

1 The Pelagic In situ Observation System (PELAGIOS) to reveal
2 biodiversity, behavior and ecology of elusive oceanic fauna

3 Hoving, Henk-Jan¹, Christiansen, Svenja², Fabrizius, Eduard¹, Hauss, Helena¹, Kiko, Rainer¹,
4 Linke, Peter¹, Neitzel, Philipp¹, Piatkowski, Uwe¹, Körtzinger, Arne^{1,3}

5
6 ¹GEOMAR, Helmholtz Centre for Ocean Research Kiel, Düsternbrooker Weg 20, 24105 Kiel, Germany.

7 ²University of Oslo, Blindernveien 31, 0371 Oslo, Norway

8 ³Christian Albrecht University Kiel, Christian-Albrechts-Platz 4, 24118 Kiel, Germany

9
10 Corresponding author: hoving@geomar.de

1. Abstract

There is a need for cost-efficient tools to explore deep ocean ecosystems to collect baseline biological observations on pelagic fauna (zooplankton and nekton) and establish the vertical ecological zonation in the deep sea. The Pelagic In situ Observation System (PELAGIOS) is a 3000 m-rated slowly (0.5 m/s) towed camera system with LED illumination, an integrated oceanographic sensor set (CTD-O₂) and telemetry allowing for online data acquisition and video inspection (Low Definition). The High Definition video is stored on the camera and later annotated using annotation software and related to concomitantly recorded environmental data. The PELAGIOS is particularly suitable for open ocean observations of gelatinous fauna, which is notoriously undersampled by nets and/or destroyed by fixatives. In addition to counts, diversity and distribution data as a function of depth and environmental conditions (T, S, O₂), in situ observations of behavior, orientation and species interactions are collected. Here, we present an overview of the technical setup of the PELAGIOS as well as example observations and analyses from the eastern tropical North Atlantic. Comparisons to MOCNESS net sampling and data from the Underwater Vision Profiler are provided and discussed.

2. Introduction

The open ocean pelagic zones include the largest, yet least explored habitats on the planet (Robison, 2004; Webb et al., 2010; Ramirez-Llodra et al., 2010). Since the first oceanographic expeditions, oceanic communities of macrozooplankton and micronekton have been sampled using nets (Wiebe and Benfield, 2003). Such sampling has revealed a community typically consisting of crustaceans, cephalopods, fishes and some sturdy and commonly found gelatinous fauna (Benfield et al., 1996). Underwater observations in the open ocean via SCUBA diving

(Hamner et al., 1975) and later via submersibles (Robison, 1983; Robison and Wishner, 1990) and in situ camera systems (Biard et al., 2016, Picheral et al., 2010) revealed that a variety of organisms are much more abundant in the open ocean than previously estimated from net sampling (Robison, 2004). This was particularly true for fragile gelatinous zooplankton, a diverse taxonomic group of different phyla, including the ctenophores and medusae (Remsen et al., 2004; Haddock, 2004) as well as polychaetes (Christiansen et al., 2018), rhizaria (Biard et al., 2016) and pelagic tunicates (Remsen et al., 2004; Neitzel, 2017) , which often are too delicate to be quantified using nets as they are damaged beyond identification, or they are easily destroyed by the use of common fixatives.

Underwater (*in situ*) observations in the pelagic ocean not only revealed a previously unknown community, they also allowed the collection of fine-scale distribution patterns in relation to biotic and abiotic factors (e.g. Haslob et al., 2009; Möller et al., 2013; Hauss et al., 2016) as well as information on posture, interactions, and behavior (Hamner and Robison, 1992; Robison, 2004; Robison, 1999; Hoving et al., 2017). Submersibles have proven to be valuable instruments to study deep-sea pelagic biology (e.g. Robison, 1987; Bush et al., 2007; Hoving et al., 2013; 2016). Using video transecting methodology, pelagic ROV surveys have been applied to study inter and intra-annual variation in mesopelagic zooplankton communities (Robison et al., 1998; Hull et al., 2011) and to explore deep pelagic communities in different oceans (Youngbluth et al., 2008; Hosia et al., 2017; Robison et al., 2010). However, due to high costs as well as technological and logistical challenges, regular submersible operations are still restricted to very few institutes and geographical locations. Hence, there is a need for the development of additional more cost-effective methodologies to explore and document deep-sea communities via in situ observations.

In the last decades, a variety of optical instruments has been developed to image and quantify plankton *in situ* (Benfield et al., 2007). The factors that typically differentiate the available plankton imaging technologies are the size fraction of the observed organisms, illumination type, resolution of collected images/video, depth rating, deployment mode (e.g., autonomous, towed, CTD-mounted) and towing speed. Examples of instruments include the autonomous Underwater Vision Profiler (UVP5; Picheral et al., 2010), the Lightframe On-sight Key species Investigations (LOKI; Schulz et al., 2009) and towed plankton recorders (ISiS; Cowen and Guigand 2008; for review see Benfield et al., 2007). These instruments can be deployed from ships of opportunity and collect detailed information on fine-scale distribution and diversity patterns of particles and plankton. The data reveal biological patterns on a global scale (Kiko et al., 2017) and of previously underappreciated plankton species (Biard et al., 2016). More recently, optical (and acoustic) instruments have been combined with autonomous gliders, rapidly increasing spatial resolution (Ohman et al. 2019).

Various towed camera platforms have been developed that can obtain video transect observations above the deep sea floor. Examples are the TowCam (WHOI), the DTIS (Deep Towed Imaging system, NIWA), the WASP vehicle (Wide Angle Seafloor Photography), OFOS (Ocean Floor Observation System, GEOMAR), and the more recent version OFOBS (Ocean Floor Observation and Bathymetry System; Purser et al., 2018). All these instruments are used for video or photo transects of the seafloor, with a downward looking camera, and typically a set of lasers for size reference. However, published descriptions of optical systems, other than ROVs and submersibles, that visualize macrozooplankton and micronekton (>1 cm) in the water column undisturbed by a filtering device or cuvette are, to the best of our knowledge, restricted to one (Madin et al., 2006). The Large Area Plankton Imaging System (LAPIS) is the only towed system that was developed

for the documentation of larger organisms in the water column (Madin et al., 2006). LAPIS visualizes organisms between 1 and 100 cm, it combines a high-resolution color digital CCD camera using progressive scanning interline-transfer technology with flashing strobes, and it is towed at 1 knot via a fibre optic wire. LAPIS collects still images, illumination is sideways, and organisms have to enter an illuminated volume to be visualized. Deployments in the Southern Ocean enabled the reconstruction of depth distributions of the pelagic fauna (salps, medusae) but also allowed some behavior observations, e.g. the moulting of krill (Madin et al., 2006). More publications of data collected with LAPIS are unavailable to our knowledge. Other than LAPIS, we wanted to develop a towed pelagic observation system that collects video during horizontal transects (with forward projected light), in a similar way as pelagic ROV video transects, in order to document behaviour in addition to diversity, species-specific distribution and abundance data of pelagic fauna.

