Spatial distribution of demersal and epibenthic communities along the northern Atlantic waters of Morocco -North West Africa-
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Abstract:
The composition and abundance of demersal and epibenthic communities along the northern Atlantic coast of Morocco were studied. Eighty two bottom trawl hauls were carried out in July 2010, at depths ranging from 20 to 800 m. One hundred forty eight species have been identified. Most of them belonged to the fish groups, followed by crustaceans, cephalopods, gastropods, echinoderms, cnidarians and bivalves. Only European hake (Merluccius merluccius) was considered frequent because this species was present in more than 75% for all depth strata. As a result of multivariate analyzes, four assemblages were defined. The group I, was located from 200 to 300 m, on the muddy-sands bottoms on the outer continental shelf and the upper slope, and characterized by high abundance and high diversity. The group II, distributed on trawlable bottoms between 100 to 200 m, limited and influenced by the rocky and coralligenous grounds. The group III, localized on the middle slope, beyond 300 m depth, on muddy bottoms and characterized by deep sea species. The group IV, situated in less than 100 m depth on sandy-muddy bottoms and characterized by typical shelf species. Each assemblage was characterized by specific species and had both qualitative and quantitative differences. Depth appeared to be the main structuring factor of demersal and epibenthic communities in the northern Atlantic coast of Morocco. The substrate type seems also, play an important role in this structuration.
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Introduction
The Moroccan Atlantic coast, between Cap Spartel (35°47'N) and Sidi Ifni (29°22'N), is located on the border between three biogeographic marine regions, the Lusitanian, Mauritanian and Mediterranean regions. This is a transition zone between northeastern Atlantic warm-temperate, cold-temperate waters and Mediterranean outflow [1, 2]. This area is influenced by the Canary current [3] and characterized by the occurrence of strong upwelling during summer [4, 5]. The continental shelf is characterized by a wide range of soft bottom (sand, mud and muddy sand) and hard bottoms (rocky and coralligenous) [6, 7] and the occurrence of a Dendrophyllia ramea coral barrier [8]. This coralligenous is almost continuous and parallel to the coast between 120 and 180 m depth [8]. All these characteristics give to this region an important biodiversity, which includes a wide range of species, many of which are of commercial interest [9]. The most important target species in this region are Merluccius merluccius and Parapenaeus longirostris [10, 11]. Because of intense exploitation of these species by a coastal fleet and a deep sea trawl fleet, this fishery in the last decade has been characterized by a severe decline [12].

Several studies showed that fishing associated with climate variability indirectly affect community structure and functioning of marine ecosystems [13, 14, 15]. The study of the species composition and community organization has become an essential and major approach to understanding the functioning of marine ecosystems [16]. The assemblage composition and structure analysis provide a snapshot of the interactions between species and the environment [17].

The first census of the Moroccan marine life was established in the early 20th century during European shipments [8]. These surveys were designed to explore new fishing opportunities. The focus was on the coastal zone and fishing areas, leaving the most of the continental shelf and the offshore waters poorly known. From the
1980s, many bottom trawl surveys have been conducted to monitor and assess the status of the exploited fish stocks but without considering ecosystem issues as a whole [18, 9]. Studies are monospecific in nature, focused on target species of important commercial interest. Only a few have focused on the faunal composition and bathymetric distribution of communities [8, 19, 20].

The aim of this study is to contribute to the basic information on spatial distribution of the epibenthic and demersal assemblages, and the main ecological parameters that shape their structure in the northern Atlantic coast of Morocco.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Sampling

The data used in this study was collected from 82 trawl hauls, undertaken by the Institut National de Recherche Halieutique (INRH), in July 2010, using the research vessel "R/V Charif Al Idrissi". The surveys were conducted using a stratified random sampling (Figure 1), from Cap Spartel (35°47'N) to Sidi Ifni (29°22'N) at depths ranging from 20 to 800 m. The fishing gear used during these surveys was a locally designed bottom trawl for targeting demersal fish and shrimps. The stretched mesh sizes were 40 mm, the vertical opening (1.5 to 3 m) and the horizontal opening (18 to 22 m). Trawling time had varied between 20 minutes (depth < 200 m) and 60 minutes (depth > 200 m) depending on the depth and speed was maintained as constant as possible during the survey (3 knots). Therefore, all catches rates were standardized per 1hour. Unusually, during these surveys, species identification has concerned the total catch (demersal and epibenthic fauna), substrate type and species number were noted. Unlike regular surveys, that was focused on commercial species and the individual number was rarely taken into consideration.

