

1 *Journal of Fish Biology* (XXXX) **XX**, XXX-XXX

2

3

4 **Investigating trophic level variability**
5 **in Celtic Sea fish predators**

6

7 E. CHASSOT^{*†}, T. ROUYER^{*‡}, V. M. TRENKEL[†] AND D. GASCUEL^{*}

8

9 **Agrocampus Rennes, Pôle Halieutique, Laboratoire d'Ecologie Halieutique, 65*
10 *rue de St-Brieuc, C. S. 84215, 35042 Rennes cedex, France, ‡Ifremer, CRH,*
11 *Boulevard Jean Monnet, B. P. 171, 34203 Sète Cedex and †Ifremer, Département*
12 *EMH, B. P. 21105, 44311 Nantes Cedex 03, France*

13

14 *(Received 30 October 2007, Accepted XX XXXX 2008)*

15

16 The trophic level (T_L) mean and variance, and the degree of omnivory for five
17 Celtic Sea fish predators were estimated using a database of stomach content
18 records characterized by a high level of taxonomic resolution. The predators
19 occupied a high position in the food web, *i.e.* 4.75 for Atlantic cod *Gadus*

[†]Author to whom correspondence should be addressed. IRD, CRH, Boulevard Jean Monnet, B. P. 171, 34203 Sète Cedex, France. Tel.: +33 4 99 57 32 24; fax: +33 4 99 57 32 95; email: Emmanuel.Chassot@ird.fr

1 *morhua*, 4.44 for haddock *Melanogrammus aeglefinus*, 4.88 for European hake
2 *Merluccius merluccius*, 5.00 for megrim *Lepidorhombus whiffiagonis* and 5.27 for
3 whiting (*Merlangius merlangus*). The level of taxonomic resolution of the prey
4 did not greatly affect mean T_L predator values; an effect on variance was evident,
5 low resolution masking intra-population variability in T_L . Generalized additive
6 models were used to explain the variability of predator T_L caused by
7 environmental variables (ICES subdivision, season) and predator characteristics
8 (length). Significant year, location, season, and interaction effects were found for
9 some species and with length at the scale of ICES subdivision. The species
10 specific variability of T_L could be due to spatio-temporal variations in prey
11 availability and/or in predator selectivity following ontogenetic changes.
12 Omnivorous fish T_L was less affected by spatio-temporal variations. In addition,
13 results showed that the omnivory index and T_L variability provide dissimilar
14 information on predator feeding strategy. Combining information on T_L variability
15 and omnivory allowed us to separate between within-individual and between-
16 individual components contributing to trophic niche width and to identify the type
17 of generalization of fish predators.

18

19 Running headline: Trophic level variability

20 Key words: food web, GAM, indicator, omnivory, predation, trophic level

21

22

23

24

INTRODUCTION

The trophic level (T_L) reflects the position of an organism, species, population, or trophic group within the food web as it traces the path lengths for energy in an ecosystem (Lindeman, 1942). T_L plays a major role in theoretical and applied ecology (Post, 2002; Williams & Martinez, 2004) and appears relevant for an ecosystem approach to fisheries management (EAF; Garcia *et al.*, 2003). In particular, T_L constitutes the basis for the measurement of several indicators for evaluating the ecosystem effects of fishing (Pauly *et al.*, 1998, 2000; Gascuel *et al.*, 2005; Stergiou *et al.*, 2007). Among the six trophodynamic indicators selected by Cury *et al.* (2005) in an EAF perspective, three are based on T_L values: primary production required to support catches, mean T_L of the catch and the Fishing-In-Balance index. In addition, the mean T_L of the catch has been proposed as a measure of biodiversity, following the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (Pauly & Watson, 2005). All these indicators are generally calculated based on mean T_L values for each species that are either provided by FishBase, or derived from stomach content analyses or applications of Ecopath models (Christensen & Pauly, 1992). Mean T_L values, averaged over time and area, may conceal potentially high T_L variability associated with food web dynamics (*e.g.* Greenstreet *et al.*, 1997) and ontogenetic changes.

T_L results from the predation process and depends on the combination of different factors that determine prey availability and vulnerability (Sih & Christensen, 2001) including predator morphological and behavioural characteristics (Mérigoux & Ponton,

1 1998; Karpouzi & Stergiou, 2003). For a given species, diet composition has notably
2 been shown to vary with time (Albert, 1995; Adlerstein & Welleman, 2000), season (du
3 Buit, 1995, 1996; Cabral & Murta, 2002) and predator length through ontogenetic
4 changes (Stergiou & Karpouzi, 2002; Pinnegar *et al.*, 2003). Hence, T_{LS} are expected to
5 display spatio-temporal variations according to fish age or length. In addition, estimates
6 of T_{LS} based on stomach content data rely on the T_L values assigned to the prey and the
7 level of taxonomic resolution of the prey. Therefore, it is important to study the relative
8 contribution of different sources of variability of T_L to understand how T_L -based
9 indicators are sensitive to fish feeding behaviours and ecosystem characteristics in
10 addition to fishing.

11

12 In the present analysis, the amount and sources of T_L variability is investigated for a
13 selection of representative predator fish species in the Celtic Sea, Atlantic cod (*Gadus*
14 *morhua* L.), haddock (*Melanogrammus aeglefinus* L.), European hake (*Merluccius*
15 *merluccius* L.), megrim (*Lepidorhombus whiffiagonis* W.) and whiting (*Merlangius*
16 *merlangus* L.). The feeding habits of these five predator species greatly differ and they all
17 have been shown to display, to varying extents, ontogenetic and/or spatio-temporal
18 variations in diet (*e.g.* Hislop *et al.*, 1991; Hop *et al.*, 1992; Jiang & Jorgensen, 1996;
19 Morte *et al.*, 1999; Carpentieri *et al.*, 2005; Guichet 1995). Such changes might be
20 reflected in their T_L and omnivory.