The functional requirements for the instrument were the ability to: (1) visualize organisms > 1 cm in waters down to 1000 m with high-definition video, (2) deploy the instrument from ships of opportunity in an autonomous or transmitting mode, (3) make it lightweight and practical so it can be deployed easily and safe with two deck persons and a winch operator, (4) enable correlation of observations with environmental parameters (S, T, O₂) and other sensor data, and (5) make observations comparable to ROV video transects in other reference areas. We present a description of the Pelagic In situ Observation System (PELAGIOS), examples of the kind of biological information it may gather, as well as biological discoveries that have resulted from deployments on research cruises in the eastern tropical North Atlantic.

3. Pelagic In Situ Observation System

3.1 Technical Specifications

The PELAGIOS consists of an aluminum frame (length = 2 m) that carries the oceanographic equipment (Figure 1). White light LED arrays (4 LEDs produced at GEOMAR, 2 LED arrays (type LightSphere of Deep-Sea Power and Light ©) which illuminate the water in front of the system are mounted on an aluminum ring (diameter = 1.2 m). Power is provided by two lithium batteries (24V; 32 Ah) in a deep-sea housing. High-definition video is collected continuously by a forward viewing deep-sea camera (type lCam Alpha, SubC Imaging ©) which is mounted in the center of the ring. We used the maximum frame rate of 50 frames s⁻¹ but a lower frame rate is possible. A CTD (SBE 19 SeaCAT, Sea-Bird Scientific ©) with an oxygen sensor (SBE 43, Sea-Bird Scientific ©) records environmental data. A deep-sea telemetry (DST-6, Sea and Sun Technology ©; Linke et al., 2015) transmits video and CTD data to a deck unit on board allowing a low-resolution preview (600 x 480 lines) of the high definition video that is stored locally on the SD card (256 GB) of the camera. The power from the batteries is distributed to the LEDs via the camera. The lCam Alpha camera is programmable in such a way that there is a delay between providing power to the camera (by connecting to the battery) and the start of recording and switching on the LEDs. This enables the illumination to be turned on only underwater, and prevents overheating of the LED arrays while out of the water. During a cruise with the German research vessel MARIA S. MERIAN (MSM 49) we mounted a steel scale bar in front of the camera at a distance of 1 m. The distance between the centers of the white marks on the bar measured 5 cm.

3.2 Video transects

The PELAGIOS is towed horizontally at specified depths of 20-1000 m. The standard towing speed over ground is 1 knot (0.5 m/s), and the speed is monitored via the ship's navigational

system. A video transect at a particular depth can take as long as desired and is terminated by lowering the PELAGIOS to the next desired depth. Maximum deployment time with full batteries is approximately 6 hours. The typical transect duration is 10-30 min. The depth of the PELAGIOS can be monitored via online CTD data. Figure 2 shows the trajectories of the PELAGIOS at different depths in the water column during a video transect down to 700 m. The deployment from deck into the water and the reverse is fast and typically takes only about 5 min (see video clip in the ESM). It is possible to deploy PELAGIOS in ‘blind mode’, where only the depth is monitored using an online depth sensor (e.g., Hydrobios ©) and the video (without transmitted preview) is recorded locally on the camera. The system can be operated completely blind (i.e., with no communication between deck and underwater unit) where the target depth is estimated from the length and angle of the wire put out, and the actual depth is recorded on the system by CTD or an offline pressure sensor e.g. SBE Microcat ©.

3.3 Video analysis and curation

After a deployment, the video (consisting of individual clips of one hour) is downloaded from the camera. Synchronisation between video and CTD data is done by setting all instruments to UTC prior to deployment, which allows the data and video to be linked during analysis. The video is annotated using the Video Annotation and Reference System VARS developed at the Monterey Bay Aquarium Research Institute (Schlining and Jacobsen, 2006). This annotation program allows for frame grabs from the video including time code. A Knowledge Base allows for inserting taxonomic names and hierarchy, and a Query allows for searching the created database. While many kinds of annotation software are available (for review see Gomes-Pereira et al., 2016), we consider VARS the most suitable for our purposes since it combines the features of high resolution

video playback with a user friendly annotation-interface and the automatic creation of an annotation database which can easily be accessed through the various search-functions and tools of the Query. The taxonomic hierarchy and phylogenetic trees in the database are directly applicable to our video transects. Since this software was developed by MBARI, which also maintains the most extensive databases of deep pelagic observations, it makes communication about and comparison of observations and data practical. Videos are transported on hard drives after an expedition and are transferred for long term storage on servers maintained by the central data and computing centre at GEOMAR, providing instant access to videos and images with metadata description via the media server ProxSys.

3.4 Sample volume

To estimate the sample volume of the PELAGIOS we compared video counts from the PELAGIOS with concomitantly obtained abundance data from an Underwater Vision Profiler (UVP5; Picheral et al., 2010). Four deployments from the R/V Maria S. Merian cruise MSM 49 (28.11.- 21.12.2015, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria/Spain – Mindelo/Cape Verde) were used for the comparison where a UVP5 was mounted underneath the PELAGIOS. The UVP5 takes between 6-11 images per second of a defined volume (1.03 L) and thus enables a quantitative assessment of particle and zooplankton abundances. Objects with an equivalent spherical diameter (ESD) >0.5 mm are saved as images, which can be classified into different zooplankton, phytoplankton and particle categories. For the comparison between PELAGIOS and the UVP5, we used the pelagic polychaete *Poeobius* sp., as 1) this organism could be observed well on both instruments, 2) *Poeobius* sp. is not an active swimmer and lacks an escape response and 3) it was locally very abundant, thus providing a good basis for the direct instrument comparison.

The UVP5 images were classified as described in Christiansen et al. (2018). *Poeobius* sp. abundance (ind m⁻³) was calculated for 20 s time bins and all bins of one distinct depth step (with durations of 10-11 minutes at depths ≤ 50 m, 19-22 minutes at depths < 350 m and 9-11 minutes at depths ≥ 350 m) averaged. These mean abundances were compared to the PELAGIOS counts (ind s⁻¹) of the same depth step. A linear model between the PELAGIOS counts as a function of UVP5 abundance provided a highly significant relationship (linear regression: $p < 0.001$, *adjusted* $r^2 = 0.69$; Figure 3). The linear regression slope b (0.116 m³ s⁻¹, standard error 0.01 m³ s⁻¹) between the PELAGIOS-based count ($C_{PELAGIOS}$, ind s⁻¹) and mean UVP-based abundance (A_{UVP} , ind m⁻³):

$$C_{PELAGIOS} = b * A_{UVP} + a \quad (\text{Equation 1})$$

was used to estimate the volume recorded per time in m³ s⁻¹ (b) and the field of view in m² (b /towing speed) recorded by PELAGIOS.