![Figure1: Map of the study area and distribution of the trawl hauls in the Moroccan Atlantic coast, between Cap Spartel (35°47'N) and Sidi Ifni (29°22'N),](image)

2.2. Data analysis

For each trawl haul, species richness ($S$) was calculated as the number of species per trawl haul and the density was expressed in number of individuals per hour. The species frequency of occurrence ($FO$) was computed for all the identified taxa and expressed in percentage: $FO = \frac{Pa}{P} \times 100$; where $Pa$ is the total number of trawl hauls with the considered taxa, and $P$ is the total number of trawl hauls. The occurrence of a taxon is considered frequent when $FO \geq 75\%$, common when $75\% > FO \geq 50\%$, occasionally when $50\% > FO \geq 25\%$, rare when $25\% > FO \geq 10\%$ and accidentally when $FO < 10\%$ following [21].
To test the effects of depth (depth strata) and substrate type (muddy, sandy, hard) on species distribution, a non-parametric Multivariate analysis of variance was conducted [22].

In order to study the spatial distribution patterns of the demersal and epibenthic fauna, two multivariate analyses were performed without considering the pelagic and endobenthic species (not accurately sampled by bottom trawling method) and the accidental species i.e. present in less than 7 trawl hauls with a frequency of occurrence lower than 10% [21].

A principal component analysis (PCA) was carried out using a ‘haul x species’ matrix where data were log (x+1) transformed (x: abundance of the species i) to reduce the influence of dominant species in the analysis.

For the identification of assemblage groups, a hierarchical clustering analysis [23] was conducted on the Euclidean distance matrix, calculated from the factorial coordinates of trawl hauls on the main axes of the PCA (4 axes were selected in Fig. 3). The aggregation criteria selected to create the classification dendrogram of trawl hauls was the “average linkage” (selected according to the methodological approach provided by [24]. The number of assemblage groups from the dendrogram was determined using the GAP statistical method [25]. The robustness estimates of the groups formed by the hierarchical classification were computed through a resampling process (500 bootstraps).

To characterize each identified assemblage group, the total number of individuals (N) of all the species in the assemblage, species richness per assemblage (S), the heterogeneous Shannon index specific (richness and evenness) and the Pielou $J'$ evenness index were calculated. Shannon Index [26] was computed using the following formula:

$$H' = - \sum_{i=1}^{s} p_i \log_2(p_i)$$

Where $p_i$= proportion of species $i= n_i/N$ where $n_i$ = number of individuals of a species in the assemblage and $N$ = total number of individuals. $H'$ ranges from 0 (when there is one species or one predominant species) to $H'_{max} = \log S$ (when all the species have equal abundance) [27]. The Pielou evenness index [28] corresponds to $J' = H'/H'_{max}$ and ranges from 0 (when there is one predominant species) to 1 (when there is an equal distribution of individuals among all the species) [27]. Differences in each descriptor (faunal abundance and diversity indices) among assemblage groups were examined using a Kruskal-Wallis test 1-way ANOVA [29]. When significant differences were detected, we used the post-hoc multiple comparisons test Dwass-Steel-Critchlow-Fligner to identify the groups, which are responsible for such differences [30].

Furthermore, to identify indicator species for each group, we used the Indicator Value method [31]. The significance of the indicator value of each species was tested by randomization test (10 000). Only species showed an indicator value higher than 25% and were significantly different from the calculated values (p<0.05) were considered as characteristic of the group [31].

Besides, the k-dominance curves initiated by [32] and [33] have been plotted. These curves were used to display the cumulative abundance in relation to the rank of the species in order to compare the equitability between assemblages on the same graphic. If a given curve is always localized above another, it reflects a greater dominance. Additionally abundance-biomass comparison curves (ABC plots) allowed representing abundance and biomass of the species by superimposing all these species on the same graphic for a given group [34, 35]. The comparison of cumulative dominance curves, based on the abundance and biomass of species allowed visualizing if the assemblages are dominated by individuals of low or high biomass.

All statistical analyzes were performed with the R software [36].

