800-2 500 m) were recognized, and were separated by a transition zone (500-800 m) with little species endemism. The Enoplidae, Ceramonematidae, Chromadoridae and Desmodorinae have their centers of abundance in sandy sediments; the Leptosomatidae, Oxystominidae, Axonolaimidae, Leptolaimidae, Linhomoeidae, Siphonolaimidae, Sphaerolaimidae and Comesomatidae tended towards increasing abundance in the clayey-silts. Dinet & Vivier (1979) found the Monhysteridae, Chromadoridae, Oxystominidae, Desmoscolecidae, Microlaimidae and Axonolaimidae most abundant in the deeper parts of the Bay of Biscay.

The existence of a characteristic deep sea nematode fauna is striking. From the 317 species recorded by Dinet & Vivier (1979) only three could be identified to known species. All the others had affinities with known abyssal genera or were not described at all.

Nematode diversity decreases with depth as the sediment becomes finer (Tietjen, 1976). However, the diversity of the deep sea nematode assemblages

is significantly higher than that of shallow-water assemblages with the same sediment characteristics. A faunal change occurs around the depth of 4 000 m (Dinet & Vivier, 1979). This increased diversity may be due to the greater stability of the deep sea environment and may on the other hand indicate the possible susceptibility of these populations to man-made disturbances such as dumping or deep sea mining (Thiel, 1975).

## HORIZONTAL AND VERTICAL DISTRIBUTION

### Small-scale horizontal distribution

Many studies have shown that meiofaunal populations are distributed in aggregations, forming patches of high abundance on the sea bottom. For nematodes, this has been demonstrated by Vitiello (1968), Gray & Rieger (1971), Arlt (1973) and Gerlach (1977).

These patchy distributions have often been correlated with patchiness of the environment, though other mechanisms such as reproductive patterns may be involved (Heip, 1975). Gerlach (1977) showed that decaying organisms and the associated microflora may attract certain meiofaunal organisms, such as nematodes, and food in general is thought to be important. Meiofauna was shown to be attracted selectively to patches of some species of algae but not to others, and this selective recruitment may be important when food species are patchily distributed (Lee *et al.*, 1977).

Biogenic structures (e.g. Uca or Arenicola burrows, or roots of Spartina) affect the distribution of meiofauna significantly and must be taken into account when quantifying meiofauna in areas where much structural heterogeneity is present (Bell *et al.*, 1978; Reise & Ax, 1979).

### Vertical distribution

The vertical zonation in marine sediments is clearly reflected in the fauna. The depth to which organisms penetrate is correlated with characteristics of the sediment such as oxygen concentration and food availability. In most sediments the surface layers are oxidized and it is improbable that a permanent meiofauna can develop in sediments which are periodically or permanently anoxic. When light is available photosynthesis in the

oxidized surface layer is possible, but reduced oxygen tensions will be obvious only after a few centimeters in even well aerated sediments, with the exception of high-energy beaches where the oxidized layer can be several meters deep.

Photosynthesis and possibly chemosynthesis at the boundary between oxidized and reduced layers (the redox discontinuity layer) provide new organic material and the distribution of many meiofauna species in shallow waters is linked to this. Nematodes are often concentrated in the uppermost layers in late spring and summer and extend into deeper sediments in winter. Also 2A species (epigrowth-feeders) tend to dominate in summer and 1B species (non-selective deposit-feeders) later in the year.

In muds, the vertical distribution is not the same as in sands. Salvat & Renaud-Mornant (1969) show that 2B species (omnivores) decrease with depth in coralligenous sands whereas 2A species increase. In muddy sediments, Boucher (1972) obtained contrary results, with 2A species decreasing with depth and 1B species increasing.

Perhaps the most important factor regulating vertical distribution is not food but the capability to adapt to stress conditions (McLachlan, 1978). Wieser et al. (1974) demonstrated that several species had lethal temperatures close to the maximum temperatures experienced in the habitat. Wieser & Kanwisher (1961) and Teal & Wieser (1966) showed that nematodes that live deepest in the sediments have the lowest metabolism.

Wieser et al. (1974) describe how Paramonhystera wieseri seems to thrive better in (apparently) oxygen-free environments and therefore considered the species to be an obligate anoxobiont, as at least some of its life functions are irreversibly damaged by normal oxygen tensions.

The evidence for a characteristic nematode fauna inhabiting permanently sediments (Ott & Schiemer, 1973) has recently been questioned in general (Reise & Ax, 1979) but the dispute is far from settled.

## FEEDING

Nematodes occupy very different roles in aquatic ecosystems as consumers of bacteria, as grazers of primary producers and as predators and parasites. Rhabditis marina has been reported to take up dissolved organic matter directly (Chia & Warwick, 1969), but these results have been questioned (Tietjen & Lee, 1975; Tietjen, pers. comm.).

As already mentioned, the first approach towards elucidating the role of nematodes was based on the morphology of the buccal cavity (Wieser, 1953a). Wieser (1960) himself conceded that his classification was not as strict as he thought and that many nematodes are omnivorous, not only species with heavily armed mouth cavities but also some species classified as deposit or epistratum feeders on the basis of their mouth morphology.

The feeding behaviour of marine nematodes has been reviewed by Tietjen & Lee (1977a) but quantitative information for marine species is scarce. The daily ingestion rate of algae by Chromadorina germanica is equal to its body weight, and this species consumes significantly more algae than bacteria when offered the choice. This tends to confirm Wieser's views but Monhystera denticulata and Rhabditis marina show no difference in preference between algae and bacteria in terms of weight, though much more bacteria were consumed in terms of cells available. This suggests that ingestion rate in these species is determined by the size of the food particles. The data of Tietjen & Lee (1977a) also point out that some selection of food occurs, though the mechanism remains unknown.

The food ingestion of three species has been calculated by Tietjen (1980b) to be 144 and 600 ng C per day per animal, or between 9 and 37 ng C per day and per ng C of animal. This is in the range reported for meiofauna in general, i.e. between 0.1 and 10 ug dry-weight per day (about 40 and 4 000 ng C).

Qualitative information on aspects of feeding indicates the often highly complex nature of the interactions between nematodes and the microflora of sediments. Riemann & Schrage (1978) described the continuous production of mucus by nematodes, which produce a slimy trail along which particles adhere firmly. By creeping repeatedly on their traces, burrows are made that may be very important in determining sediment texture. Riemann & Schrage (1978) suppose that small particles such as bacteria and even macromolecules may become trapped in the mucus and are subsequently browsed. A similar mechanism has been advanced by Gerlach (1978): through their activity meiofauna stimulate bacterial growth and thus increase bacterial production to levels which are not attainable without this activity. This process has been called 'gardening'.

The amount to which marine nematodes serve as food for higher trophic levels remains unclear. There certainly are important predators within the meiofauna itself (e.g. hydrozoans such as Protohydra or Halammohydra,

many turbellarians, nematodes); there are also known consumers of nematodes among the macrofauna and some fish species. Coull & Bell (1979) suggest that the meiofauna of muds and detritus-rich habitats serves as a significant source of food for higher trophic levels (primarily browsers) whereas in sandy substrates the members of the meiofauna serve primarily as nutrient regenerators.

#### POLLUTION BIOLOGY

The possible use of nematodes as tools in monitoring the biological effects of pollution has been discussed by Heip (1980). Benthic organisms in general are probably the best all-round biotic component to monitor (Gray et al., 1980) and nematodes in particular possess some characteristics such as a short life-span and high diversity which makes them potentially useful.

The influence of pollution on nematodes has received comparatively little attention. Oil pollution has been most thoroughly studied. Nematodes from intertidal habitats appear to be vulnerable to oil pollution and even seven months after the Amoco Cadiz spill, nematode abundance was generally decreased (Boucher, 1980a). However, sublittoral nematode communities showed no such decrease in diversity following the increase of tolerant species such as Anticoma ecotrons, Sabatieria celtica, Paracyatholaimus occultus and Microlaimus conspicuus which achieved densities 2-4 higher after pollution occurred. A similar increase in nematode density was observed by Renaud-Mornant & Gourbault (1980), who also found little permanent damage to the meiofauna in general. After the Tsesis spill in the Baltic Sea all meiofauna groups except nematodes were drastically reduced (Elmgren et al., 1980).

That the nematodes as a group are more resistant to different forms of pollution than other benthic groups has also been demonstrated by Van Damme & Heip (1977) in the Southern Bight of the North Sea. In an area with a mixed type of pollution, nematodes were often the only animal group present in the samples.

The effects of heavy metal pollution have been studied by Lorenzen (1974b). He found no short-term effects of industrial wastes containing 10%  $H_2SO_4$  and 14%  $FeSO_4$  on the nematode assemblage of the dumping area. Tietjen (1977, 1980a) related nematode distribution with pollution in the New York Bight area and found significant differences between stations

with an elevated organic carbon or heavy metal load and clean medium sand stations. Sabatieria pulchra and Tripyloides gracilis, usually restricted to silty bottoms, were dominant in a contaminated sandy station with a high organic content. It appears that the complex of species that normally inhabits medium sands may be especially sensitive to elevated loads of heavy metals and/or organic matter. Species belonging to the Chromadoridae, Desmodoridae and Monoposthiidae may be reduced or even eliminated and species normally associated with finer sediments such as Sabatieria may increase.

The use of nematodes in monitoring thus requires at least some knowledge of nematode systematics, as the response of different species may be very different whereas overall parameters such as density may remain unaffected as some species decrease whereas others increase. However, it appears possible that analysis to species level, which is particularly difficult, may not be necessary and that higher taxonomic groups are as a whole similar in their response. This needs elaboration.

#### LIFE CYCLES

Evaluation of the importance of nematodes in marine ecosystems has centered mainly around the structural characteristics such as abundance and biomass and direct measurement or calculation of production has until now not been achieved. Indirect methods which have been used so far depend on Waters (1969) concept of life-cycle turnover or on respiration data. The first method requires knowledge of the annual number of generations in the field. In most instances this number has been estimated from laboratory experiments and the field data which are available are for large slow-growing species with only one or a few generations annually.

Enoplus communis has only one generation annually in a salt marsh in Massachusetts (Wieser & Kanwisher, 1960), whereas Enoploides spiculohamatus (2-3), Oncholaimus brachycercus and Viscosia viscosa (2) had only two or three generations annually in the Weser estuary (Skoolmun & Gerlach, 1971). In a four-year study, Smol et al. (1980) established that Oncholaimus oxyuris had most probably two generations in three years in a remarkable pattern in which overwintering juveniles belong to two different generations. <sup>Overwintering</sup> Large juveniles become adult early in spring and produce another generation in the same year which overwinters as small

juveniles. These small juveniles become adult much later in the year and their offspring overwinters as large juveniles.