21

22 This paper follows the works of Pinnegar *et al.* (2003) and Trenkel *et al.* (2005) who
23 studied the relationships between prey availability and predator diets, and the spatio-
24 temporal structure of predator-prey relationships in the Celtic Sea. The main outcome of

1 the first analysis (Pinnegar *et al.*, 2003) was that the diet of predator species changed as
2 the animals grew larger, but generally did not reflect fish prey availability. This analysis
3 provided evidence of the existence of interannual changes in prey importance and strong
4 prey preferences in certain predators. By contrast, the results of the second study (Trenkel
5 *et al.*, 2005) suggested spatial and seasonal prey-switching behaviour by some fish
6 predators and concluded that the Celtic Sea fish community is globally characterized by
7 opportunistic predators and weak interspecific predator interactions. In the present study,
8 knowledge of feeding relationships in the Celtic Sea was used to address the following
9 objectives: (1) estimate the T_L for the 5 predators and the corresponding T_L variance, (2)
10 investigate predator T_L sensitivity to prey T_L and level of taxonomic resolution, and (3)
11 identify, quantify and order the factors that affect T_L by species to better understand the
12 sensitivity of this indicator to species ecological features and food web dynamics.

13

14

MATERIALS AND METHODS

15

16 STOMACH CONTENT DATA

17

18 Fish stomachs were collected from 1981 to 1985 aboard nine French commercial
19 trawlers during routine fishing operations in the Celtic Sea (Fig. 1). Samples were briefly
20 investigated and only 'full' stomachs were preserved in seawater containing 10% formalin
21 (du Buit, 1982, 1992, 1995, 1996). Empty stomachs and those with partially regurgitated
22 or unidentifiable contents were excluded. Time period (day, month, year), fishing depth
23 (m), and International Council for the Exploration of the Sea (ICES) subdivision where
24 the fish were caught were recorded. Prey items were identified and sorted into taxonomic

1 groups, to the species level whenever possible. The state of digestion of the prey was not
2 considered in the analysis. For the selected dataset of stomachs, 57 prey taxa were
3 identified at the species level, 32 were identified at the genus level and prey items that
4 could not be identified beyond the sub-order level were pooled into broad taxonomic
5 group levels, *i.e.* polychaete, echinoderm, cnidarian, cephalopod, mollusc (other than
6 cephalopod), crustacean and fish. For each stomach, predator total length (cm), prey
7 number, prey identity and prey weight (g) were recorded.

8

9 Because the original sampling scheme was not randomized or random-stratified over
10 space and time, in the present analysis, only fish sampled in years 1981, 1983, 1984, and
11 1985 and in ICES subdivisions VIIg and VIIIh were considered in order to 'rebalance' the
12 sampling design. This resulted in a total of 3271 stomachs sampled, *i.e.* 829 for Atlantic
13 cod 24-116 cm in length, 403 for haddock 24-83 cm in length, 682 for hake 25-95 cm in
14 length, 749 for megrim 20-63 cm in length and 608 for whiting 20-60 cm in length.
15 Despite 'rebalancing' sample sizes varied from year to year and between subdivisions
16 (Table I).

17

18 PREY TROPHIC LEVELS

19

20 Stable isotope methods rely on the consistent enrichment of the stable nitrogen
21 isotope, ^{15}N (3.4 ± 0.3 per mil), between prey and predator (Minagawa & Wada, 1984;
22 Owens, 1987), allowing its use as a measure of an organism's continuous trophic position.
23 Mean T_L values of prey were extracted from a literature review of stable isotopes in the
24 North Sea, Celtic Sea and Bay of Biscay (Jennings *et al.*, 2002a,b; Pinnegar *et al.*, 2002;

1 Le Loc'h, 2004). When the T_L -size relationship was available (Jennings *et al.*, 2002a) T_L s
 2 assigned to fish prey were estimated corresponding to the median prey length of fish
 3 predators (Pinnegar *et al.*, 2003). For prey identified at a broad taxonomic group level,
 4 the mean T_L was calculated as the arithmetic mean of the values obtained from isotopic
 5 ratios for species belonging to this group. 'Cnidarians' were assigned the mean T_L ($T_L =$
 6 2.5) value available in FishBase (<http://www.fishbase.org>; Froese & Pauly, 2005)
 7 because no information was available for this group based on stable isotope methods.

8

9 The impact of the level of taxonomic resolution on estimates of predator T_L was
 10 investigated replacing the T_L of each prey by the T_L of their broad taxonomic group level,
 11 *i.e.* cephalopod, cnidarian, crustacean, echinoderm, fish, mollusc (other than cephalopod)
 12 and polychaete. Sensitivity of predator T_L s to prey T_L s was also analysed based on T_L
 13 values extracted from the FishBase database (www.fishbase.org; Froese & Pauly, 2005).
 14 Non-parametric Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney tests were performed in both cases to analyse
 15 differences between T_L distributions.

16

17 PREDATOR TROPHIC LEVELS AND OMNIVORY

18

19 The T_L of each individual sampled was calculated as the sum of its prey T_L , weighted
 20 by their relative importance in the stomach following Adams *et al.* (1983):

21

$$22 \quad T_{L_{jl}} = 1 + \sum_{i=1}^{n_{jl}} \rho_{ijl} \times \overline{T_{L_i}} \quad (1)$$

23

1 where ρ_{ijl} represents the relative biomass of prey i in the stomach of individual l of
 2 predator species j , *i.e.* the relative weight of food i in the stomach, n_{jl} is the number of
 3 prey in the stomach of individual l of predator species j and $\overline{T_{L_i}}$ is the mean T_L of prey i .

4

5 T_{Lj} s estimated for the five predator species of interest were compared on the one hand
 6 with values estimated by stable isotope methods in the Celtic Sea and in the North Sea
 7 (Pinnegar *et al.*, 2002; Jennings *et al.*, 2002a) and on the other hand with values
 8 available in different areas of the world extracted from the FishBase database
 9 (<http://www.fishbase.org>; Froese & Pauly, 2005).

10

11 Omnivory indices (O_I) of each individual sampled were also computed following
 12 Christensen & Pauly (1992):

13

$$14 \quad O_{I_{jl}} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_{jl}} \rho_{ijl} \times (T_{L_{ijl}} - T_{L_{jl}})^2 \quad (2)$$

15

16 where $T_{L_{jl}}$ is the predator T_L computed from equation (1). O_I describes the range of T_{Lj} s
 17 consumed and weights each prey item by its relative biomass in the stomach. The square
 18 root of O_I has been proposed as a preliminary estimate of the standard deviation of T_L
 19 (Christensen & Pauly, 1992). Non-parametric Wilcoxon Mann-Whitney tests were
 20 performed to analyse differences between O_I distributions.