3. Results and discussion

3.1. Faunal composition

A total of 148 species belonging to 9 faunal groups were identified. Most of the species belonged to the fish groups, followed by crustaceans, cephalopods, gastropods, echinoderms, cnidarians and bivalves. The predominance of bony fish in the study area, has also been observed by various authors [37, 8]. It’s to note that the trawl used in this study is generally considered as more suitable for shrimp and fish sampling than for other groups of species.

In this study, 28 species were identified for the first time in the study area, in comparison with the various taxa found during the period 1981-2007 [20]. This is due to the additional systematic identification effort provided during this last survey (Appendix 2). The species identified for the first time, belong to fish groups (4 species), crustaceans (4 species), cephalopods (1 species), gastropods (6 species), echinoderms (7 species), cnidarians (4 species) and bivalves (2 species).

In term of species frequency occurrence, Merluccius merluccius was the only frequent species, from the coast to 800 m depth (Table 1). The importance of European hake on the northern Atlantic coast of Morocco has been, also confirmed by several authors [38, 9, 20]. It’s the most important target specie in the region with a high economic value [11].
Table 1: Frequent and common species in each depth stratum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Depth strata</th>
<th>20-100</th>
<th>100-200</th>
<th>200-500</th>
<th>500 &lt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Hauls</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO ≥ 75%</td>
<td><em>Merluccius merluccius</em></td>
<td><em>Parapenaeus longirostris</em></td>
<td><em>Merluccius merluccius</em></td>
<td><em>Hoplostethus mediterraneus</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common species</td>
<td>75% &gt; FO ≥ 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sepia Officinalis</em></td>
<td><em>Octopus vulgaris</em></td>
<td><em>Capros aper</em></td>
<td><em>Caelorinchus caelorhincus</em></td>
<td><em>Plesionika narval</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. 2. Demersal and epibenthic assemblages’ structure

The non-parametric multivariate analysis of variance (Table 2) showed that depth and substrate type had significant effect on species distribution (p<0.05).

Table 2: The non-parametric Multivariate analysis of variance’s results, to test effect of depth and substrate type on species distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Pillai</th>
<th>approx F</th>
<th>num Df</th>
<th>den Df</th>
<th>Pr(&gt;F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.3040</td>
<td>0.3887</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.021021*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substrate type</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.4874</td>
<td>1.5159</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>0.024085*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance codes: 0 "***" 0.001 "**" 0.01 "*" 0.05 "." 0.1 " ' " 1

The PCA performed on the data matrix (trawl hauls x species abundance) identified the contribution of different species (Figure 2 a, b, Appendix 1).

Figure 2: Factorial plane (30 % of the total inertia) of the principal component analysis. (a) The correlation circle species, (b) The projection of the trawl hauls

The first axis (21% of the total inertia) was correlated with the negative side of the offshore trawl hauls and was dominated by deep-sea species (*Nezumia aequalis*, *Rossia macrosoma*, *Galeus melastomus*, *Hoplostethus mediterraneus*, *Neprops norvegicus*, *Coelorhynchus coelorhynchus*, *Plesionika narval*, *Cytttopsis rosea*, *Hymenocephalus italicus* and *Helicolenus dactylopterus*). At the positive side of the first axis *Sepia officinalis*, *Gobius arnatus*, *Alloteuthis subulata*, *Goneplax rhomboides*, *Citharus linguatula*, were unveiled. Other species, as well as trawl hauls, in this side of the axis, appeared under represented with a little contribution. In contrast,
the second axis (9% of the total inertia) was mainly correlated to trawl hauls, which were rich in abundance and dominated by *Parapenaeus longirostris* and *Plesionika martia*. The positive side of this axis included the coastal trawl hauls which were dominated by *Dicologoglossa cuneata*, *Pagellus acarne*, *Trachinus vipera*, *Cymbium cucumis* and *Raja asterias*. For the remaining trawl hauls, the second axis opposed mud to muddy-sand bottoms at varied bottom.

