



HAL
open science

Exploitation of trophic resources by fish under stressful estuarine conditions

Stéphanie Pasquaud, V. David, Jérémy Lobry, Michel Girardin, B. Sautour,
Pierre Elie

► **To cite this version:**

Stéphanie Pasquaud, V. David, Jérémy Lobry, Michel Girardin, B. Sautour, et al.. Exploitation of trophic resources by fish under stressful estuarine conditions. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 2010, 400, p. 207 - p. 219. hal-00474342

HAL Id: hal-00474342

<https://hal.science/hal-00474342>

Submitted on 19 Apr 2010

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

ABSTRACT

Despite the high complexity and variability of estuaries, these ecosystems are very productive and play an important role in fish feeding. This paper constitutes a preliminary investigation to test how fish optimize the use of the available trophic resources, by studying trophic preference variability and feeding strategies of some pelagic and demersal fish in the Gironde estuary (southwest France). Fish and their prey were collected approximately every two months from July 2003 to June 2004 in the upstream area of the saline estuary. Stomach content analyses were realized to describe the variability of fish feeding according to their size and the time of year. Intra- and interspecific food niche overlap was evaluated using Schoener's index and a cross-calculation method was used to highlight the general fish trends in predation strategy. Stomach content results showed interspecific and intraspecific variability in fish feeding, which can be explained by their different or evolutionary ecomorphology. Their diets are composed mainly of zooplankton and hyperbenthic crustaceans with temporal variations in the consumed taxa. Optimization of the available trophic resource use, a key element in estuarine resilience, is thus possible due to the temporal adaptation of this structural trophic web. However, in spite of their temporal adaptation capacity, most fish species exhibited a specialist feeding strategy. This result was not expected. Since zooplankton and hyperbenthic crustaceans exhibit a low specific richness in estuaries, especially in the high turbidity of the Gironde estuary; the loss of one of these species could affect the fish trophic web structure and hence the resilience of the system.

Keywords: Pelagic and demersal fish - Stomach contents - Diet composition - Feeding strategy - Prey characteristics - Estuarine ecosystem - Gironde estuary

37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61

INTRODUCTION

Estuaries are particular ecosystems, where the abiotic environment is especially characterized by fast and high spatio-temporal fluctuations in physico-chemical characteristics (e.g. oxygen, temperature, salinity) in both water column and bed sediment dynamics (McLusky & Elliott 2004). This high environmental variability leads to a high spatio-temporal heterogeneity of the biological communities (McLusky & Elliott 2004, David et al. 2005), with a low diversity of all components yet often with high abundances of adapted species (Mc Lusky & Elliott 2004). Thus, this strong biological variability is related to the ability of the estuarine biota to cope with natural stress, a key element in estuarine resilience (Elliott & Quintino 2007).

In addition, estuaries are generally exposed to high degrees of anthropogenic pressures which can modify their ecological status. Recent works underline the similarity between the features of organisms and assemblages in estuaries and anthropogenically-stressed areas and hence the difficulty of distinguishing natural from human-induced stress in estuaries ("Estuarine quality paradox", Elliott & Quintino 2007, Dauvin & Ruellet 2009).

Because of these particularities, monitoring and assessing the biodiversity and ecological status of marine ecosystems require a substantial knowledge and a comprehensive understanding of properties across the entire biological system, in particular its structure (e.g. species composition) and functional properties (e.g. ecosystem processes, Hooper et al. 2005, de Jonge et al. 2006). Studying interactions between the biological compartments of an ecosystem, especially trophic relationships, provides a good picture of the biological community structure and is an essential step to understanding how an aquatic system functions (e.g. Elliott & Hemingway 2002, Livingston 2002, Pasquaud et al. 2007, Pasquaud et al. 2008).

62 Topological approaches in trophic models are used to better understand estuarine
63 ecological structure and functioning (e.g. Baird & Ulanowicz 1993, Wolff et al. 2000, Lin et
64 al. 2007, Lobry et al. 2008). Most authors (in particular Lobry et al., 2008) suggest that
65 estuarine communities have to optimize available trophic resources to successfully cope with
66 stressful conditions. This suggests that (1) a temporal adaptation of the trophic web would be
67 observed, (2) most estuarine species would be opportunists. This paper constitutes a
68 preliminary investigation to test both these assumptions by analysing the food preferences and
69 the feeding strategies of the main fish species of the Gironde estuary.