21

22 IDENTIFYING SOURCES OF VARIABILITY IN TROPHIC LEVEL VALUES

23

1 Generalized additive models (GAMs) were used to investigate the variability of T_L
2 over space and time and according to predator length. GAMs are non-parametric
3 generalizations of multiple linear regressions (Hastie & Tibschirani, 1990). In particular,
4 GAM fitting methods do not rely on a rigid parametric shape, expressing the dependence
5 between the response variable and the covariates, but on local smoothers. Individual
6 predator T_{Lj} s computed from equation (1) were modeled as a function of year, ICES
7 subdivision, season and predator length. ICES subdivision was used to represent distinct
8 areas assumed to characterize various types of habitat where prey availability changes.
9 Season was modeled as a factor, *i.e.* winter, spring, summer, and autumn, and predator
10 length (in cm) as a continuous variable. Interaction effects were tested when possible.
11 The general form of the model fitted for each predator species j and without interaction
12 was then:

13

$$14 \quad T_{Lj} = s_j(\text{length}) + \text{year} + \text{subdivision} + \text{season}$$

15

16 where T_L is the trophic level and $s_j(\cdot)$ represents a smooth function (regression spline) for
17 species j . Model fitting and automatic selection of the degrees of freedom for the
18 regression splines, were performed using the generalized cross-validation method based
19 on minimising the jackknifed squared prediction error in the *mgcv* package in R (R
20 Development Core Team, 2007) as described in Wood & Augustin (2002). The
21 assumption of Gaussian error distributions was checked through the residuals. Selection
22 of the 'best' model was based upon the Akaike information criterion (AIC). For each
23 species, the AIC and percentage of deviance explained by each factor and covariate kept

1 in the 'best' model were also given. The residuals in each GAM were used as a measure of
2 T_L intra-population variability.

3

4

RESULTS

5

TROPHIC POSITION IN THE CELTIC SEA

6

7
8 The distributions of estimated individual T_L values were rather asymmetric for all
9 predator species (Fig. 2). All five species exhibited a range of T_{LS} in the size range
10 sampled: 3.81-5.88 for Atlantic cod, 3.50-5.95 for haddock, 4.02-6.08 for hake, 3.88-5.95
11 for megrim, and 3.99-5.95 for whiting. T_L values estimated in the present study showed
12 that the five species had a high position in the food web, the highest value of mean T_L
13 being 5.27 for whiting (Fig 3). T_L standard deviations were relatively similar for the five
14 species, the values ranging from 0.44 for Atlantic cod to 0.69 for hake (Fig. 3).

15

16 Estimated mean T_L for the five predator species were higher than those available from
17 FishBase (Fig. 3). T_L estimates were also higher than values estimated from stable
18 isotope methods in the Celtic Sea except for whiting (Fig. 3). The discrepancy was
19 particularly important for haddock, hake and megrim with differences in T_L values close
20 or higher than 1 T_L , *i.e.* 0.88, 0.73 and 1.09 respectively. Differences were less marked
21 with T_L estimated from stable isotope methods in the North Sea (Fig. 3).

22

SENSITIVITY OF TROPHIC LEVEL ESTIMATES

23
24

1 The level of taxonomic resolution used for prey had impacts on estimates of predator
2 T_L (Fig. 4a). Predator T_L s based on prey groups were significantly lower than T_L s based
3 on a high taxonomic resolution for Atlantic cod ($P < 0.001$), megrim ($P < 0.01$), and
4 whiting ($P < 0.001$) and significantly higher for hake ($P < 0.001$). Although significant,
5 the differences between mean estimates of T_L were small, *i.e.* less than 0.1 for Atlantic
6 cod and hake, 0.12 and 0.35 for megrim and whiting respectively. Estimates of the T_L of
7 haddock were not modified by a decrease in the level of prey taxonomic resolution. By
8 contrast, standard deviations of the T_L were strongly modified and significantly higher for
9 the 5 species when considering a high level of taxonomic resolution.

10

11 Values of T_L assigned to the prey strongly affected estimates of predator T_L (Fig. 4b).
12 Predator T_L based on prey T_L derived from FishBase were significantly lower than T_L
13 estimates based on T_L s derived from stable isotope methods ($P < 0.001$). These results
14 show that prey T_L s are important to estimate mean values of predator T_L and that the level
15 of resolution attained during stomach content analysis is essential for analysis of T_L
16 variability.

17

18 MODELLING TROPHIC LEVEL VARIABILITY

19

20 The covariates explaining T_L varied between species (Table II). The total deviance
21 explained by the 'best' models was high for hake and megrim, 43.3% and 26.1%
22 respectively, while it was 13.1%, 11.3%, and 5.9% for whiting, haddock, and Atlantic
23 cod respectively (Table II). Comparison between the deviance of the 'best' models and the

1 deviance explained by the different covariates or factors individually showed that there
2 were confounded effects, particularly for hake and megrim.

3

4 Considering the 'best' model, significant year and season effects were found for all
5 species except Atlantic cod (Table II). This indicated interannual and seasonal variations
6 in T_L due to changes in types or relative proportions of prey consumed. Year and season
7 effects differed between species. For instance, haddock showed estimates of T_L higher in
8 subdivision VIIg in 1983 ($T_L = 4.63$) than in 1981 ($T_L = 4.40$) whereas hake showed an
9 overall negative effect on T_L in 1983 relative to 1981 ($-0.44 T_L$) and the highest T_L for
10 hake was observed in spring 1985 in subdivision VIIIh ($T_L = 5.72$). Year-to-year changes
11 in species specific T_L led to variations in the rank of their position occupied within the
12 food web. For instance, megrim was the 'top-predator' in subdivision VIIg in spring 1983,
13 followed by whiting, Atlantic cod, haddock and hake. As hake's T_L increased from 1983
14 to 1985 and whiting and haddock's T_L s decreased throughout this period, in spring 1985
15 hake occupied a higher position than haddock and Atlantic cod, and a similar position as
16 whiting.

17

18 Subdivision effects were also found to vary between Celtic sea fish predators. The
19 overall effect of subdivision VIIIh was positive for hake ($+0.53 T_L$) and negative for
20 megrim ($-0.34 T_L$) relative to their respective GAM intercepts.

21

22 A subdivision effect in interaction with year or season was found significant for
23 haddock, hake and megrim. For hake, a positive effect was found in autumn 1981 in

1 subdivision VIIg (+0.14 T_L relative to spring) whereas a negative season effect was found
2 for autumn in subdivision VIIIh (-0.22 T_L relative to spring). For megrim, the 1985 effect
3 was found positive (+0.2 T_L) in subdivision VIIIh whereas it was negative in subdivision
4 VIIg. Hence, temporal changes in T_{LS} for the Celtic Sea fish predators were not similar
5 among habitats defined here by the ICES subdivisions.

