

24. N. Calakos and M. K. Bennett, unpublished data.
 25. M. W. McEnery, A. M. Snowman, A. H. Sharp, M. E. Adams, S. H. Snyder, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **88**, 11095 (1991).
 26. H. Saisu, K. Ibaraki, T. Yamaguchi, Y. Sekine, T. Abe, *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* **181**, 59 (1991).
 27. M. Takahashi *et al.*, *Brain Res.* **551**, 279 (1991).
 28. C. Leveque *et al.*, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **89**, 3625 (1992).
 29. D. W. Wilson, S. W. Whiteheart, M. Wiedmann, M. Brunner, J. E. Rothman, *J. Cell Biol.* **117**, 531 (1992).
 30. C. Charriaut-Marlangue, S. Otani, C. Creuzet, Y. Ben-Ari, J. Loeb, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **88**, 10232 (1991).
 31. D. V. Madison, R. C. Malenka, R. A. Nicoll, *Annu. Rev. Neurosci.* **14**, 379 (1991).
 32. R. B. Pearson and B. E. Kemp, *Methods Enzymol.* **200**, 62 (1991).
 33. We thank R. Tsien, W. Horne, L. Elferink, J. Pevsner, and S. Bajjalieh for discussions and

critical reading of the manuscript; R. Kelly, L. Reichardt, and W. J. Nelson for provision of hippocampal neuron cultures (21); and K. Miller for providing bacterially expressed p65-IIs (18). Supported by the National Institute of Mental Health. N.C. is a Medical Scientist Training Program trainee supported by NIH grant 2T32G07365.

19 March 1992; accepted 29 May 1992

TECHNICAL COMMENTS

Carbon and the Antarctic Marine Food Web

M. Huntley *et al.* present (1) a model of an Antarctic marine food web and suggest that top predators in the Southern Ocean are responsible for a large efflux of carbon into the atmosphere, up to 20 to 25% of primary production. These values are probably an order of magnitude too large because Huntley *et al.* have used an oversimplified food web and invalid assumptions and parameter values.

In the model (1), phytoplankton respiration is not accounted for, and all calculations refer to net rather than total primary production, which elevates the estimated contribution of all heterotrophs to the carbon flux. Net primary production, or photosynthetically fixed carbon (P), is apportioned between macrozooplankton (P_Z) and the microbial loop (P_L). Mean values of 0.875 (sensitivity range 0.08 to 0.95) and 0.125 (0.2 to 0.05) were assigned to P_Z and P_L , respectively. That is, in all situations, it is assumed that the majority (at least 80%) of net primary production is directly channeled to macrozooplankton, with at most 20% entering the microbial loop. It is further assumed (1) that all fecal material produced by the microbial loop is ingested by macrozooplankton, bringing the total proportion of net primary production reaching macrozooplankton to 95%. In general, however, much of the carbon fixed during primary production in marine pelagic systems is believed to enter the microbial food web (2), and studies in productive coastal regions indicate that macrozooplankton probably consume no more than 20% of primary production (3). The relative abundances of protozooplankton and the structure of Antarctic marine food webs are sufficiently similar to those of lower latitude regions (4) that the possibility of a grazing pathway dominated by microbes should be incorporated in the model.

The value of P_L in the model apparently was chosen because bacterial production has been measured as 7 to 14% of phytoplankton production near the ice edge in the austral spring (5) and because bacteria

do not comprise a large fraction of total microbial biomass (6). However, this assumes that the only production that enters the microbial loop is that of bacterioplankton. Heterotrophic flagellates, other protozooplankton, and small microzooplankton feed directly on phytoplankton cells of the appropriate size (4). Because most chlorophyll in the Antarctic is contained in cells smaller than 20 μm and because krill generally eat particles greater than 30 μm (7), a considerable factor may be heterotrophic organisms within the microbial loop grazing on phytoplankton (4, 7, 8). Carbon flux through the microbial food web may be low, but it does not follow that carbon entering the microbial food web is also reduced, as assumed in the model.