70 The first objective was thus to describe the trophic relationship variability according to
71 fish size and time of year of the main Gironde estuarine demersal and pelagic fish species
72 using stomach content analysis, which appears to be the most reliable method to determine
73 fish feeding (Pasquaud et al. 2007). The second objective was to analyze the dynamics of the
74 fish feeding preferences using characteristics of their diet and of their prey population
75 (abundance in the environment, mean weight).

76

MATERIALS AND METHODS

77

Study area

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

The Gironde estuary (Lat. 45°20'N, Long. 0°45'W, Fig. 1) is located in South West France and opens onto the Bay of Biscay. Its surface area is approximately 625 km² at high tide. It is 76 km long between the ocean and the Bec d'Ambès, where the Dordogne and Garonne rivers meet and which generally constitutes the upstream salinity limit. The watershed covers 81,000 km² and the mean annual rate of freshwater discharge is around 760 m³ s⁻¹. These characteristics make it the biggest estuary in France and the largest in Western Europe (Salomon 2002). The tidal range is 4.5 m at the mouth of the estuary and over 5 m at Bordeaux. The Gironde is one of the most turbid estuaries in Europe (Sautour & Castel 1995). River systems carry annually between 1.5 and 3x10⁶ t of suspended particulate matter (SPM, David et al. 2005) to the estuary, with a fairly permanent maximum turbidity zone (SPM about 1 g L⁻¹ at the surface and 10 g L⁻¹ near the bed, (Sottolichio 1999)). As a consequence, primary production in the Gironde is reduced (10 gC m⁻² y⁻¹, Irigoien & Castel 1997) and the food web base consists, for the most part, of a varied nutritional pool containing a high proportion of detritus (Irigoien & Castel 1995).

The climate of the region is temperate under oceanic influence. Typically, water temperature variability is moderate (between 2°C in January and 26°C in August) and monthly rainfall fluctuates between 50 mm in summer and 100 mm in winter (Tank et al. 2002). During the sampling period (from July 2003 to June 2004) the water temperature oscillated between 9.78°C in February and 25.42°C in July in the study area. The river flow remained very low from July to December 2003, in spite of a few strong freshwater inputs in December. The first half of 2004 was relatively dry, characterized only by episodes of flooding in January and April-May (unpublished data). Because of these hydrological conditions, a very strong marine intrusion was observed during summer 2003, with maximum

101 salinity values in September (average salinity 11.43 in the sampling area) and low salinities
102 were recorded in February (0.08), April (0.41) and June (3.48).

103

104 **Fish samplings**

105 To analyze temporal feeding variability, fish were collected approximately every two
106 months from July 2003 to June 2004 in the upper and middle area of the Gironde estuarine
107 haline part (Table 1; Fig. 1). Specimens were caught once per sampled month at five stations
108 (Fig. 1) using an otter trawl (4 m opening and a cod-end with a mesh size of 8 mm). Trawling
109 was restricted to daylight at high tide in order to standardize the samplings, and only when the
110 tidal coefficient was below 75 (trawling above coefficient 80 in this system is not reliable).
111 Haul duration was limited to 15 minutes to optimize the analysis of the stomach contents by
112 minimizing regurgitation and feeding under abnormal conditions in the trawl (Pasquaud et al.
113 2007). All the sampled fish were identified, counted, measured (total length) and weighed.
114 Fish smaller than 200 mm long were immediately placed on dry ice in order to stop the
115 digestion processes. The digestive tract of the largest specimens was conserved on dry ice.
116 The samples were stored at -18°C in the lab. Using this protocol, all the analyses could be
117 carried out on fresh material, after defrosting, thus facilitating handling and also the
118 identification of the fish species and their prey.

119

120 **Stomach content analyses**

121 The fish species analyzed were selected because they were considered typical of the
122 estuarine ichthyofauna both in terms of occurrence and of functional guilds, i.e. ecological and
123 feeding categories (see Lobry et al. 2003 for details; Table 1). Prey sampled in the system for
124 which data were available (cf. “prey data” paragraph) were zooplankton and hyperbenthos.
125 We thus focused on their fish predator species.