6

7 Length was significant for all species except haddock. T_L increased with body length
8 for Atlantic cod and megrim, and for hake from a 50 cm length (Fig. 5). Maximum
9 changes in T_L predicted by the GAMs for the range of length observed were +0.43,
10 +0.45, +0.80, and -0.21 T_L for Atlantic cod, hake, megrim, and whiting respectively. For
11 whiting, no clear relationship was found, though there might be an indication of a
12 decreasing pattern of T_L with length over the size range 30-60 cm.

13

14 TROPHIC LEVEL VARIABILITY AND OMNIVORY INDEX

15

16 Overall GAM results showed that T_L standard deviation reflected on the one hand T_L
17 variations due to differences in area or season, and on the other hand between-individual
18 (intra-population) variations. T_L intra-population variability, derived from GAM
19 residuals, was higher for megrim and hake (0.47 and 0.40 respectively) than for haddock
20 (0.37), and Atlantic cod and whiting that showed a similar value of 0.30. Results on T_L
21 intra-population variability differed from information provided by the omnivory indices.
22 O_I distributions were highly skewed and characterized by a high proportion of 0 values
23 corresponding to predators with only 1 type of prey in their stomach (Fig. 6). Statistical
24 tests showed that O_I distributions were significantly different ($P < 0.001$) in all cases.

1 Atlantic cod and haddock were the most omnivorous fish with mean values of O_I equal to
2 0.054 and 0.041, respectively. Hake and whiting were less omnivorous than Atlantic cod
3 and haddock with mean O_I s of 0.017 and 0.012 respectively and megrim was the least
4 omnivorous predator with a mean O_I of 0.008.

5
6 Megrim's diet could then be characterized by a high between-individual variability of
7 T_{LS} with most of the individuals preying upon a small range of T_{LS} at any given time. By
8 contrast, Atlantic cod showed a lower T_L variability but individual fish tended to
9 consume on average a larger range of T_{LS} . In other terms, it was shown that Atlantic cod
10 dietary niche width was mainly explained by generalist individuals all taking a wide
11 range of food types (Type A generalization) whereas the larger dietary niche width for
12 megrim resulted from individuals specializing on a different but narrow range of food
13 types (Type B generalization). Whiting displayed both a low T_L variability and a low
14 degree of omnivory, suggesting it was the most specialist species among the 5 predators.
15 Haddock and hake appeared in intermediate positions in terms of both T_L variability and
16 omnivory.

17

18 **DISCUSSION**

19

20 The T_L of five major predator species of the Celtic Sea was estimated based on a
21 database of food stomachs collected in the early 1980s and characterized by a high level
22 of taxonomic resolution (> 150 prey taxa), and using mean values of prey T_{LS} derived
23 from a literature review of stable isotope analyses in adjacent seas. Predator T_{LS} differed

1 from values available in the literature or available from FishBase. The source of T_L
2 values assigned to the prey was found to potentially strongly affect predator T_L ,
3 depending on the species of interest. The level of taxonomic resolution of the prey did not
4 greatly affect mean values of predator T_{LS} but did affect T_L variance, low resolution
5 masking intra-population variability in T_L . In addition and assuming that stable isotopes
6 correctly reflect prey T_{LS} , results provided evidence for high variability of T_{LS} in space
7 and time, and with length at the scale of ICES subdivision. The species specific
8 variability of T_L would be due to spatio-temporal variations in prey availability and/or in
9 predator selectivity following ontogenetic changes (see below). Our findings also show
10 that information available from T_L variability and omnivory is complementary and
11 adequate to describe ecological features of fish predators such as generalization type.

12

13 ESTIMATING TROPHIC LEVELS

14

15 Although stomach content data are submitted to specific limits such as differential
16 digestion rates and tissue digestibility (Hyslop, 1980), the use of stomach content data
17 allowed us to investigate T_L variability on relatively short time (season) and small spatial
18 scales (ICES subdivision) as they reflect food present in the stomach over the digestion
19 period. Prey digestion state could not be considered in the present analysis because
20 information was generally missing. Gastric evacuation models might improve estimates
21 of consumption rates but were not tested here (Andersen, 2001).

22

23 The level of taxonomic resolution reached during stomach content analysis depends on
24 the objectives of the study and can be low for pragmatic (*e.g.* time restriction for

1 identification) or ecological (*e.g.* rapid digestion) reasons. Effects of taxonomic
2 resolution on mean T_L values were rather low and differed between predator species. On
3 the contrary, taxonomic resolution strongly affected T_L standard deviations. Observed
4 trophic levels as well as other major food web patterns have been shown to be sensitive to
5 the level of resolution data (Martinez, 1991). In this context, high taxonomic resolution of
6 prey, as in our dataset, is a major prerequisite for analysis of species specific T_L
7 variability.

8

9 Mean T_{LS} assigned to prey in equation (1) also have a strong impact on predator T_{LS}
10 and are therefore of major concern for ecosystem analyses based on T_L -based indicators.
11 It was assumed here that isotope values correctly characterise the T_L of the prey animals
12 although some studies have shown that they may vary with size due to ontogenetic
13 changes (Hentschel, 1998). The use of mean values for prey T_L constitutes the classic
14 approach to estimate predator T_L following equation (1) and the standard deviation of
15 prey T_{LS} were generally low in the samples of Pinnegar *et al.* (2002), Jennings *et al.*
16 (2002b) and Le Loc'h (2004). Prey T_{LS} used were thus considered as the best current
17 information available to analyse the variability of predator T_{LS} . Using prey T_{LS} derived
18 from stable isotopes of nitrogen allowed us to avoid the use of default values for prey T_{LS}
19 currently used in FishBase except for cnidarians and allowed us to assign mean T_L values
20 for small invertebrate prey groups for which diets are generally poorly known.
21 Application of stable isotope methods to estimate cnidarians T_L in the European seas
22 would allow better quantifying their T_L for future analyses. In addition, the use of mean
23 prey T_{LS} provided by isotope methods seems consistent for the estimation of predator T_{LS}

1 because they integrate prey diet over a period ranging from a few months to one year,
2 depending on the turn-over rate of the tissues (O'Reilly *et al.*, 2002). Recent work has
3 however suggested that the assumption of average enrichment of 3.4 per mil, may be
4 problematic as isotopic fractionation can be impacted by feeding rate, nitrogen content of
5 the food, excretion rate and assimilation efficiency (*e.g.* Olive *et al.*, 2003). Such
6 validation has however not been completed in a complex open sea food web and Post
7 (2002) has shown using a comparative cross-system analysis that the mean fractionation
8 of $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ is remarkably constant among trophic levels in many species. On the basis of the
9 currently 'best' values of prey T_L available, species specific T_L estimates relevant at the
10 scale of the Celtic Sea were thus provided.

