

1

2

3

4

5 **The fossil record and palaeoenvironmental significance of**
6 **marine arthropod zooplankton**

7

8 Vincent Perrier *, Mark Williams and David J. Siveter

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 Department of Geology, University of Leicester, Leicester LE1 7RH, UK

17

18 * Corresponding author: vp110@leicester.ac.uk, T: +44 (0)116 252 5314

19

20

20

21 **Abstract.**

22 Arthropods are a major component of the marine zooplankton, functioning as
23 intermediates between primary producers and tertiary consumers in pelagic food
24 webs. They have likely occupied the water column ecospace since the early
25 Cambrian, co-evolving with several major plankton groups through the Phanerozoic.
26 Analysis of the fossil record of arthropods indicates that a zooplanktonic lifestyle has
27 arisen independently across several arthropod groups, and that the arthropod body
28 plan has shown adaptability to fundamental environmental change. Key anatomical
29 adaptations and reproductive strategies that are compatible with and/or facilitate a
30 zooplanktonic lifestyle include well-developed swimming appendages, buoyancy, an
31 active metabolism supported by efficient respiration, visual or photoreception organs
32 for use in detecting mates, food and predators, and the nurturing of young within the
33 exoskeleton. Many of these characters are apparent in the earliest record of
34 arthropods. The development and diversification of arthropod zooplankton into the
35 food chain helped enable large secondary and tertiary consumers to enter the water
36 column and also contributed to the export of organic matter to the seabed via the
37 faecal stream. Although the fossil record of arthropod zooplankton is extremely poor
38 for most of the Phanerozoic, their position in marine food webs suggests they have
39 been fundamental to rebuilding marine trophic structure following major extinction
40 events, and to maintaining marine plankton diversity through Phanerozoic time.

41

42 **Keywords.**

43 Arthropods, marine zooplankton, food webs, marine ecosystems, fossil record

44

1. Introduction

The global ocean fauna and flora is dominated in abundance and biomass by the drifting and swimming organisms collectively referred to as plankton, ranging from tiny picoplankton, just 2-3 μm in diameter, that are a significant component of ocean biomass (Buitenhuis et al., 2012), to macro-scale arthropod zooplankton predators (CMarZ, 2004). Plankton occurs at all depths within the oceans, and many species have wide biogeographical distribution. Zooplankton includes both animals and unicellular ‘protists’ that are critical intermediaries (primary and secondary consumers) in the flow of energy and biomass through marine ecosystems.

In this paper we use the term ‘zooplankton’ to embrace organisms that have both a strictly planktonic (floating or drifting in the water column) and/or a nektonic lifestyle (able to swim and move independently of currents) as the difference between these lifestyles is often difficult to evaluate for fossil species. Zooplankton lives both in demersal (the zone close to the sea bed) and pelagic (the water column between the demersal zone and the surface) environments. Marine zooplankton diversity consists of about 7000 species, which includes eukaryotes such as rhizarians, actinopods, ciliophors, chaetognaths, rotifers, arthropods, ctenophores, cnidarians and chordates (CMarZ, 2004). Even given that this diversity is most likely an under-estimate relative to the physical area they occupy, it is by no means rich when compared, for example, to the more than 1 million insect species described from the terrestrial biosphere (Bucklin et al., 2010). The lower diversity of the zooplankton possibly in part reflects the environmental uniformity of pelagic habitats, with their relatively low physical heterogeneity compared to benthic or terrestrial niches. However, recent genetic studies have challenged previous assessments of biodiversity, and morphologically defined species might consist of complex, genetically distinct populations and cryptic

species, as it is well documented, for example, for foraminifera (see Darling et al., 1996, 1999).

Among the Recent zooplankton, arthropods, with more than 4000 species living permanently in the water column (holoplankton), are the most diverse group (Fig. 1). In addition to these taxa, many arthropods are present in the plankton for only the first part of their life cycle (meroplankton). Arthropods, at both adult and larval/juvenile stages are primary and secondary consumers and frequently represent more than 50-70% of the total plankton species diversity. Among the arthropods, copepods are by far the dominant group, both in terms of species diversity (often more than 50% of total plankton species diversity (CMarZ, 2004) and sheer abundance (e.g., Jivaluk, 2000), but other groups such as ostracods and eumalacostracans (both holo- and meroplanktonic) can also be very diverse, constituting 2-10% of total plankton diversity and abundance (Jivaluk, 2000; CMarZ, 2004).

This paper examines the key parameters of morphology that characterise arthropod zooplankton. Many of these characteristics have been evident for over 500 million years. We examine the veracity of the arthropod zooplankton fossil record through time, focussing especially on the earliest evidence of arthropod zooplankton in the Cambrian, where the fossil record is most complete, and also identifying major gaps in the post-Carboniferous record of all arthropod groups. Lastly, we review the impact of arthropod zooplankton on the evolution of marine ecosystems. Herein, the informal terms ‘early’, ‘mid’ and ‘late’ Cambrian refer to the Terreneuvian Epoch and unnamed Cambrian Epoch 2, the unnamed Cambrian Epoch 3, and the Furongian Epoch respectively (for details of Cambrian stratigraphy see Peng and Babcock, 2011).

2. Arthropod anatomies and zooplanktonic lifestyle

Arthropods possess several anatomical adaptations and reproductive strategies that are compatible with and/or facilitate a planktonic lifestyle (Figs 1, 2). These include well developed swimming appendages, buoyancy, an active metabolism supported by an efficient respiration, sensory organs (to find mates, or detect food or predators), and nurturing of young within the carapace (Figs 1, 2). Molecular clocks point to possible divergence times between major arthropod groups (e.g., Edgecombe and Legg, 2014), but with considerable uncertainties, sometimes tens of Myrs (see Rota-Stabelli et al., 2013). Nevertheless, they provide a general time frame for the appearance of key anatomical characteristics in arthropod evolutionary history (Figs 2, 3).

2.1. A basis for arthropod adaptability

The hypothetical ancestral Precambrian pan-arthropod was probably benthic and possessed a trunk of externally homonomous (essentially identical) segments, each bearing an undifferentiated pair of appendages (Edgecombe and Legg, 2013). Though the precise body plan organization of these arthropods is unknown, the hypothetical animal might be compared to living onychophorans and tardigrades, or to some early Cambrian lobopodian-like ecdysozoans (see review in Dzik, 2011) in which only the first head appendage is differentiated (e.g., *Jianshanopodia*; Vannier et al., 2014). The early Cambrian pan-arthropod body plan already represented an exceptional evolutionary basis for diversification and appendage specialisation, as exemplified by the wide range of arthropod morphologies observable from the early Cambrian onwards (Hou et al., 2004; Figs 2, 4).

Specialization in appendage structure along the antero-posterior axis commenced with the first post-antennular appendage, the process of appendage specialization being controlled by Hox genes (Pearson et al., 2005; Stansbury and Moczek, 2013). Specialisation of the appendages is associated with feeding and locomotion strategies (e.g., Budd, 2003; Chen et al., 2007; Waloszek et al., 2007). These adaptations, for locomotion and feeding were already expressed in Cambrian free-living arthropod larval stages such as *Wujicaris muelleri* Zhang et al., 2010 and *Rehbachella kinnekullensis* Waloszek and Mass, 2005. As feeding and locomotory strategies are of the utmost importance for plankton and other types of colonization (see below), this suggests that ancestral arthropods possessed an anatomical basis that allowed colonization of the water column.

2.2. Locomotion

The morphology of numerous Cambrian arthropods suggests that they had swimming abilities, pertinently in basal groups such as the Radiodonta (e.g., *Anomalocaris*, *Peytoia* and *Hurdia*; Fig. 2), gilled lobopodians (e.g., *Opabinia*) and bivalved arthropods such as *Nereocaris* and *Isoxys* (see Legg et al., 2012, 2013; Vannier and Chen, 2000; Fig. 4F, J). Radiodonta and gilled lobopodians swam in the water column by synchronized movement of lateral flap-like structures (Figs 2, 4I). *Anomalocaris* and related forms possibly waved their lateral lobes as a continuous single flap, reminiscent of the swimming of Recent manta rays (Usami, 2006; Daley et al., 2013). Among arthropods, this mode of swimming seems to be unique to the Radiodonta and gilled lobopodians and as such is limited to the early Cambrian-Early Devonian interval.

Unlike the majority of arthropods that swim using their appendages, some bivalved

arthropods may have used the posterior part of their body for propulsion, as in the case of *Nereocaris* (Legg et al., 2012; Fig. 2). Propulsion may have been generated by undulations of the elongate abdomen and telson. This swimming mechanism, involving the abdomen and posterior paddle, recalls the caridoid escape reaction observed in some Recent arthropods, such as euphausiaceans and decapods, that allows animals to escape predators through rapid abdominal flexures that produce powerful backwards swimming strokes (Waggett and Buskey, 2008). Several Cambrian arthropods such as *Nereocaris* and *Waptia* possessed a flexible posterior body (Legg et al., 2012; Vannier et al., 2012), implying that they might have performed an escape reaction by fast contraction of the “abdomen”. This kind of locomotion could be performed by any arthropod in which at least part of the trunk protrudes posteriorly from the carapace, as in malacostracans such as *Nebalia* (see Vannier et al., 1997a).

These ‘early’ modes of locomotion are quite different from those of Recent and more derived arthropod zooplankton in which movement mostly involves swimming adaptations of various appendages (Fig. 2). The development of swimming appendages was made possible by a rigid exoskeleton, allowing the attachment of the musculature, and by arthrodization of appendages (Legg et al., 2012). The earliest evidence of swimming appendages in arthropods comes from Cambrian forms, for example bivalved arthropods such as *Isoxy* (Vannier and Chen, 2000), from some ‘Orsten’ taxa such as *Martinsonia*; Müller and Walossek, 1986, and from marelomorphs and possibly trilobites (Fortey and Owens, 1999; Fig. 2) that probably used synchronized short movements of several identical appendages. This mode of swimming can be observed in living planktonic arthropods, as in some branchiopods and remipeds (e.g., Kohlhage and Yager, 1994).

The first direct evidence, by comparison with Recent counterparts, of arthropod appendages specifically adapted for swimming is identified in exceptionally well-preserved Late Ordovician myodocope ostracods, which used their second antenna for locomotion (Siveter et al., 2014; Figs 2, 4Q-S). A modified second appendage is used for swimming by many Recent zooplanktonic arthropods including cladocerans and copepods (Fig. 1A-B, D-F). In their evolutionary history, arthropods have developed appendages specialized for swimming at several positions in their tagmosis. For example, swimming eurypterids use a paddle-shaped 6th appendage (Fig. 4H), Recent portunid crabs use the posteriormost (5th) thoracic appendage and euphausiaceans and amphipods use five pairs of pleopods (Fig. 1L). Swimming appendages clearly evolved independently in different groups of arthropods, and there are several convergently acquired morphological features that replicate across arthropod groups. Thus, a paddle-like posterior body is present in the Cambrian gilled lobopodian *Opabinia*, some Radiodonta (*Anomalocaris*), some bivalved arthropods (e.g., *Waptia*), some eurypterids and many malacostracans (e.g., *Caryocaris*, *Angustidontus*; Vannier et al., 1997a; Rolf and Dzik, 2006; Fig. 4I-K). Specialized swimming appendages are either paddle-shaped, as for example in eurypterids and decapods, or have numerous ramifications and secondary setae as in ostracods and copepods (Fig. 2). All of these modifications increased the surface area of the appendage for use in swimming and demonstrate the ability of the arthropod body to advance various solutions for moving efficiently through the water column.

2.3. Respiration and circulation

Although not limited to planktonic forms, in order to enhance and/or sustain an active metabolism for swimming, zooplanktonic arthropods need a higher oxygen

194 supply and have developed various respiratory strategies involving either a very thin
195 cuticle through which the oxygen enters the hemolymph by diffusion, or the
196 possession of a heart, circulatory system and in some cases also gills. Basal groups
197 present in the Cambrian, such as gilled lobopodians (e.g., *Opabinia*) and Radiodonta
198 (e.g., *Anomalocaris*), possessed a dorsal array of flexible blades attached to a
199 transverse rachis on the trunk segments that probably acted like gills (Van Roy and
200 Briggs, 2011; Fig. 2): though no heart or circulatory system has so far been identified
201 in these fossils, such structures would have been essential to carry the oxygen from
202 the gills to the rest of the large body. The benthic *Fuxianhuia protensa* bears a
203 complex heart and cardiovascular system (Ma et al., 2014) showing that these
204 structures were already present in early Cambrian stem euarthropods (see also
205 Vannier et al., 1997b). Some early Cambrian Orsten arthropods (*Yicaris* Zhang et al.,
206 2007), bivalved arthropods (*Isoxys*; Fu et al., 2011), and trilobites bear putative gill-
207 like structures on the exopods of their trunk appendages, a situation similar to that in
208 many extant arthropod groups such as branchiopods and malacostracans. In addition
209 to the presence of possible respiration-related flap-like exopods on their trunk
210 appendages, many early Cambrian bradoriid arthropods show the pattern of a complex
211 and well-developed putative circulatory system preserved as a trace on the carapace,
212 and comparable to that present in living and fossil myodocope ostracods (see Abe and
213 Vannier, 1995; Vannier et al., 1997b; Williams et al., 2011, and in press; compare
214 Fig. 1C and Fig. 4P). Although gill-like structures are present in Cambrian animals
215 such as *Waptia* and *Naraoia* (Williams et al., 2011, fig. 2; Briggs et al., 1994) and
216 Ordovician trilobites (Suzuki and Bergström, 2008; Suzuki et al., 2008), the first
217 undoubted gills in the arthropod fossil record are from exceptionally preserved
218 Silurian myodocope ostracods (Siveter et al., 2003, 2007, 2010, 2013; Fig. 4R) which

show posteriorly positioned book gills comparable to that of living cylindroleberids (Abe and Vannier, 1995).

Not all planktonic arthropods require complex respiratory systems. Because of their small size, most copepods have no need of a heart or circulatory system (the members of the order Calanoida have a heart but no blood vessels; Howse et al., 1975), and most also lack gills. Instead, they possess a very thin cuticle through which the oxygen enters the hemolymph by diffusion, the hemolymph being kept in motion by either a blood pump or rhythmic movements of the body, gut, or appendages. Similarly, the small, benthic, podocope ostracods (Ordovician to Recent) have no integumental circulatory system and simply take in oxygen through the cuticle (Vannier and Abe, 1995).

