

of Biscay, the three dominant epibenthic species are certainly linked with the anteriorly described environmental conditions in the confinement area of the submarine valley (reduced substratum, oxygen depletion and stagnation of near-bottom water). Such a dominance of a few species in canyon communities in comparison with adjacent non-canyon slope communities was also reported for the epi- and megabenthic fauna of the Hatteras, Alvin and Hudson canyons from the east coast of North America [10, 11, 23, 24]. However, this peculiarity was not observed by Houston and Haedrich [13] for the Carson canyon (Grand Banks) which was considered as an 'active' canyon where sediment was continually flushed out all along the submarine valley, thus preventing the development of abundant epibenthic populations. Finally, as previously suggested by Rowe [24] and Rowe et al. [25], such dominant epibenthic species may be considered as 'canyon indicator species' mainly observed in canyons which act as depocenter for organic matter. Further investigations on the benthic communities of the Capbreton canyon will provide new insights on the distribution of these species with regard to the extension of the confinement area within the upper portion of this submarine valley.

Acknowledgments

Thanks are due to DGO (Talence) for the loan of the Flusha box-corer, to BMM-MNHN (Paris) for the loan of the sieving equipment, to the crew of the RV *Côte d'Aquitaine* for their valuable assistance at sea and to A. Urzelai, I. Esteban and I. Zabala (INSUB, San Sebastian) for their helpful contribution to the sorting of Capbreton samples. This French-Spanish co-operative research programme was partly supported by the French CIRMAT-CNRS (1988-89 CAPBRETON cruises).

REFERENCES

- [1] Aguirrezabalaga F., Altuna A., Marruedo J., Miner A., Pena J., Romero A., San Juan R., San Vicente C., Serrano A., Ibañez M., Contribución al conocimiento de la fauna marina de la Costa Vasca. VI, Lurralde 11 (1988) 217-265.
- [2] Barnard J.L., Karaman G.S., The families and genera of marine gammaridean Amphipoda (except marine gammaroids), Rec. Aust. Mus. 13 (Suppl. 1 and 2) (1991) 1-866.
- [3] Bonnier J., Edriophthalmes, in: Koehler R. (Ed.), Résultats scientifiques de la campagne du « Caudan » dans le golfe de Gascogne, août-septembre 1895, Ann. Univ. Lyon 26 (1896) 527-689.
- [4] Chevreux E., Amphipodes provenant des campagnes de l'Hirondelle (1885-1888), Résultat. Camp. Scient. Prince Albert I 16 (1900) 1-195.
- [5] Cunha M.R., Sorbe J.C., Bernardes C., On the structure of the neritic suprabenthic communities from the Portuguese continental margin, Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 157 (1997) 119-137.
- [6] Dauvin J.C., Sorbe J.C., Suprabenthic amphipods from the southern margin of the Cap-Ferret canyon (Bay of Biscay, northeastern Atlantic Ocean): abundance and bathymetric distribution, Pol. Arch. Hydrobiol. 42 (1995) 441-460.
- [7] Elizalde M., Les communautés suprabenthiques bathyales de la marge sud du canyon du Cap Ferret (Golfe de Gascogne), Ph.D. thesis, université de Bordeaux-I, France, 1994, 212 p.
- [8] Elizalde M., Sorbe J.C., Dauvin J.C., Las comunidades suprabentónicas batiales del golfo de Vizcaya (margen sur del cañón de Cap-Ferret): composición faunística y estructura, Publ. Espec. Inst. Esp. Oceanogr. 11 (1993) 247-258.
- [9] Elizalde M., Weber O., Sorbe J.C., Influence des caractères sédimentologiques sur la distribution des Crustacés benthiques de la pente atlantique (golfe de Gascogne; marge sud du canyon du Cap-Ferret), Actes du III^e Colloque international « Océanographie du Golfe de Gascogne », 1993, pp. 269-273.
- [10] Haedrich R.L., Rowe G.T., Polloni P.T., Zonation and faunal composition of epibenthic populations on the continental slope south of New England, J. Mar. Res. 33 (1975) 191-212.
- [11] Haedrich R.L., Rowe G.T., Polloni P.T., The megabenthic fauna in the deep sea south of New England, USA, Mar. Biol. 57 (1980) 165-179.
- [12] Holdich D.M., Jones J.A., Tanaids. Keys and Notes for the Identification of the Species, Synopses of the British Fauna No. 27, 1983, 98 p.
- [13] Houston K.A., Haedrich R.L., Abundance and biomass of macrobenthos in the vicinity of Carson Submarine Canyon, northwest Atlantic Ocean, Mar. Biol. 82 (1984) 301-305.
- [14] Koehler R., Arcturidés nouveaux provenant des campagnes de la Princesse-Alice ou appartenant au Musée Océanographique de Monaco, Bull. Inst. Océanogr. 214 (1911) 1-65.
- [15] Lagardère J.P., Distribution des décapodes dans le sud du golfe de Gascogne, Rev. Trav. Inst. Pêches Marit. 37 (1973) 77-95.
- [16] Le Danois E., Les profondeurs de la mer. Trente ans de recherches sur la faune sous-marine au large des côtes de France, Payot Édition, Paris, 1948, 303 p.
- [17] Le Floch J., Quelques propriétés des eaux d'origine méditerranéenne dans le golfe de Gascogne, Trav. Centre Rech. Étud. Océanogr. 7 (1968) 25-36.
- [18] Ogawa N., Tauzin P., Contribution à l'étude hydrologique et géochimique du Gouf de Capbreton, Bull. Inst. Géol. Bassin Aquitaine 14 (1973) 19-46.
- [19] Peypouquet J.P., Sur la présence d'espèces méditerranéennes au niveau des étages circalittoral et épibathyal de la zone de Cap-Breton, Bull. Inst. Géol. Bassin Aquitaine 13 (1973) 143-146.
- [20] Rallo A., Estudio biológico de los fondos de la fosa del Capbreton (golfo de Vizcaya, Atlantico Oriental). Campaña preparatoria, Julio (1987). Nota sobre las primeras capturas de fauna de poliquetos, Cuad. Invest. Biol. (Bilbao) 13 (1988) 145-149.
- [21] Rallo A., García-Arberas L., Isasi I., Distribución y asociaciones entre diversos grupos de invertebrados béticos en aguas del cañón del Capbreton (golfo de Vizcaya), Actes du III^e Colloque international « Océanographie du Golfe de Gascogne », 1993, pp. 275-278.
- [22] Rallo A., García-Arberas L., Isasi I., Fauna macrobentónica de los fondos del cañón de Capbreton: análisis faunístico de poliquetos, crustáceos y cnidarios y caracterización de puntos de muestreo según estos descriptores, Cah. Biol. Mar. 35 (1993) 69-90.