11
12 Predator T_L s estimated in this study were generally higher than estimates obtained by
13 Pinnegar *et al.* (2002) using stable isotopes. The differences between our estimates and
14 T_L s derived from $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ data are difficult to interpret regarding the assumptions made in
15 both methods. Among other causes, this could be inherent to the nominal 'baseline'
16 organisms with known T_L used to estimate prey T_L s in stable isotope analyses. If the
17 'baseline' is wrong then all values will be shifted upwards or downwards incorrectly. The
18 low sample size used by Pinnegar *et al.* (2002), whose study mainly focused on large
19 fishes, could also be responsible for the underestimation observed in predator T_L
20 estimates.

21
22 T_L s estimated in the present analysis were higher than FishBase values. These
23 differences can result both from the T_L s assigned to the prey and to the predator size-

1 range sampled. Prey T_{LS} used were based on a review of stable isotope methods that
2 showed that default values available for species groups from FishBase (bivalves,
3 cephalopods, crustaceans, echinoderms and polychaetes) were always underestimated.

4

5 FACTORS INFLUENCING TROPHIC LEVEL VARIABILITY

6

7 T_L values were found to vary with respect to different variables according to the
8 predator species considered. Deviance explained by GAMs was the lowest for Atlantic
9 cod and haddock that displayed the most omnivorous feeding strategy. This could suggest
10 that spatio-temporal changes in prey abundance and composition in the ecosystem might
11 affect omnivorous species less than more specialist predators.

12

13 ICES subdivision was used here to characterize distinct habitats described by
14 differences in prey availability and/or composition. It was shown that T_L could
15 significantly vary at the scale of ICES subdivision for haddock, hake, and megrim.
16 Atlantic cod did not show significant change in T_L between ICES subdivisions although
17 they are generalist predators that have been shown to display variations in diet according
18 to area (du Buit, 1995; Hanson & Chouinard, 2002; Link & Garrison, 2002). The type A
19 generalization (Van Valen, 1965) observed for Atlantic cod could explain that spatial
20 variations in diet composition were not reflected in T_L as Atlantic cod consumed a wide
21 diversity of prey in each area of the Celtic Sea. No significant spatial effect on T_L was
22 found for whiting whereas they were found to show geographical differences in diet
23 composition in the North Sea and the Sea of Marmara (Hislop *et al.*, 1991; Artüz, 2005).
24 In the Celtic Sea, whiting mainly consumed fish prey such as sprat (*Sprattus sprattus*),

1 *Trisopterus* spp., and blue whiting (*Micromesistius poutassou*) that are distributed all
2 over the area. This could explain the absence of variations in T_L between ICES
3 subdivisions. In operational terms for an EAF, showing significant spatial variations in T_L
4 for particular species emphasizes the need to consider ecosystem specific predator T_L .
5 Considering spatialized T_L s would seem of major importance for specialist predators with
6 prey showing a limited geographic distribution.

7
8 Hake have been shown to display large seasonal diet variations in the Bay of Biscay
9 (Guichet, 1995) but not in the Cantabrian Sea (Velasco & Olaso, 1998). Major prey of
10 hake, *i.e.* blue whiting (*Micromesistius poutassou*), mackerel (*Scomber scombrus*) and
11 horse mackerel (*Trachurus trachurus*) were found to be consumed in accordance with
12 their higher densities in the Celtic Sea (Pinnegar *et al.*, 2003; Trenkel *et al.*, 2005).
13 Megrim has also been shown to consume more blue-whiting when this prey was at higher
14 abundance in the environment (Pinnegar *et al.*, 2003; Trenkel *et al.*, 2005). Density
15 related prey selection seems therefore to explain seasonal changes in T_L for hake and
16 megrim. For hake, the interaction effect between season and subdivision showed that
17 seasonal changes in T_L could vary according to area. The diet of whiting has also been
18 shown to display seasonal variations, with some prey such as sandeel (*Ammodytes* spp.)
19 being more prominent in whiting diets during the summer, which coincided with their
20 peak abundance (Greenstreet *et al.*, 1998).

21
22 The absence of a seasonal effect for haddock was not expected as different studies
23 have evidenced considerable seasonal variation in their diet (Jiang & Jorgensen, 1996,

1 Greenstreet *et al.*, 1998; Adlerstein *et al.*, 2002). These variations might not be reflected
2 in terms of T_L for haddock as they are omnivorous fish and their diet is mostly composed
3 of echinoderms, molluscs and polychaetes that were assigned similar T_L values
4 comprised between 3.0 and 3.4. This could indicate that although there are marked
5 changes in the types of invertebrate prey targeted by haddock, these fishes may actually
6 select prey with similar T_{LS} (Deudero *et al.*, 2004). Finally, the absence of seasonal effect
7 for Atlantic cod could again be explained by the wide diversity of prey they consumed in
8 the Celtic Sea.

9

10 The increase in T_L for Atlantic cod is mainly explained by the increasing proportion of
11 fish in their diet with age, although crustaceans always remain a major component in the
12 food, even for older specimens (du Buit, 1995; Pinnegar *et al.*, 2003). Hake are
13 opportunistic consumers mostly piscivorous that do not seem to have a selective
14 predatory behaviour (du Buit, 1996). Nevertheless, larger fish (> 50 cm) tend to target
15 horse-mackerel (*Trachurus* spp.; $T_L = 4.95$) and pilchard (*Sardina pilchardus*; $T_L = 3.59$)
16 whereas small predators exploit blue whiting ($T_L = 3.14$), *Argentina* spp. ($T_L = 3.44$) and
17 *Trisopterus* spp. ($T_L = 4.52$) (Pinnegar *et al.*, 2003; Mahé *et al.*, 2007). This might be the
18 reason for the increasing relationship between T_L and size observed for hake larger than
19 50 cm. Megrin was also found to show increasing T_L with length with a plateau from 50
20 cm that is related to the increasing proportion of fish in their diet with length.