From this calculation it can be derived that PELAGIOS recorded an average volume of 0.116 m³ s⁻¹ at a towing speed of 1 knot (= 0.5144 m s⁻¹). A cross-sectional view field of approximately 0.23 m² of PELAGIOS can be expected, compared to a theoretical field of view (FOV) of 0.45 m² based upon the maximum image dimensions (0.80 m * 0.56 m) at 1 m distance from the lens. We can now calculate the individuals observed by PELAGIOS per time to individuals per volume. To do so we use the number of individuals in one transect and divide this number by the duration of the transect to obtain individuals/minute, and divide this by 60 to get the individuals/second. From the UVP-PELAGIOS comparison we derived a conversion factor of 6 to calculate the number of individuals per second to number of individuals per m³. This value is then multiplied by the conversion factor 6, and again multiplied by 1000 to go from m³ to 1000 m³.

3.5 Abundance, size and diversity at an example station “Senghor NW”

To provide an example of the type of data that can be obtained with the PELAGIOS, we report here on day and night video transects down to 950 m in the Eastern Tropical North Atlantic, on the northwestern slope of Senghor Seamount (17°14.2'N, 22°00.7'W; bottom depth of approximately 1000 m). The results from the video annotations show that faunal abundances depend on the depth of deployment, and time of the day. During two transects of 11 minutes at 400 m, 226 individuals (1066 Ind/1000m³) were encountered during the day (the three dominant organism groups were fish, euphausiids and appendicularians) compared to 196 individuals (591 Ind/1000m³) during the night (the four dominant organism groups are fish, chaetognaths, medusae and ctenophores). Overall abundance of chaetognaths, decapods and mysids, and somewhat for fishes was higher during the night. The peak of euphausiids' abundance at 400 m shifts to the surface at night (Figure 4). The higher abundance of decapods, mysids and chaetognaths at night may indicate lateral migration or daytime avoidance. The vertical migration that was observed for fishes and crustaceans was much less clear for the gelatinous zooplankton groups including medusae and appendicularians (Figure 4). Ctenophores and siphonophores were abundant in the surface at night (but we did not perform transects at 20 and 50 m during the day) and the thaliaceans migrated vertically and were most abundant in shallow waters at night. The total number of annotated organisms for the daytime transects (total transect time 187 minutes; max. depth 950 m) was 835 compared to 1865 organisms for the longer nighttime transects (total transect time 292 minutes; max depth 900). Remarkable is the enormous abundance of gelatinous zooplankton (128) annotated organisms (899 Ind/1000m³) belonging to the three dominant groups of Ctenophora (53), Siphonophorae (21) and Thaliacea (44) in the topmost layer (20 m) at night. Below this layer, the depth profile shows a minimum in numbers of annotated individuals at 100, 200, and 300 m

water depth with a smaller peak of 57 gelatinous organisms (299 Ind/1000m³) in 450 m. Compared to this, the depth distribution at day time shows a more regular, almost Gaussian shape with a maximum of 31 (254 Ind/1000m³) and 54 (254 Ind/1000m³) gelatinous organisms at 200 and 400 m water depth, respectively.

The faunal observations at station Senghor NW include a wide variety of taxa (Table 1; Figures 5 and 6), spanning in size from radiolarians to large siphonophores (such as *Praya dubia* and *Apolemia*). Chaetognaths were the dominant faunal group. Typical examples of fragile organisms that were not present or identifiable in the MOCNESS samples from the same cruise (Christiansen et al 2016; Lüsrow et al in prep.) but which can be efficiently observed by PELAGIOS include large larvaceans (probably *Bathochordaeus* and *Mesochordaeus*), pelagic polychaetes (*Poeobius*, *Tomopteris*) (Figure 5), and smaller siphonophores (such as *Bargmannia* and *Lilyopsis*; the latter can be easily distinguished by their fluorescent body parts). (Figure 5). Observed medusae belonged to the genera *Periphylla*, *Halitrephes*, *Haliscera*, *Crossota*, *Colobonaema*, *Solmissus* and *Solmundella* (Figure 5). Venus girdles (*Cestum* spp.), *Beroe*, cydippids and lobate ctenophores (such as *Thalassocalyce inconstans*, *Leucothea*, *Bathyceroe*, see Harbison et al., 1978 for differences in robustness among ctenophores) were encountered at Senghor NW (Figure 5). Cephalopod observations were rare but small individual cranchiid squids were observed in the upper 50 m at night. Mastigoteuthid squids were observed with their mantle in a vertical orientation and with extended tentacles in waters below 500 m. One large squid, *Taningia danae* was observed during a transit between transecting depths. Other pelagic molluscs include the nudibranch *Phylliroe* and different pteropod species. Observed fishes are snipe eels, hatchet fishes, lantern

fishes and *Cyclothone*. Fishes are among the dominant organisms encountered during PELAGIOS transects but it is often impossible to identify fishes to species level from the video.

3.6 Individual behavior

In situ observations by PELAGIOS video may reveal direct observations on individual behavior. Decapod shrimps were observed to release a blue or green bioluminescent cloud after performing their tail flip as part of the escape response (Figure 6d). Potential reproductive behavior was observed for two specimens of krill which were seen in a what could be a mating position, and salps were observed to reproduce asexually by the release of salp oozoids (Figure 6c). Feeding behaviors were observed for large prayid siphonophores and calyphoran siphonophores which had their tentacles extended. *Poeobius* worms were observed with their mucus web deployed to capture particulate matter (Christiansen et al., 2018) (Figure 6a). Narcomedusae of the genus *Solmissus* were observed with their tentacles stretched up and down, which is a feeding posture (Figure 5). In situ observations by the PELAGIOS also showed the natural body position of pelagic organisms. Snipe eels were observed in a vertical position with their heads up, while dragonfishes and some myctophids were observed in an oblique body position with their head down (Figure 6b).

4. Discussion

PELAGIOS is a pelagic ocean exploration tool that fills a gap in the array of observation instruments that exist in biological oceanography, as transparent and fragile organisms (> 1 cm) are up to now undersampled by both net-based and optical systems. The PELAGIOS video transects are comparable to ROV video transects and can be obtained in a cost-effective way. The

resulting data can provide information on diversity, distribution and abundance of large ($> 1\text{ cm}$), fragile zooplankton and some nekton, and also of rare species. Due to the collection of HD color video, behavior, color and position in the water column are documented which may provide additional ecological information. Thus, the system complements gear that are suitable for stratified observations and collections of robust mesozooplankton and micronekton (MOCNESS, Hydrobios Multinet, and others) and optical systems that are suitable for high-resolution sampling of small and abundant organisms (e.g. VPR, UVP5) (e.g. Benfield et al., 2007; Picheral et al., 2010; Biard et al., 2015). The instrument can be deployed with a small team and from vessels of opportunity, in transmission or ‘blind’ mode. The relatively simple design limits technical failures and makes the PELAGIOS a reliable tool for oceanic expeditions. While thus far the system has only been deployed in the open ocean, it can be used in any pelagic environment with water that has reasonable clearance and visibility. The data obtained after annotation of the video can be uploaded into databases (e.g., the large database PANGAEA) after publication of the results allowing for efficient data sharing and curation.