- [23] Rowe G.T., Observations on bottom currents and epibenthic populations in Hatteras Submarine Canyon, *Deep-Sea Res.* 18 (1971) 569–581.
- [24] Rowe G.T., The exploration of submarine canyons and their benthic faunal assemblages, *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh (B)* 73 (1972) 159–169.
- [25] Rowe G.T., Polloni P.T., Haedrich R.L., The deep-sea macrobenthos on the continental margin of the northwest Atlantic Ocean, *Deep-Sea Res.* 29 (1982) 257–278.
- [26] San Martín G., Ceberio A., Aguirrezabalaga F., *Exogone* species (Polychaeta: Syllidae: Exogoninae) from the Capbreton Canyon (Bay of Biscay, NE Atlantic), *Cah. Biol. Mar.* 37 (1996) 249–258.
- [27] Scherrer B., *Biostatistique*, Gaëtan Morin Edition, Paris, 1984, 850 p.
- [28] Schoener T.W., Resource partitioning in ecological communities, *Science* 185 (1974) 27–39.
- [29] Shepard F.P., Dill R.F., *Submarine Canyons and Other Sea Valleys*, Rand McNally & Company, Chicago, 1966, 381 p.
- [30] Sorbe J.C., Contribution à la connaissance des peuplements suprabenthiques néritiques sud-Gascogne, Ph.D. thesis, université de Bordeaux-I, France, 1984, 225 p.
- [31] Sorbe J.C., Structural evolution of two suprabenthic soft-bottom communities of the south Gascogne continental shelf, *Sci. Mar.* 53 (1989) 335–342.
- [32] Sorbe J.C., Le canyon de Capbreton : état des connaissances sur ce site exceptionnel de la marge atlantique européenne, in: Urrutia J., Rallo A. (Eds.), *Oceanografía del golfo de Vizcaya*, Servicio Editorial UPV-EHU, Bilbao, 1990, pp. 93–140.
- [33] Sorbe J.C., Weber O., Influence de la profondeur et des sédiments superficiels sur la structure des communautés suprabenthiques bathyales sud-Gascogne, *Actas del IV Coloquio Internacional sobre Oceanografía del Golfo de Vizcaya*, 1995, pp. 183–194.
- [34] Tauzin P., Étude des relations entre les caractéristiques physico-chimiques et chimiques des milieux de dépôt et la distribution de quelques éléments métalliques dans les sédiments de divers environnements du golfe de Gascogne, Ph.D. thesis, université de Bordeaux-I, France, 1974, 117 p.
- [35] Teixeira Gomes A.A., Análise morfológica dos canhões submarinos da Nazaré e de Setúbal, *Mestre em Ciências das Zonas Costeiras*, Universidade de Aveiro, Portugal, 1996, 152 p.
- [36] Urzelai A., Elizalde M., Arana B., Capellan T., Esteban I., San Vicente C., Ibañez M., Estudio de las comunidades de los fondos batiales de la fosa de Capbreton (golfo de Vizcaya): metodología y resultados preliminares, *Bentos* 6 (1990) 345–353.
- [37] Urzelai A., Elizalde M., Capellan T., Esteban I., Quiroga A., Zabala I., Ibañez M., Estudio preliminar de las comunidades de *Pagurus alatus* Fabricius, 1775 y *Parapagurus pilosimanus* S. I. Smith, 1879 (Crustacea Decapoda) y *Epizoanthus paguriphilus* Verril, 1883 (Anthozoa Zoantaria) de la fosa de Capbreton (golfo de Vizcaya), *Lurralde* 13 (1990) 193–206.
- [38] Vanney J.R., Mougnot D., Un canyon sous-marin de type « gouf ». Le canhão de Nazaré (Portugal), *Oceanol. Acta* 13 (1990) 1–14.