The cluster analysis showed four groups of trawl hauls (Figure 3). (1) group I corresponding to the hauls located from 200 to 300 m, on the muddy-sands bottoms, on the outer continental shelf and the upper slope, (2) group II, corresponding to the hauls located from 100 to 200 m, on trawlable bottoms limited and influenced by the rocky and coralligenous grounds, (3) group III corresponding to the deepest hauls located on the middle slope, beyond 300 m depth, on muddy bottoms, (4) group IV corresponding to the coastal hauls located in less than 100 m depth on sandy-muddy bottoms. In addition to those groups, two trawl hauls on muddy bottoms, characterized by their low abundance, and three separate trawl hauls were also showed but could not be considered as groups. The three last trawl hauls were very different from the others, with the dominance of some species that contributed to the second axis of the PCA.

![Cluster Dendrogram](image)

**Figure 3**: Hierarchical clustering (average linkage) of the trawl hauls made from the factorial coordinates of Principal Component Analysis calculated on the species abundances and groups. Number of groups determined using the GAP statistical method.

In this study, the depth seemed to be an important factor revealing two main assemblages. The organization of demersal species along the bathymetric gradient was raised by various authors [39, 40, 41, 29]. For instance, in the Gulf of Lion (the Mediterranean Sea), and in the Bay of Biscay (Atlantic Ocean), three assemblages of species were highlighted: 1) coastal assemblage, from 0 to 80 m, 2) continental shelf assemblage, from 80 to 150 m and 3) continental slope assemblage, beyond 150 m [39, 40, 42]. However, it remains difficult to explicitly identify factors along the bathymetric gradient that could influence the organization of the communities. Previous studies have shown that some environmental factors such as water temperature, salinity, light, hydrological characteristics influence the structure and the organization of demersal communities [43, 44, 29].

In addition to the bathymetric factor, the analysis identified the substrate nature as another key factor structuring faunal assemblages in the study area. The nature of the substrate appeared also to play an important role by structuring the assemblages. An increased gradient in terms of biomass was highlighted with pure mud or sandy mud being highly productive [45]. The substrate type has been argued by several authors in order to explain the depth distribution of fish species, echinoderms and arthropods in New England [46] and in the Mediterranean Sea [47, 29]. However, intensive sampling would be required, to clarify the effect of the nature of substrate in structuring assemblages.
Indeed, the continental shelf of the Northern Moroccan Atlantic coasts is characterized by the presence of a coralligenous barrier (mainly dominated by Dendrophyllia species) which is almost continuous and parallel to the coast and located between 120 and 180 m depth [37, 8]. This barrier extends from Cap Spartel (35°47’N) to the Sebou River (34°04’N). In the south of this region, only Dendrophyllia spots persist but without forming a continuous barrier. So the third assemblage corresponded to the sandy passages located between the coralligenous barrier.

Each identified group was characterized by specific species (indicator value higher than 25% and p<0.05) (Table 3) and had both qualitative and quantitative differences (Table 4). The rank of species changed from one group to another. In the group (I), only Octopus vulgaris had IndVal value more than 25% even if not significant (p=0.31) and two species were dominated; Parapeneaus longirostris (28%) and Merluccius merluccius (15%).

Table 3: Characteristics species for each group (IndVal method)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>IndVal</th>
<th>pValue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Octopus vulgaris</td>
<td>27.49%</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macroramphosus scolopax</td>
<td>88.65%</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capros aper</td>
<td>59.80%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illex coindetii</td>
<td>59.23%</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepia officinalis</td>
<td>36.42%</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merluccius merluccius</td>
<td>29.37%</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnoglossus thorii</td>
<td>28.52%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galeus melastomus</td>
<td>76.57%</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoplostethus mediterraneus</td>
<td>75.92%</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helicolenus dactylopterus</td>
<td>65.44%</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephrops norvegicus</td>
<td>53.75%</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caelorhinchus caelorhinchus</td>
<td>53.75%</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyttopsis rosea</td>
<td>53.21%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nezumia aequalis</td>
<td>49.84%</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plesionika narval</td>
<td>46.05%</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymenocephalus italicus</td>
<td>45.92%</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rossia macrosomus</td>
<td>36.97%</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group IV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gobius arnatus</td>
<td>95.06%</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alloteuthis subulata</td>
<td>92.95%</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gonoepax rhomboides</td>
<td>60.14%</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citharus linguatula</td>
<td>56.23%</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conger conger</td>
<td>47.98%</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parapeneaus longirostris</td>
<td>41.23%</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sepia officinalis</td>
<td>37.57%</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merluccius merluccius</td>
<td>32.02%</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squilla mantis</td>
<td>31.98%</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnoglossus imperialis</td>
<td>27.73%</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance codes: * p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p < 0.001, ns (no significant) : p>0.05

Group II was characterized by four species (IndVal>25% and p < 0.05): Macroramphosus scolopax, Capros aper, Illex coindetii and Arnoglossus thorii. The two first species (Macroramphosus scolopax, Capros aper) were in the major part of the catches in this group (more than 60%).