However, the number of annual generations in most nematode species is probably much higher than one or two, but as in many cases breeding is almost continuous laboratory experiments are necessary to obtain information on this aspect of their life-cycles.

The already large amount of literature on cultivation of marine nematodes has been summarized recently by Kinne (1977) in which culture methods have been extensively documented for the following species (original publication mentioned between brackets): Aphelenchoides marinus (Meyers et al., 1964), Chromadora macrolaimoides (Tietjen & Lee, 1973), Diplolaimella ocellata (Chitwood & Murphy, 1964), Metoncholaimus scissus (Hopper & Meyers, 1966a; Meyers & Hopper, 1966, 1973; Meyers et al., 1970), Monhystera denticulata (Tietjen & Lee, 1972), Monhystera disjuncta (Chitwood & Murphy, 1964; von Thun, 1968; Gerlach & Schrage, 1971), Monhystera filicaudata (Tietjen, 1967), Rhabditis marina (Lee et al., 1970; Tietjen et al., 1970), Theristus pertenuis (Gerlach & Schrage, 1971) and Adoncholaimus thalassophygas, Chromadorina tenuis, Diplolaimella ocellata, Diplolaimelloides orchei (von Thun, 1968 in Gerlach, 1971). Recent studies have done by Heip et al. (1978) for Oncholaimus oxyuris and Vranken et al. (in press) for Monhystera parelegantula.

A number of these species have been cultured only at room temperature and constant salinity. Under these conditions generation times are often of the order of two to four weeks, though much longer generation times have been observed e.g. for oncholaimids and much shorter generation times such as for Rhabditis marina (2.5 days) exist as well. However, temperature has a profound influence on development time and generation time. This effect can be described by a simple power equation  $D = aT^b$  relating development (or generation) time and temperature. Values of  $b$  vary between -1.05 for Theristus pertenuis (Gerlach & Schrage, 1971) and -2.87 for Diplolaimella ocellata (Hopper et al., 1973). A modal value is  $b = -1.8$ , indicating that development accelerates with a factor 2.5 to 3.5 between 10 and 20°C and 1.8 to 2.2 between 20 and 30°C. This modal value is high when compared with other groups such as Calanoida ( $b = -1.04$ ) and Harpacticoida ( $b = -1.29$ ) (Heip & Smol, 1976)., and it therefore appears that temperature has a more profound effect on nematodes than on other meiobenthic groups.

The combined influence of temperature and salinity on development has been studied by Tietjen & Lee (1972, 1977b) on Rhabditis marina, Monhystera denticulata and Chromadorina germanica. Both M. denticulata and C. germanica appear to be better adapted for life in the middle and upper portions of their salinity range.

The average number of generations in natural populations with continuous breeding has been estimated from experiments as described above. These estimations vary from 5 for Monhystera parelegantula in a lagoon in Belgium (Vranken *et al.*, in press) to 15 for Chromadorina germanica and Monhystera denticulata in the New York area (Tietjen & Lee, 1972, 1977b) and 17 for Monhystera disjuncta in Germany (Gerlach & Schrage, 1971). As only a few species have been studied, and most of them belong to the same genus, it is too early to give some modal value of the annual number of generations.

#### PRODUCTION

Estimation of production using the classical method as described e.g. by Crisp (1971) based on growth analysis of field populations has until now not been attempted for marine nematodes. Estimations of this important ecological parameter in the literature are either based on biomass data using a standard figure proposed by Gerlach (1971) or on respiration data using a regression equation proposed by McNeil & Lawton (1970).

Gerlach (1971) based his values on the concept of life-cycle turnover introduced by Waters (1969), which has to be multiplied by the annual number of generations to obtain an estimate of a yearly P/B- ratio; and on experiments of von Thun (1968) who studied the life-cycle of the brackish-water species Chromadorita germanica. Starting with one male and one female (ww = 1 ug) and assuming a random mortality of 10 % per day and 20 eggs per female, he calculated a production of 10 ug during the life-cycle and an average standing stock of 3.3 ug so that life-cycle turnover is around 3.

A mortality of 10 % per day may be too high but this factor is relatively unimportant in calculating life-cycle turnover. Although such calculations are rather crude, there is good agreement with estimates based on standard demographic techniques (Heip, unpublished), provided a stable age-distribution is reached, which might be the case for many small species with continuous breeding.

In order to obtain the annual turnover or P/B-ratio this figure has to be multiplied with the annual number of generations. On the basis of the literature Gerlach (1971) suggested that a modal figure might be three generations annually, and the subsequent result  $P = 9B$  has found wide acceptance to estimate production for nematodes and indeed for meiofauna as a whole. As already mentioned, this figure seems to be <sup>an</sup> underestimate for many species but it may be too early to put another figure in its place, if indeed such a general number exist.

New work along the same line is that of Zaika & Makarova (1979) who preferred to calculate daily turnover rates (or specific production),  $C = P/B$ , from the literature. In theory  $C = b$ , the instantaneous birth rate (and not the intrinsic rate of increase  $r$  as stated in the paper) but to evaluate  $C$  in this way  $r$  has to be known and  $r$  can be calculated exactly only when a life-table is available, which is not the case for any marine nematode.

Also, in this as in Gerlach's work, an average of 20 eggs per female is probably too low. It therefore seems that the equation proposed by Zaika & Makarova (1979) relating specific production with temperature  $C = 0.008 T^{0.96}$  (not 0.08 as stated in the paper) must be treated with caution. On a yearly basis  $P/B = 27$  for a mean water temperature of  $10^{\circ}\text{C}$  using this equation, and this may well be too high.

An indirect approach to calculate production has been used by Warwick & Price (1979) who used the empirical relationship calculated between production and respiration of short-lived poikilotherm animals proposed by McNeil & Lawton (1970)  $\log P = 0.8262 \log R - 0.0948$  (in  $\text{k cal. m}^{-2} \cdot \text{yr}^{-1}$ ). By measuring respiration of 16 species they found an average of  $P/B = 8.4$ , surprisingly close to a value of  $P/B = 8.7$  calculated by accepting a net growth efficiency of  $P/P+R = 0.38$  (as found by Marchant & Nicholas (1975) for the freshwater species *Pelodera*); and, of course, also surprisingly close to Gerlach's older figure of  $P/B = 9$ . Though this adds some strength to this figure, it seems to us that it remains too low and that the resemblance is largely coincidental.

The validity of such an approach depends amongst other things on a functional relationship between  $P$  and  $R$ . It is interesting to note in this context that Schimer et al. (1980) in experiments with the freshwater species *Plectus palustris* found that both parameters depended on food concentration, but production more so than respiration. To cover metabolic costs threshold densities of  $10^8$  cells/ml of *Acetivobacter* were found that did not permit growth or reproduction. As these bacterial densities are not attained in oligotrophic and mesotrophic lakes, this also indicates that food density may be limiting this species in nature.

## RESPIRATION

Respiration of individual or several nematodes has been measured as oxygen consumption using oxygen electrodes (Atkinson, 1973) or Cartesian Diver Respirometry (see Lasserre, 1976, for a review of techniques). The available information has been summarized by Warwick & Price (1979) who published data on 48 species representing all trophic categories.

Respiration (in  $\text{nl O}_2 \cdot \text{ind}^{-1} \cdot \text{h}^{-1}$ ) is traditionally expressed in units of body weight such as volume (in  $\text{nl}$ ) using a power equation  $R = aV^b$ . The coefficients  $a$  and  $b$  are calculated by regressing  $\log R$  against  $\log V$ . As in other poikilotherms  $b = 0.75$  on the average, though Atkinson (1976) suggested a somewhat higher value  $b = 0.79$  and Zeuthen (1953) even believed that metabolism in nematodes is weight-independent. This is certainly not true, but it is interesting to note that Laybourn (1979) found a varying value of  $b$  according to temperature in the freshwater species Anonchus, with  $b$  approaching the value of one at temperature of 20-25°C.

The value of  $a$  is considered to be an indication of metabolic intensity (Schiemer & Duncan, 1974). Warwick & Price (1979) recalculated  $a$  from existing data using  $b = 0.75$  throughout and could distinguish four groups of nematodes according to values of  $\log a$ . In general the predator/omnivore and non-selective deposit feeders have faster respiration rates than the epigrowth feeders and selective deposit feeders. Also larger species have a higher metabolic intensity than smaller species and species from well-oxygenated habitats have a higher respiration rate than species from poorly oxygenated habitats. This may be due to a partly anaerobic respiration as suggested by Schi<sup>e</sup>mer & Duncan (1974).

A typical value is around  $\log a = -0.1$  which is equal to a respiration of  $\pm 0.8 \text{ nl O}_2 \cdot \text{h}^{-1}$  for a volume unit of respiring nematode. Thus, for a 'typical' nematode, with  $\delta = 1.13$  and  $\text{dwt} = 0.25 \text{ ww}$ , we have  $\log R (\text{nl O}_2 \cdot \text{h}^{-1}) = -0.1 + 0.75 \log \text{dwt}$  (in  $\mu\text{g dwt}$ ) or  $\log R = \text{---} + 0.75 \log W$ , an equation which could be used with caution in the absence of other information.

Community respiration has been evaluated from laboratory measurements by Wieser & Kanwisher (1961), Teal & Wieser (1966) and Warwick & Price (1979). It has been noted by the last of these authors that in these three studies respiration per  $\text{g ww}$  is very similar and an average value of  $6 \text{ l O}_2 \cdot \text{m}^{-2} \cdot \text{yr}^{-1} \cdot \text{g}^{-1}$  is therefore proposed by Warwick & Price (1979) as of possible use when drawing energy budgets when respiration data are not available. Such general values do not take temperature properly into account.

The effect of temperature on respiration has been investigated by Price & Warwick (1980) for Sphaerolaimus hirsutus and for Trefusia schiemi and Theristus floridianus by Wieser & Schiemer (1977). By plotting the log respiration per unit body weight  $R_c = R/W$  against temperature  $T$ ,  $Q_{10}$  values can be simply obtained as  $Q_{10} = 10^d$  from  $\log R = c + d.T$ .  $Q_{10}$ -values were 1.17 for S. hirsutus between 5 and 25°C but outside this range the relationship was non-linear.  $Q_{10}$  was about 2 for Trefusia schiemi and based on this and some data on other meiofauna animals Price & Warwick (1980) suggested that animals with stable food supplies might have  $Q_{10} \sim 1$  whereas animals with a more variable food supply might have  $Q_{10} \sim 2$ . With the scarce data at our disposal it is difficult to see if this generalisation really holds.