2.4. Buoyancy

Most living zooplanktonic arthropods have developed near neutral buoyancy. The smaller forms, for example copepods and branchiopods (Fig. 1), have virtually non-calcified cuticles, whereas lipids are thought to play a key role in buoyancy control in some larger arthropods (Campbell and Dower, 2003). A number of negatively buoyant zooplankton species have developed a ‘hop and sink’ behaviour characterized by repeated upward swimming for a short distance followed by passive sinking (Haury and Weihs, 1976). This hop and sink behaviour may save energy relative to continuous swimming at a fixed depth (Campbell and Dower, 2003). Buoyancy is difficult to evaluate in the fossil record, as poorly calcified and fragile bodies will not, in most cases, be preserved: this feature is, therefore, not plotted in Figure 2. However, a possible rare example of these light carapaces may be evidenced in Cambrian groups such as *Isoxys* that possibly had carapaces comparable to that of

Recent halocyprid ostracods (see Vannier and Chen, 2000). The presence of lipids used for buoyancy in ancient fossil forms is difficult to assess, and these seem to have left no specific biomarkers in sedimentary deposits. Some morphological characteristics preserved in fossil zooplanktonic arthropods possibly functioned to aid buoyancy and stability during swimming. For example, the external ornament such as reticulation, corrugation and various flanges (compare Figs 1B and 4S) present on the carapaces of several early Palaeozoic and Recent zooplanktonic taxa (e.g., some bivalved arthropods [e.g., *Isoxys*, *Tuzoia*], ostracods, phyllocarids) probably represent an adaptation for strengthening without adding to carapace mass (Benson, 1974, 1981). Some ornament may also have functioned to facilitate locomotion, reduce turbulence or retard sinking in fossil and Recent arthropods (e.g., halocypridid ostracods; Vannier and Chen, 2000; Vannier et al., 2007). Another feature shared by several bivalved arthropods, planktonic ostracods, phyllocarids and decapod larval stages are long cardinal spines at the dorsal margins of the carapace (compare Figs 1B, I, K, 4F). These and other carapace spines could clearly have an anti-predatory defensive function, but they might also increase the drag and/or assist the stability of the animal during swimming (Strathmann, 1993; Vannier and Chen, 2000).

2.5. Feeding

Arthropods have developed various strategies to feed in the water column, and through their evolutionary history they have occupied all trophic levels from primary consumers to top predators. These strategies and feeding modes involve various kinds of specialized appendages. Although in Recent oceans most zooplanktonic arthropods are primary or secondary consumers, as is the case of copepods, branchiopods and cladocerans, the fossil evidence suggests that some early Cambrian arthropods swam

in the water column and were predators (Legg et al., 2012). Animals such as Radiodonta, *Isoxys* and *Angustidontus* (Fig. 4F, K; Rolf and Dzik, 2006; Vannier et al., 2009; Daley et al., 2013) were relatively large, about 5-50 cm long, and had robust raptorial appendages armed with spines that were clearly designed to feed on other organisms. However, some of these arthropods, such as the Radiodonta and gilled lobopodians were possibly demersal rather than strictly pelagic and probably fed on fauna present on or near the sea floor, as attested to by coprolites containing trilobite fragments (Vannier and Chen, 2005) and also by trilobites with healed injuries (Nedin, 1999) which have been attributed to anomalocaridid activity. Furthermore, complex digestive structures in early Cambrian forms such as gilled lobopodians and some basal arthropods (e.g., Radiodonta, bivalved arthropods) but absent in onychophorans, tardigrades and many other Cambrian lobopodians, are ‘arthropod-specific’ innovations interpreted as digestive glands that facilitated carnivory and macrophagy (Vannier et al., 2014). Carnivory is an important step in the colonization of the water column as it opens a route for secondary and tertiary predators to adapt to new food sources. The large early Cambrian (Epoch 2) anomalocaridid *Tamisiocaris* (40-70 cm long) had, as a possible secondary consumer, substantial frontal appendages that probably functioned in filter-feeding on mesozooplankton in a manner recalling Recent cetaceans (Vinther et al., 2014; Fig. 4E).

Small carbonaceous fossils from the early and mid Cambrian (Epochs 2 and 3; Harvey and Butterfield, 2008) consist mainly of complex disarticulated feeding appendages that are interpreted as mixed scraping and suspension-feeding apparatuses possibly belonging to copepods and branchiopods (Butterfield, 1997; Harvey et al., 2012; Fig. 4A-B). This, and the presence of coeval faecal pellets rich in acritarchs (Harvey and Butterfield, 2011; Fig. 4C), suggests the presence of herbivorous or

omnivorous mesozooplankton in mid Cambrian Epoch 3 (Harvey et al., 2012; Harvey and Pedder, 2013). Moreover, the diversification of unicellular phytoplankton, which has been equated with increased predation, might imply that arthropods with specialized appendages for feeding on phytoplankton were already present in the latest Precambrian or earliest Cambrian (e.g., Butterfield, 1997).

2.6. Vision

Fossil evidence suggests that photoreception (i.e. vision) is a feature developed already in basal arthropods (Legg et al., 2012; Fig. 2). Some early Cambrian Radiodonta and gilled lobopodians such as *Opabinia* (Fig. 4I) bear very large and complex pedunculate compound lateral eyes and are interpreted as having been highly mobile visual predators in the water column (e.g., Paterson et al., 2011). The basal euarthropods *Jugatacaris*, *Isoxys* and *Nereocaris* have well-developed pedunculate eyes and a photoreceptor organ (Fu and Zhang, 2011; Legg et al., 2012; Vannier. et al., 2009; Fig. 2, 4J). Most living pelagic arthropods have eyes (e.g., hyperiid amphipods, cypridinid ostracods) or photoreceptor organs (e.g., halocyprid ostracods and most copepods) for use, *inter alia*, in predation, defence, recognition of circadian cycles, or detection of bioluminescence. Pelagic trilobites generally bear very large compound eyes supposedly used, in part, to hunt smaller zooplankton (Fortey, 1985; Fig. 4L-M). The known Silurian ostracods with preserved soft-parts possessed large lateral eyes (Siveter et al., 2003, 2007, 2010, 2013; Fig. 4R) comparable to those of the Recent zooplanktonic myodocopid ostracod *Macrocypridina*. If complex eyes in the Radiodonta and trilobites had the same function as those of recent hyperiid amphipods, they would have been capable of detecting small objects at low contrast in dim-light conditions such as transparent prey against a dark background (Land, 1989).

The possession of lateral eyes is a symplesiomorphy of the euarthropods, but they are not always present (Legg et al., 2012). Thus, most copepods only have a single compound eye in the middle of their head (Fig. 1F) and some Recent zooplanktonic groups such as remipeds and the halocyprid ostracods have secondarily lost their lateral compound eyes. For such groups, chemical and/or tactile and other receptors likely play a major role for detection and orientation (Fanenbruck et al., 2004). In pelagic halocyprids the Bellonci organ, a mid-cephalic finger-like projection, probably acts to detect changes in light and possibly pressure. The Bellonci organ is already known from the Silurian, in the myodocope ostracod *Nasunaris* Siveter et al., 2010.

2.7. Bioluminescence

Bioluminescence is generally more common in deep-marine living and planktonic organisms than in benthic or shallow-water species. An estimated 90% of animals that live below 500 m in the oceans are bioluminescent (Widder, 1999). Bioluminescence is well represented in ctenophores and siphonophores, in which none of the benthic species but more than 90% of planktonic genera are known to produce light (Haddock and Case, 1995). Among zooplanktonic arthropods, copepods are also one of the most prolific bioluminescent groups (Haddock et al., 2010). Bioluminescence serves an important function in various Recent zooplanktonic arthropods such as copepods, ostracods, euphausiaceans, decapods, mysids and amphipods. It is used, *inter alia*, to lure prey, to attract mates and to aid defence; for example, to startle or misdirect predators or to camouflage an otherwise dark silhouette (Haddock et al., 2010; Nilsson et al., 2014). Based on the number of light-producing chemistries across monophyletic lineages, bioluminescence is estimated to have evolved independently

at least 40 times across a range of groups from bacteria to vertebrates (Haddock et al., 2010). Possible bioluminescent organs in fossil arthropods have been proposed for one Ordovician trilobite genus, namely *Pricyclopyge* (Vassel et al., 2012), and for some Silurian ostracods. The Silurian myodocope ostracod *Colymbosathon* possesses tubercle-like processes at/near the margins of the labrum that resemble bioluminescent-associated structures of living cypridinid ostracods (Siveter et al., 2003) such as *Vargula hilgendorfii* (Vannier and Abe, 1993), and the Silurian myodocope *Parabolbozoe* bears tubercles on its carapace, which are comparable to those of Recent halocyprids that are interpreted as possible bioluminescent organs (Perrier et al., 2011). Amongst ostracods, only Myodocopa have bioluminescence. The two myodocope lineages, namely the Halocyprida and Myodocopida that possess pelagic representatives have light emitting organs and produce different bioluminescent chemicals (Haddock et al., 2010). These two groups may have diverged around 460 Ma (Oakley et al., 2013), suggesting this as a maximum age for at least one of the known luminescence systems (Haddock et al., 2010).

2.8. Reproductive strategies and planktonic larval stages

Zooplanktonic arthropods have developed various strategies for nurturing the young within body parts and various protective extensions of the carapace. While some mesozooplankton release their eggs, as in the case of some eucarids and copepods (Ohman and Townsend, 1998), many arthropod species retain their eggs until they hatch, either in egg sacs (e.g., copepods, Fig. 1F; Ohman and Townsend, 1998), in brood chambers (e.g., some ostracods, Fig. 4Q; Ikeda and Imamura, 1992) or in a ventral marsupium derived from their appendages (e.g., peracarids; Poore and Bruce, 2012). In Recent zooplanktonic copepods, brooding behaviour appears to be

more common in small species that produce only a limited number of small eggs (Strathmann, 1993), as the predation risk associated with carrying eggs increases with body size (Ohman and Townsend, 1998). This reproductive strategy was likely present already in early benthic arthropods, as is evident in the early Cambrian (Epoch 2) bradoriid *Kunmingella douvillei*, which shows putative egg brooding within its carapace (Shu et al., 1999; Duan et al., 2013). This strategy is also demonstrated for Ordovician and Silurian nektobenthic myodocopid ostracods (Siveter et al., 2007, 2014; Fig. 4Q), which nurtured eggs and, in the case of *Nymphatolina* from the Silurian, a first instar juvenile within their carapaces. Though a brooding strategy is also common in benthic species (e.g., phyllocarids, a few podocope ostracods and possibly trilobites; Vannier and Abe, 1993; Vannier et al., 1997; Fortey and Hughes, 1998; Cederstrom et al., 2011) and is not a prerequisite for a successful zooplanktonic lifestyle, it was likely an important asset for protecting eggs from predation and thus enhancing reproductive success within the water column.

A free-swimming larval phase is known from some species in most classes of Recent marine arthropods for which developmental information is available. For example, some Recent decapods (crabs, lobsters, Fig. 1I) and stomatopods (mantis shrimp) are known to have several planktonic larval stages (protozoa, zoea, megalopa; Harvey et al., 2002). There are naupliar stages of arthropods represented in Cambrian ‘Orsten’ deposits (Zhang et al., 2010 and references therein), though these fossils have mostly been interpreted as meiofauna (Waloszek et al., 2007). Trilobites also possessed nauplius-like larvae (Fortey and Morris, 1978; Fig. 4N-O). A free-swimming ‘cyprid’ larval stage is known from the crustacean *Rhamphoverritor* (Cirripedia) from the Silurian Herefordshire Lagerstätte (Briggs et al., 2005). Although malacostracans are known since the early Palaeozoic (Vannier et al., 2003),

the only evidence of possible decapod larvae in the fossil record is based on two specimens from the Lower Cretaceous Santana Formation of Brazil that are interpreted as planktonic protozoa of a branchyuran crab (Maisey and De Carvalho, 1995).

Orsten species provide evidence of various morphological stages of the arthropod life cycle (i.e. nauplius, zoea, megalopa) in the Cambrian (Zhang et al., 2010). This has important potential implications for the evolutionary and ecological success of many arthropod lineages, especially for groups where the larval stages and adults have distinct ecologies, such as trilobites, barnacles and crabs. Neoteny of planktonic larval stages has been considered to be a long established route into the plankton (Rigby and Milsom, 2000). This could be the case, for example, for some trilobites that had a planktonic larval stage (protaspid; Fig. 4N-O) morphologically similar to Recent crab zoea (Speyer and Chatterton, 1989). The colonisation of the water column by some unrelated species of nine malacostracan higher taxa (see Table 1), some also having a planktonic larval stage, may also have been the result of neotenic processes.

All of these major innovations in arthropod design and morphology fundamentally affected, *inter alia*, locomotion, vision, feeding and digestive systems, and reproductive strategies, and they are beneficial to organisms living in the water column.

3. The fossil record of arthropod zooplankton

Although diverse and abundant in Recent ecosystems, arthropod zooplankton are rare in the fossil record, with virtually no occurrences from post-Carboniferous strata (Fig. 3). In part, this reflects post-mortem buoyancy, scavenging of carcasses in the

water column, and reduction of skeletal material in response to lifestyle, meaning that in many cases planktonic arthropods are small, fragile and have diminished preservation potential (Rigby and Milsom, 2000; Fig. 5). In part, the record also reflects the enhanced taphonomic window in the Cambrian, from where many early arthropods are preserved, including forms with a non-mineralised exoskeleton. And finally, it also reflects the record of pelagic arthropods that did possess a mineralised exoskeleton – at least for part of their life cycle, and particularly including the trilobites and ostracods (Fig. 3). Here we assess the veracity of the fossil record of arthropod zooplankton and its potential to better interpret patterns of zooplankton evolution through time.

3.1. Taphonomy of arthropod zooplankton

Studies comparing living plankton communities with fossil assemblages are mostly restricted to groups which possess cysts or mineralized skeletons and therefore have a better potential to become fossilized; for example, diatoms, dinoflagellates, coccolithophores, radiolarians and foraminifers. Although many of these studies have shown that surface productivity signals are transmitted to the sea bed (e.g., Billett et al., 1983; Abelman and Gersonde, 1991; Lampitt et al., 2001), several also report that factors such as zooplankton grazing in upper waters, selective dissolution of microfossils, and re-mobilization/re-deposition can distort or decouple this signal entirely (e.g., Samtleben et al., 1995; Von Bodungen et al., 1995; Kohly, 1998). Comparison of water column plankton diatom assemblages with those in core tops demonstrates that a fundamental taphonomic change occurs in the surface sediment, with sedimentary diatom accumulation rates being only about 1% of plankton production rates (Ryves et al., 2003). Dissolution as well as bioturbation by the

zoobenthos has a significant impact on preservation. The same processes (post-mortem transport, scavenging, decay and dissolution) are most likely involved in arthropod zooplankton preservation but perhaps at an even more extensive scale, as most of these animals are poorly or not mineralized (Fig. 5).