The clear distribution patterns that we observed in some animal groups (fish, crustaceans and some gelatinous fauna) after annotating the video transects confirms that established biological processes such as diurnal vertical migration (e.g. Barham, 1963) can be detected in PELAGIOS data, and that the distribution data that we observe for encountered organisms are representative for the natural situation. It has to be noted, though, that while the observed distribution patterns should be representative, care must be taken with regards to abundance estimates of especially actively- and fast-swimming organisms. Some fish and crustaceans react to the presence of underwater instrumentation (e.g. Stoner et al., 2008). Gear avoidance (e.g. Kaartvedt et al., 2012) can lead to an underestimation of abundance, whereas attraction to the camera lights (e.g. Utne-

Palm et al, 2018; Wiebe et al., 2004) would result in an overestimation. The large bioluminescent squid *Taningia danae* seemed to be attracted to the lights of the PELAGIOS, and attraction behaviour of this species has been described in other publications (Kubodera et al., 2007). Compared to day transects, the high abundance of gelatinous organisms close to the surface during night is likely to be partly an effect of the higher contrast in the videos of the night transects and better visibility of the gelatinous fauna than during day transects. Therefore we did not perform transects shallower than 50 m during the day. Many of the observed gelatinous fauna might be present as well at shallow depths during day-light but are not detectable at ‘blue-water-conditions’. The difference between encountered taxa during the day and night transect may also be due to trapping of organisms at the slopes of Senghor Seamount during the day (Isaacs and Schwartzlose, 1965; Genin, 2004) or by other causes for patchiness (Haury et al., 2000). However, from a methodological side it should be noted that while the ship’s towing speed is typically 1 knot, the current speeds at the survey depths may differ, also between day and night. Currents may result in more or less sampled volume of water and hence a variation in plankton being visualized. Since abundance estimation relies on an accurate determination of the image volume, it needs to be pointed out that it is our aim to better technically constrain the image area in future developments (now derived from UVP quantitative observations) and to include flowmeter measurements.

After annotation, the PELAGIOS video transects may be used to reconstruct species-specific distribution patterns, which can be related to environmental gradients (Neitzel, 2017; Hoving et al. in prep.). Such data are valuable for overlap comparison in distribution patterns of consumers and food items (see e.g. Haslob et al., 2009; Möller et al., 2012). The data can also be used in biological studies that aim to predict the consequences of a changing ocean with altering environmental gradients for species’ distributions, as it has been done for net sampling of

mesozooplankton (Wishner et al., 2013) One example of changing environmental gradients is the global trend of oxygen loss in the world oceans (Oschlies et al., 2018). Oxygen minimum zones (OMZs) are occurring naturally in the mesopelagic zone (Robinson et al., 2010), and in different oceans they have been found to expand horizontally and vertically as a result of climate change (Stramma et al., 2008; Oschlies et al., 2018). Expansion of OMZs may result in a habitat reduction of the pelagic fauna (e.g., Stramma et al., 2012), or increase the habitat for species with hypoxia tolerance (Gilly et al., 2013). To predict the potential consequences of OMZ expansion for pelagic invertebrates we investigated the abundance and distribution of distinct large gelatinous zooplankton species, including medusae, ctenophores, siphonophores and appendicularians, in the eastern tropical North Atlantic using PELAGIOS video transects and correlated the biological patterns to the oxygen gradients (Neitzel, 2017; Hoving et al., in prep.).

During various cruises, the UVP5 was mounted underneath the PELAGIOS providing concomitant data on macrozooplankton and nekton (PELAGIOS) as well as particles and mesozooplankton (UVP5). The combination of the two instruments provides a great opportunity to assess both the mesopelagic fauna and particles during one sampling event. The joint deployment of the PELAGIOS and UVP5 also allowed an estimation of the sampled water volume of the PELAGIOS as described above. The linear relationship between counts of the non-moving *Poeobius* sp. with UVP5 and the PELAGIOS indicates comparability of the two different methods for animals in this size class and provides a correction factor to estimate organism abundance (ind m^{-3}) from PELAGIOS count (ind s^{-1}) data.

The field of view (FOV) derived from the UVP5 comparison for the PELAGIOS was estimated to be 0.23 m^2 in comparison to 0.45 m^2 based on measurement of the scale bar at 1 m from the camera. The angle of view of the PELAGIOS is 80° and therefore the field of view (FOV) is much smaller

330 than the FOV of video transects with a wide-angle lens e.g. by ROV Tiburon (Robison et al.,
331 2010). When comparing the FOV, it is important to take into account the object that is observed.
332 We provided an estimate of the FOV using *Poeobius* sp., which is a small organism that can be
333 detected only when it is close to the camera. Therefore, the area of the FOV for quantification of
334 *Poeobius* sp. is smaller than when quantifying larger organisms, and the initial identification
335 distance differs between species (Reisenbichler et al., 2017).

336 We compared PELAGIOS video transects with MOCNESS net (opening 1 m²) abundance data by
337 integrating the PELAGIOS counts over the respective depth strata of the MOCNESS that happened
338 at the same cruise (Lüskow et al in prep.). The diversity of the gelatinous zooplankton in the total
339 MOCNESS catch is much lower (8 different taxa) (Lüskow et al., in prep.) than in the pooled video
340 transects (53 different annotated taxa) on the same station. The ctenophore *Beroe* is an example of
341 a gelatinous organism captured in MOCNESS hauls and also observed on PELAGIOS transects.
342 Normalization and subsequent standardization of the encountered *Beroe* in MOCNESS and
343 PELAGIOS transects show that on the same station and the same depths, PELAGIOS observes 3-
344 5 times more *Beroe* at the three depths where they were encountered by both instruments.
345 Additionally, the PELAGIOS also repeatedly observed *Beroe* at depths where they were not
346 captured by MOCNESS at all (although there were also depths where PELAGIOS did not observe
347 any *Beroe*). Preliminary comparisons of the data obtained with PELAGIOS and with MOCNESS
348 indicate substantial differences in the documented fauna, a phenomenon also observed in previous
349 comparisons between optical and net data (Remsen et al., 2004). Many more gelatinous taxa were
350 observed during PELAGIOS video transects than were captured in MOCNESS catches at the same
351 station (data presented here, Lüskow et al., in prep.) due to the delicate nature of many ctenophores,
352 medusae and siphonophores, preventing their intact capture by nets. A notable exception are the

small and robust calyophoran colonies of the families Diphyidae and Abylidae which were also captured by MOCNESS. In contrast, avoidance behavior of strongly and fast swimming jellyfish (e.g. *Atolla*, *Periphylla*), which may escape from the relatively slowly towed PELAGIOS, may explain their increased occurrence in nets compared to video recordings. While PELAGIOS is certainly suitable for visualizing delicate gelatinous fauna, it cannot replace net-sampling since complementary specimen collections are needed to validate the identity of organisms that were observed during PELAGIOS video observations. Therefore, it is desired that net tows with open and closing nets such as Multinet Maxi or MOCNESS are performed in the same areas, or that collections during submersible dives are made. An advantage of ROVs over PELAGIOS is the ROV's ability to stop on organisms for detailed close up recording and potentially the collection of the observed organisms. This is not possible with PELAGIOS as the ship is towing the instrument.