#### CONCLUDING REMARKS : ON THE IMPORTANCE OF NEMATODES IN MARINE ECOSYSTEMS

It has been stated many times by meiofauna workers that nematodes must be important in marine ecosystems. The arguments have centered mainly around their enormous abundance, with an order of magnitude of tens of millions per square meter in estuaries and salt marshes, millions per square meter in the shallow subtidal and still hundreds of thousands per square meter in the deep sea. However, the message has still not reached a large part of the scientific community and whereas nearly everybody concerned with the sea is aware of the importance of copepods in the plankton this is certainly not so for the importance of nematodes in the benthos.

There are several reasons for this. Firstly, nematology is a relatively young science and the number of active nematologists is small. Ecological research with nematodes started only a few decades ago by isolated workers; only with the start of the International Meiofauna Conferences (Tunis, 1969; York, 1973, Hamburg, 1977 and Columbia, 1980) and the Workshops on Aquatic Nematodes (Genève, 1977; Bremerhaven, 1979; Plymouth, 1981) has there been a growing exchange between nematologists of different nations. Whereas plankton research has a long tradition, benthic research is younger. Earlier workers in the beginning of the century used large mesh sieves and so lost nearly all the nematodes present in the sediment. Because nematodes are indeed small, many species measure only a few hundred micrometers in length and are consequently difficult to study in the field or in laboratory experiments. They have to be examined under the microscope and identification

to the species level is tedious and difficult to the unexperienced. A final reason may be that they are inconspicuous animals, thriving mostly in the muds, and muds are not particularly in favour with many people.

All these reasons have hindered research on nematodes for a long time and will continue to do so in the future. There are only a few laboratories actively engaged in the study of marine nematodes and as the number of new ideas in any science is roughly proportional to the number of people working in it, it is clear that marine nematology will continue to progress only slowly, moreover so as it is unlikely that much more funds will become available in the near future, and the contrary seems more likely.

Nevertheless, all the evidence obtained in recent years clearly demonstrates that nematodes are important in marine ecosystems. Most of the arguments have been summarized recently by Platt & Warwick (1980) and partially by Tietjen (1980). We will illustrate this with two examples: the intertidal mud flat of the Lynher estuary in Cornwall (Warwick & Price, 1979) and the Southern Bight of the North Sea (Heip et al., 1979).

In the Lynher estuary nematodes are extremely abundant, though it may be expected that roughly the same abundance will be found in many other estuaries. Their average density over the year is 12.5 million ind./m<sup>2</sup>, their average biomass 1.97 g dwt/m<sup>2</sup>; this indicates that the Lynher species are small, with an average individual biomass of only 0.16 ug dwt or roughly 0.64 ug ww. Their respiration amounts to 11.2 g C metabolized per year and this contrasts with the figure of 21.6 g C metabolized for the entire macrofauna. Consumption must be even more astounding: when calculated as the sum of production and respiration it amounts to 29.7 g C per year, again about half the total consumption of the macrofauna. When assuming however that nematodes eat about their own body weight daily, total consumption would be 2.9 kg ww per m<sup>2</sup> and per year. This figure seems totally unrealistic, but one has to take into account that nematodes increase their food supply through several mechanisms stimulating bacterial growth.

In the area near the Belgian coast of the Southern Bight of the North Sea average nematode abundance is 1.65 million ind./m<sup>2</sup> and average biomass is 0.99 g dwt/m<sup>2</sup>; although there are fewer nematodes than in the Lynher estuary, their total biomass is not much lower as these are larger species with an average individual biomass of 0.60 ug dwt or 2.40 ug ww. Their respiration has been estimated at about 7 g C per m<sup>2</sup> and per year, whereas macrofauna in the same area metabolizes only 3.4 g C per m<sup>2</sup>. Nematodes alone

respire thus two times more than the entire macrofauna.

It is clear from these two examples that a very significant portion of the energy flow through the benthic system passes through the nematodes. However, one of the main reasons why marine nematodes have remained unpopular research objects is that it has not been shown very conclusively that they are of direct benefit or nuisance to man. It has been a popular viewpoint to consider meiofauna as a whole as something of a closed system, a trophic dead end, in fact a system that is competitive to the macrofauna with its obvious importance to man. It is true that there is little concrete evidence suggesting important direct consumption of meiofauna by species which are directly important to man, but in recent years considerable indirect evidence has become available suggesting that nematodes are indeed passed up in the food chain (Platt & Warwick, 1980; Coull & Bell, 1979). Crustaceans and maybe some fish species such as mullets are expected to be the main predators of nematodes, and a lot of macrofaunal deposit feeders will at least partly depend on them as a food source.

Apart from being directly important to man, nematodes certainly play an important indirect role in the marine ecosystem. Their role in stimulating bacterial metabolism is well documented (Tenore *et al.*, 1977; Tietjen, 1980b) and they must have an important and direct influence on the productivity of shallow waters by enhancing nutrient regeneration in the sediments. Their influence on sediment texture has also been documented (Cullen, 1973) and the extensive production of mucus by animals in such density will certainly change the physical characteristics of sediments, which will have importance in dredging and dumping operations.

In conclusion, although it has become clear during the last decade, that free-living nematodes are ecologically the most important animal taxon in all marine sediments, much work remains to be done, both on the ecology and the systematics of this group, before evaluation of their role in the marine environment will reach the degree of sophistication already attained for many planktonic groups.

## REFERENCES

- Allen, M.W. & Noffsinger, E.M. (1978). A revision of the marine nematodes of the superfamily Draconematoidea Filipjev, 1918 (Nematoda : Draconematina). *University of California Publications in Zoology*, 109, 1-133.
- Andrassy, I. (1976). Evolution as a basis for the systematisation of nematodes. *Pitman Publishing, L.T.D. London*, 238 pp.
- Arlt, G. (1973). Vertical and horizontal distribution of the meiofauna in the Greifswalder Bodden. *Oikos*, suppl. 15, 105-111.
- Atkinson, H.J. (1973). The respiratory physiology of the marine nematodes *Enoplus brevis* (Bastian) and *E. communis* (Bastian). *J. exp. Biol.*, 59, 255-266.
- Atkinson, H.J. (1975). The functional significance of the haemoglobin in a marine nematode, *Enoplus brevis* (Bastian). *J. exp. Biol.*, 62, 1-9.
- Bastian, H.C. (1865). Monograph on the Anguillulidae, or free Nematoids, marine, land, and freshwater; with descriptions of 100 new species. *Trans. Linn. Soc. London*, 25, 73-184.
- Baylis, H.A. & Daubney, R. (1926). A synopsis of the families and genera of Nematoda. *London (British Museum)*, 1-277.
- Bell, S.S., Watzin, M.C. & Coull, B.C. (1978). Biogenic structure and its effect on the spatial heterogeneity of meiofauna in a salt marsh. *J. exp. mar. Biol. Ecol.*, 35, 99-107.
- Belogurova, L.S. (1977). Nematoda, Oncholaimidae. *Zoologisch Joernaal*, LVI, (11), 1587-1604.
- Belogurov, O.I. & Belogurova, L.S. (1977). Systematics and evolution of Oncholaimidae (Nematoda) II. Summary. *Russisch Tijdschrift*, 5, 33-39.
- Bilio, M. (1966). Die aquatischen Bodenfauna von Salzwiesen der Nord- und Ostsee. II. Ökologische Faunenanalyse: Hydrozoa, Nematoda, Rotatoria, Gastrotricha, Nemertini, Polychaeta, Oligochaeta, Halacaridae, Ostracoda, Copepoda. *Int. Revue ges. Hydrobiol.*, 51, 1: 147-195.
- Bird, A.F. (1971). The structure of nematodes. *Academic Press, New York, London*, 318 pp.
- Boaden, P.J.S. & Platt, H.M. (1971). Daily migration in an intertidal meiobenthic community. *Thalassia jugoslavica*, 7, 1-12.
- Boucher, G. (1972). Distribution quantitative et qualitative des Nématodes d'une station de vase terrigène côtière de Banyuls-sur-Mer. *Cah. biol. mar.*, 13, 457-474.
- Boucher, G. (1980a). Impact of Amoco Cadiz oil spill on intertidal and sublittoral meiofauna. *Marine Pollution Bulletin*, 11, 95-101.
- Boucher, G. (1980b). Facteurs d'équilibre d'un peuplement de Nématodes des sables sublittoraux. *Mém. Mus. natn. Hist. nat.*, A-114, 1-81.
- Bougis, P. (1946). Analyse quantitative de la microfaune d'une vase marine à Banyuls. *C.R. Acad. Sci., Paris*, 222, 1122-1124.
- Bougis, P. (1950). Méthode pour l'étude quantitative de la microfaune des fonds marins (meiobenthos). *Vie et Milieu*, 1, 23-38.

- de Bovée, F. (1975). Etude morphométrique de *Dorylaimopsis mediterranea* Grimaldi de Zio, nématode libre marin. *Vie et Milieu*, 25, 2A, 215-226.
- Brenning, U. (1973). The distribution of littoral nematodes in the Wismar-bucht. *Oikos*, suppl. 15, 98-104.
- Capstick, C.K. (1959). The distribution of free-living nematodes in relation to salinity in the middle and upper reaches of the River Blyth estuary. *J. Animal Ecol.*, 28, 2, 189-210.
- Chia Fu-Shiang & Warwick, R.M. (1969). Assimilation of labelled glucose from seawater by marine nematodes. *Nature*, 224, (5220), 720-721.
- Chitwood, B.G. (1933). A revised classification of the Nematoda. *Journal of Parasitology*, 20, 131.
- Chitwood, B.G. (1937). A revised classification of the Nematoda. *Papers in Helminthology, Moscou*, 69-79.
- Chitwood, B.G. (1951). North American marine nematodes. *Tex. J. Sci.*, 3, 617-672.
- Chitwood, B.G. & Chitwood, H.B. (1950). An introduction to nematology. 2. Auflage. *Monumental Printing - Baltimore*, 213 pp.
- Chitwood, B.G. & Murphy, D.G. (1964). Observations on two marine Monhysterids - their classification, cultivation, and behavior. *Tr. Trans. Am. microsc. Soc.* 83(3), 311-329.
- Clark, W.C. (1962). The systematic position of the Alaimidae and the Dipthero-phoroidea (Enoplida, Nematoda). *Nematologica*, 7, 119-121.
- Clasing, E. (1980). Postembryonic development in species of Desmodoridae, Epsilonematidae and Draconematidae. *Zool. Anz., Jena*, 204, 5/6, 337-344.
- Cobb, N.A. (1919). The orders and classes of nemas. *Contrib. Sci. Nematology*, 8, 213-216.
- Cobb, N.A. (1920). One hundred new nemas (type species of 100 new genera). *Contrib. Sci. Nematology (Baltimore)*, 9, 217-343.
- Coomans, A.C. (1977). Evolution as a basis for the systematisation of nematodes - A critical review and exposé. *Nematologica*, 23, 129-136.
- Coomans, A.C. (1979). A proposal for a more precise terminology of the body regions in the nematode. *Ann. Soc. r. Zool. Belg.*, 108, 1-2, 115-117.
- Coomans, A.C., De Coninck, L.A.P. & Heip, C. (1979). Round table discussions. *Ann. Soc. r. Zool. Belg.*, 108, 1-2, 109-113.
- Coull, B.C. (1973). Estuarine meiofauna. A review : trophic relationships and microbial interactions. In : *Estuarine Microbial Ecology*. Stevenson, L.H. & Colwell R.R. (Editors), Univ. South Carolina Press. Columbia, South Carolina, 499-512.
- Coull, B.C. & Bell, S.S. (1979). Perspectives of marine meiofaunal ecology. *Ecological processes in coastal and marine Systems*, Livingston, R.J. (Editor), 189-216.
- Crisp, D.J. (1971). Energy flow measurements. In : *Methods of the Study of Marine Benthos*. Holme, N.A. & McIntyre, A.D. (Editors), Blackwell, Oxford, 197-279.
- Cullen, D.J. (1973). Bioturbation of superficial marine sediments by interstitial meiobenthos. *Nature*, 242, 323-324.