The absence of a zooplanktonic arthropod record for much of the Phanerozoic (Fig. 3) is explicable from an assessment of the likely preservation potential of arthropod cuticle and soft tissues. Experimental taphonomy data are rare for planktonic arthropods (Harding, 1973). However, several authors have noted that microbial activity causes rapid (within days) disarticulation of crustacean (and insect) carcasses left unburied in oxic conditions (Harding, 1973; Hof and Briggs, 1997; Duncan et al., 2003). In addition, weakly calcified zooplanktonic arthropods are likely to endure more or less long periods of post-mortem drift (Bengtson, 2002) and also scavenging during their journey to the sea bottom. The rarity of arthropod zooplankton in early Palaeozoic graptolite black shales (for an exception see Page et al., 2010) suggests that, on the whole, arthropod cuticles were likely much less recalcitrant than the organic skeletons of graptolites. As small, lightly mineralized pelagic or epipelagic animals die and drift slowly down through the water column, a combination of processes can break down and transport carcasses and component anatomy (Brett and Baird, 1986). Small, flat and light parts that are weakly connected with the trunk, such as appendages, are expected to travel farthest; partially articulated abdomens may travel less distance than the lightest pieces, and carapaces might travel the least distance (Collette and Hagadorn, 2010; Fig. 5). Support for this hypothesis is given by sorting in death assemblages of other planktonic organisms, where heavier components drop to the seafloor quickly, and lighter or complex-shaped components may drift farther with even a weak current (Johnson, 1960; Kontrovitz, 1975).

Once partially decayed and disarticulated arthropods reach the sea floor, bioturbation generally destroys the remains. More heavily mineralized or sclerotized structures, such as carapaces of ostracods and trilobites and anomalocaridid grasping appendages, are more likely to escape this process and this probably explains their better fossil record. Experimental studies of arthropod carcasses that are buried under less than 10 cm of sediment have shown rapid damage by scavenging and bioturbation, whilst below 10 cm their preservation is largely undisrupted (Plotnick, 1986).

For small carbonaceous fossils (SCFs) the taphonomic pathways are probably different than for whole animals, as these represent only disarticulated fragments of sclerotized appendages and feeding structures that have the highest fossilization potential of poorly biomineralized arthropods (Van Waveren, 1994; Figs 4A-B, 5). Studies of modern marine sediment surfaces have identified various fragments of zooplanktonic crustaceans that can, if the conditions are favourable, fossilise as SCFs (Van Waveren, 1994). Indeed, analysis of the contents of copepod faecal pellets has yielded an almost unaltered crustacean mandible (Turner, 1978, fig. 5J). Copepod mandibles and sometimes appendages are also found in the guts of modern zooplanktonic crustaceans such as euphausiaceans (e.g., Dalpadado et al., 2008) as well as in chaetognaths (e.g., Baier and Terazaki, 2005). These suggest that some SCF-type cuticular elements might represent the undigested remains of mid-water predators that were originally wrapped in pellets and sunk to the bottom via the faecal stream. So far, the study of SCFs has focussed on the Cambrian (e.g., Harvey et al., 2012), but given the paucity of the arthropod zooplankton record (Fig. 3), future analyses of other intervals of the Phanerozoic record may throw light on a largely cryptic arthropod zooplankton story.

494

495 *3.2. Is the fossil record sufficient to make inferences about arthropod*
496 *zooplankton evolution through time?*

497 It follows from consideration of taphonomic factors that except for those groups
498 with mineralized skeletons, such as some bradoriids, trilobites, ostracods and
499 malacostracans, most zooplanktonic arthropods are known almost exclusively from
500 Konservat-Lagerstätten, and the majority of these in the Cambrian. This includes most
501 of the Cambrian ‘soft bodied’ animals such as gilled lobopodians, Radiodonta, certain
502 bivalved arthropods and marelomorphs, and also many groups present in Recent
503 pelagic niches, such as branchiopods, copepods and most malacostracans. The
504 (sparse) occurrence of these ‘soft bodied’ animals as fossils is the product of
505 particular taphonomic windows. Thus, gilled lobopodians, radiodonts and
506 marelomorphs have a very discontinuous record (see Fig. 3) in Cambrian (e.g., Sirius
507 Passet, Chengjiang, Emu Bay, Burgess Shale), Ordovician (e.g., Fezouata), Silurian
508 (e.g., Herefordshire) and Devonian (e.g., Hunsrück Slate) Lagerstätten.

509 Some SCFs (Harvey et al., 2012) in the Cambrian potentially represent groups
510 such as branchiopods, copepods or ostracods, but they are known only from a few
511 disarticulated appendages, which precludes a detailed reconstruction of their lifestyle.
512 In addition, because studies of SCFs have mostly concentrated on Cambrian material,
513 the Phanerozoic record of these arthropods is strongly biased, with virtually no record
514 of copepods, for example, between the Cambrian and Recent (Selden et al., 2010; Fig.
515 3).

516 More strongly mineralized pelagic arthropods have a much higher fossilisation
517 potential and thus a more continuous fossil record (see Figs 3, 5). These include
518 representatives of such groups as ostracods (by far the most abundant and diverse

arthropod group in the fossil record) and trilobites that are common as fossil specimens and species worldwide. However, usually the crucial soft anatomy is missing, in part a result of post-mortem drifting of carcasses, making it more circumspect to interpret the lifestyle of these organisms. The interpretation of a pelagic lifestyle is then derived from skeletal morphology (which is not always reliable; see Siveter et al., 2003, 2013) and from a set of indirect inferences that include palaeogeographic distribution, depositional setting and associated faunas (Fortey, 1974, 1975, 1985; Siveter et al., 1991).

Compared to other groups of arthropods, the fossil record of eumalacostracans is notably incomplete (Fig. 3). Combined with the considerable range of variation in the calibration of molecular data from this group (Jenner et al., 2009), this results in fragile and imperfectly constrained phylogenetic trees (Wills et al., 2009). Porter et al., (2005) place the first diversification of decapods in the early Silurian (437 Ma), implying that the major diversification of malacostracans occurred between the late Cambrian and the Ordovician (Fig. 3). Apart from putative phyllocarids (see Vannier et al., 2003), no fossil zooplanktonic malacostracans are known before the Devonian. Most of the record of possible zooplanktonic malacostracans (mainly decapods) from the Devonian onwards comes from Lagerstätten such as the Sahel Alma (Late Cretaceous, Santonian, Lebanon; Audo and Charbonnier, 2013). All other Recent zooplanktonic eumalacostracans, for example Amphipoda (McMenamin et al., 2013), Isopoda (Feldmann and Rust, 2006), Mysidia/Lophogastrida (Taylor et al., 2001) and Cumacea (Schram et al., 2003) have a fossil record that is doubtful or absent (e.g., Euphausiacea, Amphionidacea). Apart from phyllocarids, the first convincing evidence of malacostracans living in the water column comes from a genus that cannot be assigned to a Recent higher taxon, the Late Devonian stem

Mysidia/Euphausiacea *Angustidontus* (Rolf and Dzik, 2006; Fig. 4K).

Despite the overall paucity of fossil data, some intervals of arthropod zooplankton evolution are well constrained (Fig. 3), especially the record of soft-bodied forms in the Cambrian, and forms with an exoskeleton in the Ordovician, Silurian and Devonian. Therefore, inferences about the contribution of arthropods to early Palaeozoic zooplankton ecologies can be made, and some of these inferences are likely applicable to other parts of the geological column where data is wanting.

4. The fossil record of Arthropod zooplankton colonization

Herein, the definitions of plankton and zooplankton, especially the size categories for the latter, follow Omori and Ikeda (1984; see Fig. 6).

Given the paucity of zooplankton arthropod fossils from much of the geological record, the following discussion focuses on colonisation during the early Palaeozoic, especially the Cambrian. There is sufficient evidence to suggest that the zooplankton food web was already well developed by the early Cambrian, and arthropods are likely to have been present in plankton ecospace from that time onwards (e.g., Signor and Vermeij, 1994; Rigby and Milsom, 2000; Peterson et al., 2004; Vannier, 2007; Vannier et al., 2009). Many of the major arthropod groups that have a supposed record of water column colonization were already present during the Cambrian, albeit not necessarily as zooplankton (Fig. 3).

A prerequisite for the development of heterotrophic zooplankton is the development of primary productivity, the origins of which lie deep in the Precambrian (Huntley et al., 2006; Knoll, 1994; Butterfield, 1997, 2007; Javaux et al., 2010). Heterotrophic consumers of the phytoplankton developed much later, probably in the terminal Precambrian or early Cambrian. In the absence of direct body fossil

evidence, the marked evolutionary radiation of rapidly evolving ornamented acritarchs in the early Cambrian (Huntley et al., 2006) may signal an evolutionary response to the evolution of small planktonic herbivorous metazoans (Butterfield, 1997, 2007). This is supported by phylogenetic reconstructions (e.g., Legg et al., 2013; Edgecombe and Legg, 2014) suggesting that euarthropods were present in the latest Precambrian (ca. 543 Ma; Rota-Stabelli et al., 2013).

4.1. Mesozooplanktonic arthropods

Mesozooplankton (size: 0.2-20 mm) is the essential link between the phytoplankton and higher levels of the zooplankton food web (Fig. 6). Colonisation of the water column by mesozooplankton must therefore have represented an important step in the construction of higher trophic levels in marine food webs, and it follows that they were essential for reconstructing food webs in the wake of major extinction events. In Recent pelagic ecosystems, mesozooplankton is composed of essentially primary consumers (e.g., copepods) but occasionally also of secondary consumers (e.g., ostracods) preying on other mesozooplankton.

Apart from chaetognaths (Vannier et al., 2007), there is no fossil record of mesozooplankton in the early Cambrian. Arthropod appendages that belong to three extant crustacean groups, branchiopods, copepods and a putative ostracod (Harvey et al., 2012), have been recorded from Cambrian deposits, but their appendage morphology suggests grazing/scraping/filtering ecologies more consistent with a benthic lifestyle. Nevertheless, some Cambrian (Epoch 3) copepod mandibles that are strikingly similar to those of modern planktonic species (Harvey and Pedder, 2013) suggest that copepods may have been present in the water column during the mid Cambrian. The existence of an arthropod mesozooplankton is also supported by

evidence from faecal pellets rich with sphaeromorph acritarchs (Cambrian Epoch 3; Harvey and Butterfield, 2011; Fig. 4C) that may be the product of arthropod grazers among the Cambrian zooplankton. The high abundance of intact pellets in organic-rich mudstones suggests that these were exported from an open water column overlying an undisturbed, probably anoxic seabed. Furthermore, the appendages of the large (up to 70 cm long) early Cambrian (Epoch 2) anomalocaridid *Tamisiocaris* suggest that it was a microphagous suspension feeder (Vinther et al., 2014; Fig. 4E), using its appendages for sweep-net capture of food items down to 0.5 mm, which is within the size range of mesozooplankton such as copepods and branchiopods.

Other small putative mesozooplankton in the Cambrian include species of the bradoriid *Anabaroichilina* (Fig. 4P) that probably originated in benthic shelf settings in the early and mid Cambrian (Siveter and Williams, 1997; Williams and Siveter, 1998), possibly migrating into the water column during intervals of widespread shelf dysoxia in the Drumian and Guzhangian ages of Cambrian Epoch 3 (Collette et al., 2011; Williams et al., in press). Species of *Anabaroichilina* have a fossil distribution that spans a trans-palaeolatitude distribution in the Cambrian, from the tropics to the southern polar region (Williams et al., 2007) and between major palaeocontinents separated by wide oceans (Hinz-Schallreuter, 1993; Colette et al., 2011). The size of *Anabaroichilina* species (about 5-10 mm long) is consistent with an animal feeding on detritus or small mesozooplankton, as do Recent pelagic (myodocope) ostracods.

Post-Cambrian examples of mesozooplankton colonisations of the water column are best exhibited by the Silurian radiation of ostracods (myodocopids) following the mid-Homerian biotic crisis (Siveter et al., 1991; see Cramer et al., 2012 for context): certain species developed a transoceanic distribution at this time, including *Richteria migrans*, *Parabolbozoe bohémica* and *Silurocypridina calva* (Perrier et al., 2007,

2011; Perrier and Siveter, 2013; Fig. 4S). This colonisation event is associated with the restoration of the planktonic ecosystem in general (including zooplankton such as graptolites) post-dating the mid-Homerian extinction (Siveter et al., 1991; Porebska et al., 2004; Cramer et al., 2012), though the precise factors that facilitated the radiation of ostracods into the water column remain enigmatic (see Siveter et al., 1991 for a review). During the Devonian and Carboniferous, the myodocopid Entomozoidae with their weakly mineralized carapaces provide a continued, but rare, fossil record of mesozooplankton (Gooday, 1983; Olempska, 1992; Fig. 3).

4.2. Macrozooplanktonic arthropods

Macrozooplanktonic (size: 20-200 mm) arthropods are primary or secondary consumers and are represented in Recent pelagic ecosystems by groups such as euphausiaceans (e.g., krill) and decapods (Fig. 6). Most of them are filter feeders primarily on phytoplankton, although some species are predators on mesozooplankton and other macrozooplankton (e.g., amphipods).

The record of arthropod macrozooplankton in the Cambrian is meager. *Isoxys*, with its light carapace, appendages adapted for swimming, flap-like telson, powerful prehensile frontal appendages, well-developed digestive system and large spherical eyes, is probably one of the best candidates as a macrozooplankton predator (Vannier and Chen, 2000; Vannier et al., 2009). Although *Isoxys* is not cosmopolitan at the species level like some Cambrian bradoriids, evidence from functional morphology, taphonomy and palaeogeographic distribution suggests that it may have been a widespread visual predator living in the lower levels of the water column (Vannier et al., 2009).