Group III was characterized by 10 deep-sea species (IndVal>25% and p<0.05): Galeus melastomus, Hoplostethus mediterraneus, Helicolenus dactylopterus, Nephrops norvegicus, Caelorhinchus caelorhinchus, Cyttopsis rosea, Nezumia aequalis, Plesionika narval, Hymenocephalus italicus and Rossia macrosomus. In term of abundance the first species Parapeneaus longirostris, had represented 12% of the catches, followed by Galeus melastomus (9%). The more coastal group (IV) was characterized by 7 species (IndVal>25% and p<0.05): Gobius arnatus, Alloteuthis subulata, Goneplax rhomboides, Citharus linguatula, Conger conger, Squilla mantis and Arnoglossus imperialis. The two first species had represented 22% each of abundance in this group.

In this area, the depth seems to induce changes in substrate type and epibenthic community, which affects the distribution of demersal species. The first assemblage was distinguished by the dominance of P. longirostris and the top predator M. merluccius. The high abundance of these species on the muddy sands bottoms was reported by [8], [48] and [11]. The Penaeidae dominance indicates a planktonic origin of the trophic resources [49].
According to [10], *P. longirostris* abounds in the muddy sands bottoms, because of the presence of the increased productivity in this area, and consequently, the abundance of food. *M. merluccius* is ubiquitous species; its growth is associated with a change in feeding habit, the young feed mostly on crustaceans while fishes are the main prey of the adults [50].

Low trophic level fish such as Macroramphosus scolopax, Capros aper [29], distinguished the second assemblage. On the Portuguese coast, these species play an important role in the trophodynamics of the ecosystem [51]. They are important prey for many commercial species and, given their abundance, may have a great impact on zooplankton communities [51].

The third assemblage was characterized by typical deep-sea species, such as *Galeus melastomus*, and *C. caelorhincus* [42, 29].

**Table 4:** The most dominant species in different assemblage groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Group I</th>
<th>% in number</th>
<th>Group II</th>
<th>% in number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Parapenaeus longirostris</em></td>
<td>27.94</td>
<td><em>Macroramphosus scolopax</em></td>
<td>49.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><em>Merluccius merluccius</em></td>
<td>15.23</td>
<td><em>Capros aper</em></td>
<td>11.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><em>Gobius arnatus</em></td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td><em>Merluccius merluccius</em></td>
<td>8.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><em>Citharus linguatula</em></td>
<td>6.76</td>
<td><em>Plesionika martia</em></td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><em>Alloteuthis subulata</em></td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td><em>Citharus linguatula</em></td>
<td>5.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>Diplopus senegalensis</em></td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td><em>Parapenaeus longirostris</em></td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>Pagellus acarne</em></td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td><em>Arneglossus thori</em></td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Ophiura albida</em></td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td><em>Sepia officinalis</em></td>
<td>2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>Squilla mantis</em></td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td><em>Cidaris cidaris</em></td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>Sepia officinalis</em></td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td><em>Illex coindetii</em></td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth assemblage was characterized by typical shelf species, most of them are benthophagous feeding habit, such as *Squilla mantis*, *Goneplax rhomboids*, *Citharus linguatula* and *Arneglossus imperialis*. Similar observations were showed by in the study area [8], in French Mediterranean Sea [42] and in the northern Alboran Sea [29].

There is a close relationship between the bathymetric distributions of prey and predators [52, 17]. [53] showed that substrate type and macrofaunal communities could explain a significant part of the organization of fishes along the bathymetric gradient. Each type of sediment is characterized by a specific community of invertebrates, which are the main prey for a number of species [54]. Thus, for predators whose diet is very specialized, the disappearance of their preferred prey can lead to a limitation in their spatial distribution. Shelf fishes and crustaceans are more dependent on benthic resources and slope species had utilized plankton resources [55].