- De Coninck, L.A.P. (1942). De symmetrie-verhoudingen aan het vooreinde der (vrijlevende) Nematoden. *Natuurwetenschappelijk Tijdschrift*, 24, 29-68.
- De Coninck, L.A.P. (1965). Classe des Nématodes - Systématique des Nématodes et sous-classe des Adenophorea. *Traité de Zoologie*, P. Grassé (editor), 4(2), 586-681.
- De Coninck, L.A.P. (1965). Classe des Nématodes - Généralités. *Traité de Zoologie*, P. Grassé (editor), 4(2), 1-217.
- Decraemer, W. (1974a). Scientific report on the Belgian Expedition to the Great Barrier Reef in 1967. Nematodes.II. *Desmoscolex* species (Nematoda, Desmoscolecida) from Yonge Reef, Lizard Island and Nympe Island. *Zool.Scr.*, 3, 167-176.
- Decraemer, W. (1974b). Scientific report on the Belgian expedition to the Great Barrier Reef in 1967. Nematodes IV. *Desmoscolex* species (Nematoda, Desmoscolecida) from Yonge Reef and Nympe Island with detailed study of *Desmoscolex longisetosus* Timm, 1970. *Biol.Jb.Dodonaea*, 42, 86-104.
- Decraemer, W. (1974c). Scientific report on the Belgian expedition to the Great Barrier Reef in 1967. Nematodes V. Observations on *Desmoscolex* (Nematoda, Desmoscolecida) with description of three new species. *Zool. Scr.*, 243-255.
- Decraemer, W. (1975a). Soil Desmoscolecids (Nematoda, Desmoscolecida). *Biol. Jb. Dodonaea*, 43, 127-136.
- Decraemer, W. (1975b). Scientific report on the Belgian expedition to the Great Barrier Reef in 1967. Nematodes.I. *Desmoscolex* species (Nematoda - Desmoscolecida) from Yonge Reef, Lizard Island and Nympe Island with general characteristics of the genus *Desmoscolex*. *Annls. Soc. r. Zool. Belg.*, 104, 105-130.
- Decraemer, W. (1975c). Scientific report on the Belgian expedition to the Great Barrier Reef in 1967. Nematodes III. Further study on *Desmoscolex* species (Nematoda - Desmoscolecida) from Yonge Reef, Lizard Island and Nympe Island. *Cah. Biol. Mar.* 16, 269-284.
- Decraemer, W. (1975d). The aberrant structure of the head in the genus *Desmottimma* Freudenhammer, 1975 (Nematodes, Desmoscolecida). *Z.Morph.Tiere*, 81, 191-194.
- Decraemer, W. (1976a). The cuticular structure in *Desmoscolex* with description of *D. spinosus* and redescription of *D. michaelseni* Steiner, 1916 (Nematoda-Desmoscolecida). *Biol.Jb.Dodonaea*, 44, 123-134.
- Decraemer, W. (1976b). Scientific report on the Belgian expedition to the Great Barrier Reef in 1967. Nematodes VI. Morphological observations on a new genus *Quadricomoides* of marine desmoscolecida. *Austr.J.Mar. Freshwater Res.*, 27, 89-115.
- Decraemer, W. (1977a). Scientific report on the Belgian expedition to the Great Barrier Reef in 1967. Nematodes IX. Four new species of *Quadricoma* Filipjev (Nematoda, Desmoscolecida). *Zool.Scr.*, 6, 275-292.
- Decraemer, W. (1977b). Origin and evolution of the Desmoscolecida, an aberrant group of nematodes. *Z.zool.Syst.Evolut.-Forsch.*, 15, 232-236.
- Decraemer, W. (1977c). The genus *Desmolorenzenia* Freudenhammer, 1975 with a redescription of *D. crassicauda* (Timm, 1970) (Nematoda, Desmoscolecida) Contribution VII on the Nematodes from the Greta Barrier Reef, collected during the belgian expedition in 1967. *Cah.Biol.Mar.*, 18, 49-58.

- Decraemer, W. (1978a). The genus *Quadricoma* Filipjev, 1922 with a redescription of *Q. cobbi* (Steiner, 1916), *Q. crassimoides* Timm, 1970 and *Q. loricata* Filipjev, 1922 (Nematoda, Desmoscolecida). *Cal. Biol. Mar.*, 19, 63-89.
- Decraemer, W. (1978b). Morphological and taxonomic study of the genus *Tricoma* Cobb (Nematoda, Desmoscolecida), with the description of new species from the Great Barrier Reef of Australia. *Austr. J. Zool.*, Suppl. Ser., 55, 1-121.
- Decraemer, W. (1978c). Scientific report on the Belgian expedition to the Great Barrier Reef in 1967. Nematodes XIV. *Prototricoma dherdei* sp.n. and *Desmolorenzenia cooleni* sp.n., with a discussion of the genus *Prototricoma* Timm (Nematoda, Desmoscolecida). *Annls. Soc. r. Zool. Belg.*, 107, 109-123.
- Decraemer, W. & Coomans, A.C. (1978). Scientific report on the Belgian expedition to the Great Barrier Reef in 1967. Nematodes XIII. A description of four new species and a redescription of four known species from and around Mangroves on Lizard Island. *Aust. J. Mar. Freshwater Res.*, 29, 509-541.
- Dinet, A. (1979). A quantitative survey of meiobenthos in the deep Norwegian Sea. *Ambio Special Report*, 6, 75-77.
- Dinet, A. & Vivier, M.H. (1979). Le méiobenthos abyssal du Golfe de Gascogne. II. Les peuplements de Nématodes et leur diversité spécifique. *Cah. Biol. Mar.*, 20, 109-123.
- Elmgren, R. (1976). Baltic Benthos communities and the role of the meiofauna. *Contr. from the Askö Laboratory*, Univ. of Stockholm, Sweden, 14, 1-31.
- Elmgren, R., Hansson, S., Larsson, U. & Sundelin B. (1980). Impact of the oil on Deep Soft Bottoms. In: *The Tsesis Oil Spill* (Kineman, Elmgren, Hansson, editors), Askö Laboratory, University of Stockholm, 97-128.
- Fenchel, T.M. (1978). The ecology of micro- and meiobenthos. *Ann. Rev. Ecol. Syst.*, 9, 99-121.
- Filipjev, I. (1918/1921). Free-living marine Nematodes of the Sevastopol area. *Trudy osob. zool. Lab. Sebastop. biol. Sta.*, (2), 4: 1-350 (1918); 351-614 (1921).
- Filipjev, I. (1929). Les Nématodes libres de la baie de la Néva et de l'extrémité orientale du Golfe de Finlande, Première partie. *Arch. Hydrobiol.*, 20, 637-699.
- Filipjev, I. (1934). The classification of the free-living nematodes and their relation to the parasitic nematodes. *Smithson. mix. Collns.*, 89(6), 1-63.
- Freudenhammer, I. (1975). Desmoscolecida aus der Iberischen Tiefsee, zugleich eine revision dieser Nematoden-Ordnung. *"Meteor" Forsch.-Ergebnisse*, Reihe, D, 20, 1-65.
- Gadea, E. (1972). Some aspects on phylogeny of nematoda. *Abstracts of the 11th. Intern. Symposium on Nematology*, (Europe. Soc. of Nematologists), 23.
- Gadea, E. (1973). Sobre la filogenia interna de los Nematodos. *Publns. Inst. Biol. apl. (Barcelona)*, 54, 87-92.
- Gerlach, S.A. (1953). Die biozönotische Gliederung der Nematodenfauna an den deutschen Küsten. *Z. Morph. Okol. Tiere*, 41, 411-512.
- Gerlach, S.A. (1971). On the importance of marine meiofauna for benthos communities. *Oecologia*, 6, 176-190.