While the imaging processing pipeline is not as streamlined as in other optical systems that use still images such as the VPR or the UVP5, the potential of the PELAGIOS as an exploration tool is illustrated by the discovery of previously undocumented animals. An example is the ctenophore *Kiyohimea usagi* (Matsumoto and Robison, 1992) which was observed seven times by the PELAGIOS and once by the manned submersible JAGO during cruises in the eastern tropical North Atlantic. This large (>40 cm wide) lobate ctenophore was previously unknown from the Atlantic Ocean and demonstrates how in situ observations in epipelagic waters can result in the discovery of relatively large fauna (Hoving et al., 2018). Since gelatinous organisms are increasingly recognized as vital players in the oceanic food web (Choy et al., 2017) and in the biological carbon pump (Robison et al., 2005), in situ observations with tools like the PELAGIOS can provide new important insights into the oceanic ecosystem and the carbon cycle. But small

gelatinous organisms may also have a large biogeochemical impact on their environment. This was illustrated by the discovery of the pelagic polychaete *Poeobius* sp. during the PELAGIOS video transects in the eastern tropical North Atlantic (Christiansen et al., 2018). The observations of the PELAGIOS provided the first evidence for the occurrence of *Poeobius* sp. in the Atlantic Ocean. During the R/V Meteor cruise M119, *Poeobius* was found to be extremely abundant in a mesoscale eddy. Following this discovery, it was possible to reconstruct the horizontal and vertical distribution of Atlantic *Poeobius* in great detail using an extensive database of the UVP5 (956 vertical CTD/UVP5 profiles) in the eastern tropical North Atlantic, and to establish that the high local abundance of *Poeobius* was directly related to the presence of mesoscale eddies in which they substantially intercepted the particle export flux to the deep sea (Christiansen et al., 2018; Hauss et al., 2016).

Future effort should be focused on improving the assessment of the sample volume by integrating technology that can quantify it (e.g. current meters, a stereo-camera setup or a laser-based system). A stereo-camera set up would also allow for size measurements of the observed organisms, which could be beneficial to estimate the biomass of the observed organisms from published size-to-weight relationships. It might also be possible to obtain similar information based on structure-from-motion approaches that proved successful in benthic video imaging (Burns et al., 2015). The PELAGIOS system can also be a platform for other sensors. For example, the PELAGIOS was used to mount and test the TuLUMIS multispectral camera (Liu et al., 2018). Future developments include the preparation of the system for deployments down to 6000 m water depth. The integration of acoustic sensors would be valuable to measure target strength of camera observed organisms,

to estimate gear avoidance or attraction and to estimate biomass and abundance of organisms outside the field of view of the camera. We strongly encourage the use of complementary instruments to tackle the relative importance of a wide range of organisms in the oceanic pelagic ecosystem.

Author contribution

This instrument was designed, tested and applied by Henk-Jan Hoving and Eduard Fabrizio. Rainer Kiko and Helena Hauss developed the idea of combining the PELAGIOS with the UVP5. Philipp Neitzel and Svenja Christiansen analyzed the data in this manuscript in consultation with Henk-Jan Hoving, Rainer Kiko and Helena Hauss. Arne Körtzinger, Uwe Piatkowski and Peter Linke added valuable input to the further development of the instrument and its application and/or the data interpretation. All authors contributed to writing the paper. All authors approved the final submitted manuscript.

Data availability

The datasets generated and/or analysed during the current study will be available in the PANGAEA repository: <https://doi.pangaea.de/10.1594/PANGAEA.902241>

419

420 **Acknowledgements**

421 Our sincere gratitude goes to Ralf Schwarz, Sven Sturm, and other colleagues of GEOMAR's
422 Technology and Logistics Centre as well as Svend Mees for their indispensable support in design
423 and construction during the development of PELAGIOS. We want to thank the crew of the research
424 vessels METEOR, MARIA S. MERIAN and POSEIDON for their excellent support during
425 research expeditions, and Bernd Christiansen (University of Hamburg) for collaboration and
426 leading of the expedition MSM49. Anneke Denda and Florian Lüsrow are acknowledged for their
427 help on the MOCNESS samples of gelatinous zooplankton collected during MSM49. Shiptime on
428 RV Maria S. Merian and supporting funds were provided by the German Research Foundation
429 (DFG) (grant MSM49 to Bernd Christiansen). We also thank the DFG for providing financial
430 support to HJH under grants HO 5569/1-2 (Emmy Noether Junior Research Group) and a grant
431 CP1218 of the Cluster of Excellence 80 "The Future Ocean". RK and SC were supported by grant
432 CP1650 of the Cluster of Excellence 80 "The Future Ocean". "The Future Ocean" is funded within
433 the framework of the Excellence Initiative by the DFG on behalf of the German federal and state
434 governments. RK and HH were supported by the DFG as part of the Collaborative Research Centre
435 (SFB) 754 "Climate-Biogeochemistry Interactions in the Tropical Ocean".

436

437

438

References

- Barham, E.G.: Siphonophores and the deep scattering layer. *Science*, 140, 826-828, 1963.
- Benfield, M. C., Grosjean, P., Culverhouse, P. F., Irigoien, X., Sieracki, M. E., Lopez-Urrutia, A., Dam, H. G., Hu, Q., Davis, C. S., Hansen, A., Pilskaln, C. H., Riseman, E. M., Schultz, H., Utgoff,, P. E. and Gorsky, G.: RAPID: Research on Automated Plankton Identification, *Oceanography* 20(2), 172–187, 2007.
- Benfield, M. C., Davis, C. S., Wiebe, P. H., Gallager, S. M., Lough, R. G., and Copley, N. J.: Video Plankton Recorder estimates of copepod, pteropod and larvacean distributions from a stratified region of Georges Bank with comparative measurements from a MOCNESS sampler, *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, 43, 1925-1945, 1996.
- Biard, T., Picheral, M., Mayot, N., Vandromme, P., Hauss, H., Gorsky, G., Guid, L., Kiko, R., Not, F.: In situ imaging reveals the biomass of giant protists in the global ocean, *Nature* 532, 504–507, 2016.
- Burns, J. H. R., Delporte, D., Gates, R. D. and Takabayashi, M.: Integrating structure-from-motion photogrammetry with geospatial software as a novel technique for quantifying 3D ecological characteristics of coral reefs, *PeerJ* 3, e1077, 2015.
- Bush, S.L., Caldwell, R.L. and Robison, B.H.: Ink utilization by mesopelagic squid, *Mar. Biol.* 152(3), 485-494, 2007.
- Choy, C. A., Haddock, S. H. D., and Robison, B. H.: Deep pelagic food web structure as revealed by *in situ* feeding observations, *Proc. R. Soc. B. Biol. Sci.*, 284, 1869, 2017.
- Christiansen, B., Buchholz, C., F. Buchholz, F., Chi, X., Christiansen, S., Denda, A., Fabrizio, E., Hauss, H., Hoving, H.-J. T. and Janßen, S. SEAMOX: The Influence of Seamounts and Oxygen Minimum Zones on Pelagic Fauna in the Eastern Tropical Atlantic Cruise No. MSM49 November