3.3 Assemblages diversity

The total species richness was highest in group I (120 species), intermediate for the group III (80 species) and less important for groups II and IV (51 and 52 species respectively) (Table 5). The Shannon index $H'$ and Pielou equitability $J'$ varied respectively from 2.8 to 4.5 and from 0.49 to 0.71(Table 5). The Kruskal-Wallis test for these two indices indicated that there were no significant differences among groups. On the other hand, the difference was significant for total species richness (p<0.0001) and total abundance (p<0.0001) (Table 6).

In this study, diversity and abundance did not show any trend with depth. The lowest values were observed in the continental shelf, less than 200 m (Groups II and IV) and the highest between 200 to 300 m. In
Mediterranean Sea, [56, 40, 57] depth affect diversity of the main taxa of demersal organisms and cause a decrease in their abundance and their biomass.

Table 5: Number of trawl hauls, abundance and diversity indices in each group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of hauls</th>
<th>Total specific richness</th>
<th>Abundance N (ind/h)</th>
<th>Shannon index H’</th>
<th>Equitability J’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>18425</td>
<td>4.201</td>
<td>0.6082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10178</td>
<td>2.802</td>
<td>0.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10669</td>
<td>4.523</td>
<td>0.7155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>18626</td>
<td>3.164</td>
<td>0.555</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Dwass-steel- Critchlow-Fligner multiple comparison test per pairwise assemblage group calculated for the abundance and richness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Abundance</th>
<th>Richness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I II III IV</td>
<td>I II III IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1 0.040* 0.018* 0.0003*</td>
<td>1 0.068 0.004* 0.283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.041* 1 0.995 0.042*</td>
<td>0.068 1 0.733 0.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.018* 0.995 1 0.012*</td>
<td>0.0044* 0.733 1 0.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>0.0003* 0.042* 0.012* 1</td>
<td>0.283 0.991 0.999 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

K-dominance curves had close profiles with the species distribution that were quite different for the first species. Their trend was consistent with the trends of the equitability index J (Figure 4). The comparison of cumulative frequency curves, based on the abundance and biomass of species allowed visualizing the assemblages that are dominated by individuals of low or high biomass (Figure 5). For the groups I, II and IV, the frequency distribution curve in term of species richness was higher than the distribution of biomass, which indicated a strong dominance of low biomass individuals. This could be probably the results of high fishing pressure in this region [9]. In group III, the distribution in terms of species biomass and abundance indicate a dominance of high biomass individuals.

Previous studies indicated that the oceanic circulation of water masses, which could create hydrological barriers that would limit the extent of large-scale communities, could influence the geographical distribution of demersal species [58]. As similar situation can occur in the northern Atlantic coast of Morocco, that is part of the large canary current marine ecosystem. This area is characterized by seasonal coastal upwelling and strong localized currents, which enhance primary production and plankton biomass, in some regions. [59, 60, 5].

Figure 4: k-dominance curves, Based on abundance data, for each assemblages in the Northern Moroccan Atlantic area (Summer 2010)
Figure 5: ABC plots based on the abundance and biomass of each assemblage group in the Northern Moroccan Atlantic area (Summer 2010)