- Gerlach, S.A. (1977). Attraction to decaying organisms as a possible cause for patchy distribution of nematodes in a Bermuda Beach. *Ophelia*, 16(2), 151-165.
- Gerlach, S.A. (1978). Food-chain relationships in subtidal silty sand marine sediments and the role of meiofauna in stimulating bacterial productivity. *Oecologia*, 33, 55-69.
- Gerlach, S.A. (1980). Development of marine nematode taxonomy up to 1979. *Veröff. Inst. Meeresforsch. Bremerh.*, 18, 249-255.
- Gerlach, S.A. & Riemann, F. (1973/1974). The Bremerhaven Checklist of Aquatic nematodes. *Veröff. Inst. Meeresforsch. Bremerh.*, Suppl.4, 1-404 (1973), 405-734 (1974).
- Gerlach, S.A. & Schrage, M. (1971). Life cycles in marine meiobenthos. Experiments at various temperatures with *Monhystera disjuncta* and *Theristus pertenuis* (Nematoda). *Marine Biology*, 9, 274-280.
- Goodey, T. (1963). Soil and freshwater nematodes. London, New York, 1-544.
- Gray, J.S. & Rieger, R.M. (1971). A quantitative study of the meiofauna of an exposed sandy beach, at Robin Hood's Bay, Yorkshire. *J.mar.Biol.Ass.U.K.*, 51, 1-19.
- Gray, J.S. *et al.* (1980). The role of ecology in marine pollution monitoring ecological panel report. *Rapp.P.-v.Réun.Cons.int.Explor.Mer*, 179, 237-252.
- Haspelslagh, G. (1972). Morphological evolution in a group of marine nematodes (Ceramonelematoidea). *Abstracts 11th.Intern.Symposium on Nematology*, (Europ.Soc.Nematologists), 27-28.
- Haspelslagh, G. (1973). Superfamille des Ceramonematoidea (Cobb, 1913), (Nematoda), évolution et systématique. *Annls.Soc.r.Zool.Belg.*, 102, 235-251.
- Haspelslagh, G. (1978). Superfamily Ceramonematoidea (Cobb, 1913). General Morphology. *Annls.Soc.r.zool.Belg.*, 108, 65-74.
- Heip, C. (1975). On the significance of aggregation in some benthic marine invertebrates. *Proc.9th.Europ.mar.biol.Symp.*, Barnes, editor, Aberdeen University Press, 527-538.
- Heip, C. (1980). Meiobenthos as a tool in the assessment of marine environmental quality. *Rapp.P. - v. Réun. Cons.int. Explor.Mer*, 179, 182-187.
- Heip, C. & Decraemer, W. (1974). The diversity of nematode communities in the southern North Sea. *J. mar.biol. Ass.U.K.*, 54, 251-255.
- Heip, C. & Smol, N. (1976). Influence of temperature on the reproductive potential of two brackish-water Harpacticoids (Crustacea, Copepoda). *Marine Biology*, 35, 327-334.
- Heip, C., Smol, N. & Absillis, V. (1978). Influence of temperature on the reproductive potential of *Oncholaimus oxyuris* (Nematoda, Oncholaimidae). *Marine Biology*, 45, 255-260.
- Heip, C., Herman, R., Bisschop, G., Govaere, J., Holvoet, M., Van Damme, D., Vanosmael, C., Willems, K. & De Coninck, L.A.P. (1979). Benthic studies of the southern Bight of the North Sea and its adjacent continental estuaries. Progress Report I. ICES, CM L/9, 133-163.
- Hendelberg, M. (1978). *Paralinhomoeus gerlachi* (Linhomoeidae), a new marine nematode from Bermuda. *Zoon*, 5, 79-86.
- Hendelberg, M. (1979). Occurrence and taxonomical significance of additional cephalic seate in some Linhomoeidae (Nematoda). *Annls.Soc.r.zool.Belg.*, 108, 57-64.

- Hope, W.D. (1971). The current status of the systematics of marine Nematodes. In: *Proceedings of the first international conference on meiofauna*. Hulings, N.C. (editor). Smithsonian contr.to Zoology, 76, 33-36.
- Hope, W.D. & Murphy, D.G. (1972). A taxonomic hierarchy and checklist of the genera and higher taxa of marine nematodes. *Smithsonian Contribution in Zoology*, 137, 1-101.
- Hopper, B.E. (1972). Free-living marine nematodes from Biscayne Bay, Florida IV. Cyatholaimidae: On the occurrence of *Marilynia* n.gen. and *Longicyatholaimus* Micoletzky, 1924 in Biscayne Bay, with a description of *L. longicaudatus* (de Man, 1876) from the type locality. *Zool. Anz.*, 189, 64-88.
- Hopper, B.E. & Meyers, S.P. (1966). Aspects of the life cycle of marine nematodes. *Helgoländer wiss. Meeresunters.*, 13, 444-449.
- Hopper, B.E. & Meyers, S.P. (1967a). Populations studies on benthic nematodes within a subtropical seagrass community. *Marine Biology*, 1(2), 85-96.
- Hopper, B.E. & Meyers, S.P. (1976b). Follicolous marine nematodes on turtle grass, *Thalassia testudinum* König, in Biscayne Bay, Florida. *Bull. Mar.Sc.*, 17 (2), 471-517.
- Hopper, B.E., Fell, J.W. & Cefalu, R.C. (1973). Effect of temperature on life cycles of nematodes associated with the mangrove (*Rhizophora mangle*) detrital system. *Marine Biology*, 23, 293-296.
- Hulings, N.C. & Gray, J.S. (1976). Physical factors controlling abundance of meiofauna on tidal and atidal beaches. *Marine Biology*, 34, 77-83.
- Inglis, W.G. (1964). The structure of the nematode cuticle. *Proc.zool.Soc.London*, 143, 465-502.
- Inglis, W.G. (1970). Cyatholaimidae (Nematoda) from the coast of western Australia. *Rec.S.Aust.Mus.*, 16 (5), 1-13.
- Jensen, P. (1978). Revision of Microlaimidae, erection of Molgolaimidae fam.n. and remarks on the systematic position of *Paramicrolaimus* (Nematoda, Desmodorida). *Zoologica Scripta*, 7 (3), 159-173.
- Jensen, P. (1979). Revision of the Comesomatidae (Nematoda). *Zoologica Scripta*, 8, 81-105.
- Juario, J.V. (1975). Nematode species composition and seasonal fluctuation of a sublittoral meiofauna community in the German Bight. *Veröff.Inst.Meeresforsch.Bremerh.*, 15, 283-337.
- Kinne, O. (1977). Cultivation of animals; research cultivation. In: *Marine Ecology*, vol III, Cultivation, part 2. Kinne, O. (editor), Wiley, Chichester, 579-1293.
- Kreis, H. (1934). Oncholaiminae Filipjev, 1916. Eine monographische Studie. *Capita Zool.*, 4(5), 1-271.
- Krogh, H. & Spärck, R. (1936). On a new bottom sampler for investigations of the microfauna of the sea bottom, with remarks on the quantity and significance of the benthonic microfauna. *K. danske.vidensk.Selsk.Skr. (Biol.)*, 13(4), 3-12.
- Lasserre, P. (1976). Metabolic activities of benthic microfauna and meiofauna. Recent advances and review suitable methods of analysis. *Benthic Boundary Layer*, McCave (editor), Plenum publ.Cy,N.Y., 95-142.

- Laybourn, J. (1979). The effects of temperature on the respiration and production of the freshwater nematode *Anonchus* sp. *Oecologia*, 41, 329-337.
- Lee, J.J., Tietjen, J.H., Stone, R.J., Muller, W.A., Rullman, J. & McEnery, M., (1970). The cultivation and physiological ecology of members of salt marsh epiphytic communities. *Helgoländer wiss. Meeresunters.*, 20, 136-156.
- Lee, J.J., Tietjen, J.H., Mastropolo, C. & Rubin, H. (1977). Food quality and the heterogeneous spatial distribution of meiofauna. *Helgoländer wiss. Meeresunters.*, 30, 272-282.
- Lorenzen, S. (1973). Die Familie Epsilonematidae (Nematoda). *Mikrofauna Meeresboden*, 25, 1-86.
- Lorenzen, S. (1974a). *Glochinema* nov.gen. (Nematoda, Epsilonematidae) aus Südchile. *Mikrofauna Meeresboden*, 47, 1-22.
- Lorenzen, S. (1974b). Die Nematodenfauna der sublittoralen Region der Deutschen Bucht, insbesondere im Titan-Abwassergebiet bei Helgoland. *Veröff.Inst. Meeresforsch.Bremerh.*, 14, 305-327.
- Lorenzen, S. (1977). Revision der Xyalidae (freilebende Nematoden) aus der Grundlage einer kritischen Analyse von 56 Arten aus Nord- und Ostsee. *Veröff. Inst.Meeresforsch.Bremerh.*, 16, 197-261.
- Lorenzen, S. (1978a). Postembryonale Entwicklung von *Steineria* und Spärolaimidenarten (Nematoden) und ihre Konsequenzen für die Systematik. *Zool.Anz., Jena*, 200, 1/2, 53-78.
- Lorenzen, S. (1978b). Discovery of stretch receptor organs in Nematodes structure arrangement and functional analysis. *Zoologica Scripta*, 7, 175-178.
- Lorenzen, S. (1978c). The system of the Monhysteridae (Nematodes) - A new approach. *Zool.Jb.Syst.Bd.*, 105, 515-536.
- Lorenzen, S. (1981). Entwurf eines phylogenetischen Systems der freilebenden Nematoden. *Veröff.Inst.Meeresforsch.Bremerh.*, Suppl.7, 1-449.
- McIntyre, A.D. (1969). Ecology of marine meiobenthos. *Biol.Rev.*, 44, 245-290.
- McIntyre, A.D. (1971). Observations on the status of subtidal meiofauna research. In: *Proceedings of the First International Conference on Meiofauna*, Hulings (editor), Smithsonian Contr.Zool., 76, 149-154.
- McIntyre, A.D. & Murison, D.J. (1973). The meiofauna of a flatfish nursery ground. *J.mar.biol.Ass.U.K.*, 53, 93-118.
- McLachlan, A. (1978). A quantitative Analysis of the Meiofauna and the Chemistry of the Redox Potential Discontinuity Zone in a Sheltered Sandy Beach. *Est. and Coast.Mar.Science*, 7, 275-290.
- McLachlan, A., Winter, P.E.D. & Botha, L. (1977). Vertical and horizontal distribution of sub-littoral meiofauna in Algoa Bay, South Africa. *Mar. Biol.*, 40, 355-364.
- McNeil, S. & Lawton, J.H. (1970). Annual production and respiration in animal populations. *Nature*, 225, 472-474.
- Maggenti, A.R. (1963). Comparative morphology in nemic phylogeny. In: *The Lower Metazoa*, Dougherty (editor), Berkeley, University of California Press, 273-282.
- Maggenti, A.R. (1970). System analysis and nematode phylogeny. *J.Nematol.*, 2, 7-15.