Although trilobites were already diverse during the Cambrian (Fortey and Owens,

1997), there are but a few adult forms that have been interpreted as pelagic (Table 1). The Ordovician bears a wider range of what are generally agreed to be pelagic trilobite species (Fortey, 1974, 1975, 1985). Some of these, such as *Carolinites genacinaca*, display the most cosmopolitan distribution of any trilobite species (McCormick and Fortey, 1999) and occur across inner and outer shelf facies. Morphologically, pelagic trilobites are typically recognized, *inter alia*, by their large or even hypertrophied downwards-pointing eyes, elongate exoskeletons with reduced pleurae, and their downwards-directed genal spines (Fortey and Owens, 1999; Figs 2, 4L-M). Unfortunately, there is no preserved appendage morphology for supposed pelagic trilobites. It is unknown, for example, whether the appendages were modified for swimming or for feeding in the water column (Fortey and Owens, 1999). Based mostly on functional morphology, small (20-40 mm) Ordovician trilobites such as the Cyclopygidae and the Telephinidae have been interpreted as primary and/or secondary consumers, whereas larger (up to 100 mm) and streamlined forms such as *Degamella* were likely secondary consumers (predators) feeding on mesozooplankton (Fortey and Owens, 1999; Table 1).

The first putative malacostracan crustaceans entered the water column during the Early Ordovician (Fig. 3). Based on its cosmopolitan palaeogeographic distribution and its associated faunas, the putative phyllocarid *Caryocaris*, recorded from the Tremadocian onward, has been interpreted as a microphageous/opportunistic mid-water zooplanktonic animal (Vannier et al., 2003). The fossil record of zooplanktonic malacostracans, excluding phyllocarids, is poor (Fig. 3), especially compared to their diverse and abundant benthic record and their ecological importance in Recent oceans. The diversity of zooplanktonic malacostracan groups in the modern oceans, represented *inter alia* by at least four families of Decapoda, and by Amphipoda,

Isopoda, Mysidia, Lophogastrida, Cumacea, Amphionidacea and Euphausiacea (Fig. 1L), suggests multiple zooplankton colonization events. However, it is difficult to determine exactly when these events took place, as most of these groups also comprise benthic representatives. The first definitive malacostracan (stem Mysidia/Euphausiacea) recorded supposedly in the water column is from the Late Devonian (*Angustidontus*, Rolf and Dzik, 2006; Fig. 4K)

Although Euphausiaceans have no known fossil record, their presence during the mid Cenozoic can be inferred by indirect evidence. Significantly, baleen whales (Mysticeti) evolved from the ancestors of toothed whales (Odontoceti) in the late Eocene (at ca 35 Ma) and underwent a major adaptive radiation in the mid Oligocene (30 Ma; Fordyce and Barnes, 1994; O’Leary and Uhen, 1999; Cavin, 2010). Many modern Mysticeti are obligate krill predators (Matthews, 1978), so it is possible that their radiation is associated with the exploitation of krill as a new food resource (Jarman et al., 2002), linked to the reorganization of the Southern Ocean ecosystem at this time (Houben et al., 2013).

4.3. Large predators

Although arthropods are absent from the highest trophic level in Recent pelagic open-water ecosystems of the oceans, the presence of large (>200 mm) pan-arthropod top predators (e.g., Radiodonta) in the early Cambrian (Epoch 2) water column is well documented (Fig. 6 and Table 1). These animals reached metre-scale in length in the Cambrian and Ordovician (Van Roy and Briggs, 2011) and were present until at least the Early Devonian (Kühl et al., 2009). The functional morphology of the frontal appendages suggests that some anomalocaridid taxa were durophagous predators, whilst others fed on soft-bodied organisms (Daley et al., 2013; Fig. 4D), with one

early Cambrian species most probably a microphagous suspension feeder (Vinther et al., 2014; Fig. 4E). The only other large arthropod predators of the early Palaeozoic with a fossil record are the eurypterids, which were present from the Ordovician to the Permian (Fig. 4H). The earliest (swimming) eurypterids are recorded from the Late Ordovician (Hirnantian) but it is not until early Silurian (Llandovery) times that some pterygotids possess a wide biogeographical distribution at the generic level (Tetlie, 2007). Selden (1981, 1984) suggested that some Silurian pterygotoid and hughmillerioid eurypterids were slow but accomplished swimmers probably living in the demersal zone. Provided with well-developed raptorial appendages, they almost certainly occupied high trophic levels, as is also suggested by several pterygotoid forms among the largest arthropods ever discovered (Miller, 2007; Braddy et al., 2008). Some early Palaeozoic giant trilobites (up to 90 cm long), for example *Isoletus* and *Hungioides*, were also probably tertiary predators/scavengers, but their morphology and depositional setting suggest a strictly benthic lifestyle (Rudkin et al., 2003; Gutiérrez-Marco et al., 2009).

The presence of such a diversity of lifestyles and feeding strategies in early Palaeozoic arthropods suggests that the pelagic food web was already complex perhaps as early as *circa* 521 Ma, implying that arthropods were present at several trophic levels from primary consumer to tertiary predator (see Signor and Vermeij, 1994; Rigby and Milsom, 2000; Peterson et al., 2004; Vannier, 2007; Fig. 6).

5. Arthropod zooplankton and their environment

The Precambrian–Cambrian transition witnessed a succession of ecological changes. Over a few tens of millions of years, the marine realm changed from relatively simple ecosystems dominated by microorganisms and predominantly sessile

organisms, as occur in the Ediacaran biota, to complex ecosystems where many new ecological interactions such as predation occupied a central position and exerted feedback effects on the environment and evolutionary processes (Butterfield, 2011). The adaptive radiation of arthropods during the Cambrian and their subsequent evolution during the rest of the Phanerozoic played a central role in this process. The arthropod colonisation of the water column provided a new food supply and enabled large secondary and tertiary consumers to enter the water column. Planktonic arthropods are also important consumers of phytoplankton and other organic matter, repackaging carbon and delivering it to other parts of the water column, and as such are integral to the efficient functioning of the biological pump (Butterfield, 1997). They therefore provide a food source for organisms living in the water column as well as in the benthos (Rigby and Milsom, 2000). The following review examines some of the interactions of the arthropod zooplankton with the marine ecosystem.

5.1. Predation and plankton

The ‘fast pelagic predator’ niche was probably occupied since the early Cambrian (Bambach et al., 2007). Indeed, some of the first arthropods were probably predators (Legg et al., 2012). Until the Ordovician, with the diversification of the cephalopods (Kröger et al., 2009), the ‘fast pelagic predator’ niche was mostly occupied by arthropods such as gilled lobopodians, Radiodonta, some bivalved arthropods and possibly trilobites, as well as non-arthropod conodonts and chaetognaths. The increase in demersal predators in Cambrian epochs 2 and 3, such as gilled lobopodians, Radiodonta and possibly some bivalved arthropods, coincides with the development of specialised appendages designed for grasping prey (Vannier et al., 2009; Daley et al., 2013; Vinther et al., 2014) and complex feeding appendages with which to

process food (Harvey et al., 2012). This also coincides with the development of features that characterise predators such as well-developed vision (Paterson et al., 2011), fast locomotion (Usami, 2006), and an efficient digestive system (Vannier et al., 2014). Several authors (e.g., Signor and Vermeij, 1994; Peterson, 2005; Peterson et al., 2005) have suggested that the Cambrian water column may have served as a refuge for small animals from benthic and demersal predation pressure, and this might have been one of the triggers of Cambrian plankton colonization events. According to Verity and Smetacek (1996), amongst plankton, predator avoidance strategies fall into four general categories that can be recognized in arthropods: chemical (e.g., bioluminescence), morphological (e.g., eyes, swimming appendages, spines), behavioural (e.g., vertical migration, escape reaction) and life history (e.g., brooding). Most of these predator avoidance strategies were already present in arthropods from Cambrian epochs 2 and 3, as reviewed in section 2, and these strategies may have facilitated colonisations of the water column multiple times during arthropod evolutionary history. Assuming this hypothesis is correct, an initial high diversity in the demersal zone (e.g., as witnessed in Chengjiang arthropods) was followed by a radiation of some transitional demersal/nektonic organisms (e.g., some Bradoriida; Williams et al., in press) and then finally by a nekton diversification (Klug et al., 2010). Elements of these ecologies are clearly present in Cambrian arthropod faunas.

Klug et al., (2010) proposed that the Devonian nekton revolution (affecting, e.g., cephalopods and fishes) might have resulted from sea bottom predator pressure. An important event in the history of the Palaeozoic nekton is the initial radiation of gnathostomes in the Early Devonian (Emsian; Kröger, 2005), with the simultaneous appearance of the Chondrichthyes, Placodermi, and Paleoniscides, the main late Palaeozoic competitors and predators of cephalopods (Mapes et al., 1995; Mapes and

Chaffin, 2003). The radiation of gnathostomes may have increased predator pressure on cephalopods, selecting for higher mobility forms (Klug and Korn, 2004) and forcing an invasion of benthic or demersal organisms into the water column (Klug et al., 2010).

5.2. Impact on the phytoplankton

The development of spiny acritarchs in the late Precambrian may have been a reaction to mesozooplankton grazing pressure (Butterfield, 1997). Two earlier radiation events of acanthomorphic acritarchs in the Proterozoic, one before the Sturtian glaciation (750-700 Ma) and one immediately following (600-575 Ma) the Marinoan glaciation, occurred at a time when mesozooplankton probably did not exist and could not have affected phytoplankton evolution (Vidal and Moczyłowska-Vidal, 1997; Moczyłowska, 2002). Although zooplankton affects the growth of phytoplankton populations (Berger et al., 1989; Brett et al., 1994), spines most likely evolved to enhance buoyancy, and the best defense strategy of phytoplankton against predation is mass occurrence, blooms, and the formation of colonies (Moczyłowska, 2002).

Nevertheless, the sharp increase in acritarch diversity and turnover during the Cambrian and Ordovician coincide with a comparable evolutionary adaptive radiation in animals (Servais et al., 2008, 2010). Multiple arthropod zooplankton colonisations could have contributed in several ways to the complexity of environments occupied by protistan-, nanno- and micro-plankton; for example, through predation (providing a greater range of ecological niches and sub-environments, and trophic positions), and the alteration of nutrient fluxes in marine platform and shelf waters (Butterfield, 2011).

In modern oceans, higher trophic levels, occupied by fish and marine mammals, depend on short food chains driven by bloom-forming phytoplankton, which is usually based on diatoms (Falkowski et al., 2004). The intermediaries in this energy transfer are metazoan zooplankton, such as copepods and euphausiaceans: whilst both of these groups have virtually no fossil record (Fig. 3), arthropods occupying this position in the trophic structure, and being essential for this energy transfer, may have existed since the Cambrian. It is possible that the rise of armoured phytoplankton (coccolithophores, dinoflagellates and diatoms), from the Mesozoic onwards represents a protective response to the diversification of primary and secondary consumers. Though there is no direct fossil evidence to support this, it is possible that armour developed in part in order to protect the phytoplankton from predation and/or to prevent its digestion (Sarnelle, 2005; DeMott and Van Donk, 2013) by a newly diversified arthropod zooplankton.

5.3. Impact on the nekton

The development and diversification of an arthropod zooplankton into the food chain may have enabled the expansion of larger animals (macrozooplankton and nekton) into this realm. The initial rise and rapid diversification of pelagic cephalopods during the Early and Middle Ordovician indicate the establishment of a food chain that could sustain a diverse fauna of large, active predators (Kröger et al., 2009). This diversification in general was coeval with the diversification of two major pelagic trilobite taxa, the Asaphida and Proetida (Adrain et al., 2004), and the appearance of widespread phyllocarid malacostracans (Vannier et al., 2003). These relatively large (up to about 5 cm long) zooplanktonic arthropods could have represented an important food source for early cephalopods and possibly played an

important role in their Ordovician diversification. In turn, the presence of larger predators indicates the likely presence of smaller meso- and microplankton as intermediaries between the primary production and larger predators.

During the Silurian, vertebrates underwent an adaptive radiation into diverse marine ecological niches (the nekton revolution of vertebrates *sensu* Blieck, 2009). Agnathans and gnathostomes dominate these assemblages, and both include representatives that were demersal or swimmers in the upper levels of the water column (Blieck, 2011). The migration of fish into the water column during the late Silurian (Ludlow and Prídolí; see Blieck, 2011, his Fig. 2) is associated with the first ostracod zooplankton (Siveter et al., 1991), and as Recent pelagic fishes feed on ostracods (e.g., Tanaka et al., 2006), there might be a putative link between these events. The increase in diversity of marine vertebrate higher taxa during the Middle to Late Devonian (Blieck, 2011) is also coeval with a contemporaneous radiation of entomozoid ostracods, being the dominant (taphonomically preservable) component of the Devonian-Carboniferous arthropod mesozooplankton. Thus, colonization events across several animal groups may be linked, though the drivers of these events remain speculative. Certainly the maintenance of an arthropod mesozooplankton may have been an important component of sustaining fish stocks at higher trophic levels.

The lack of a detailed and continuous arthropod zooplankton fossil record for much of the post-Carboniferous (Fig. 3) almost certainly reflects a taphonomic bias, coupled with the likely dominance of zooplanktonic arthropods with unmineralised or very weakly mineralized exoskeletons: this even pertains to pelagic ostracods, which are known from the Carboniferous but are then absent until the Holocene (Fig. 3). Likely, radiations of arthropod zooplankton were important for the reconstruction of pelagic food webs following the major environmental crises marked by the Permian-

Triassic, Triassic-Jurassic and Cretaceous-Tertiary boundaries, though there is no direct fossil record to support this. Nevertheless, the importance of the arthropod zooplankton during the Cenozoic is evident for the evolution of the Southern Ocean ecosystem at the transition between the warm Eocene and cooler Oligocene. The major adaptive radiation of diatoms during the late Eocene (Falkowski et al., 2004) and their ecological response to climate cooling produced by the development of an Antarctic ice sheet in the early Oligocene (Houben et al., 2013) may have been an important driver of niche differentiation in the oceans, affecting many biotic groups. For example, baleen whales (Mysticeti) evolved from the ancestors of toothed whales (Odontoceti) in the late Eocene (35 Ma) and underwent a major adaptive radiation in the mid Oligocene (ca 30 Ma; Fordyce and Barnes, 1994; O’Leary and Uhen, 1999; Cavin, 2010). This coincides with the origination of penguins in the Eocene and their radiation during the Oligocene (Baker et al., 2006). Many modern Mysticeti (Matthews, 1978) and penguins (Watanuki et al., 1994; Croxall et al., 1999) are krill predators, and krill are filter feeders primarily on phytoplankton and in particular on diatoms (Mauchline and Fisher, 1969). Though krill have no fossil record, it is reasonable to infer that their evolution would have been influenced by diatom abundances, and this in turn was possibly one of the triggers of baleen whale diversification (Houben et al., 2013).