Values of growth efficiencies and carbon assimilation efficiencies in the model appear to be inappropriately large. This is a result of treating aggregations of organisms as trophic levels, when it would be more appropriate to consider them as food webs. For example, the microbial loop is given a mean growth efficiency (K_L) of 0.35 and comprises bacterioplankton, heterotrophic flagellates, ciliates, and many other protozoa and small zooplankton. Carbon entering this compartment may undergo four or five trophic transfers before being packaged into a form that can be eaten by macrozooplankton. In such a scenario, growth efficiency of the compartment would be expected to be approximately 0.5 to 1.5% (9), rather than the 35% assumed by Huntley *et al.*

In all instances, the model overestimates the amount of carbon being transferred to macrozooplankton, which leads to invalid estimates of carbon fluxes in the food web. If revised estimates of parameters are used in the model ($P_Z = 0.20$, $K_L = 0.01$), a different result is obtained, with birds respiring approximately 5% of net carbon fixed and the microbial component approximately 60%. Thus, marine birds and mammals probably play a minor

role as producers of atmospheric CO_2 , especially when compared with microbial plankton.

Coleen L. Moloney*
 Zoology Department,
 University of Cape Town,
 Rondebosch 7700,
 South Africa

*Present address: Center for Population Studies, Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Biology, University of California, Davis, CA 95616.

REFERENCES AND NOTES

- M. E. Huntley, M. D. G. Lopez, D. M. Karl, *Science* **253**, 64 (1991).
- G. M. Capriulo, in *Protozoa and Their Role in Marine Processes*, P. C. Reid, C. M. Turley, P. H. Burkhill, Eds. (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991), pp. 205-218.
- C. L. Moloney, J. G. Field, M. I. Lucas, *J. Plankton Res.* **13**, 1039 (1991).
- D. L. Garrison, *J. Mar. Syst.* **2**, 317 (1991).
- G. F. Cota, S. T. Kottmeier, D. H. Robinson, W. O. Smith, Jr., C. W. Sullivan, *Deep-Sea Res.* **37**, 1145 (1990).
- D. M. Karl, O. Holm-Hansen, G. T. Taylor, G. Tien, D. F. Bird, *ibid.* **38**, 1029 (1991).
- C. D. Hewes, O. Holm-Hansen, E. Sakshaug, in *Antarctic Nutrient Cycles and Food Webs*, W. R. Siegfried, P. R. Condy, R. M. Laws, Eds. (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985), pp. 277-283.
- V. Smetacek, R. Scharck, E.-M. Nothig, in *Antarctic Ecosystems: Ecological Change and Conservation*, K. R. Kerry and G. Hempel, Eds. (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1990), pp. 103-114.
- If it is assumed that growth efficiencies (K) for each trophic transfer within the microbial compartment are 35%, after n trophic transfers, the resulting growth efficiency of the microbial loop will be 0.35^n . Substituting $n = 4$ and 5 gives estimates of K_L of 0.015 and 0.005, respectively.

15 October 1991; revised 30 April 1992; accepted 1 May 1992

Response: C. L. Moloney suggests that we overestimated the potential of Southern Ocean birds and mammals to respire CO_2 to the atmosphere (1). On the basis of estimates for the Benguela Current, she has found (2) that zooplankton probably use only 20% of the primary production. This would require that 80% of primary production enter the microbial loop. We have no disagreement with these results, which are characteristic of a subtropical environment. However, studies cited in our *Science* report (3, 4) and results from our ongoing Research on Coastal Antarctic Ecosystem Rates (RACER) program (5) indicate that less than 10% of primary production enters the microbial loop of South-

ern Ocean waters, particularly in highly productive coastal and ice-edge ecosystems. The exact nature of the apparent suppression of microbial loop processes in eutrophic Antarctic ecosystems remains unresolved but is actively under investigation.