Conclusion

This work is the first attempt to describe the spatial patterns of the epibenthic and demersal communities’ structure in the northern Atlantic coast of Morocco in relation to main ecological parameters (depth, substrate nature). It points the way towards further studies, including analysis of the temporal trends of species distribution in this area. However, in order to fully understand this community structure we recommend investigating the relationship between spatial patterns in community structure and environmental factors such as water bottom temperature, salinity, indices of upwelling that are known to influence the structure and organization of demersal communities. Studies on species Age structure are needed to, in order to provide more detailed information on the structure of the assemblages and their response to various environmental parameters.
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Appendix 1: Species Code used in the principal component analysis (PCA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species Code</th>
<th>Species Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MERLMER</td>
<td>PAGEACA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAPELON</td>
<td>GALUMEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEPOIF</td>
<td>GONERHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITHLIN</td>
<td>TRIGLU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCTPVUL</td>
<td>HOPLMED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONGCON</td>
<td>SQUIMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPOAPE</td>
<td>CALMLYR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELEDICIR</td>
<td>HELIDAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOBIAR</td>
<td>NEZUAEQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPHAL</td>
<td>PLEKMAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAGUBE</td>
<td>MULLSUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALLOSUB</td>
<td>PERSCAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIOCDEP</td>
<td>TRACVI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNOTHO</td>
<td>TRISLUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILLECOI</td>
<td>PLEKNAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACOSCO</td>
<td>ARNOIMP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENTMAR</td>
<td>CAELCAE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZEUSFAB</td>
<td>CEPOMAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARRUB</td>
<td>HYMEEITA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYMBMAR</td>
<td>NEPHNOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CYTTTROS</td>
<td>POLYTY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAGOLGA</td>
<td>RAJAASST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANEOL</td>
<td>SOLESOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSSMAC</td>
<td>CALPGRA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 2: List of identified species in the Northern Moroccan Atlantic area (Summer 2010). Species in red and* were identified for the first time in this survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groupe taxonomique</th>
<th>Ordre</th>
<th>Famille</th>
<th>Espèce</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actinoptérygiens</td>
<td>Anguilliformes</td>
<td>Congridae</td>
<td>Conger conger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nemichthyidae</td>
<td>Nemichthys scolopaceus*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ophichthidae</td>
<td>Ophichthus rufus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aulopiformes</td>
<td>Aulopidae</td>
<td>Aulopus filamentosus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beryciformes</td>
<td>Berycidae</td>
<td>Beryx splendens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trachichthyidae</td>
<td>Hoplostethus mediterraneus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chimaeriformes</td>
<td>Chimaeridae</td>
<td>Chimaera monstrosa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clupeiformes</td>
<td>clupeidae</td>
<td>Sardina pilchardus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Engraulidae</td>
<td>Engraulis encrasciolus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gadiformes</td>
<td>Gadidae</td>
<td>Gadilus argenteus, Gadus poutassou, Trisopterus luscus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Macrouridae</td>
<td>Caelorinchus caelorhinchus, Hymenolepis italicus, Nezumia aequalis, Trachyrynchus trachyrynchus,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Merlucciidae</td>
<td>Merluccius merluccius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Phycidae</td>
<td>Physic blemnoides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lophiiformes</td>
<td>Lophidae</td>
<td>Lophius budicass, Lophius piscatorius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Melanocetidae</td>
<td>Melanocetus jonsonii*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ophidiiformes</td>
<td>Ophidiidae</td>
<td>Ophidion barbatum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osmeriformes</td>
<td>Alepocephalidae</td>
<td>Rouleina attrita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argentinidae</td>
<td>Argentina sphyraena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perciformes</td>
<td>Callionymidae</td>
<td>Callionymus lyra, Callionymus maculatus, Synchiropus phaeton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carangidae</td>
<td>Trachurus trachurus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cepolidae</td>
<td>Cepola macropenthalma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Epigonidae</td>
<td>Epigonus telescopus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gobiidae</td>
<td>Gobius arnatus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mugilidae</td>
<td>Mugil cephalus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mullidae</td>
<td>Mullus surmuletus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sciaenidae</td>
<td>Umbrina cirrosa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scombridae</td>
<td>Scomber japonicus, Scomber scombrus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sparidae</td>
<td>Boops boops, Dentex maroccanus, Diplodus cervinus, Diplodus senegalensis, Diplodus vulgaris, Lithognathus mormyrus, Pagellus erythrinus, Pagellus acarne, Pagellus bogaraveo, Spondylosoma cantharus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trachinidae</td>
<td>Trachinus draco, Trachinus viper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trichiuridae</td>
<td>Aphanopus carbo, Lepidopus caudatus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleuronectiformes</td>
<td>Bothidae</td>
<td>Arneglossus imperialis, Arneglossus thorii*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Citharidae</td>