5.4. Impact on the benthos

Zooplankton plays a central role in the planktonic food web, both in terms of biomass and energy fluxes. Grazing of phytoplankton by mesozooplankton provides increased nutrient cycling, maintains autotroph populations in a state of more rapid growth, and increases the food availability in the water column, allowing additional

trophic levels to be developed (Sterner and Elser, 2002). Furthermore, it simultaneously increases the rain of organic matter to the benthos (Logan et al., 1995; Tyson, 1995). Thus, the reorganization of biogeochemical cycles that occurred between the latest Neoproterozoic and early Cambrian (Logan et al., 1995) has long been attributed to the evolution of zooplanktonic metazoans whose faecal pellets removed organic matter from the water column and delivered this to the benthos (Butterfield, 1997). The increasing presence of meso- and microzooplankton in the water column allowed the subsequent development of macrozooplankton and nekton, whose faecal pellets are large enough to settle before they are consumed in the water column (Turner, 2002). Possibly, these larger tertiary plankton consumers developed mainly from the Ordovician onwards (e.g., trilobites, phyllocarids and cephalopods), and the development of this enhanced faecal stream may have influenced diversifications of various filter-feeding organisms such as crinoids and brachiopods (Peterson et al., 2005). Within the water column, the Great Ordovician Biodiversification Event involved a significant increase in the diversity of the phytoplankton (e.g., protistan acritarchs; Servais et al., 2008, 2010), followed by the development of a diverse zooplankton including arthropods such as trilobites and phyllocarids. This revolution in the plankton may have enabled the establishment of a diverse fauna of macrozooplankton and nekton, including vertebrates, molluscs and arthropods (Kröger et al., 2009), and it may have promoted the rise of suspension feeders in the benthos (Servais et al., 2009).

6. Conclusions

Analysis of the fossil record indicates that arthropods had already developed morphologies during the Cambrian Period that facilitated a zooplanktonic lifestyle.

894 These anatomical adaptations, coupled with key reproductive strategies, included
895 well-developed swimming and feeding appendages, buoyancy, an active metabolism
896 supported by efficient circulatory systems, photoreception and bioluminescent organs
897 (to locate food or avoid being eaten, or to find mates), and the nurturing of young
898 within the carapace. Arthropods possess a unique evolutionary plasticity that has
899 allowed them to be a major force in marine planktonic ecosystems for over 500
900 million years.

901 Although diverse and abundant in recent ecosystems, zooplanktonic arthropods are
902 rare in the post-early Palaeozoic fossil record. Several factors diminish their
903 preservation potential, including a paucity of skeletal material, and post-mortem
904 transport damage and scavenging of carcasses in the water column. Nevertheless,
905 there is sufficient direct (fossil) and indirect (e.g., faecal pellets) evidence to suggest
906 that a complex zooplanktonic food web, involving primary to tertiary consumers, was
907 already well developed by the Cambrian, and that many of the major arthropod groups
908 that have a record of water column colonization were already present at that time,
909 albeit not necessarily as zooplankton.

910 As intermediates between the consumption of primary production and the
911 provision of food to higher trophic levels, mesozooplanktonic arthropods such as
912 copepods and ostracods are critical go-betweens in marine food webs. Although the
913 overall fossil record of arthropod zooplankton is very poor, their nascent ability to
914 colonise the water column was likely integral to the restructuring of the marine
915 trophic structure in post-extinction intervals, and to the long-term survival of
916 complexity in the marine ecosystem.

917

918 **Acknowledgements**

We thank the Leverhulme Trust [grant number RP14G0168] for funding; Matúš Hyrzný (Comenius University, Bratislava, Slovakia), Tom Harvey and Sarah Gabbott (University of Leicester, UK) for fruitful discussion; and Jean Vannier (University of Lyon) and an anonymous reviewer for insightful comments that improved our manuscript. This is a contribution to the International Geoscience Programme (IGCP) Project 591.

References

Abe, K., Vannier, J., 1995. Functional morphology and significance of the circulatory system of Ostracoda, exemplified by *Vargula hilgendorffii* (Myodocopida). Marine Biology, 124(1), 51–58.

Abelmann, A., Gersonde, R., 1991. Biosiliceous particle flux in the Southern Ocean. Marine Chemistry, 35(1), 503–536.

Adrain, J.M., Edgecombe, G.D., Fortey, R.A., Hammer, Ø., Laurie, J.R., et al., 2004. Trilobites, in: Webby, B.D, Paris, F., Droser, M., Percival, I. (Eds) The Great Ordovician Diversification Event. New York: Columbia University Press, pp 231–254.

Audo, D., Charbonnier, S., 2013. Late Cretaceous Crest-Bearing Shrimps from the Sahel Alma Lagerstätte of Lebanon. Acta Palaeontologica Polonica, 58(2), 335-349.

Baier, C.T., Terazaki, M., 2005. Interannual variability in a predator–prey interaction: climate, chaetognaths and copepods in the southeastern Bering Sea. Journal of Plankton Research, 27(11), 1113-1125.

Baker, A.J., Pereira, S.L., Haddrath, O.P., Edge, K.A., 2006. Multiple gene evidence for expansion of extant penguins out of Antarctica due to global cooling. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 273(1582), 11-17.

944 Bambach, R.K., Bush, A.M., Erwin, D.H., 2007. Autecology and the filling of
 945 ecospace: key metazoan radiations. *Palaeontology*, 50(1), 1-22.

946 Bengtson, S., 2002. Origins and early evolution of predation. *Paleontological*
 947 *Society Papers*, 8, 289-318.

948 Benson, R.H., 1974. The role of ornamentation in the design and function of the
 949 ostracode carapace. *Geoscience and Man*, 6, 47-57.

950 Benson, R.H., 1981. Form, function, and architecture of ostracode shells. *Annual*
 951 *Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences*, 9, 59-80.

952 Berger, W.H., Smetacek, V.S. Wefer, G., 1989. *Productivity of the Ocean: Present*
 953 *and Past*. Wiley, Chichester.

954 Billett, D.S.M., Lampitt, R.S., Rice, A.L., Mantoura, R.F.C., 1983. Seasonal
 955 sedimentation of phytoplankton to the deep-sea benthos. *Nature*, 302(5908), 520-522.

956 Blieck, A., 2009. Biodiversité, environnements et évolution au Paléozoïque: le cas
 957 des vertébrés du Cambrien au Dévonien (-542 à -359 Ma). *Annales de la Société*
 958 *Géologique du Nord*, 2e série, 16, 19-33.

959 Blieck, A., 2011. The André Dumont medallist lecture – From adaptive radiations
 960 to biotic crises in Palaeozoic vertebrates: a geobiological approach. *Geologica*
 961 *Belgica*, 14, 203–227.

962 Braddy, S.J., Poschmann, M., Tetlie, O.E., 2008. Giant claw reveals the largest
 963 ever arthropod. *Biology letters*, 4(1), 106-109.

964 Brett, C.E., Baird, G.C., 1986. Comparative taphonomy: a key to
 965 paleoenvironmental interpretation based on fossil preservation. *Palaios*, 207-227.

966 Brett, M.T., Wiackowski, K., Lubnow, F.S., Mueller-Solger, A., Elser, J.J.,
 967 Goldman, C.R., 1994. Species-dependent effects of zooplankton on planktonic
 968 ecosystem processes in Castle Lake, California. *Ecology*, 2243-2254.

969 Briggs, D.E., Erwin, D.H., Collier, F.J. 1994. The fossils of the Burgess Shale.
970 Washington DC, Smithsonian Institution Press. 238pp.

971 Briggs, D.E., Sutton, M.D., Siveter, David J., Siveter, Derek J. 2005.
972 Metamorphosis in a Silurian barnacle. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*
973 *Sciences*, 272(1579), 2365-2369.

974 Bucklin, A., Hopcroft, R.R., Kosobokova, K.N., Nigro, L.M., Ortman, B.D.,
975 Jennings, R.M., Sweetman, C.J., 2010. DNA barcoding of Arctic Ocean
976 holozooplankton for species identification and recognition. *Deep Sea Research Part*
977 *II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, 57(1), 40-48.

978 Budd, G.E., 2003. The Cambrian fossil record and the origin of the phyla.
979 *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, 43(1), 157-165.

980 Buitenhuis, E.T., Li, W.K., Vaultot, D., Lomas, M.W., Landry, M., Partensky, F., et
981 al., 2012. Picophytoplankton biomass distribution in the global ocean. *Earth System*
982 *Science Data Discussions*, 5(1), 221-242.

983 Butterfield, N.J., 1997. Plankton ecology and the Proterozoic-Phanerozoic
984 transition. *Paleobiology*, 23(2), 247-262.

985 Butterfield, N.J., 2007. Macroevolution and macroecology through deep time.
986 *Palaeontology*, 50(1), 41-55.

987 Butterfield, N.J., 2011. Animals and the invention of the Phanerozoic Earth
988 system. *Trends in ecology and evolution*, 26(2), 81-87.

989 Campbell, R.W., Dower, J.F., 2003. Role of lipids in the maintenance of neutral
990 buoyancy by zooplankton. *Marine ecology. Progress series*, 263, 93-99.

991 Cavin, L., 2010. On giant filter feeders. *Science*, 327(5968), 968-969.

992 Cederström, P., Ahlberg, P., Nilsson, C.H., Ahlgren, J., Eriksson, M.E., 2011.
993 Moulting, ontogeny and sexual dimorphism in the Cambrian ptychopariid trilobite

994 *Strenuaeva inflata* from the northern Swedish Caledonides. *Palaeontology*, 54(3), 685-
995 703.

996 Chen, J., Waloszek, D., Maas, A., Braun, A., Huang, D., Wang, X., Stein, M. 2007.
997 Early Cambrian Yangtze Plate Maotianshan Shale macrofauna biodiversity and the
998 evolution of predation. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 254(1),
999 250-272.

1000 CMarZ, 2004. Science Plan for the Census of Marine Zooplankton. Unpublished
1001 report from a Census of Marine Life workshop held 17-22 March 2004 in Portsmouth
1002 NH, with support from the Alfred P. Sloan

1003 Collette, J.H., Hagadorn, J.W., 2010. Early evolution of phyllocarid arthropods:
1004 phylogeny and systematics of Cambrian-Devonian archaeostracans. *Journal of*
1005 *Paleontology*, 84(5), 795-820.

1006 Collette, J.H., Hughes, N.C., Peng, S., 2011. The First Report of a Himalayan
1007 Bradoriid Arthropod and the Paleogeographic Significance of this Form. *Journal of*
1008 *Paleontology*, 85(1), 76-82.

1009 Cramer, B.D., Condon, D.J., Söderlund, U., Marshall, C., Worton, G.J., Thomas,
1010 A.T., et al., 2012. U-Pb (zircon) age constraints on the timing and duration of
1011 Wenlock (Silurian) paleocommunity collapse and recovery during the “Big Crisis”.
1012 *Geological Society of America Bulletin*, 124(11-12), 1841-1857.

1013 Croxall, J.P., Reid, K., Prince, P.A., 1999. Diet, provisioning and productivity
1014 responses of marine predators to differences in availability of Antarctic krill. *Marine*
1015 *ecology. Progress series*, 177, 115-131.

1016 Daley, A.C., Paterson, J.R., Edgecombe, G.D., García-Bellido, D.C., Jago, J.B.,
1017 2013. New anatomical information on *Anomalocaris* from the Cambrian Emu Bay

1018 Shale of South Australia and a reassessment of its inferred predatory habits.
1019 *Palaeontology*, 56(5), 971-990.

1020 Dalpadado, P., Yamaguchi, A., Ellertsen, B., Johannessen, S., 2008. Trophic
1021 interactions of macro-zooplankton (krill and amphipods) in the Marginal Ice Zone of
1022 the Barents Sea. *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, 55(20),
1023 2266-2274.

1024 Darling, K.F., Kroon, D., Wade, C.M., Brown, A.L., 1996. Molecular phylogeny
1025 of the planktic foraminifera. *The Journal of Foraminiferal Research*, 26(4), 324-330.

1026 Darling, K.F., Wade, C.M., Kroon, D., Brown, A.J.L., Bijma, J., 1999. The
1027 diversity and distribution of modern planktic foraminiferal small subunit ribosomal
1028 RNA genotypes and their potential as tracers of present and past ocean circulations.
1029 *Paleoceanography*, 14(1), 3-12.

1030 DeMott, W.R., Van Donk, E. 2013. Strong interactions between stoichiometric
1031 constraints and algal defenses: evidence from population dynamics of *Daphnia* and
1032 algae in phosphorus-limited microcosms. *Oecologia*, 171(1), 175-186.

1033 Duan, Y., Han, J., Fu, D., Zhang, X., Yang, X., Komiya, T., Shu, D., 2014.
1034 Reproductive strategy of the bradoriid arthropod *Kunmingella douvillei* from the
1035 Lower Cambrian Chengjiang Lagerstätte, South China. *Gondwana Research*, 25(3),
1036 983-990.

1037 Duncan, I.J., Titchener, F., Briggs, D.E.G., 2003. Decay and disarticulation of the
1038 cockroach: Implications for preservation of the blattoids of Writhlington (Upper
1039 Carboniferous), UK. *Palaios*, 18(3), 256-265.

1040 Dzik, J., 2011. The xenusian-to-anomalocaridid transition within the lobopodians.
1041 *Bollettino della Società Paleontologica Italiana*, 50, 65-74.

1042 Edgecombe, G.D., Legg, D.A., 2013. The arthropod fossil record, in: Minelli, A.,
1043 Boxshall, G., Fusco, G. (Eds), *Arthropod Biology and Evolution.*) Springer, Berlin,
1044 Heidelberg, pp. 393-415.

1045 Edgecombe, G.D., Legg, D.A., 2014. Origins and early evolution of arthropods.
1046 *Palaeontology*, 57(3), 457-468.

1047 Falkowski, P.G., Katz, M.E., Knoll, A.H., Quigg, A., Raven, J.A., Schofield, O.,
1048 Taylor, F.J.R., 2004. The evolution of modern eukaryotic phytoplankton. *science*,
1049 305(5682), 354-360.

1050 Fanenbruck, M., Harzsch, S., Wägele, J.W., 2004. The brain of the Remipedia
1051 (Crustacea) and an alternative hypothesis on their phylogenetic relationships.
1052 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*,
1053 101(11), 3868-3873.