462 28-December 21, 2015 Las Palmas de Gran Canaria (Spain)-Mindelo (Republic of Cape Verde),
 463 2016.
 464
 465 Christiansen, S., Hoving, H. J. T., Schütte, F., Hauss, H., Karstensen, J. Körtzinger, A., Schröder,
 466 M., Stemmann, L., Christiansen, B., Picheral, M., Brandt, P., Robison, B. H., Koch, R., and Kiko,
 467 R.: Particulate matter flux interception in oceanic mesoscale eddies by the polychaete *Poeobius*
 468 sp., *Limn. and Oceanograph.*, 63 (5), 2018.
 469 Cowen, R.K. and Guigand, C.M.: In situ ichthyoplankton imaging system (ISIIS): system design
 470 and preliminary results, *Limn. and Oceanograph. Methods*, 6, 126-132, 2008.
 471 Genin, A.: Bio-physical coupling in the formation of zooplankton and fish aggregations over
 472 abrupt topographies, *Journal of Marine systems*, 50, 3-20, 2004.
 473 Gilly, W.F., Beman, J.M., Litvin, S.Y., Robison, B.H.: Oceanographic and biological effects of
 474 shoaling of the oxygen minimum zone. *Annual Review in Marine Science*, 5, 393-420, 2013.
 475 Gomes-Pereira, J. N., Auger, V., Beisiegel, K., Benjamin, R., Bergmann, M., Bowden, D., Buhl-
 476 Mortensen, P., De Leo, F. C., Dionísio, G., Durden, J. M., Edwards, L., Friedman, A., Greinert, J.,
 477 Jacobsen-Stout, N., Lerner, S., Leslie, M., Nattkemper, T. W., Sameoto, J. A., Schoening, T.,
 478 Schouten, R., Seager, J., Singh, H., Soubigou, O., Tojeira, I., van den Beld, I., Dias, F., Tempera,
 479 F. and Santos, R. S.: Current and future trends in marine image annotation software, *Prog. in*
 480 *Oceanography*, 149, 106-120, 2016.
 481 Haddock, S. H. D.: A golden age of gelata: past and future research on planktonic ctenophores and
 482 cnidarians, *Hydrobiologia*, 530, 549–556, 2004.
 483 Haddock, S. H. D.: Comparative feeding behavior of planktonic ctenophores, *Integ. and Comp.*
 484 *Biol.*, 47, 847–853, 2007.

485 Hamner, W. M., Madin, L. P., Alldredge, A. L., Gilmer, R. M. & Hamner, P. P.: Underwater
 486 observations of gelatinous zooplankton: sampling problems, feeding biology and behavior,
 487 *Limnol. and Oceanogr.*, 20, 907–917, 1975.

488 Hamner, W. M., and Robison, B. H. In situ observations of giant appendicularians in Monterey
 489 Bay, *Deep-Sea Res. Part A. Ocean. Res. Pap.* 39 (7-8), 1299-1313, 1992.

490 Harbison, G., Madin, L., and Swanberg, N.: On the natural history and distribution of oceanic
 491 ctenophores, *Deep Sea Research*, 25, 233-256, 1978.

492 Harbison, G. R.: Toward a study of the biogeography of the pelagic ctenophores. In: Pierrot-Bults,
 493 A. C., van der Spoel, S., Zahuranec, B. J., Johnson, R. K. (eds), *Pelagic Biogeography*. UNESCO
 494 *Technical Papers in Marine Science*, 49, 112–117, 1986.

495 Haslob, H., Rohlf, N., and Schnack, D.: Small scale distribution patterns and vertical migration of
 496 North Sea herring larvae (*Clupea harengus*, Teleostei: Clupeidae) in relation to abiotic and biotic
 497 factors, *Scientia Marina*, 73, 13-22, 2009.

498 Haury, L., Fey, C., Newland, C., and Genin, A.: Zooplankton distribution around four eastern
 499 North Pacific seamounts, *Progress in Oceanography*, 45, 69-105, 2000.

500 Hauss, H., Christiansen, S., Schütte, F., Kiko, R., Edvam Lima, M., Rodrigues, E., Karstensen, J.,
 501 Löscher, C. R., Körtzinger, A., and Fiedler, B.: Dead zone or oasis in the open ocean? Zooplankton
 502 distribution and migration in low-oxygen medowater eddies, *Biogeosciences*, 13, 1977-1989,
 503 2016.

504 Hosia A., Falkenhaus, T., Baxter, E.J., and Pagès F.: Abundance, distribution and diversity of
 505 gelatinous predators along the Mid Atlantic Ridge: A comparison of different sampling
 506 methodologies, *PLoS One* 12(11), e0187491, 2017.

507 Hoving, H.-J., Neitzel, P., and Robison, B.: In situ observations lead to the discovery of the large
 508 ctenophore *Kiyohimea usagi* (Lobata: Eurhamphaeidae) in the eastern tropical Atlantic, *Zootaxa*,
 509 4526, 232-238, 2018.

510 Hoving, H. J. T., Bush, S. L., Haddock, S. H. D., Robison, B. H.: Bathyal feasting: post-spawning
 511 squid as a source of carbon for deep-sea benthic communities, *Proc. R. Soc. B* 284: 20172096,
 512 2017.

513 Hoving, H. J. T. and Robison, B. H.: Deep-sea in situ observations of gonatid squid and their prey
 514 reveal high occurrence of cannibalism, *Deep Sea Res. Part I: Oceanograph. Res. Papers* 116, 94-
 515 98, 2016.

516 Hoving, H. J. T., Zeidberg, L., Benfield, M., Bush, S., Robison, B. H. and Vecchione, M.: First in
 517 situ observations of the deep-sea squid *Grimalditeuthis bonplandi* reveals unique use of tentacles,
 518 *Proc. R. Soc. B*, 280, (1769), 2013.

519 Isaacs, J. D. and Schwartzlose, R. A.: Migrant sound scatterers: interaction with the sea floor,
 520 *Science*, 150, 1810-1813, 1965.