Appendix I. Abundance and percentage contribution of the macrobenthic crustaceans sampled with an epibenthic sled within sites A and B of the Capbreton canyon. * Damaged specimens; unid.: unidentified specimens; juv.: juveniles; MYS: Mysidacea; AMP: Amphipoda; CUM: Cumacea; ISO: Isopoda; TAN: Tanaidacea; EUP: Euphausiacea; DEC: Decapoda.

Site/Station	A/DI19		B/DI66		Site/Station	A/DI19		B/DI66	
Depth (m)	923		1 009		Depth (m)	923		1 009	
Species	No. ind.	%	No. ind.	%	Species	No. ind.	%	No. ind.	%
MYS <i>Amblyops spinifera</i>	1	0.02	–	0.00	<i>Stegocephaloides auratus</i>	1	0.02	–	0.00
<i>Paramblyops rostrata</i>	22	0.48	–	0.00	<i>Bruzelia typica</i>	9	0.20	–	0.00
<i>Parapseudomma calloplura</i>	2	0.04	–	0.00	<i>Gammaridea unid.*</i>	50	1.09	17	2.37
<i>Parerythrobs obesa</i>	1	0.02	–	0.00	<i>Parvipalpus major</i>	15	0.33	–	0.00
Erythropini unid.*	2	0.04	–	0.00	Caprelliacea unid.	–	0.00	17	2.37
<i>Bathymysis helgae</i>	1	0.02	–	0.00	CUM <i>Bathycuma brevivrostre</i>	–	0.00	13	1.81
Mysidacea unid.	2	0.04	–	0.00	<i>Cyclaspis longicaudata</i>	–	0.00	6	0.84
AMP <i>Iphimedia obesa</i>	1	0.02	–	0.00	<i>Diastrylodes serrata</i>	12	0.26	2	0.28
<i>Ampelisca declivitatis</i>	1	0.02	–	0.00	<i>Leptostylis villosa</i>	–	0.00	7	0.98
<i>Ampelisca pusilla</i>	8	0.17	60	8.37	<i>Makrokyllindrus longicaudatus</i>	–	0.00	10	1.39
<i>Ampelisca uncinata</i>	10	0.22	–	0.00	<i>Makrokyllindrus longipes</i>	112	2.44	20	2.79
<i>Byblis gernei</i>	5	0.11	–	0.00	<i>Vemakylindrus hastatus</i>	5	0.11	15	2.09
<i>Haploops cf. proxima</i>	–	0.00	1	0.14	<i>Hemilamprops normani</i>	–	0.00	2	0.28
<i>Gitana abyssicola</i>	–	0.00	1	0.14	<i>Eudorella truncatula</i>	1	0.02	21	2.93
Amphilochidae unid.	–	0.00	1	0.14	<i>Epileucon pusillus</i>	–	0.00	20	2.79
Aoridae unid.	1	0.02	9	1.25	<i>Leucon (Crymoleucon) tener</i>	9	0.20	28	3.90
<i>Argissa hamatipes</i>	–	0.00	5	0.70	<i>Leucon (Crymoleucon) sp.A</i>	3	0.07	–	0.00
<i>Chevreuxius grandimanus</i>	–	0.00	76	10.60	<i>Leucon (Crymoleucon) sp.B</i>	–	0.00	5	0.70
<i>Erichthonius cf. fasciatus</i>	18	0.39	–	0.00	<i>Leucon (Leucon) serratus</i>	43	0.94	50	6.97
<i>Cleonardopsis carinata</i>	22	0.48	–	0.00	<i>Leucon (Macrauloleucon)</i>	2	0.04	10	1.39
<i>Eusirus longipes</i>	5	0.11	–	0.00	<i>siphonatus</i>	–	0.00	–	–
<i>Rhachotropis caeca</i>	10	0.22	–	0.00	<i>Leucon spp.*</i>	1	0.02	–	0.00
<i>Rhachotropis gracilis</i>	5	0.11	–	0.00	<i>Campylaspis glabra</i>	–	0.00	1	0.14
<i>Rhachotropis grimaldii</i>	2	0.04	6	0.84	<i>Campylaspis squamifera</i>	–	0.00	1	0.14