1054 Feldmann, R.M., Rust, S., 2006. *Palaega kakatahi* n. sp.: the first record of a
1055 marine fossil isopod from the Pliocene of New Zealand. *New Zealand Journal of*
1056 *Geology and Geophysics*, 49(4), 411-415.

1057 Fordyce, R.E., Barnes, L.G., 1994. The evolutionary history of whales and
1058 dolphins. *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences*, 22, 419-455.

1059 Fortey, R.A., 1974. A new pelagic trilobite from the Ordovician of Spitsbergen,
1060 Ireland and Utah. *Palaeontology*, 17, 111-124.

1061 Fortey, R.A., 1975. Early Ordovician trilobite communities. *Fossils and Strata*, 4,
1062 331-352.

1063 Fortey, R.A., 1985. Pelagic trilobites as an example of deducing the life habits of
1064 extinct arthropods. *Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh: Earth Sciences*,
1065 76(2-3), 219-230.

1066 Fortey, R.A., Hughes, N.C., 1998. Brood pouches in trilobites. Journal of
 1067 Paleontology, 638-649.

1068 Fortey, R.A., Owens, R.M., 1997. Evolutionary History, in: Kaesler, R.L. (Ed.),
 1069 Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology, Part O, Arthropoda 1, Trilobita, revised.
 1070 Volume 1: Introduction, Order Agnostida, Order Redlichiida. The Geological Society
 1071 of America, Inc., Boulder, CO, Lawrence, KA, The University of Kansas, pp. 249–
 1072 287.

1073 Fortey, R.A., Owens, R.M., 1999. Feeding habits in trilobites. Palaeontology,
 1074 42(3), 429-465.

1075 Fortey, R.A., Morris, S.F., 1978. Discovery of nauplius-like trilobite larvae.
 1076 Palaeontology, 21(4), 823-833.

1077 Fu, D.J., Zhang, X., 2011. A new arthropod *Jugatacaris agilis* n. gen. n. sp. from
 1078 the Early Cambrian Chengjiang biota, south China. Journal of Paleontology, 85(3),
 1079 567-586.

1080 Fu, D.J., Zhang, X.L., Shu, D.G. 2011. Soft anatomy of the Early Cambrian
 1081 arthropod *Isoxys curvirostratus* from the Chengjiang biota of South China with a
 1082 discussion on the origination of great appendages. Acta Palaeontologica Polonica,
 1083 56(4), 843-852.

1084 Gooday, A.J. 1983. Entomozoacean ostracods from the Lower Carboniferous of
 1085 south-western England. Palaeontology, 26(4), 755-788.

1086 Gutiérrez-Marco, J.C., Sá, A.A., García-Bellido, D.C., Rábano, I., Valério, M.,
 1087 2009. Giant trilobites and trilobite clusters from the Ordovician of Portugal. Geology,
 1088 37(5), 443-446.

1089 Haddock, S.H., Case, J.F., 1995. Not all ctenophores are bioluminescent:
 1090 Pleurobrachia. The Biological Bulletin, 189(3), 356-362.

1091 Haddock, S.H., Moline, M.A., Case, J.F., 2010. Bioluminescence in the sea.
 1092 Marine Science, 2.

1093 Harding, G.C., 1973. Decomposition of marine copepods. Limnol. Oceanogr,
 1094 18(4), 670-673.

1095 Harper, D.A.T., Owen, A.W., Bruton, D.L., 2009. Ordovician life around the
 1096 Celtic fringes: diversifications, extinctions and migrations of brachiopod and trilobite
 1097 faunas at middle latitudes. Geological Society, London, Special Publications, 325(1),
 1098 157-170.

1099 Harvey, A.W., Martin, J.W., Wetzer, R., 2002. Phylum Arthropods: Crustacea.
 1100 Atlas of marine invertebrate larvae. Academic Press, San Diego, 337-370.

1101 Harvey, T.H., Butterfield, N.J., 2008. Sophisticated particle-feeding in a large
 1102 Early Cambrian crustacean. Nature, 452(7189), 868-871.

1103 Harvey, T.H., Butterfield, N.J., 2011. Great Canadian Lagerstätten 2. Macroand
 1104 Microfossils of the Mount Cap Formation (Early and Middle Cambrian, Northwest
 1105 Territories). Geoscience Canada, 38(4).

1106 Harvey, T.H., Pedder, B.E., 2013. Copepod mandible palynomorphs from the
 1107 Nolichucky Shale (Cambrian, Tennessee): implications for the taphonomy and
 1108 recovery of small carbonaceous fossils. Palaios, 28(5), 278-284.

1109 Harvey, T.H., Vélez, M.I., Butterfield, N.J., 2012. Exceptionally preserved
 1110 crustaceans from western Canada reveal a cryptic Cambrian radiation. Proceedings of
 1111 the National Academy of Sciences, 109(5), 1589-1594.

1112 Haury, L., Weihs, D. 1976. Energetically efficient swimming behavior of
 1113 negatively buoyant zooplankton. Limnology and Oceanography 21(6), 797-803.

1114 Hinz-Schallreuter, I. 1993. Cambrian ostracodes mainly from Baltoscandia and
 1115 Morocco. Archiv für Geschiebekunde 1, 385–448.

1116 Hof, C.H., Briggs, D.E.G., 1997. Decay and mineralization of mantis shrimps
 1117 (Stomatopoda; Crustacea); a key to their fossil record. *Palaios*, 12(5), 420-438.

1118 Hou, X.G., Aldridge, R., Bergstrom, J., Siveter, David J., Siveter, Derek, J., Feng,
 1119 X.H. 2004. The Cambrian fossils of Chengjiang, China: the flowering of early animal
 1120 life. pp. 233; Blackwell, Oxford.

1121 Houben, A.J., Bijl, P.K., Pross, J., Bohaty, S.M., Passchier, S., Stickley, C.E., et
 1122 al., 2013. Reorganization of Southern Ocean plankton ecosystem at the onset of
 1123 Antarctic glaciation. *Science*, 340(6130), 341-344.

1124 Howse, H.D., Woodmansee, R.A., Hawkins, W.E., Perry, H.M., 1975.
 1125 Ultrastructure of the heart of the copepod *Anomalocera ornata* Sutcliffe. *Transactions*
 1126 *of the American Microscopical Society*, 1-23.

1127 Huntley, J.W., Xiao, S., Kowalewski, M., 2006. 1.3 billion years of acritarch
 1128 history: an empirical morphospace approach. *Precambrian Research*, 144(1), 52-68.

1129 Ikeda, T., Imamura, A., 1992. Population structure and life cycle of the
 1130 mesopelagic ostracod *Conchoecia pseudodiscophora* in Toyama Bay, southern Japan
 1131 Sea. *Marine Biology*, 113(4), 595-601.

1132 Jarman, S.N., Gales, N.J., Tierney, M., Gill, P.C., Elliott, N.G., 2002. A
 1133 DNA-based method for identification of krill species and its application to analysing
 1134 the diet of marine vertebrate predators. *Molecular Ecology*, 11(12), 2679-2690.

1135 Javaux, E.J., Marshall, C.P., Bekker, A., 2010. Organic-walled microfossils in 3.2-
 1136 billion-year-old shallow-marine siliciclastic deposits. *Nature*, 463(7283), 934-938.

1137 Jenner, R.A., Dhubhghaill, C.N., Ferla, M.P., Wills, M.A., 2009. Eumalacostracan
 1138 phylogeny and total evidence: limitations of the usual suspects. *BMC Evolutionary*
 1139 *Biology*, 9(1), 21.

1140 Jivaluk, J., 2000. Distribution of Planktonic Malacostraca and Cephalopod
 1141 Paralarvae in the South China Sea, Area III: Western Philippines. Proceedings of the
 1142 third Technical Seminar on Marine Fishery Resources Survey in the South China Sea,
 1143 Area II: Western Philippines. Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center,
 1144 Bangkok, Thailand, 177-196.

1145 Johnson, R.G., 1960. Models and methods for analysis of the mode of formation of
 1146 fossil assemblages. Geological Society of America Bulletin, 71(7), 1075-1086.

1147 Klug, C., Korn, D., 2004. The origin of ammonoid locomotion. Acta
 1148 Palaeontologica Polonica, 49(2), 235-242.

1149 Klug, C., Kröger, B., Kiessling, W., Mullins, G.L., Servais, T., Fryda, J., Korn, D.
 1150 Turner, S., 2010. The Devonian nekton revolution. Lethaia, 43(4), 465-477.

1151 Knoll, A.H., 1994. Proterozoic and Early Cambrian protists: evidence for
 1152 accelerating evolutionary tempo. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences,
 1153 91(15), 6743-6750.

1154 Kohlhage, K., Yager, J. 1994. An analysis of swimming in remipede crustaceans.
 1155 Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological
 1156 Sciences, 346(1316), 213-221.

1157 Kohly, A., 1998. Diatom flux and species composition in the Greenland Sea and
 1158 the Norwegian Sea in 1991–1992. Marine Geology, 145(3), 293-312.

1159 Kontrovitz, M., 1975. A study of the differential transportation of ostracodes.
 1160 Journal of Paleontology, 49, 937-941.

1161 Kröger, B., 2005 Adaptive evolution in Paleozoic coiled cephalopods.
 1162 Paleobiology, 31, 253-268.

1163 Kröger, B., Servais, T., Zhang, Y., 2009. The origin and initial rise of pelagic
 1164 cephalopods in the Ordovician. PloS one, 4(9), e7262.

1165 Kühl, G., Briggs, D.E.G., Rust, J., 2009. A great-appendage arthropod with a radial
 1166 mouth from the Lower Devonian Hunsrück Slate, Germany. *Science*, 323(5915), 771-
 1167 773.

1168 Lampitt, R.S., Bett, B.J., Kiriakoulakis, K., Popova, E.E., Ragueneau, O.,
 1169 Vangriesheim, A., Wolff, G.A., 2001. Material supply to the abyssal seafloor in the
 1170 Northeast Atlantic. *Progress in Oceanography*, 50(1), 27-63.

1171 Land, M.F. 1989. The eyes of hyperiid amphipods: relations of optical structure to
 1172 depth. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A*, 164(6), 751-762.

1173 Lefebvre, B., Sumrall, C.D., Shroat-Lewis, R.A., Reich, M., Webster, G.D.,
 1174 Hunter, A.W., et al., 2013. Palaeobiogeography of Ordovician echinoderms.
 1175 Geological Society, London, *Memoirs*, 38(1), 173-198.

1176 Legg, D.A., Vannier, J. 2013: The affinities of the cosmopolitan arthropod *Isoxys*
 1177 and its implications for the origin of arthropods. *Lethaia*, 46, 540–550.

1178 Legg, D.A., Sutton, M.D., Edgecombe, G.D., Caron, J.B., 2012. Cambrian
 1179 bivalved arthropod reveals origin of arthrodization. *Proceedings of the Royal Society*
 1180 *B: Biological Sciences*, rspb20121958.

1181 Legg, D.A., Sutton, M.D., Edgecombe, G.D., 2013. Arthropod fossil data increase
 1182 congruence of morphological and molecular phylogenies. *Nature communications*, 4.

1183 Lerosey-Aubril, R., Feist, R., 2005. First Carboniferous protaspid larvae
 1184 (Trilobita). *Journal of Paleontology* 79, 702–718.

1185 Logan, G.A., Hayes, J.M., Hieshima, G.B., Summons, R.E., 1995. Terminal
 1186 Proterozoic reorganization of biogeochemical cycles. *Nature*, 376(6535), 53-56.

1187 Ma, X., Cong, P., Hou, X., Edgecombe, G.D., and Strausfeld, N.J. 2014. An
 1188 exceptionally preserved arthropod cardiovascular system from the early Cambrian.
 1189 *Nature communications*, 5, doi:10.1038/ncomms4560.

1190 Maisey, J.G., Carvalho, M.D.G.P.D., 1995. First records of fossil sergestid
 1191 decapods and fossil brachyuran crab larvae (Arthropoda, Crustacea): with remarks on
 1192 some supposed palaemonid fossils, from the Santana Formation (Aptian-Albian, NE
 1193 Brazil). American Museum Novitates 3132.

1194 Mapes, R.H., Chaffin, D.T., 2003. Predation on cephalopods, in: Kelley, P.H.,
 1195 Kowalewski, M., Hansen, T.A. (Eds.) Predator-prey interactions in the fossil record
 1196 (Vol. 20). Springer, pp. 177-213.

1197 Mapes, R.H., Sims, M.S., Boardman, D.R., 1995. Predation on the Pennsylvanian
 1198 ammonoid *Gonioloboceras* and its implications for allochthonous vs. autochthonous
 1199 accumulations of Goniatites and other ammonoids. Journal of Paleontology, 441-446.

1200 Matthews, L.H., 1978. Natural history of the whale. Columbia University Press,
 1201 New York.

1202 Mauchline, J., Fisher, L.R. 1969. The biology of Euphausiids. Advances in Marine
 1203 Biology 7, Academic press, New York.

1204 McCormick, T.I.M., Fortey, R.A., 1999. The most widely distributed trilobite
 1205 species: Ordovician *Carolinites genacinaca*. Journal of Paleontology, 202-218.

1206 McMenamin, M.A., Zapata, L.P., Hussey, M.C., 2013. A Triassic giant amphipod
 1207 from Nevada, USA. Journal of Crustacean Biology, 33(6), 751-759.

1208 Miller, R.F., 2007. *Pterygotus anglicus* Agassiz (Chelicerata: Eurypterida) from
 1209 Atholville, Lower Devonian Campbellton Formation, New Brunswick, Canada.
 1210 Palaeontology, 50(4), 981-999.

1211 Moczydłowska M., 2002. Early Cambrian phytoplankton diversification and
 1212 appearance of trilobites in the Swedish Caledonides with implications for coupled
 1213 evolutionary events between primary producers and consumers. Lethaia, 35(3), 191-
 1214 214.

1215 Müller, K.J., Walossek, D. (1986). *Martinssonia elongata* gen. et sp. n., a
1216 crustacean-like euarthropod from the Upper Cambrian 'Orsten' of Sweden. *Zoologica*
1217 *Scripta*, 15(1), 73-92.

1218 Nedin, C., 1999. *Anomalocaris* predation on nonmineralized and mineralized
1219 trilobites. *Geology*, 27(11), 987-990.