- de Man, J.G. (1876). Onderzoekingen over vrij in de aarde levende Nematoden. *Tijdschrift ned.dierk.Vereen.*, 2, 78-196.
- de Man, J.G. (1876a). Contribution à la connaissance des Nématodes marins du Golf de Naples. *Tijdschrift ned.dierk.Vereen.*, 3, 88-118.
- de Man, J.G. (1886). Anatomische Untersuchungen über freilebende Nordsee-Nematoden. *Leipzig (Paul Froberg)*, 1-82.
- de Man, J.G. (1888). Sur quelques Nématodes libres de la mer du Nord nouveaux ou peu connus. *Mém. Soc. zool. Fr.*, 1, 1-51.
- de Man, J.G. (1922). Vrijlevende Nematoden. In: *Flora en Fauna der Zuiderzee*, Redeke (editor), C.De Boer, 214-261.
- Marchant, R. & Nicholas, W.L. (1974). An energy budget for the free-living nematode *Pelodera* (Rhabditidae). *Oecologia*, 16, 237-252.
- Mare, M.F. (1942). A study of a marine benthonic community with special reference to micro-organisms. *J.mar.biol.Ass.U.K.*, 25, 517-554.
- Meyers, S.P., Feder, W.A. & Tsue, K.M. (1964). Studies of relationships among nematodes and filamentous fungi in the marine environment. *Devs. ind. Microbiol.*, 5, 354-364.
- Meyers, S.P. & Hopper, B.E. (1966). Attraction of the marine nematode *Metoncholaimus* sp., to fungal substrates. *Bulletin of Marine Science*, 16, 142-150.
- Meyers, S.P. & Hopper, B.E. (1973). Nematological-Microbial interrelationships and estuarine biodegradative processes. *Estuar. Microb. Ecol.*, 483-489.
- Meyers, S.P., Hopper, B.E. & Cefalu, R. (1970). Ecological investigations of the marine nematode *Metoncholaimus scissus*. *Marine Biology*, 6,1, 43-47.
- Moore, H.B. (1931). Muds of the Clyde sea area. 3. Chemical and physical conditions rate and nature of sedimentation; and fauna. *J. mar.biol.Ass.U.K.*, 17, 325-358.
- Moore, P.G. (1971). The nematode fauna associated with holdfasts of kelp (*Laminaria hyperborea*) in North-east Britain. *J.mar.biol.Ass.U.K.*, 51, 589-604.
- Moss, W.W. & Webster, W.A. (1970). Phenetics and numerical taxonomy applied to systematic nematology. *J. Nematol.*, 2(1), 16-25.
- Munro, A.L.S., Wells, J.B.J. & McIntyre, A.D. (1978). Energy flow in the flora and meiofauna of sandy beaches. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, 76 B, 297-315.
- Nicholas, W.L. (1975). The Biology of free-living nematodes. *Oxford University Press, London and New York*.
- Ott, J. (1967). Vertikalverteilung von Nematoden in Beständen nordadriatischer Sargassaceen. *Helgoländer wiss. Meereunters.*, 15, 412-428.
- Ott, J. (1972). Studies on the diversity of the nematode fauna in intertidal sediments. *Fifth Europ.Mar.Biol.Symp.*, 275-285.
- Ott, J. & Schiemer, F.S. (1973). Respiration and anaerobiosis of free-living nematodes from marine and limnic sediments. *Neth.J.Sea Res.*, 7, 233-243.
- Pearse, A.S. (1942). An Introduction to Parasitology. Baltimore, Thomas (editor), 375pp.

- Platonova, T.A. (1970). On the taxonomy of the family Leptosomatidae (Nematoda) from the Mediterranean and the adjacent Atlantic waters. *Zool.Zh.*, 49, 1298-1305.
- Platt, H.M. & Warwick, R.M. (1980). The significance of free-living nematodes to the littoral ecosystem. In: *The Shore Environment, 2, Ecosystems*, 729-759.
- Price, R. & Warwick, R.M. (1980). The effect of temperature on the respiration of meiofauna. *Oecologia*, 44, 145-148.
- Rachor, E. (1969). Das de Mansche Organ der Oncholaimidae, eine genito-intestinale Verbindung bei Nematoden. *Z.Morph. Tiere*, 66, 87-166.
- Rachor, E. (1970). Systematische Bemerkungen zur Familie der Oncholaimidae (Nematoda, Enoplidae). *Veröff.Inst.Meeresforsch.Bremerh.*, 12, 443-453.
- Reise, K. & Ax, P. (1979). A meiofaunal "Thiobios" limited to the anaerobic sulfide system of marine sand does not exist. *Marine Biology*, 54, 225-237.
- Renaud-Mornant, J; & Goubault, N. (1980). Survie de la Méiofaune après l'échouement de l'"Amoco-Cadiz" (chenal de Morlaix, grève de Roscoff). *Bull. Mus. natn. Hist.nat.*, Paris, 4 série, 2, 759-772.
- Riemann, F. (1966). Die interstitielle Fauna in Elbe-Aestuar, Verbreitung und Systematik. *Arch. Hydrobiol.*, Suppl., 31, 1-279.
- Riemann, F. (1977a). Oesophagusdrüsen bei Linhomoeidae (Monhysterida, Siphonolaimoidea). Beitrag zur Systematik freilebender Nematoden. *Veröff.Inst.Meeresforsch.Bremerh.*, 16, 105-116.
- Riemann, F. (1977b). On the Excretory Organ of *Sabatieria* (Nematoda, Chromadorida). *Veröff. Inst. Meeresforsch. Bremerh.*, 16, 263-267.
- Riemann, F. & Schrage, M. (1978). The Mucus-Trap Hypothesis on feeding of aquatic Nematodes and Implications for biodegradation and sediment texture. *Oecologia*, 34, 75-88.
- Rudolphi, C.A. (1819). Entozoorum synopsis cui accedunt mantissa duplex et indices locupletissimi. *Berlin*, 811 pp.
- Saad, M.A.H. & Arlt, G. (1977). Studies on the bottom deposits and the meiofauna of Shatt-al-Arab and the Arabian Gulf. *Cah.Biol.Mar.*, 18, 71-84.
- Salvat & Renaud-Mornant, (1969). Etude écologuque du macrobenthos et du meiobenthos d'un fond sableux de lagon du Mururoa (Tuamotu-Polynésie). *Cah.Pacifique*, 13, 159-179.
- Schiemer, F. & Duncan, A. (1974). The oxygen consumption of a freshwater benthic nematode *Tobrilus gracilis* (Bastian). *Oecologia*, 15, 121-126.
- Schiemer, F., Duncan, A. & Klekowski, R.Z. (1980). A bioenergetic study of a benthic nematode *Pelodera palustris* de Man, 1880, throughout its life cycle. *Oecologia*, 44, 205-212.
- Schneider, W. (1939). Freilebende und pflanzenparasitische Nematoden. In: *Die Tierwelt Deutschlands*, Dahl (editor), 36, 1-260.
- Schrage, M. & Gerlach, S.A. (1975). Über Greefilinae (Nematoda, Desmoscolecidae). *Veröff.Inst.Meeresforsch.Bremerh.*, 15, 37-64.
- Skoolmun, P. & Gerlach, S.A. (1971). Jahreszeitliche Fluktuationen der Nematodenfauna im Gezeitenbereich des Weser-Ästuars. *Veröff.Inst.Meeresforsch. Bremerh.*, 13, 119-138.

- Sharma, J., Hopper, B.E. & Webster, J.M. (1979). Benthic nematodes from the Pacific coast with special reference to the Cyatholaimids. *Annls.Soc.r. Zool.Belg.*, 108, 1/2, 47-56.
- Smol, N., Heip, C. & Govaert, M. (1980). The life cycle of *Oncholaimus oxyuris* (Nematoda) in its habitat. *Annls.Soc.r.Zool.Belg.*, 110, 2, 87-103.
- Soyer, J. (1971). Bionomie benthique du plateau continental de la côté catalane française.V. Densités et biomasses du méiobenthos. *Vie Milieu*, 22 (2B), 351-424.
- Steiner, G. (1931). Die Nematoden der Deutschen Südpolar-Expedition 1901-1903, Teil I und II. *Dt. Südpol.-Exped.*, 20, 167-216; 305-433.
- Stekhoven, J.H. Schuurmans, (1935). Nematoda: Systematischer Teil, Nematoda errantia. In: *Die Tierwelt der Nord- und Ostsee*. Grimpe G. & Wagler, E. (editor). 5b, 1-173.
- Stekhoven, J.H. Schuurmans & De Coninck, L.A.P. (1933). Morphologische Fragen zur Systematik der freilebenden Nematoden. *VerH dt. zool. Ges.*, 35, 138-143.
- Stiles, C.W. & Hassall, A. (1905). The determination of generic types and a list of roundworm genera, with their original and type species. *Bull. Bur. Anim. Ind.U.S. Dep. Agric* 79, 1-150.
- Stiles, C.W. & Hassall, A. (1920). Index-catalogue of medical and veterinary zoology. Subjects: Roundworms (Nematoda, Gordiacea, and Acanthocephali) and the diseases they cause. *Hygienic Laboratory Bulletin*, 114, 1-886.
- Swedmark, B. (1964). The interstitial fauna of marine sand. *Biol.Rev.*, 39, 1-42.
- Tarjan, A.C. (1980). An illustrated guide to the marine nematodes. *Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences*, University of Florida, 1-135.
- Teal, J.M. & Wieser, W. (1966). The distribution and ecology of nematodes in a Georgia salt marsh. *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 11, 217-222.
- Tenore, K.R., Tietjen, J.H. & Lee, J.J. (1977). Effect of meiofauna on incorporation of aged eelgrass, *Zostera marina*, detritus by the polychaete *Nephtys incisa*. *J. Fish. Res. Bd Can.*, 34, 563-567.
- Thiel, H. (1975). The size structure of the deep-sea benthos. *Int. Revue ges. Hydrobiol.*, 60, 575-606.
- Thiel, H. (1979). Structural aspects of the deep-sea benthos. *Ambio Special Report*, 6, 25-31.
- Thun, W. von, (1968). Autökologische Untersuchungen an freilebenden Nematoden des Brackwassers. *Thesis University Kiel*, 1-72.
- Tietjen, J.H. (1967). Observations on the ecology of the marine nematode *Monhystera filicaudata* Allgen, 1929.
- Tietjen, J.H. (1969). The ecology of shallow water meiofauna in two New England estuaries. *Oecologia*, 2, 251-291.
- Tietjen, J.H. (1976). Distribution and species diversity of deep-sea nematodes off North Carolina. *Deep-sea Res.*, 23, 755-768.
- Tietjen, J.H. (1977). Population distribution and structure of the free-living nematodes of Long Island Sound. *Marine Biology*, 43, 123-136.
- Tietjen, J.H. (1980a). Population structure and species composition of the free-living nematodes inhabiting sands of the New York Bight Apex. *Est. & Coast. Mar. Sc.*, 10, 61-73.