21

22 Changes in prey targeted with size is a well known phenomenon for marine fish
23 predators and is mostly associated with increase in mouth size and improved swimming

1 performance (Karpouzi & Stergiou, 2003; Scharf *et al.*, 2000). For hake and Atlantic cod,
2 the fact that large predators continued to select small benthic prey of lower T_L throughout
3 their lives explained why the size- T_L relationships were not as strong as shown in the
4 North Sea (Jennings *et al.*, 2002a). In this context, the weak interactions inherent to the
5 large opportunism characterizing the Celtic Sea fish community (Trenkel *et al.*, 2005) led
6 here to a smaller variation in T_L with length compared to the North Sea fish community.

7
8 Regarding haddock, it has been reported elsewhere that the proportion of fish in their
9 diet increased as their size increased (Greenstreet *et al.*, 1998). The absence of significant
10 effect on T_L is due to the similar range of fish prey T_L consumed with increasing length
11 of haddock. Variations in T_L with length for whiting differ from the increasing T_L -size
12 relationship observed by Jennings *et al.* (2002a) in the North Sea. The increase in T_L
13 from 20 cm to 30 cm whiting seems mainly due in our analysis to the switch from sprats
14 ($T_L = 4.28$) to *Trisopterus* spp. ($T_L = 4.52$) in their diet as they grew. Such a switch has
15 also been observed for whiting in the Moray Firth, NE Scotland, and could be linked to a
16 change from pelagic to demersal habits as they grow older (Greenstreet *et al.*, 1998). The
17 progressive increase of blue whiting ($T_L = 3.14$) in the diet of whiting with length could
18 explain the decreasing trend in T_L from 30 cm (Fig.5).

19

20 TROPHIC LEVEL VARIABILITY AND OMNIVORY

21

22 Our results show that mean values of T_L mask a high intra-population T_L variability
23 that can differ between species. In addition, O_I appears to be a bad proxy for T_L
24 variability therefore its square root should not be a good estimate of the standard error of

1 T_L as proposed by Christensen and Pauly (1992). O_{IS} however provide information
2 regarding the range of T_{LS} targeted by individual predators and seem very useful to
3 estimate the trophic niche width of a population. In complement with T_L variability
4 derived from GAM residuals, O_{IS} were used to identify generalization type (Van Valen,
5 1965) and separate between within-individual and between-individual components
6 contributing to niche width. The assessment of feeding strategy and measure of
7 individual-level niche variation is a major issue both in theoretical and applied ecology
8 (Amundsen *et al.*, 1996; Bolnick *et al.*, 2003; Bearhop *et al.*, 2004) and combining
9 information on T_L variability and omnivory seems a promising approach to address such
10 questions.

11

12 Quantifying T_L variability is also useful for estimating ecosystem indicators and
13 improving trophodynamic models. For instance, the weighted smoothing technique
14 adopted to spread biomass or catches of a species along a range of fractional T_L in trophic
15 spectra assumes constant and symmetrical distribution of T_L among species (Gascuel *et*
16 *al.*, 2005). Here our results suggest that the distribution of individual T_L is neither
17 symmetric nor constant between species and that the range of $0.7 T_L$ used by Gascuel *et*
18 *al.* (2005) underestimates T_L variability observed for Celtic Sea fish predators, the 95%
19 reference range being comprised between 1.6 for Atlantic cod and 2.0 for haddock. In the
20 same way, application of trophodynamic models based on T_L to real case-studies
21 (Chassot *et al.*, 2005; Gascuel, 2005) requires information on species T_L distribution to
22 spread the biomass among trophic groups.

23

1 We are grateful to M. H. du Buit for collecting and analysing all stomach contents. We
2 thank A. Colomb, Y. -M. Bozec and E. Rivot (Agrocampus) for stimulating and fruitful
3 discussions on the variability of trophic level and J. K. Pinnegar (CEFAS) for insightful
4 comments on an earlier version of the manuscript. J. Guitton and S. Bonhommeau
5 (Agrocampus) helped with map drawing. We also thank A. Caskenette (DFO) for English
6 corrections. Anonymous reviewers helped to improve the manuscript. This work was
7 financed by the EU funded RTD project QLRT-2000-02277 “PECHDEV”.

8

9

References

10

11 Adams, S. M., Kimmel, B. L. & Ploskey, G. R. (1983). Sources of organic matter for reservoir
12 fish production: a trophic-dynamics analysis. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and*
13 *Aquatic Sciences* **40**, 1480-1495.

14

15 Adlerstein, S. A. & Welleman, H. C. (2000). Diel variation of stomach contents of North Sea cod
16 (*Gadus morhua*) during a 24-h fishing survey: an analysis using generalized additive
17 models. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **57**, 2363-2367.

18

19 Adlerstein, S. A., Temming, A. & Mergardt, N. (2002). Comparison of stomach contents of
20 haddock (*Melanogrammus aeglefinus*) from the 1981 and 1991 North Sea International
21 Stomach Sampling Projects. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* **59**, 497-515.

22

23 Albert, O. T. (1995). Diel changes in food and feeding of small gadoids on a coastal bank. *ICES*
24 *Journal of Marine Science* **52**, 873-885.

25

- 1 Amundsen, P. -A., Gabler, H. -M., & Staldvik, F. J. (1996). A new approach to graphical
2 analysis of feeding strategy from stomach contents data-modification of the Costello
3 (1990) method. *Journal of Fish Biology* **48**, 607-614. doi: 10.1111/j.1095-
4 8649.1996.tb01455.x
- 5
- 6 Andersen, N. G. (2001). A gastric evacuation model for three predatory gadoids and implications
7 of using pooled field data of stomach contents to estimate food rations. *Journal of Fish*
8 *Biology* **59**, 1198-1217. doi:10.1111/j.1095-8649.2001.tb00186.x
- 9
- 10 Artüz, M. L. (2005). The diet and food consumption of whiting *Merlangius merlangus merlangus*
11 (Linné) 1758 in the Sea of Marmara. *Hidrobiologica* **1**, 23-26.
- 12
- 13 Bearhop, S., Adams, C. E., Waldron, S., Fuller, R. A. & Macleod, H. (2004). Determining trophic
14 niche width: a novel approach using stable isotope analysis. *Journal of Animal Ecology*
15 **73**, 1007-1012.
- 16
- 17 Bolnick, D. I., Svanbäck, R., Fordyce, J. A., Yang, L. H., Davis, J. M., Hulsey, C. D., & Forister,
18 M. L. (2003). The ecology of individuals: incidence and implications of individual
19 specialization. *American Naturalist* **161**, 1-28.
- 20
- 21 Cabral, H. N. & Murta, A. G. (2002). The diet of blue whiting, hake, horse mackerel and
22 mackerel off Portugal. *Journal of Applied Ichthyology* **18**, 14-23. doi: 10.1046/j.1439-
23 0426.2002.00297.x
- 24