1220 Neiber, M.T., Hartke, T.R., Stemme, T., Bergmann, A., Rust, J., Iliffe, T.M.,
1221 Koenemann, S. 2011. Global biodiversity and phylogenetic evaluation of Remipedia
1222 (Crustacea). *PloS one*, 6(5), e19627.

1223 Nilsson, D.E., Warrant, E., Johnsen, S., 2014. Computational visual ecology in the
1224 pelagic realm. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological*
1225 *Sciences*, 369(1636), 20130038.

1226 Novack-Gottshall, P.M., Miller, A.I., 2003. Comparative geographic and
1227 environmental diversity dynamics of gastropods and bivalves during the Ordovician
1228 Radiation. *Paleobiology*, 29(4), 576-604.

1229 O'Leary, M.A., Uhen, M.D., 1999. The time of origin of whales and the role of
1230 behavioral changes in the terrestrial-aquatic transition.

1231 Oakley, T.H., Wolfe, J.M., Lindgren, A.R., Zaharoff, A.K., 2013.
1232 Phylotranscriptomics to bring the understudied into the fold: monophyletic Ostracoda,
1233 fossil placement, and pancrustacean phylogeny. *Molecular biology and evolution*,
1234 30(1), 215-233.

1235 Ohman, M.D., Townsend, A.W., 1998. Egg strings in *Euchirella pseudopulchra*
1236 (Aetideidae) and comments on constraints on egg brooding in planktonic marine
1237 copepods. *Journal of marine systems*, 15(1), 61-69.

1238 Olempska, E., 1992. Shell structure of the entomozoaceans: allegedly planktonic
1239 ostracodes of the Palaeozoic. *Acta Palaeontologica Polonica*, 36(4), 373-398.

1240 Omori, M., Ikeda, T., 1984. Methods in marine zooplankton ecology. Wiley, New
1241 York.

1242 Page, A., Wilby, P.R., Williams, M., Vannier, J., Davies, J.R., Waters, R.A.,
1243 Zalasiewicz, J.A., 2010. Soft-part preservation in a bivalved arthropod from the Late
1244 Ordovician of Wales. Geological magazine, 147(02), 242-252.

1245 Paterson, J.R., García-Bellido, D.C., Lee, M.S., Brock, G.A., Jago, J.B.,
1246 Edgecombe, G.D., 2011. Acute vision in the giant Cambrian predator *Anomalocaris*
1247 and the origin of compound eyes. Nature, 480(7376), 237-240.

1248 Pearson, J.C., Lemons, D., McGinnis, W., 2005. Modulating Hox gene functions
1249 during animal body patterning. Nature Reviews Genetics, 6(12), 893-904.

1250 Peng, S.C., Babcock, L.E., 2011. Continuing progress on chronostratigraphic
1251 subdivision of the Cambrian System. Bulletin of Geosciences, 86(3), 391-396.

1252 Perrier, V., Siveter, David J., 2013. Testing Silurian palaeogeography using
1253 'European' ostracod faunas. Geological Society, London, Memoirs, 38(1), 355-364.

1254 Perrier, V., Vannier, J., Siveter, David J., 2007. The Silurian pelagic myodocope
1255 ostracod *Richeria migrans*. Earth and Environmental Science Transactions of the
1256 Royal Society of Edinburgh, 98(02), 151-163.

1257 Perrier, V., Vannier, J., Siveter, David J., 2011. Silurian bolbozoids and
1258 cypridinids (Myodocopa) from Europe: pioneer pelagic ostracods. Palaeontology,
1259 54(6), 1361-1391.

1260 Peterson, K.J., 2005. Macroevolutionary interplay between planktic larvae and
1261 benthic predators. Geology, 33(12), 929-932.

1262 Peterson, K.J., Lyons, J.B., Nowak, K.S., Takacs, C.M., Wargo, M.J., McPeck,
1263 M.A., 2004. Estimating metazoan divergence times with a molecular clock.

1264 Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America,
1265 101(17), 6536-6541.

1266 Peterson, K.J., McPeck, M.A., Evans, D.A., 2005. Tempo and mode of early
1267 animal evolution: inferences from rocks, Hox, and molecular clocks. *Paleobiology*,
1268 31(sp5), 36-55.

1269 Plotnick, R.E., 1986. Taphonomy of a modern shrimp: Implications for the
1270 arthropod fossil record. *Palaios*, 286-293.

1271 Poore, G.C., Bruce, N.L., 2012. Global diversity of marine isopods (except
1272 Asellota and crustacean symbionts). *PloS one*, 7(8), e43529.

1273 Porębska, E., Kozłowska-Dawidziuk, A., Masiak, M., 2004. The lundgreni event in
1274 the Silurian of the East European Platform, Poland. *Palaeogeography*,
1275 *Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 213(3), 271-294.

1276 Porter, M.L., Pérez-Losada, M., Crandall, K.A., 2005. Model-based multi-locus
1277 estimation of decapod phylogeny and divergence times. *Molecular phylogenetics and*
1278 *evolution*, 37(2), 355-369.

1279 Rigby, S., Milsom, C.V., 2000. Origins, evolution, and diversification of
1280 zooplankton. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 293-313.

1281 Rolfe, W.D., Dzik, J., 2006. *Angustidontus*, a Late Devonian pelagic predatory
1282 crustacean. *Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh: Earth Sciences*, 97(01),
1283 75-96.

1284 Rota-Stabelli, O., Daley, A.C., Pisani, D., 2013. Molecular timetrees reveal a
1285 Cambrian colonization of land and a new scenario for ecdysozoan evolution. *Current*
1286 *Biology*, 23(5), 392-398.

1287 Rudkin, D.M., Young, G.A., Elias, R.J., Dobrzanski, E.P. 2003. The world's
 1288 biggest trilobite - *Isotelus rex* new species from the Upper Ordovician of northern
 1289 Manitoba, Canada. *Journal Information*, 77(1).

1290 Ryves, D.B., Jewson, D.H., Sturm, M., Battarbee, R.W., Flower, R.J., Mackay,
 1291 A.W., Granin, N.G., 2003. Quantitative and qualitative relationships between
 1292 planktonic diatom communities and diatom assemblages in sedimenting material and
 1293 surface sediments in Lake Baikal, Siberia. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 48(4),
 1294 1643-1661.

1295 Samtleben, C., Schäfer, P., Andruleit, H., Baumann, A., Baumann, K.H., Kohly,
 1296 A., et al., 1995. Plankton in the Norwegian-Greenland Sea: from living communities
 1297 to sediment assemblages - an actualistic approach. *Geologische Rundschau*, 84(1),
 1298 108-136.

1299 Sarnelle, O. 2005. *Daphnia* as keystone predators: effects on phytoplankton
 1300 diversity and grazing resistance. *Journal of Plankton Research*, 27, 1229–1238.

1301 Schram, F.R., Hof, C.H.J. Mapes, R.H. Snowdon P., 2003. Paleozoic cumaceans
 1302 (Crustacea, Malacostraca, Peracarida) from North America. *Contribution to Zoology*
 1303 72(1): 1–16. <http://www.ctoz.nl/vol72,/nr01/a01>

1304 Selden, P.A., 1981. Functional morphology of the prosoma of *Baltoeurypterus*
 1305 *tetragonophthalmus* (Fischer)(Chelicerata: Eurypterida). *Transactions of the Royal*
 1306 *Society of Edinburgh: Earth Sciences*, 72(01), 9-48.

1307 Selden, P.A., 1984. Autecology of Silurian eurypterids. *Special Papers in*
 1308 *Palaeontology*, 32, 39-54.

1309 Selden, P.A., Huys, R., Stephenson, M.H., Heward, A.P., Taylor, P.N., 2010.
 1310 Crustaceans from bitumen clast in Carboniferous glacial diamictite extend fossil
 1311 record of copepods. *Nature communications*, 1, 50.

1312 Servais, T., Lehnert, O., Li, J., Mullins, G.L., Munnecke, A., Nuetzel, A., Vecoli,
 1313 M., 2008. The Ordovician Biodiversification: revolution in the oceanic trophic chain.
 1314 Lethaia, 41(2), 99-109.

1315 Servais, T., Harper, D.A.T., Munnecke, A., Owen, A.W., Sheehan, P.M., 2009.
 1316 Understanding the Great Ordovician Biodiversification Event (GOBE): Influences of
 1317 paleogeography, paleoclimate, or paleoecology. GSA Today, 19(4), 4-10.

1318 Servais, T., Owen, A.W., Harper, D.A.T., Kröger, B., Munnecke, A., 2010. The
 1319 great ordovician biodiversification event (GOBE): the palaeoecological dimension.
 1320 Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology, 294(3), 99-119.

1321 Shu, D., Vannier, J., Luo, H., Chen, L., Zhang, X., Hu, S., 1999. Anatomy and
 1322 lifestyle of *Kunmingella* (Arthropoda, Bradoriida) from the Chengjiang fossil
 1323 Lagerstätte (lower Cambrian; southwest China). Lethaia, 32(4), 279-298.

1324 Signor, P.W., Vermeij, G.J., 1994. The plankton and the benthos: origins and early
 1325 history of an evolving relationship. Paleobiology, 297-319.

1326 Siveter, David J., Williams M., 1997. Cambrian bradoriid and phosphatocopid
 1327 arthropods of North America. Special Papers in Palaeontology 57, 1-69.

1328 Siveter, David J., Briggs, D.E.G., Siveter, D.J., Sutton, M.D. 2010. An
 1329 exceptionally preserved myodocopid ostracod from the Silurian of Herefordshire, UK.
 1330 Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 277(1687), 1539-1544.

1331 Siveter, David J., Briggs, D.E.G., Siveter, Derek J., Sutton, M.D., Joomun, S.C.,
 1332 2013. A Silurian myodocope with preserved soft-parts: cautioning the interpretation
 1333 of the shell-based ostracod record. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological
 1334 Sciences, 280(1752), 20122664.

1335 Siveter, David J., Siveter, Derek J., Sutton, M.D., Briggs, D.E.G., 2007. Brood
 1336 care in a Silurian ostracod. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*,
 1337 274(1609), 465-469.

1338 Siveter, David J., Sutton, M.D., Briggs, D.E.G., Siveter, Derek J., 2003. An
 1339 ostracode crustacean with soft parts from the Lower Silurian. *Science*, 302(5651),
 1340 1749-1751.

1341 Siveter, David J., Tanaka, G., Farrell, Ú.C., Martin, M.J., Siveter, Derek J., Briggs,
 1342 D.E.G., 2014. Exceptionally Preserved 450-Million-Year-Old Ordovician Ostracods
 1343 with Brood Care. *Current Biology*, 24(7), 801-806.

1344 Siveter, David J., Vannier, J. Palmer, D., 1991. Silurian myodocopes: pioneer
 1345 pelagic ostracods and the chronology of an ecological shift. *Journal of*
 1346 *Micropalaeontology*, 10(2), 151-173.

1347 Speyer, S.E., Chatterton, B.D., 1989. Trilobite larvae and larval ecology. *Historical*
 1348 *Biology*, 3(1-2), 27-60.

1349 Stansbury, M.S., Moczek, A.P., 2013. The evolvability of arthropods, in: Minelli,
 1350 A., Boxshall, G., Fusco, G. (Eds), *Arthropod Biology and Evolution*. Springer, Berlin,
 1351 Heidelberg, pp. 479-493.

1352 Sterner, R.W., Elser, J.J., 2002. *Ecological stoichiometry: the biology of elements*
 1353 *from molecules to the biosphere*. Princeton University Press.

1354 Strathmann, R.R., 1993. Hypotheses on the origins of marine larvae. *Annual*
 1355 *Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 89-117.

1356 Suzuki, Y., Bergström, J., 2008. Respiration in trilobites: a reevaluation. *GFF*,
 1357 130(4), 211-229.

1358 Suzuki, Y., Kondo, A., Bergström, J., 2008. Morphological requirements in limulid
 1359 and decapod gills: A case study in deducing the function of lamellipedian exopod
 1360 lamellae. *Acta Palaeontologica Polonica*, 53(2), 275-283.

1361 Tanaka, H., Aoki, I., Ohshimo, S. 2006. Feeding habits and gill raker morphology
 1362 of three planktivorous pelagic fish species off the coast of northern and western
 1363 Kyushu in summer. *Journal of fish biology*, 68(4), 1041-1061.

1364 Taylor, R.S., Schram, F.R., Yan-Bin, S., 2001. A new Upper Middle Triassic
 1365 shrimp (Crustacea: Lophogastrida) from Guizhou, China, with discussion regarding
 1366 other fossil “mysidaceans”. *Journal Information*, 75(2).

1367 Tetlie, O.E., 2007. Distribution and dispersal history of Eurypterida (Chelicerata).
 1368 *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 252(3), 557-574.

1369 Turner, J.T., 1978. Scanning electron microscope investigations of feeding habits
 1370 and mouthpart structures of three species of copepods of the family Pontellidae.
 1371 *Bulletin of Marine Science*, 28(3), 487-500.

1372 Turner, J.T., 2002. Zooplankton faecal pellets, marine snow and sinking
 1373 phytoplankton blooms. *Aquatic Microbial Ecology*, 27(1), 57-102.

1374 Tyson, R.V., 1995. Sedimentary organic matter: organic facies and palynofacies.
 1375 Chapman and Hall, London

1376 Usami, Y., 2006. Theoretical study on the body form and swimming pattern of
 1377 *Anomalocaris* based on hydrodynamic simulation. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*,
 1378 238(1), 11-17.

1379 Van Roy, P., Briggs, D.E.G., 2011. A giant Ordovician anomalocaridid. *Nature*,
 1380 473(7348), 510-513.

1381 Van Waveren, I.M., 1994. Distribution of copepod egg-envelopes in sub-Recent
 1382 sediments from the Banda Sea (Indonesia). *Scripta Geologica*, 105, 53-67.

1383 Vannier, J., 2007. Early Cambrian origin of complex marine ecosystems, in:
 1384 Williams, M., Haywood, A.M., Gregory, F.J., Schmidt, D.N. (Eds), Deep time
 1385 perspectives on climate change. The Micropalaeontological Society. Geological
 1386 Society Publishing House, Bath, pp. 81–100.

1387 Vannier, J., Abe, K. 1993. Functional morphology and behavior of *Vargula*
 1388 *hilgendorffii* (Ostracoda: Myodocopida) from Japan, and discussion of its crustacean
 1389 ectoparasites: preliminary results from video recordings. Journal of Crustacean
 1390 Biology, 51-76.