Contrary to models of the microbial loop in Southern Ocean waters as presented by Hewes (6), Moloney, and others, which assume that transfer rates through the microbial loop are similar to those at lower latitudes, our model is based on direct measurements of such rates in Antarctic coastal ecosystems. The spring bloom in these regions persists for several months (7) and is characterized by a dominance of large diatoms among the phytoplankton (8); high rates of new production and particle flux from the euphotic zone (9, 10); a general dearth of heterotrophs, including bacterioplankton (4, 11); and low rates of protozoan grazing (12). Moloney's assumptions about the role of microbial loop processes appear to be inappropriate for these hypereutrophic spring blooms. Her description of an ecosystem dominated by small (less than 20 μm)

algae, large populations of microheterotrophs, and numerous trophic levels within the microbial loop does not agree with field observations made in these coastal regions, which are the principal feeding sites of Antarctic birds and mammals.

A challenge to our model would have to demonstrate that the food web structure or the values of nondimensional constants we used are incorrect or that new data produce a significantly different result. We do not consider the extrapolation of data from a subtropical ecosystem to be an adequate replacement for measurements made in the Southern Ocean.

M. E. Huntley

*Scripps Institution of Oceanography, 0202,
La Jolla, CA 92093*

M. D. G. Lopez

*Marine Science Institute,
University of the Philippines,
Diliman, Quezon City 1101, Philippines*

D. M. Karl

*School of Ocean and Earth Science
and Technology,
University of Hawaii at Manoa,
Honolulu, HI 96822*

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. M. E. Huntley, M. D. G. Lopez, D. M. Karl, *Science* **253**, 64 (1991); Equation 3 in (1) should read:

$$R_B = (a_B - K_{1B})\{K_{1Z}[(1 - a_L)P_L + P_Z + K_{1L}P_L][P_B + (K_{1F}P_F)]\}$$
2. C. L. Moloney, J. G. Field, M. I. Lucas, *J. Plankt. Res.* **13**, 1039 (1991).
3. G. F. Cota, S. T. Kottmeier, D. H. Robinson, W. O. Smith, Jr., C. W. Sullivan, *Deep-Sea Res.* **37**, 1145 (1990).
4. D. M. Karl, O. Holm-Hansen, G. T. Taylor, G. Tien, D. F. Bird, *ibid.* **38**, 1029 (1991).
5. RACER is a continuing research program supported by the Division of Polar Programs, U.S. National Science Foundation.
6. C. D. Hewes, O. Holm-Hansen, E. Sakshaug, in *Antarctic Nutrient Cycles and Food Webs*, W. R. Siegfried, P. R. Condy, R. M. Laws, Eds. (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1985), pp. 277-282.
7. M. Huntley, D. M. Karl, P. Niiler, O. Holm-Hansen, *Deep-Sea Res.* **38**, 911 (1991).
8. M. Ferrario, *Antarct. J. U.S.* **25**, 145 (1990).
9. D. M. Karl, B. D. Tilbrook, G. Tien, *Deep-Sea Res.* **38**, 1097 (1991).
10. D. M. Karl and V. L. Asper, *Antarct. J. U.S.* **25**, 167 (1990).
11. O. Holm-Hansen and B. G. Mitchell, *Deep-Sea Res.* **38**, 961 (1991).
12. D. F. Bird and D. M. Karl, *Antarct. J. U.S.* **25**, 156 (1990).

25 November 1991; revised 18 May 1992; accepted 19 May 1992

Science

Response

M. E. Huntley, M. D. G. Lopez and D. M. Karl

Science **257** (5067), 259-260.
DOI: 10.1126/science.257.5067.259-a

ARTICLE TOOLS

<http://science.sciencemag.org/content/257/5067/259.2.citation>

PERMISSIONS

<http://www.sciencemag.org/help/reprints-and-permissions>

Use of this article is subject to the [Terms of Service](#)

Science (print ISSN 0036-8075; online ISSN 1095-9203) is published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1200 New York Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20005. The title *Science* is a registered trademark of AAAS.

1992 by the American Association for the Advancement of Science