- 1 Carpentieri, P., Colloca, F., Cardinale, M., Belluscio, A. & Ardizzone, G. D. (2005). Feeding
2 habits of European hake (*Merluccius merluccius*) in the central Mediterranean Sea.
3 *Fishery Bulletin* **103**, 411-416.
4
- 5 Chassot, E., Gascuel, D. & Colomb, A. (2005). Impact of trophic interactions on production
6 functions and on the ecosystem response to fishing: a simulation approach. *Aquatic*
7 *Living resources* **18**, 1-13.
8
- 9 Christensen, V. & Pauly, D. (1992). ECOPATH II - a software for balancing steady-state
10 ecosystem models and calculating network characteristics. *Ecological Modelling* **61**,
11 169-185.
12
- 13 Cury, P. M., Shannon, L. J., Roux, J. P., Daskalov, G. M., Jarre, A., Moloney, C. L. & Pauly, D.
14 (2005). Trophodynamic indicators for an ecosystem approach to fisheries. *ICES Journal*
15 *of Marine Science* **62**, 430-442.
16
- 17 Deudero, S., Pinnegar, J. K., Polunin, N. V. C., Morey, G., & Morales-Nin, B. (2004). Spatial
18 variation and ontogenic shifts in the isotopic composition of Mediterranean littoral
19 fishes. *Marine Biology* **145**, 971-981.
20
- 21 du Buit, M. H. (1982). Essai d'évaluation de la prédation de quelques téléostéens en Mer Celtique.
22 *Journal du Conseil International pour l'Exploration de la Mer* **40**, 37-46.
23
- 24 du Buit, M. H. (1992). Alimentation de la Cardine, *Lepidorhombus whiffiagonis* en Mer Celtique.
25 *Cahiers de Biologie Marine* **33**, 501-514.
26

- 1 du Buit, M. H. (1995). Food and feeding of cod (*Gadus morhua* L.) in the Celtic Sea. *Fisheries*
2 *Research* **22**, 227-241.
- 3
- 4 du Buit, M. H. (1996). Diet of hake (*Merluccius merluccius*) in the Celtic Sea. *Fisheries Research*
5 **28**, 381-394.
- 6
- 7 Froese, R. & Pauly, D. (2005). Fishbase 2005, Concepts, design and data sources. ICLARM, Los
8 Baños, Laguna, Philippines.
- 9
- 10 Garcia, S. M., Zerbi, A., Do Chi, T. & Lasserre, G. (2003). The ecosystem approach to fisheries.
11 Issues, terminology, principles, institutional foundations, implementation and outlook.
12 FAO, Rome, Italy.
- 13
- 14 Gascuel, D. (2005). The trophic-level based model: a theoretical approach of fishing effects on
15 marine ecosystems. *Ecological Modelling* **189**, 315-332.
- 16
- 17 Gascuel, D., Bozec, Y. -M., Chassot, E., Colomb, A. & Laurans, M. (2005). The trophic
18 spectrum: theory and application as an ecosystem indicator. *ICES Journal of Marine*
19 *Science* **62**, 443-452.
- 20
- 21 Greenstreet, S. P. R., Bryant, A. D., Broekhuizen, N., Hall, S. J. & Heath, M. R. (1997). Seasonal
22 variation in the consumption of food by fish in the North Sea and implications for food
23 web dynamics. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* **54**, 243-266.
- 24
- 25 Greenstreet, S. P. R., McMillan, J. A. & Armstrong, E. (1998). Seasonal variation in the
26 importance of pelagic fish in the diet of piscivorous fish in the Moray Firth, NE

1 Scotland: a response to variation in prey abundance? *ICES Journal of Marine Science*
2 **55**, 121-33.

3
4 Guichet, R. (1995). The diet of European hake (*Merluccius merluccius*) in the northern part of the
5 Bay of Biscay. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* **52**, 21-31.

6
7 Hanson, J. M. & Chouinard, G. A. (2002). Diet of Atlantic cod in the southern Gulf of St Lawrence
8 as an index of ecosystem change, 1959-2000. *Journal of Fish Biology* **60**, 902-922. doi:
9 10.1006/jfbi.2002.1893

10
11 Hastie, T. & Tibshirani, R. (1990). Generalized Additive Models. Chapman & Hall, London, UK.

12
13 Hentschel, B. (1998). Intraspecific variations in $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ indicate ontogenetic diet changes in deposit-
14 feeding polychaetes. *Ecology* **79**, 1357-1370.

15
16 Hislop, J. R. G., Robb, A. P., Bell, M. A. & Armstrong, D. W. (1991). The diet and food
17 consumption of whiting (*Merlangius merlangus*) in the North Sea. *ICES Journal of*
18 *Marine Science* **48**, 139-156.

19
20 Hop, H., Gjosaeter, J. & Danielssen, D. S. (1992). Seasonal feeding ecology of cod (*Gadus*
21 *morhua* L.) on the Norwegian Skagerrak coast. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* **49**,
22 453-461.

23
24 Hyslop, E. J. (1980). Stomach contents analysis - a review of methods and their application.
25 *Journal of Fish Biology* **17**, 411-429. doi: 10.1111/j.1095-8649.1980.tb02775.x

26

- 1 Jennings, S., Greenstreet, S., Hill, L., Piet, G., Pinnegar, J. K. & Warr, K. J. (2002a). Long-term
2 trends in the trophic structure of the North Sea fish community: evidence from stable-
3 isotope analysis, size spectra and community metrics. *Marine Biology* **141**, 1085-1097.
4
- 5 Jennings, S., Pinnegar, J. K., Polunin, N. V. C. & Warr, K. J. (2002b). Linking size-based and
6 trophic analyses of benthic community structure. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **226**, 77-85.
7
- 8 Jiang, W. & Jorgensen, T. (1996). The diet of haddock (*Melanogrammus aeglefinus* L.) in the
9 Barents Sea during the period 1984-1991. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* **53**, 11-21.
10
- 11 Karpouzi, V. S. & Stergiou, K.I. (2003). The relationships between mouth size and shape and
12 body length for 18 species of marine fishes and their trophic implications. *Journal of Fish*
13 *Biology* **62**, 1353-1365. doi: 10.1046/j.1095-8649.2003.00118.x
14
- 15 Le Loc'h, F. (2004). Structure, fonctionnement, évolution des communautés benthiques des fonds
16 meubles exploités du plateau continental Nord Gascogne. Thèse pour l'obtention du diplôme de
17 Docteur de l'Université de Bretagne Occidentale, spécialité Océanologie Biologique, Brest,
18 France.
19
- 20 Lindeman, R. L. (1942). The trophic-dynamic aspect of ecology. *Ecology* **23**, 399-418.
21
- 22 Link, J. S. & Garrison, L. P. (2002). Trophic ecology of Atlantic cod *Gadus morhua* on the
23 northeast US continental shelf. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **227**, 109-123.
24