1391 Vannier, J., Abe, K., 1995. Size, body plan and respiration in the Ostracoda.
 1392 Palaeontology, 38(4), 843-874.

1393 Vannier, J., Chen, J.Y., 2000. The Early Cambrian colonization of pelagic niches
 1394 exemplified by *Isoxys* (Arthropoda). Lethaia, 33(4), 295-311.

1395 Vannier, J., Chen, J.Y., 2005. Early Cambrian food chain: new evidence from
 1396 fossil aggregates in the Maotianshan Shale biota, SW China. Palaios, 20(1), 3-26.

1397 Vannier, J., Boissy, P., Racheboeuf, P.R., 1997a. Locomotion in *Nebalia bipes*: a
 1398 possible model for Palaeozoic phyllocarid crustaceans. Lethaia, 30(2), 89-104.

1399 Vannier, J., García-Bellido, D.C., Hu, S.X., Chen, A.L. 2009. Arthropod visual
 1400 predators in the early pelagic ecosystem: evidence from the Burgess Shale and
 1401 Chengjiang biotas. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences,
 1402 276(1667): 2567–2574.

1403 Vannier, J., Liu, J., Lerosey-Aubril, R., Vinther, J., Daley, A.C., 2014.
 1404 Sophisticated digestive systems in early arthropods. Nature communications, 5.

1405 Vannier, J., Racheboeuf, P.R., Brussa, E.D., Williams, M., Rushton, A.W., Servais,
 1406 T., Siveter, David J., 2003. Cosmopolitan arthropod zooplankton in the Ordovician
 1407 seas. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology, 195(1), 173-191.

1408 Vannier, J., Steiner, M., Renvoisé, E., Hu, S.X., Casanova, J.P., 2007. Early
 1409 Cambrian origin of modern food webs: evidence from predator arrow worms.
 1410 Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 274(1610), 627-633.

1411 Vannier, J., Williams, M., Siveter David, J. 1997b. The Cambrian origin of the
 1412 circulatory system of crustaceans. *Lethaia*, 30(3), 169-184.

1413 Vassel, N., Cox, C.D., Naseem, R., Morse, V., Evans, R.T., Power, R.L., et al.,
 1414 2012. Enzymatic activity of albumin shown by coelenterazine chemiluminescence.
 1415 Luminescence, 27(3), 234-241.

1416 Verity, P.G., Smetacek, V., 1996. Organism life cycles, predation, and the structure
 1417 of marine pelagic ecosystems. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 130.

1418 Vidal, G., Moczyłowska-Vidal, M., 1997. Biodiversity, speciation, and extinction
 1419 trends of Proterozoic and Cambrian phytoplankton. *Paleobiology*, 230-246.

1420 Vinther, J., Stein, M., Longrich, N.R., Harper, D.A.T., 2014. A suspension-feeding
 1421 anomalocarid from the Early Cambrian. *Nature*, 507(7493), 496-499.

1422 Von Bodungen, B., Antia, A., Bauerfeind, E., Haupt, O., Koeve, W., Machado, E.,
 1423 et al., 1995. Pelagic processes and vertical flux of particles: an overview of a long-
 1424 term comparative study in the Norwegian Sea and Greenland Sea. *Geologische*
 1425 *Rundschau*, 84(1), 11-27.

1426 Waggett, R.J. Buskey, E.J. 2008 Escape reaction performance of myelinated and
 1427 non-myelinated calanoid copepods. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and*
 1428 *Ecology*, 361, 111-118.

1429 Waloszek, D., Maas, A., 2005. The evolutionary history of crustacean
 1430 segmentation: a fossil-based perspective. *Evolution development*, 7(6), 515-527.

1431 Waloszek, D., Maas, A., Chen, J., Stein, M. 2007. Evolution of cephalic feeding
 1432 structures and the phylogeny of Arthropoda. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology,*
 1433 *Palaeoecology*, 254(1), 273-287.

1434 Watanuki, Y., Mori, Y., Naito, Y., 1994. *Euphausia superba* dominates in the diet
 1435 of Adélie penguins feeding under fast sea-ice in the shelf areas of Enderby Land in
 1436 summer. *Polar Biology*, 14(6), 429-432.

1437 Widder, E.A., 1999. Bioluminescence, in: Archer, S.N., Djarngoz, M.B.A., Loew,
 1438 E.R., Partridge, J.C., Vallerger, S. (Eds.), *Adaptive Mechanisms in the Ecology of*
 1439 *Vision*. Springer, Netherlands, pp. 555–581.

1440 Williams, M., Siveter, David J., 1998. British Cambrian and Tremadoc bradoriid
 1441 and phosphatocopid arthropods. *Monograph of the Palaeontographical Society*,
 1442 London, 152, 1-49.

1443 Williams, M., Siveter, David J., Popov, L.E., Vannier, J., 2007. Biogeography and
 1444 affinities of the bradoriid arthropods: cosmopolitan microbenthos of the Cambrian
 1445 seas. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 248(1), 202-232.

1446 Williams, M., Vandenbroucke, T.R.A., Perrier, V., Siveter, David J., Servais, T. In
 1447 press. A link in the chain of the Cambrian zooplankton: bradoriid arthropods invade
 1448 the water column. *Geological magazine*.

1449 Williams, M., Vannier, J., Corbari, L., Massabuau, J.C., 2011. Oxygen as a driver
 1450 of early arthropod micro-benthos evolution. *PloS one*, 6(12), e28183.

1451 Wills, M.A., Jenner, R.A., Dhubhghaill, C.N., 2009. Eumalacostracan evolution:
 1452 conflict between three sources of data. *Arthropod Systematics Phylogeny*, 67(1), 71-
 1453 90.

1454 Zhang, X.G., Maas, A., Haug, J.T., Siveter, David J., Waloszek, D., 2010. A
1455 eucrustacean metanauplius from the Lower Cambrian. *Current Biology*, 20(12), 1075-
1456 1079.

1457 Zhang, X.G., Siveter, David J., Waloszek, D., Maas, A. 2007. An epipodite-
1458 bearing crown-group crustacean from the Lower Cambrian. *Nature*, 449(7162), 595-
1459 598.

1460

Explanation of Tables

Table. 1. Summary of fossil and Recent arthropod zooplankton. See main text for references.

Explanation of figures

Fig. 1. Examples of Recent arthropod zooplankton.

(A) Myodocopid ostracod *Gigantocypris muelleri* (image from Creative Commons 3.0/M. Angel), frontal view, width about 15 mm.

(B) Halocyprid ostracod *Conchoecia imbricata* (image courtesy of J. Vannier), lateral view, length 3.75 mm.

(C) Detail of the integumental circulatory system of a myodocopid ostracod *Azygocypridina* sp., lateral view, length 4.05 mm.

(D) Cladoceran branchiopod *Daphnia pulex* (image from Creative Commons 2.5/P. Hebert), lateral view, length up to 4 mm.

(E) Calanoid copepod *Calanus marshallae* (image from Creative Commons 3.0/R. Hopcroft), dorsal view, length 4.10 mm.

(F) Cyclopoid copepod *Eucyclops speratus* (image from Creative Commons 2.0/Proyecto Agua), dorsal view, length 0.65 mm.

(G) Remiped *Speleonectes tanumekes* (image from Creative Commons 2.5/J. van der Ham, Nieber et al., 2011), dorsal view, length up to 27 mm.

(H) Phyllocarid malacostraca *Nebaliopsis* sp. (image courtesy of D. Shale), lateral view, length up to 40 mm.

(I) Decapod malacostraca Zoea larvae (image courtesy of N. le Bescot), oblique

1486 lateral view, length about 2 mm.

1487 (J) Hyperiid amphipod malacostraca *Hyperia macrocephala* (image from
1488 Creative Commons 3.0/U. Kils), lateral view, length up to 29 mm.

1489 (K) Lophogastrid malacostraca *Gnathophausia zoea* (image from Creative
1490 Commons 3.0/A. Semenov), lateral view, length up to 70 mm.

1491 (L) Euphausiid malacostraca *Euphausia superba* (image from Creative
1492 Commons 3.0/ U. Kils), lateral view, length up to 60 mm.

1493

1494 **Fig. 2.** *Possible timing of the origins of adaptations in arthropods.* Tree and
1495 taxa compiled from Legg et al. (2013) and Edgecombe and Legg (2014). Genera
1496 reconstructed modified as follows: *Anomalocaris* after J. Meszaros
1497 (<http://nocturnalsea.deviantart.com/>); *Nereocaris* after Legg et al. (2012);
1498 *Opipeuterella* and its swimming appendages after N. Jainschigg
1499 (<http://www.nickjainschigg.org/Trilobite.html>); *Parabolbozoe* after Perrier et al.
1500 (2011); reconstruction of swimming *Anomalocaris* after Usami (2006).

1501

1502 **Fig. 3.** *The fossil record and colonization events of arthropod zooplankton*
1503 *through the Phanerozoic and their relation to other major events in the evolution*
1504 *of the marine biosphere.* Tree and taxa compiled from Legg et al. (2013),
1505 Edgecombe and Legg (2014), Wills et al. (2009) and Porter et al. (2005). See main
1506 text for arthropod zooplankton fossil record. Radiations after the following authors:
1507 suspension feeders after Harper et al. (2009: brachiopods), Lefebvre et al. (2013:
1508 echinoderms) and Novack-Gottshall and Miller (2003: bivalves); acritarchs after
1509 Servais et al. (2008, 2010); cephalopods after Kröger et al. (2009); pelagic fish

after Blieck (2011); diatoms after Falkowski et al. (2004); baleen whales after Cavin (2010); penguins after Croxall et al. (1999).

Fig. 4. Examples of fossil arthropod zooplankton.

(A-C) Small carbonaceous fossils. Fossil crustacean mandibles from the middle and upper Cambrian Deadwood Formation and carbonaceous faecal strings from the middle Cambrian Little Bear biota, Canada (images courtesy of T. Harvey and N. Butterfield; Harvey and Butterfield, 2011, 2012); (A) Branchiopod-type mandibles from the Riley Lake assemblage; length about 200 μm ; (B) Copepod-type mandibles from the Riley Lake assemblage; length about 250 μm ; (C) Carbonaceous faecal strings, length about 700 μm (inset: acritarchs, 5-6 μm diameter).

(D) Radiodonta *Anomalocaris canadensis*, predatory frontal appendage (GSC 45308), from the middle Cambrian Burgess Shale Lagerstätte, Canada (images courtesy of A. Daley); lateral view; length about 110 mm.

(E) Radiodonta *Tamisiocaris borealis*, filtering frontal appendage (MGUH 30500), from the lower Cambrian Sirius Passet Lagerstätte, North Greenland (images courtesy of J. Vinther; Vinther et al., 2014); lateral view; length about 115 mm.

(F) Bivalved arthropod *Isoxys actuangulus* (ROM 57898A) from the middle Cambrian Burgess Shale Lagerstätte, Canada (images courtesy of J. Vannier); lateral view; length about 50 mm.

(G) Agnostid trilobite *Ptychagnostus gibbus* from the middle Cambrian Wheeler shale, Utah, USA, (image from Creative Commons 3.0 /Dwergenpaartje); dorsal view; length about 5 mm.

1535 (H) Eurypterid *Eurypterus remipes* from the Silurian Fiddlers Green Formation,
1536 New York, USA (image from Creative Commons 1.0 /Daderot); dorsal view;
1537 length up to 200 mm.

1538 (I) Reconstruction of the gilled lobopodian *Opabinia regalis* from the middle
1539 Cambrian Burgess Shales Lagerstätte, Canada (image from Creative Commons
1540 3.0/N. Tamura); oblique lateral view; length up to 100 mm.

1541 (J) Reconstruction of the bivalved arthropod *Nereocaris exilis* from the middle
1542 Cambrian Burgess Shales Lagerstätte, Canada (modified after Legg et al., 2012);
1543 lateral view; length up to 140 mm.

1544 (K) Reconstruction of the malacostracan *Angustidontus seriatus* from the Upper
1545 Devonian (Famennian) Woodruff Formation, Nevada, USA (modified after Rolf
1546 and Dzik, 2006); lateral view; length up to 100 mm.

1547 (L) Reconstruction of the trilobite *Telephina* from the Upper Ordovician
1548 (modified after Fortey, 1985); dorsal view; length up to 30 mm.

1549 (M) Hyperthrophied eyes of the trilobite *Pricyclopyge binodosa* (NHM I
1550 15232) from the Middle Ordovician Šárka Formation, Bohemia, Czech republic
1551 (modified after Fortey and Owens, 1999); frontal view; width about 15 mm.

1552 (N-O) Anaprotaspid larva of proetoid trilobite (UM2-RLA4) from the lower
1553 Carboniferous (Tournaisian) Griotte Formation, Montagne Noire, southern France
1554 (image courtesy of R. Lerosey-Aubril; Lerosey-Aubril and Feist, 2005); (N) dorsal
1555 view; (O) ventral view; length about 650 µm.

1556 (P) Bradoriid *Anabaroichilina primordialis* (SGU 8622) from the middle
1557 Cambrian Alum Shale Formation, Sweden (Williams et al., *in press*); lateral view;
1558 length 8.9 mm.

1559 (Q) Myodocopid ostracod *Luprisca incubata* (YPM 237107) from the Upper

1560 Ordovician (Katian) Beecher's Trilobite Bed, New York, USA (Siveter et al.,
1561 2014); latero-dorsal view; length 3.4 mm.

1562 (R) Myodocopid ostracod *Pauline avibella* (OUMNH C.29613) from the Lower
1563 Silurian (Wenlock) Herefordshire Lagerstätte, UK (Siveter et al., 2012); lateral
1564 view of soft parts (carapace omitted), digital reconstruction with different colors
1565 corresponding to each appendage; length 10.2 mm.

1566 (S) Myodocopid ostracod *Parabolbozoe armoricana* (FSL 710401) from the
1567 Silurian (Wenlock/Ludlow) Lande Murée Formation, France (Perrier et al., 2011);
1568 lateral view; length 8 mm.

1569

1570 **Fig. 5.** *Taphonomy of Recent and fossil arthropod zooplankton.* Based on
1571 literature on Recent and fossil arthropods (e.g., Collette and Hagadorn, 2010), as
1572 cited in the text.

1573

1574 **Fig. 6.** *Schematic comparison of the position of key arthropod zooplankton in*
1575 *simplified Recent and Early Palaeozoic pelagic food webs.* Both pyramids and
1576 drawings are based on a compilation of available data for the period of time
1577 considered and do not imply that these animals were co-occurring in the same
1578 horizons. Plankton sizes after Omori and Ikeda (1984).