- Tietjen, J.H. (1980b). Microbial-Meiofaunal Interrelationships : a Review. *Microbiology*, 335-338.
- Tietjen, J.H. & Lee, J.J. (1972). Life cycles of marine nematodes. Influence of temperature and salinity on the development of *Monhystera denticulata* Timm. *Oecologia*, 10; 167-176.
- Tietjen, J.H. & Lee, J.J. (1973). Life history and feeding habits of the marine nematode *Chromadora macrolaimoides* Steiner. *Oecologia*, 12, 303-314.
- Tietjen, J.H. & Lee, J.J. (1975). Axenic culture and uptake of dissolved organic substances by the marine nematode, *Rhabditis marina*, Bastian. *Cah. Biol. mar.*, 16, 685-693.
- Tietjen, J.H. & Lee, J.J. (1977a). Feeding behaviour of marine nematodes. In: *Ecology of Marine Benthos*, Coull, B.C. (editor), Univ. of South California Press, Columbia, 21-35.
- Tietjen, J.H. & Lee, J.J. (1977b). Life histories of marine nematodes. Influence of temperature and salinity on the reproductive potential of *Chromadorina germanica* Bütschli. *Mikrofauna Meeresboden*, 61, 263-270.
- Tietjen, J.H., Lee, J.J. & Rulman, et al.. (1970). Gnotobiotic culture and physiological ecology of the marine nematode *Rhabditis marina* Bastian. *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 15(4), 535-543.
- Timm, R.W. (1970). A revision of the nematode order Desmoscolecida Filipjev, 1929. *Univ. Calif. Publs. Zool.*, 93, 1-115.
- Van Damme, D. & Heip, C. (1977). Het meiobenthos in de zuidelijke Noordzee. In: *Nationaal onderzoeks- en ontwikkelingsprogramma - Project Zee*, Nihoul, C.F. & De Coninck, L.A.P., Vol 7, 1-114.
- Van Damme, D., Herman, R. Sharma, J., Holvoet, M. and Martens, P. (1980). Benthic studies of the Southern Bight of the North Sea and its adjacent continental estuaries. Progress Report II. Fluctuations of the meio-benthic communities in the Westerschelde estuary. *ICES, C.M. /L 23, 131-170*
- Vitiello, P. (1968). Variations de la densité du microbenthos sur une aire restreinte. *Recl. Trav. Stn. mar. Endoume*, 43, 261-270.
- Vitiello, P. (1969). *Hopperia*, nouveau genre de Nématode libre marin (Cosematidae). *Téthys*, 1, 485-491.
- Vitiello, P. (1974). Considérations sur la systématique des Nématodes Araeolaimidae et description d'espèces nouvelles ou peu connues. *Arch. Zool. Exp. gen.*, 115, 651-669.
- Vranken, G., Thielemans L.K., Heip, C. & Vandycke, M. (in press). Aspects of the life cycle of *Monhystera parelegantula* (Nematoda, Monhysteridae). *Marine Ecology - Progress Series*.
- Ward, A.R. (1975). Studies on the sublittoral free-living nematodes of Liverpool Bay. II. Influence of sediment composition on the distribution of marine nematodes. *Marine Biology*, 30, 217-225.
- Warwick, R.M. (1971). Nematode associations in the Exe estuary. *J. mar. biol. Ass. U.K.*, 51, 439-454.
- Warwick, R.M. (1977). The structure and seasonal fluctuations of phytal marine nematode associations on the Isles of Scilly. In: *Biology of benthic organisms*. Keegan, B.F., Ceidigh, P.O. & Boaden, P.J.S. (editors), Pergamon Press, 577-585.

- Warwick, R.M. & Gage, J.D. (1975). Nearshore zonation of benthic fauna, especially Nematoda in Loch Etive. *J.mar.biol.Ass.U.K.*, 55, 295-311.
- Warwick, R.M. & Price, R. (1979). Ecological and metabolic studies on free-living nematodes from an estuarine mud flat. *Est. and Coast.Mar.Sci.*, 9, 257-271.
- Waters, T.F. (1969). The turnover ratio in production ecology of freshwater invertebrates. *Amer.Nt.*, 103, 173-185.
- Wieser, W. (1951). Untersuchungen über die algenbewohnende Mikrofauna Hartböden. I. Zur Oekologie und Systematik der Nematodenfauna von Plymouth. *Ost. zool.*, 3(3/4), 425-480.
- Wieser, W. (1952). Investigations on the microfauna inhabiting seaweeds on rocky coasts. IV. Studies on the vertical distribution of the fauna inhabiting seaweeds below the Plymouth Laboratory. *J.mar.biol.Ass.U.K.*, 31, 145-174.
- Wieser, W. (1953a). Die Beziehung zwischen Mundhöhlengestalt, Ernährungsweise und vorkommen bei freilebenden marinen Nematoden. *Arch. für Zool.*, 4(26), 439-484.
- Wieser, W. (1953b). Free-living marine nematodes. I. Enoploidea. *Acta Univ. Lund (N.F.2)*, 49(6), 1-155.
- Wieser, W. (1954). Free-living marine nematodes. II. Chromadoroidea. *Acta Univ. Lund (N.F.2)*, 50(16), 1-148.
- Wieser, W. (1956). Free-living marine nematodes. III. Axonolaimoidea and Monhysteroidea. *Acta Univ. Lund (N.F.2)*, 52(13), 1-115.
- Wieser, W. (1959). The effect of grain size on the distribution of small invertebrates inhabiting the beaches of Puget Sound. *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 4, 181-194.
- Wieser, W. (1960). Benthic studies in Buzzards Bay. II. The Meiofauna. *Limnol. Oceanogr.*, 5, 121-137.
- Wieser, W. (1975). The meiofauna as a tool in the study of habitat heterogeneity: Ecophysiological aspects. A review. *Can. Biol. mar.*, 16, 647-670.
- Wieser, W. & Hopper, B.E. (1967). Marine nematodes of the east coast of North America. I. Florida. *Bull. Mus.comp.Zool.Harv.*, 135, 239-344.
- Wieser, W. & Kanwisher, J. (1961). Ecological and physiological studies on marine nematodes from a small salt marsh near Woodshole, Massachusetts. *Limn. Oceanogr.*, 6, 262-270.
- Wieser, W., Ott, J., Schiemer, F. & Gnaiger, E. (1974). An ecophysiological study of some meiofauna species inhabiting a sandy beach at Bermuda. *Marine Biology*, 26, 235-248.
- Wieser, W. & Schiemer, F. (1977). The ecophysiology of some marine nematodes from Bermuda: seasonal aspects. *J.exp.mar.Biol.Ecol.*, 26, 97-106.
- Willems, K.A., Vanosmael, C. Claeys, D., Vincx, M. & Heip, C. (in preparation). Macro- and meiobenthos of a sublittoral sandbank in the Southern Bight of the North Sea.
- Wright, K.A. & Hope, W.D. (1968). Elaborations of the cuticle of *Acanthonchus duplicatus* Wieser, 1959 (Nematoda: Cyatholaimidae) as revealed by light and electron microscopy. *Can.J.Zool.*, 46, 1005-1011.

- Zaika, V.E. & Makarova, N.P. (1979). Specific production of free-living marine nematodes. *Marine Ecology - Progress series*, 1, 153-158.
- Zeuthen, E. (1953). Oxygen uptake as related to body size in organisms. *Quarterly review of biology*, 28, 1-12.

Table 1 : Diagrammatic representation of the leading different visions on the classification of nematodes, from class down to order level.

Author	Subclass	Infraclass	Ordo
FILIPJEV, 1934			Enoplata Chromadorata Desmoscolecata Monhysterata ----- Anguillulata Oxyurata Ascaridata Spirurata Filariata Dioctophymata Trichurata
SCHUURMANS-STEKHOVEN, 1935	Nematoda errantia		Enoploidea Chromadoroidea Araeolaimoidea Monhysteroidea Desmoscolecoida ----- Anguilluloidea
	Nematoda parasitica		
CHITWOOD & CHITWOOD, 1950	Aphasmidia		Chromadorida Enoplida
	Phasmidia		
DE CONINCK, 1965	Adenophorea	Chromadoria	----- Araeolaimida Monhysterida ----- Desmodorida Chromadorida ----- Desmoscolecida
	Secernentea	Enoplia	----- Enoplida Dorylaimida
HOPE & MURPHY, 1972	Adenophorea		Enoplida Chromadorida Desmodorida Desmoscolecida Monhysterida Araeolaimida
GERLACH & RIEMANN, 1973/74	Adenophorea		Araeolaimida Desmoscolecida Monhysterida Desmodorida Chromadorida Enoplida
ANDRASSY, 1976	Torquentia (=Chromadoria)		Monhysterida Desmoscolecida Araeolaimida Chromadorida
	Penetrantia (=Enoplia)		Enoplida Dorylaimida
	(Secernentia)		
LORENZEN, 1981	Adenophorea	Chromadoria	----- Chromadorida Monhysterida
	Secernentea	Enoplia	----- Enoplida Prefusiidae Dorylaimidae

Table 2 : Characters often used in the taxonomy of marine free-living nematodes.

1. Habitus
2. Cuticle : structure
3. Somatic setae
4. Cephalic region
  - a. general shape
  - b. cephalic helmet
  - c. sense organs : number, length and position
5. Amphids : shape and position
6. Buccal cavity : general structure and dentation
7. Pharynx :
  - a. general structure
  - b. radial canals
  - c. glands
8. Ventral gland
  - a. position
  - b. ventral pore
9. Cardia : shape
10. Female reproductive system
  - a. number of ovaries
  - b. structure : outstretched or reflexed ovaries
  - c. vulva position
  - d. demanian system
  - e. position of ovaries in relation to intestine
11. Male reproductive and copulatory system
  - a. number of testes
  - b. spicules
  - c. gubernaculum
  - d. accessory organs
  - e. position of testes in relation to intestine
12. Tail region
  - a. general shape
  - b. caudal glands
  - c. spinneret
13. Metanemes

Legend to tables 3-8.

Evolutionary trend in the classification of the different orders (newly introduced taxa are underlined). Characters by which members of a taxa are related, are presented by numbers (corresponding with characters listed in table 2).