<i>Rachotropis rostrata</i>	–	0.00	1	0.14	<i>Cumella gracillima</i>	–	0.00	1	0.14
<i>Rhachotropis spp.*</i>	5	0.11	–	0.00	<i>Procampylaspis armata</i>	–	0.00	24	3.35
<i>Carangoliopsis spinulosa</i>	94	2.05	7	0.97	ISO <i>Chelator insignis</i>	439	9.56	4	0.56
<i>Eriopisa elongata</i>	3	0.07	–	0.00	<i>Desmosoma elongatum</i>	14	0.30	1	0.14
<i>Maera sp.*</i>	–	0.00	1	0.14	<i>Eugerda filipes</i>	2	0.04	–	0.00
<i>Bonnierella abyssorum</i>	1 218	26.51	20	2.79	<i>Desmosomatidae*</i>	–	0.00	7	0.98
<i>Listriella sp. A</i>	4	0.09	–	0.00	<i>Haplomesus sp.A</i>	–	0.00	2	0.28
<i>Liljeborgia cf. macronyx</i>	4	0.09	–	0.00	<i>Macrostylis spinifera</i>	–	0.00	9	1.25
<i>Orchomene humilis</i>	3	0.07	–	0.00	<i>Macrostylis sp.A</i>	–	0.00	1	0.14
<i>Scopelocheirus hopei</i>	8	0.17	–	0.00	<i>Belonectes parvus</i>	2	0.04	–	0.00
<i>Tryphosella insignis</i>	13	0.28	2	0.28	<i>Eurycope complanata</i>	–	0.00	13	1.81
<i>Arrhis mediterraneus</i>	5	0.11	29	4.04	<i>Ilyarachna longicornis</i>	–	0.00	17	2.37
<i>Bathymedon longimanus</i>	1	0.02	9	1.25	<i>Ilyarachna polita</i>	22	0.48	6	0.84
<i>Monoculodes packardii</i>	–	0.00	5	0.70	<i>Pseudarachna hirsuta</i>	5	0.11	–	0.00
<i>Synchelidium maculatum</i>	1	0.02	1	0.14	<i>Janirella nansenii</i>	11	0.24	–	0.00
Oedicerotidae sp.A	–	0.00	3	0.42	<i>Bullowanthura aquitanica</i>	5	0.11	4	0.56
Oedicerotidae unid.*	–	0.00	25	3.49	<i>Leptanthura tenuis</i>	–	0.00	14	1.95
<i>Epimeria cornigera</i>	9	0.20	–	0.00	<i>Gnathia sp.</i>	–	0.00	3	0.42
<i>Halice abyssii</i>	–	0.00	1	0.14	<i>Arcturopsis giardi</i>	997	21.70	–	0.00
<i>Pardaliscia mediterranea</i>	1	0.02	1	0.14	TAN <i>Apseudes spinosus</i>	1 097	23.88	10	1.39
<i>Pardaliscella sp.A</i>	2	0.04	–	0.00	<i>Sphyrapus malleolus</i>	–	0.00	5	0.70
<i>Harpinia antennaria</i>	9	0.20	–	0.00	unid.	4	0.09	41	5.72
<i>Harpinia crenulata</i>	11	0.24	–	0.00	EUP <i>Meganyciophanes norvegica</i>	12	0.26	–	0.00
<i>Harpinia latipes</i>	85	1.85	20	2.79	Euphausiacea unid.*	–	0.00	1	0.14
<i>Harpinia sp.D</i>	–	0.00	5	0.70	DEC <i>Metarangon jacqueti jacqueti</i>	1	0.02	–	0.00
<i>Harpinia sp.E</i>	–	0.00	4	0.56	<i>Pontophilus norvegicus</i>	1	0.02	1	0.14
<i>Harpinia spp.*</i>	5	0.11	–	0.00	<i>Calocaris macandreae</i>	18	0.39	–	0.00
<i>Leptophoxus falcatus</i>	6	0.13	4	0.56	<i>Geryon sp.</i>	–	0.00	1	0.14
<i>Metaphoxus simplex</i>	–	0.00	7	0.97	Brachyura unid. (juv.)	–	0.00	1	0.14
<i>Pseudharpinia excavata</i>	–	0.00	1	0.14	Total	4 594	100.00	717	100.00
Phoxocephalidae unid.*	–	0.00	1	0.14					
<i>Laetmatophilus tuberculatus</i>	95	2.07	–	0.00					