521 Hull, P. M., Osborn, K. J., Norris, R. D., and Robison, B. H.: Seasonality and depth distribution
 522 of a mesopelagic foraminifer, *Hastigerinella digitata*, in Monterey Bay, California, *Limnology*
 523 and *Oceanography*, 56, 562-576, 2011.

524 Kiko, R., Biastoch, A., Brandt, P., Cravatte, S., Hauss, H., Hummels, R., Kriest, I., Marin, F.,
 525 McDonnell, A.M.P., Oschlies, A., Picheral, M., Schwarzkopf, F.U., Thurnherr, A.M., Stemmann,
 526 L.: Biological and physical influences on marine snowfall at the equator, *Nature Geoscience*, 42,
 527 1–8, 2017.

528 Kubodera, T., Koyama, Y., and Mori, K.: Observations of wild hunting behaviour and
 529 bioluminescence of a large deep-sea, eight-armed squid, *Taningia danae*. Proceedings of the Royal
 530 Society B 274, 1029-1034, 2007.

531 Linke, P., Schmidt, M., Rohleder, M., Al-Barakati, A. and Al-Farawati, R.: Novel online digital
 532 video and high-speed data broadcasting via standard coaxial cable onboard marine operating
 533 vessels, Mar. Tech. Soc. J., 49 (1), 7-18, 2015.

534 Liu, H., Sticklus, J., Köser, K., Hoving, H.J.T., Ying, C, Hong, S., Greinert, J. and Schoening,
 535 T.: TuLUMIS - A tunable LED-based underwater multispectral imaging system, Optics Express
 536 26(6), 7811-7828, 2018.

537 Madin, L., Horgan, E., Gallager, S., Eaton, J. and Girard A.: LAPIS: A new imaging tool for
 538 macrozooplankton, IEEE Journal of Oceanic Engineering 1-4244-0115-1/06, 2006.

539 Matsumoto, G. I. and Robison, B. H.: *Kiyohimea usagi*, a new species of lobate ctenophore from
 540 the Monterey Submarine Canyon, Bull. of Mar. Sci., 51, 19–29, 1992.

541 Möller, K. O., John, M. S., Temming, A., Floeter, J., Sell, A. F., Herrmann, J.-P., and Möllmann,
 542 C.: Marine snow, zooplankton and thin layers: indications of a trophic link from small-scale
 543 sampling with the Video Plankton Recorder, Marine Ecology Progress Series, 468, 57-69, 2012.

544 Neitzel P (2017) The impact of the oxygen minimum zone on the vertical distribution and
 545 abundance of gelatinous macrozooplankton in the Eastern Tropical Atlantic. MSc Thesis,
 546 Christian-Albrechts-Universität Kiel, Germany, 75 pp.

547 Ohman, M. D., Davis, R. E., Sherman, J. T., Grindley, K. R., Whitmore, B. M., Nickels, C. F., and
 548 Ellen, J. S.: Zooglider: An autonomous vehicle for optical and acoustic sensing of zooplankton,
 549 Limnology and Oceanography: Methods, 2019. 2019.

550 Oschlies, A., Brandt, P., Stramma, L., and Schmidtko, S.: [Drivers and mechanisms of ocean](#)
 551 [deoxygenation.](#) Nature Geoscience, 11 (7), 467-473, 2018.

552 Picheral, M., Guidi, L., Stemmann, L., Karl, D. M., Iddaoud, G., and Gorsky, G.: The
 553 Underwater Vision Profiler 5: An advanced instrument for high spatial resolution studies of
 554 particle size spectra and zooplankton, *Limnol. Oceanogr. Methods*, 8, 462–473, 2010.
 555 Purser, A., Marcon, Y., Dreutter, S., Hoge, U., Sablotny, B., Hehemann, L., Lemburg, J.,
 556 Dorschel, B., Biebow, H. and Boetius, A.: Ocean floor observation and bathymetry system
 557 (OFOBS): A new towed camera/sonar system for deep-sea habitat surveys, *IEEE Journal of*
 558 *Oceanic Engineering*, 1-13, 2018.
 559 Ramirez-Llodra, E., Brandt, A., Danovaro, R., De Mol, B., Escobar, E., German, C. R., Levin, L.
 560 A., Martinez Arbizu, P., Menot, L., Buhl-Mortensen, P., Narayanaswamy, B. E., Smith, C. R.,
 561 Tittensor, D. P., Tyler, P. A., Vanreusel, A. and Vecchione, M.: Deep, diverse and definitely
 562 different: unique attributes of the world’s largest ecosystem, *Biogeosciences*, 7, 2851-2899, 2010.
 563 Remsen, A., Hopkins, T. L., and Samson, S.: What you see is not what you catch: a comparison
 564 of concurrently collected net, Optical Plankton Counter, and Shadowed Image Particle Profiling
 565 Evaluation Recorder data from the northeast Gulf of Mexico, *Deep Sea Research Part I:*
 566 *Oceanographic Research Papers*, 51, 129-151, 2004.
 567 Robinson, C., Steinberg, D.K., Anderson, T.R., Arístegui, J., Carlson, C.A., Frost, J.R., Ghiglione,
 568 J-F., Hernández-León, S., Jackson, G.A., Koppelman, R., Quéguiner, B., Ragueneau, O.,
 569 Rassoulzadegan, F., Robison, B.H., Tamburini, C., Tanaka, T., Wishner, K.F., Zhang, J.:
 570 Mesopelagic zone ecology and biogeochemistry – a synthesis. *Deep Sea Research Part II*, 57,
 571 1504–1518, 2010
 572 Robison, B. H.: The coevolution of undersea vehicles and deep-sea research, *Mar. Tech. Soc. J.*
 573 33 (4), 65-73, 1999.
 574 Robison, B. H.: Conservation of Deep Pelagic Biodiversity, *Cons. Biol.* 23(4), 847-858, 2009.


575 Robison, B. H., Sherlock, R. E., and Reisenbichler, K.: The bathypelagic community of Monterey
 576 Bay, Deep-Sea Res. Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography. 57, 1551-1556, 2010.
 577 Robison, B. H.: Deep pelagic biology, J. of exp. Mar. boil. and ecol., 300, 253–272, 2004.
 578 Robison, B. H.: Midwater biological research with the WASP ADS, Mar. Tech. Soc. J., 17, 21-27,
 579 1983.
 580 Robison, B. H. and Wishner, K.: Biological research needs for submersible access to the greatest
 581 ocean depths, Mar. Tech. Soc. J., 24, 34-37, 1990.
 582 Robison, B. H., Reisenbichler, K. R., Sherlock, R. E., Silguero, J. M. B., and Chavez, F. P.:
 583 Seasonal abundance of the siphonophore, *Nanomia bijuga*, in Monterey Bay, Deep-Sea Res. II 45,
 584 1741-1752, 1998.
 585 Schlining, B. and Jacobsen Stout, N.: MBARI's Video Annotation and Reference System. In:
 586 Proceedings of the Marine Technology Society / Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers
 587 Oceans Conference, Boston, Massachusetts: 1 – 5, 2006.
 588 Schulz, J. Barz, K., Mengedoh, D., Hanken, T., Lilienthal, H., Rieper, N., Hoops, J., Vogel, K.,
 589 Hirche, H-J.: A Light-Frame Onsite Key Species Investigation, IEEE Journal of Oceanic
 590 Engineering, 2009.
 591 Stramma, L., Prince, E. D., Schmidt, S., Luo, J., Hoolihan, J. P., Visbeck, M., Wallace, D. W.
 592 R., Brandt, P., Körtzinger, A.: Expansion of oxygen minimum zones may reduce available
 593 habitat for tropical pelagic fishes, Nature Climate Change 2, 33-37, 2012.
 594 Webb, T. J., Vanden Berghe, E., O'Dor, R.: Biodiversity's Big Wet Secret: The Global
 595 Distribution of Marine Biological Records Reveals Chronic Under-Exploration of the Deep
 596 Pelagic Ocean, PLoS ONE, 5(8), e10223, 2010.