Table 3 : A R A E O L A I M I D A

FILLIPJEV, 1934

(Chromadorata)

Camacolaimidae

7a, 6, 5

Plectidae

(Monhysterata)

Axonolaiminae

CHITWOOD & CHITWOOD, 1950

(Chromadorida)

Plectoidea

5, 10b, 7b

Axonolaimoidea

2, 5, 10b

Plectidae  
Camacolaimidae

Axonolaimidae  
Comesomatidae

DE CONINCK, 1965

Araeolaimoidea  
4c, 5, 7a

Axonolaimoidea

Leptolaimoidea  
11d, 4c

Camacolaimoidea

6  
4c  
11c

Plectoidea  
6, 5, 11d

Tripyleidina

Tripyleidoidea

CERLACH & RIEMANN, 1973

Teratocephalidae

Plectidae

Rhabdolaimidae

Isolaimiidae

Aulolaimidae

Haliplectidae

Leptolaimidae

Bastianidae

Axonolaimidae

ANDRASSY, 1976

Leptolaimoidea

Halaphanolaimidae

Leptolaimidae

Camacolaimidae

Araeolaimidae

Cylindrolaimidae

Axonolaimidae

Diploplectidae

Araeolaimina

7a, 11d

4c

6

7a

11d

Haliplectoidea

Rhabdolaimidae

Plectoidea

Tripyleidoidea

Tripyleidae

LORENZEN, 1981

Leptolaimidae  
10e

Chronogasteridae  
6

Plectidae  
6

Teratocephalidae  
7a

Peresianidae  
5

Haliplectidae  
6

Aulolaimidae  
5

Rhadinematidae  
7a

Tarvaidae  
2

Aegialolaimidae  
6

Geramonematidae  
6

Tubolaimoidea  
6

Paramicroloaimidae  
6

Ohridiidae  
5

Bastianidae  
6

Prismatolaimidae  
6

Odontolaimidae  
6

Rhabdolaimidae

Leptolaimina  
(Chromadorida)

Axonolaimidae  
5

Comesomatidae  
5

Diploplectidae  
5

Coninckidae  
5

Table 4: DESMOSCOLECID

<p>FILIPJEV, 1934</p> <p>2 ←←←←Desmocolidae ←←←←Greeffiellidae</p>	<p>CHITWOOD &amp; CHITWOOD, 1950</p> <p>(Chromadorida)</p> <p>Desmoscolecoidea ← 2 ←←Desmoscolecidae ←←Greeffiellidae</p>	<p>DE CONINCK, 1965</p> <p>2 ←←←Desmoscolecoidea ← 5 ←←Meyliidae 3 ←←←Greeffielloidea : ←←Desmoscolecidae ←←Greeffiellidae</p>	<p>TIMM, 1970</p> <p>Desmoscolecidae</p> <p>GERLACH &amp; RIEMAN, 1973</p> <p>Meyliidae Desmoscolecidae</p>
<p>FREUDENHAMMER, 1975</p> <p>Desmoscolecidae</p>	<p>ANDRASSY, 1976</p> <p>Meyliina : Meylioida : Meyliidae ↓ 5 ↑ ←←←Greeffielloidea ← 2, 3 ←←←Calligyridae ↑ ←←←Greeffiellidae Desmoscolicina ← 2 ←←←Desmoscolecoidea : Desmoscolecidae</p>	<p>DECRAEMER, 1977</p> <p>Desmoscolicina : Desmoscolecoidea : Desmoscolecidae</p> <p>LORENZEN, 1981</p> <p>(Monhysterida)</p> <p>Desmoscolecoidea ← 11a, 3 ←←Desmoscolecidae 3 ←←←Meyliidae</p>	



Table 6: DESMODORIDA

<p><b>FILIPJEV, 1934</b></p> <p>(Chromadorata)</p> <p>           +++Richtersiinae            +-Desmodorinae            +-Monoposthinae            +-Epsilonematinae            +-Draconematinae         </p>	<p><b>CHITWOOD &amp; CHITWOOD, 1950</b></p> <p>(Chromadorida)</p> <p>           Desmodoroidea++            1 +-Desmodoridae            3 +-Epsilonematidae            +-Draconematidae         </p>	<p><b>DE CONINCK, 1965</b></p> <p>           +++Spirinoidea++            4c, 4a, 5, 6            +-Spirinidae            +-Microalaimidae            +-Desmodoroidea : Desmodoridae            5 +-Ceramonematoidea++            2 +-Dasynemellidae            +-Ceramonematidae            +-Monoposthoidea++            2, 6, 5            +-Monoposthiidae            +-Richtersiidae            Draconematoidea++ :            3, 1, 7a            +-Epsilonematidae            +-Draconematidae         </p>
<p><b>GERLACH &amp; RIEMANN, 1973</b></p> <p>           Aponchiidae            Desmodoridae            Xenellidae            Ceramonematidae            Monoposthiidae            Richtersiidae            Draconematidae            Epsilonematidae         </p>	<p><b>ANDRASSY, 1976</b></p> <p>(Chromadorida)</p> <p>           Desmodorina+++            5            4b            10b            +-Richtersiidae++            2 +-Microalaimidae            4a +-Richtersiidae            4c +-Xenellidae            +-Desmodoroidea++            2 +-Metachromadoridae            4b +-Desmodoridae            +-Ceramonematidae            Draconematina :            Draconematoidea++            4a            +-Epsilonematidae            +-Draconematidae         </p>	<p><b>LORENZEN, 1981</b></p> <p>           Desmodoroidea++            10e            3            +-Desmodoridae            +-Epsilonematidae            +-Draconematidae            Microalaimoidea++            10a            5            +-Microalaimidae            +-Aponchiidae            +-Monoposthiidae         </p>

Table 7 : C H R O M A D O R I D A

<p><b>FILIPJEV, 1934</b></p> <p>←←Camacolaimidae : see Araeolaimida</p> <p>6 ←←Plectidae : see Araeolaimida</p> <p>←←Chromadoridae</p>	<p><b>CHITWOOD &amp; CHITWOOD, 1950</b></p> <p>Monhysterina : see Monhysterida</p> <p>9 6 10b 11d</p> <p>2 4b 5 3</p> <p>Chromadorina←←</p> <p>2 ←←←←Chromadoroidea←←</p> <p>5 ←←←←Chromadoridae</p> <p>4c ←←←←Microalaimidae</p> <p>6 ←←←←Cyatholaimidae</p> <p>7a ←←←←Tripyloidae</p> <p>←←←←Desmodoroida : see Desmodorida</p> <p>Desmoscolecoida : see Desmoscolecida</p>
<p><b>DE CONINCK, 1965</b></p> <p>Chromadorina - Chromadoroidea←←</p> <p>↑ 4c 5 ↓</p> <p>Cyatholaimina←←</p> <p>2 ←←←Comesomatidae</p> <p>5 ←←←Chromadoridae</p> <p>4c ←←←Chromadoridae</p> <p>6 ←←←Chromadoridae</p> <p>7a</p> <p>←←←Cyatholaimoidea - Cyatholaimidae</p> <p>←←←Choanolaimoidea←← 6</p> <p>←←←Selachinematidae</p>	<p><b>GERLACH &amp; RIEMANN, 1973</b></p> <p>Comesomatidae</p> <p>Chromadoridae</p> <p>Cyatholaimidae</p> <p>Choniolaimidae</p> <p>Selachinematidae</p>
<p><b>ANDRASSY, 1976</b></p> <p>Desmodorina : see Desmodorida</p> <p>Draconematina : see Desmodorida</p> <p>2 ←←←Comesomatoidea←← 6</p> <p>←←←Dorylaimopsidae</p> <p>Cyatholaimina←← 6</p> <p>4b ←←←Cyatholaimoidea←← 6</p> <p>6 ←←←Ethmolaimidae</p> <p>←←←Choanolaimoidea←← 6</p> <p>←←←Chanoalaimidae</p> <p>←←←Selachinematidae</p> <p>Chromadorina - Chromadoroidea←← 6</p> <p>7a ←←←Hypodontolaimidae</p> <p>←←←Chromadoridae</p>	<p><b>LORENZEN, 1981</b></p> <p>←←←Chromadoroidea←←</p> <p>←←←Desmodoroida : see Desmodorida</p> <p>←←←Microalaimoidea : see Desmodorida</p> <p>←←←Chromadoridae</p> <p>←←←Ethmolaimidae</p> <p>←←←Neotonchidae</p> <p>←←←Achromadoridae</p> <p>←←←Cyatholaimidae</p> <p>←←←Selachinematidae</p> <p>11a, 10e, 11e</p> <p>10e, 11e</p> <p>4c</p> <p>6</p> <p>Chromadorina←←</p> <p>Leptolaimina : see Araeolaimida</p>

Table 8 : E N O P L I D A

<p><b>FILIPJEV, 1934</b></p> <p>4b ++Enoplidae 7a ++Trilobidae 7b ++Dorylaimidae 7b ++Mermitidae</p>	<p><b>CHITWOOD &amp; CHITWOOD, 1950</b></p> <p>4b +++Enoploidea+++ [6] +++Enoplidae 7c +++Tripylidae 6 +++Nononchidae 9 +++Alaimidae 9 +++Ironidae</p> <p>Enoplina+++ [7] ++ Dorylaimina Dioctophymatina</p>	<p><b>CLARK, 1961</b></p> <p>+++Enoploidea++++ +++Tripyloidea++++ [7] ++ Alaimina Dorylaimina Trichosyringina Dioctophymatina</p>
<p><b>DE CONINCK, 1965</b></p> <p>+++Tripyloidea++++ [6] +++Tripylidae ++++Ironidae 6 +++Leptosomatidae 7a +++Oxystominidae 10c +++Lauratonematidae 4c +++Phanodermatidae 5 +++Thoracostomopsidae +++Enoplidae 7a +++Oncholaimidae 11d +++Eurystominidae Oncholaimina : Oncholaimoidea+++ [7a] ++</p>	<p><b>GERLACH &amp; RIEMANN, 1974</b></p> <p>Tripylidae Prismatolaimidae Ironidae Cryptonchidae Tripyloidiidae Trefusiidae Alaimidae Oxystominidae Lauratonematidae Leptosomatidae Tridontolaimidae Anticomidae Phanodermatidae Enoplidae Rhabdodemaniidae Anoplostomatidae Oncholaimidae Enchelidiidae Rhaptothyreidae</p>	<p><b>ANDRASSY, 1976</b></p> <p>+++Leptosomatoidea+++ [4b] ++Leptosomatidae +++Thoracostomatidae 6 +++Phanodermatidae 7a +++Enoplidae 4b +++Thoracostomopsidae +++Pelagonematoidea : Pelagonematidae +++Eurystominidae 7a +++Enchelidiidae 6 +++Belbollidae +++Mononcholaimidae +++Oncholaimoidea+++ [6] ++Oncholaimidae +++Paroxystominidae 4c +++Oxystominidae 6 +++Alaimidae 10c +++Lauratonematidae 6 +++Tripylidae 7a +++Prismatolaimidae 6 +++Cryptonchidae 10b +++Ironidae</p>
<p><b>LORENZEN, 1981</b></p> <p>Enoplina+++ ++++Enoplidae+++ ++++Ironoidea+++ ++++Leptosomatidae ++++Oxystominidae ++++Oncholaimoidea+++ [13] ++ Oncholaimacea : Oncholaimoidea+++ [13] ++</p>	<p>13,6 +++Enoplidae 13,6 +++Thoracostomopsidae 6,4b +++Anoplostomatidae ++++Phanodermatidae ++++Anticomidae 6 +++Ironidae ++++Leptosomatidae ++++Oxystominidae 13 +++Oncholaimidae ++++Enchelidiidae 13,11d +++Tripyloidiidae 13,6 +++Tobrillidae 13,6 +++Tripylidae 5,6 +++Tridontolaimidae ++++Rhabdodemaniidae ++++Pandolaimidae</p>	<p><b>LORENZEN, 1981</b></p> <p>T R E F U S I I D A = nov. ordo Trefusiidae 7 +++Onchulidae 11a, 10e, 10c +++Lauratonematidae 2 +++Xenellidae</p>