- 1 Mahé, K., Amara, R., Bryckaert, T., Kacher, M. & Brylinski J. M. (2007). Ontogenetic and
2 spatial variation in the diet of hake (*Merluccius merluccius*) in the Bay of Biscay and the Celtic
3 Sea. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* **64**, 1210-1219.
4
- 5 Martinez, N. D. (1991). Artifacts or attributes? Effects of resolution on the Little Rock Lake food
6 web, *Ecological Monographs* **61**, 367-392.
7
- 8 Mérigoux, S. & Ponton, D. (1998). Body shape, diet and ontogenetic diet shifts in young fish of
9 the Sinnamary River, French Guiana, South America. *Journal of Fish Biology* **52**, 556-569. doi:
10 10.1111/j.1095-8649.1998.tb02017.x
11
- 12 Minagawa, M. & Wada, E. (1984). Stepwise enrichment of ^{15}N along food chains: further
13 evidence and the relation between ^{15}N and animal age. *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* **48**,
14 1135-1140.
15
- 16 Morte, S., Redon, M. J. & Sanz-Brau, A. (1999). Feeding ecology of two megrims
17 *Lepidorhombus boscii* and *Lepidorhombus whiffiagonis* in the western Mediterranean (Gulf of
18 Valencia, Spain). *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom* **79**, 161-
19 169.
20
- 21 Olive, P. J. W., Pinnegar, J. K., Polunin, N. V. C., Richards, G. & Welch, R. (2003). Isotope
22 trophic-step fractionation: a dynamic equilibrium model. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **72**, 608-617.
23 doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2656.2003.00730.x
24

- 1 O'Reilly, C. M., Hecky, R. E., Cohen, A. S. & Plisnier, P. -D. (2002). Interpreting stable isotopes
2 in food webs: recognizing the role of time averaging at different trophic levels. *Limnology and*
3 *Oceanography* **47**, 306-309.
- 4
- 5 Owens, N. J. P. (1987). Natural variations in ^{15}N in the marine environment. *Advances in Marine*
6 *Biology* **24**, 389-451.
- 7
- 8 Pauly, D., Christensen, V., Dalsgaard, J., Froese, R. & Torres, F. J. (1998). Fishing down marine
9 food webs. *Science* **279**, 860-863.
- 10
- 11 Pauly, D., Christensen, V. & Walters, C. (2000). Ecopath, Ecosim, and Ecospace as tools for
12 evaluating ecosystem impact of fisheries. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* **57**, 697-706.
- 13
- 14 Pauly, D. & Watson, R. (2005). Background and interpretation of the 'Marine Trophic Index' as a
15 measure of biodiversity. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London Biological*
16 *Series* **360**, 415-423.
- 17
- 18 Pinnegar J. K., Jennings, S., O'Brien, C. M. & Polunin N. V. C. (2002). Long-term changes in the
19 trophic level of the Celtic Sea fish community and fish market price distribution. *Journal of*
20 *Applied Ecology* **39**, 377-390. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2664.2002.00723.x
- 21
- 22 Pinnegar, J. K., Trenkel, V. M., Tidd, A. N., Dawson, W. A. & du Buit, M. H. (2003). Does diet
23 in Celtic Sea fishes reflect prey availability? *Journal of Fish Biology* **63**, 197-212. doi:
24 10.1111/j.1095-8649.2003.00204.x
- 25

- 1 Post, D. M. (2002). Using stable isotopes to estimate trophic position: models, methods, and
2 assumptions. *Ecology* **83**, 703-718.
- 3
- 4 R Development Core Team. (2007). R: a language and environment for statistical computing. R
5 Foundation for statistical computing, Vienna, Austria.
- 6
- 7 Scharf, F. S., Juanes, F. & Rountree, R. A. (2000). Predator size-prey relationships of marine fish
8 predators: interspecific variation and effects of ontogeny and body size on trophic niche breadth.
9 *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **208**, 229-248.
- 10
- 11 Sih, A. & Christensen, B. (2001). Optimal diet theory: when does it work, and when and why
12 does it fail? *Animal Behaviour* **61**, 379-390.
- 13
- 14 Stergiou, K. I. & Karpouzi, V. S. (2002). Feeding habits and trophic levels of Mediterranean fish.
15 *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries* **11**, 217-254.
- 16
- 17 Stergiou, K. I., Moutopoulos, D. K., Casal, H. J. A. & Erzini, K. (2007). Trophic signatures of
18 small-scale fishing gears: implications for conservation and management. *Marine Ecology
19 Progress Series* **333**, 117-128.
- 20
- 21 Trenkel, V. M., Pinnegar, J. K., Dawson, W. A., du Buit, M. H. & Tidd, A. N. (2005). Spatial and
22 temporal structure of predator-prey relationships in the Celtic Sea fish community. *Marine
23 Ecology Progress Series* **299**, 257-268.
- 24
- 25 Van Valen, L. (1965). Morphological variation and width of ecological niche. *American
26 Naturalist* **99**, 377-389.

1

2 Velasco, F. & Olaso, I. (1998). European hake *Merluccius merluccius* (L., 1758) feeding in the
3 Cantabrian Sea: seasonal, bathymetric and length variations. *Fisheries Research* **38**, 33-44.

4

5 Williams, R. J. & Martinez, N. D. (2004). Limits to trophic levels and omnivory in complex food
6 webs: theory and data. *American Naturalist* **163**, 458-468.

7

8 Wood, S. N. & Augustin, N. H. (2002). GAMs with integrated model selection using penalized
9 regression splines and applications to environmental modelling. *Ecological Modelling* **157**, 157-

10 177.