597 Wiebe, P. H. and Benfield, M. C.: From the Hensen net toward four-dimensional biological
598 oceanography, *Progress in Oceanography*, 56, 7-136, 2003.

599 K. F. Wishner, K.F., Outram, D.M., Seibel, B.A., Daly, K.L., Williams, R.L. Zooplankton in the
600 eastern tropical north Pacific: Boundary effects of oxygen minimum zone expansion. *Deep Sea*
601 *Research Part I*, 79, 122–140, 2013

602 Youngbluth, M., Sørnes, T., Hosia, A., Stemmann, L.: Vertical distribution and relative
603 abundance of gelatinous zooplankton, in situ observations near the Mid-Atlantic Ridge, *Deep-*
604 *Sea Research Part II*, 55, 119-125, 2008.

605




606

607 Figure 1: a) The Pelagic In Situ Observations System (PELAGIOS) with battery (1), CTD (2),
608 telemetry (3), camera (4), LEDs (5), depressor (6), during deployment from R/V POSEIDON in
609 February 2018.

610

Figure 2: Stairwise trajectory of PELAGIOS through the water column, to the desired depths with concomitantly measured environmental data.






Figure 3: PELAGIOS video counts of *Poeobius* sp. as a function of UVP5-derived abundance on the same transects at two stations on cruise MSM 49 on RV MARIA S. MERIAN.





Figure 4: Day and night comparison of faunal observations obtained by PELAGIOS at the North West flank of Senghor seamount A: fishes, krill, chaetognaths and decapods B: gelatinous zooplankton groups




Figure 5: Examples of organisms encountered during pelagic video transects with PELAGIOS during cruise MSM49 in the eastern tropical Atlantic. (a) a medusa *Halitrephes* sp. (b) a siphonophore *Praya dubia* (c) a tomopterid worm (d) the ctenophore *Thalassocalyce inconstans* (e) the medusa *Solmissus* (f) the ctenophore *Cestum*. The distance between the white bands on the horizontal bar on the bottom of the images is 5 cm.




Figure 6: Examples of behaviors observed during pelagic video transects with the PELAGIOS. (a) *Poeobius* sp. in a feeding position with a mucus web (left side of the animal), (b) a dragonfish of the family Stomiidae in a vertical position, (c) a salp releasing a blastozoid chain, (d) a crustacean releasing two bioluminescent clouds while performing an escape response. The distance between the white bands on the horizontal bar on the bottom of the images is 5 cm.

652 Table 1: Taxonomic groups which were encountered during pelagic video transects in the eastern
653 tropical Atlantic.

Phylum	Class	Order	Family	Genus
Cercozoa	Thecofilosea			
Radiozoa				
Cnidaria	Hydrozoa	Narcomedusae	Solmundaeginidae Aeginidae	<i>Solmundella</i> <i>Aegina</i> <i>Aeginura</i>
		Trachymedusae	Cuninidae Halicreatidae	<i>Solmissus</i> <i>Halicreas</i> <i>Haliscera</i> <i>Halitrephes</i>
			Rhopalonematidae	<i>Colobonema</i> <i>Crossota</i> <i>Rhopalonema</i>
			Geryoniidae	<i>Geryonia</i> <i>Liriope</i>
		Siphonophorae	Agalmatidae	<i>Halistemma</i> <i>Marrus</i> <i>Nanomia</i> <i>Apolemia</i>
			Apolemiidae Diphyidae Forskaliidae Hippopodiidae	<i>Forskalia</i> <i>Hippopodius</i> <i>Vogtia</i>
			Physophoridae Prayidae	<i>Physophora</i> <i>Craseoa</i> <i>Lilyopsis</i> <i>Praya</i> <i>Rosacea</i>
			Pyrostephidae Resomiidae	<i>Bargmannia</i> <i>Resomia</i>
	Scyphozoa	Coronatae	Atollidae Nausithoidae Peryphyllidae	<i>Atolla</i> <i>Nausithoe</i> <i>Periphylla</i>
Ctenophora	Nuda	Beroida	Beroidae	<i>Beroe</i>
	Tentaculata	Cestida	Cestidae	<i>Cestum</i> <i>Velamen</i>
		Cydippida	Aulacoctenidae Pleurobrachiidae	<i>Aulacoctena</i> <i>Hormiphora</i>
		Lobata	Bathocyroidae Eurhamphaeidae Leucotheidae Ocryopsidae	<i>Bathocyroe</i> <i>Kiyohimea</i> <i>Leucothea</i> <i>Ocryopsis</i>
		Thalassocalycida	Thalassocalycidae	<i>Thalassocalyce</i>

Chaeotognatha	Sagittoidea			
Annelida	Polychaeta	Phyllodocida Canalipalpata	Tomopteridae Flabelligeridae	<i>Tomopteris</i> <i>Poeobius</i>
Arthropoda	Malacostraca	Amphipoda Decapoda Euphausiacea Isopoda	Munnopsidae	<i>Munnopsis</i>
Mollusca	Cephalopoda	Octopoda Teuthida	Amphitretidae Octopodidae Cranchiidae Mastigoteuthidae Octopoteuthidae Ommastrephidae	<i>Helicocranchia</i> <i>Mastigoteuthis</i> <i>Octopoteuthis</i> <i>Taningia</i> <i>Sthenoteuthis</i>
	Gastropoda	Nudibranchia Pteropoda	Phylliroidae	<i>Phylliroe</i>
Chordata	Appendicularia	Copelata	Oikopleuridae	<i>Bathochordaeus</i> <i>Mesochordaeus</i>
	Thaliacea	Doliolida Pyrosomatida Salpida	Pyrosomatidae Salpidae	<i>Pyrostemma</i> <i>Cyclosalpa</i>
	Actinopteri	Anguilliformes Myctophiformes Stomiiformes	Nemichthyidae Myctophidae Gonostomatidae Sternoptychidae	<i>Cyclothone</i>

654

656