<td>Citharus linguatula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scophthalmidae</td>
<td>Psctta maxima</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soleidae</td>
<td>Pegusa lascaris, Solea vulgaris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scorpaeniformes</td>
<td>Peristididae</td>
<td>Peristidon cataphractum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scorpaenidae</td>
<td>Scorpaena loppei, Scorpaena notata, Scorpaena scrofa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sebastidae</td>
<td>Helicolenus dactylopterus, Trachyscorpiia cristulata echinata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trigidae</td>
<td>Aspriila cuculus, Lepidotrigla cuculus, Trigla lucerna, Trigla lyra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stomuiiformes</td>
<td>Sternoptychidae</td>
<td>Argyropelecus aculeatus, Argyropelecus olpeisi*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syngnathiformes</td>
<td>Centriscidae</td>
<td>Macroramphosus scolopax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetraodontiformes</td>
<td>Tetraodontidae</td>
<td>Lagocephalus laevigatus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeiformes</td>
<td>Caproidae</td>
<td>Capros aper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parazeniidae</td>
<td>Cytopsis rosea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zeidae</td>
<td>Zenopsis conchifer, Zeus faber</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bivalves</td>
<td>Veneroida</td>
<td>Rudites decussatus, Venus verrucosa, Venus casina*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cardiidae</td>
<td>Acanthocardia aculeata*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Céphalopodes</td>
<td>Octopoda</td>
<td>Eledone cirrhosa, Octopus vulgaris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sepioides</td>
<td>Sepia officinalis, Sepia orbigniana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sepiolida</td>
<td>Rossia macrosoma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teuthida</td>
<td>Alloteuthis subulata, Loligo forbesi*, Loligo vulgaris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ommastrephidae</td>
<td>Illex coindetti, Todaropsis eblastae</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elasmobranches</td>
<td>Carcharhiniformes</td>
<td>Galeus melastomus, Scylirhinus canula</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rajiformes</td>
<td>Raja asterias, Raja clavata, Raja miraletus, Raja naevus, Raja oxyrhynchus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Squaliformes</td>
<td>Centrophorus squamosus, Deania calcea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Torpediniformes</td>
<td>Torpedo marmorata, Torpedo torpedo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crustacés</td>
<td>Décapodes</td>
<td>Plesiopenaeus edwardsianus, Aristaeus antennatus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Calappidae</td>
<td>Calappa granulata</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corystidae</td>
<td>Corystesca sivelaunus*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dorippidae</td>
<td>Dorippa lanata*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minididae</td>
<td>Munida rugosa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gervonidae</td>
<td>Chaceon affinis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goneplacidae</td>
<td>Goneplax rhomboideis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Homolidae</td>
<td>Paromola cuvier</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Majidae</td>
<td>Maja squinado</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nephropidae</td>
<td><em>Nephrops norvegicus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pandalidae</td>
<td><em>Chlorotocus crassicornis</em>, <em>Plesionika narval</em>, <em>Plesionika martia</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plesiopidae</td>
<td><em>Pasiphaea multidentata</em>, <em>Pasiphaea sivado</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penaeidae</td>
<td><em>Parapenaeus longirostris</em>, <em>Peneaopsis Serrata</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penaeoidae</td>
<td><em>Aristaeomorpha foliacea</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polychelidae</td>
<td><em>Polycheles typhlops</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polibiidae</td>
<td><em>Liocarcinus depurator</em>, <em>Polybius henslowii</em>, <em>Bathynectes maravigna</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solenoceridae</td>
<td><em>Solenocera membranacea</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paguridés</td>
<td><em>Pagurus bernhardus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stomatopodes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squillidés</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastéropodes</td>
<td><em>Cymbium marmoratum</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neogastropoda</td>
<td><em>Buccinumhum phreysianum</em>, <em>Colus gracilis</em>, <em>Neptune acontraria</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volutidae</td>
<td><em>Cassididae</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buccinidae</td>
<td><em>Galeodea echinophora</em>, <em>Galeodea rugosa</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littorinimorpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassidae</td>
<td><em>Charonia rubicanda</em>, <em>Charonia lampas</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neotaenioglossa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranellidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinodermes</td>
<td><em>Camarodonta</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echinidae</td>
<td><em>Cidaris acutus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cidaroida</td>
<td><em>Cidaridae</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophiurida</td>
<td><em>Cidarids</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astropunctinidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brissidae</td>
<td><em>Brissopsis lyrifera</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valvatidae</td>
<td><em>Asterinae</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spatangoidae</td>
<td><em>Anseropoda placentae</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cnidaires</td>
<td><em>Alcyonacea</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcyoniidae</td>
<td><em>Alcyonium sp</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antipatharia</td>
<td><em>Myriopathidae</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sertulariidae</td>
<td><em>Antipathella subpinnata</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennatulacea</td>
<td><em>Pennatulidae</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennatulacea</td>
<td><em>Pennatula phosphorea</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>