Appendix II. Abundance, density (ind·100 m⁻²) and percentage contribution of the macrobenthic crustaceans sampled with a box-corer within sites A and B of the Capbreton canyon. * Damaged specimens; unid.: unidentified specimens; ?: total number of individuals; x: mean value; s: standard deviation; MYS: Mysidacea; AMP: Amphipoda; CUM: Cumacea; ISO: Isopoda; TAN: Tanataceae; EUP: Euphausiacea; DEC: Decapoda.

Site	A										B												
	KF50	KF51	KF52	KF53	KF57	KF58	KF60	Density	\bar{x}	$\pm s$	%	KF38	KF39	KF40	KF41	KF42	KF43	KF44	KF45	Density	\bar{x}	$\pm s$	%
Group/Species																							
MYS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0
AMP	4	-	-	-	3	-	-	7	15.4	26.6	13.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0
<i>Ampeleisca pusilla</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0
<i>Haplops cf. proxima</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.9	5.4
<i>Autoneo longidigitatus</i>	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	4.4	11.6	3.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.9	5.4
<i>Carangolopsis spinulosa</i>	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	3	6.6	17.4	5.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0
<i>Eriopisa elongata</i>	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	2.2	5.8	1.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0
<i>Bonnierella abyssorum</i>	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	6.6	17.4	5.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0
<i>Arrhis mediterraneus</i>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2.2	5.8	1.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	3.8	7.1
<i>Bathymedon longimanus</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.9	5.4
Oedicerotidae unid.*	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	2	4.4	7.5	3.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0
Pardaliscidae unid.*	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	2.2	5.8	1.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	3.8	7.1
<i>Harpinia latipes</i>	-	-	-	1	3	1	1	6	13.2	16.4	11.6	1	-	-	3	2	-	-	-	-	8	15.4	18.4
<i>Harpinia truncata</i>	5	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	11.0	29.1	9.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0
<i>Harpinia</i> spp.*	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	3	6.6	12.1	5.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0
<i>Leptophoxus fulcatus</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	7	13.5	12.8
<i>Metaphoxus simplex</i>	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	6.6	17.4	5.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0
<i>Pseudharpinia excavata</i>	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	0	2.2	5.8	1.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	5.8	16.3
Gammaridea unid.*	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2.2	5.8	1.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.9	5.4
Hyperidae unid.*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.9	5.4
<i>Makrokylinthus longicaudatus</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.9	5.4
<i>Makrokylinthus longipes</i>	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	2	4.4	11.6	3.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.9	5.4
<i>Leucon (Crymoleucon) tener</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.9	5.4
<i>Leucon (Leucon) serratus</i>	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	2.2	5.8	1.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0
<i>Leucon (Macrauloleucon) siphonatus</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.9	5.4
<i>Leucon</i> spp.*	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	2.2	5.8	1.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0
<i>Chelator insignis</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.9	5.4
<i>Desmosoma elongatum</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	7.7	11.6
<i>Engerda</i> sp.*	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	2.2	5.8	1.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0
<i>Haplomesus</i> sp.A	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.9	5.4
<i>Macrostylis spinifera</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	5.8	11.4
<i>Ilyarachna longicornis</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.9	5.4
<i>Ilyarachna polita</i>	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2.2	5.8	1.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.9	5.4
Thamematidae* ?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	5.8	8
<i>Bullowanthura aquitanica</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	4	7.76	11.6
<i>Leptanthura tenuis</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	5.8	8
<i>Apsedus spinosus</i>	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	6.6	17.4	5.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.9	5.4
<i>Splyrapus malleolus</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	2	1	-	-	-	-	5	9.6	14.1
unid.	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	8.8	23.3	7.7	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.9	5.4
EUP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0
DEC	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	0.0	0.0	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1.9	5.4
Total	28	0	0	2	20	1	1	52	114.4	178.1	100.0	10	4	19	2	12	6	2	5	60	115.1	90.1	100.0