126 The stomach contents of 538 individuals from the eight fish species caught in the
127 sampling area were analyzed (Table 1). A minimum of five specimens per taxa and per
128 sampled month, with food items in their stomachs, were selected for analysis (minimum
129 required to obtain a diet picture). Two size ranges were distinguished for *Pomatoschistus*
130 *minutus* (small size < 40mm; large size \geq 40 mm) and *Argyrosomus regius* (two age classes)
131 to test ontogenic changes in feeding. All the items in the stomachs were examined under a
132 binocular microscope, identified to the highest possible taxonomic level, counted and
133 weighed (dry weight, to nearest 10^{-4} g). Dietary analysis is traditionally assessed by
134 occurrence (i.e. the percentage of non-empty stomachs where a certain prey item occurred),
135 numerical and volumetric/gravimetric methods (see Hynes 1950, Hyslop 1980 for more
136 details). Each of these measures provides different insight into predator feeding habits (Cortès
137 1997). The numerical percentage of the prey (%N) is well adapted to our objective as it
138 describes feeding behavior (Macdonald & Green 1983). This was calculated for each item
139 consumed by a fish species per month.

140 The mean weight (\bar{W} in g) of each prey was also estimated from these stomach
141 content analyses (average of the dry weights of each item consumed by a predator species per
142 month).

143

144

Prey data

145 Sampling data for shrimps and zooplankton from the same estuarine area and the same
146 months as the fish sampling data were used to characterize prey populations in the
147 environment (Table 1).

148 Shrimps were collected from four transects, established since 1991 for monitoring the
149 smaller components of the estuarine fauna around the Blayais nuclear power plant on a
150 monthly basis (Lobry et al. 2006). Each transect consists of three sites, one close to each bank

151 and one in the main channel of the estuary (Fig. 1). At each site, sampling was carried out
152 simultaneously near the surface and near the bottom, with the water surface sampled using
153 two pushnets located on both sides of the boat (section 4 x 1 m, stretched mesh of 1mm in the
154 cod-end) and the bottom sampled using a dragnet with a 2.0 x 1.2 m frame, kept at 0.2 m
155 above the bed by runners. The net meshes are identical to those used for surface samplings.
156 Sampling was carried out in daytime, between the halfway stage of the flood tide and high
157 tide slack. Each tow lasted about 7 minutes. All the samples collected were preserved in 10%
158 formaldehyde, before being identified and counted at the laboratory.

159 Zooplankton was collected along the study area every 3 units of salinity using a
160 standard 200 µm WP-2net for zooplankton and a 500 µm bongo net, which is better adapted
161 to mysid and amphipod sampling. Vertical hauls were carried out at each station for each net.
162 The catch was preserved in 5% seawater/formalin before being identified and counted at the
163 laboratory.

164 Abundance of the different prey categories was calculated for each month, and
165 expressed as the number of individuals per m³ of filtered water at the sampling site.

166

167 **Data analyses**

168 In order to determine whether the consumption of the different prey varied with time
169 or predator size, permutation tests based on inertia analysis (Chessel et al. 2004) with a 0.05
170 significance level were performed on matrices of the diet composition per each fish predator
171 using the relative abundance (%N) of the prey items.

172 Intra- and interspecific food niche overlap was evaluated using Schoener's index (SI),
173 defined as

$$174 \quad SI_{xy} = 1 - 0.5 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n |N_{xi} - N_{yi}| \right)$$

175 Where N_{xi} is the relative abundance of prey category i in the stomach content of species x and
176 N_{yi} the same relative abundance in the species y (Hurlbert 1978). According to Wallace
177 (1981) and Wallace & Ramsay (1983), overlap values > 0.6 should be considered as
178 biologically significant.

179 The general trends in predation strategy for each species (or size group) and each
180 sampled month were studied using the cross-calculation method described by Azémar et al.
181 (2007). This method allows us to test if a predator diet can be determined by prey
182 characteristics (e.g. abundance or mean weight/size) in the environment. It consists of (1)
183 ranking the prey i of each fish of a predator group (species or size class) as a function of
184 relative abundance (N) in the stomach contents (Ni-ranks; e.g. for *E. encrasicolus*, stomach
185 content 1: $N_{Arcartia} = \text{rank1}$; stomach content 9: $N_{M.slabberi} = \text{rank1}$, $N_{cirripeds} = \text{rank2}$, $N_{Arcartia} =$
186 rank3), and (2) ranking these same prey according to their abundance (Ab-ranks) and their
187 mean weight (\bar{W} -ranks) in the environment (e.g. in July, $Ab_{Arcartia} = \text{rank1}$, $Ab_{M.slabberi} =$
188 rank2 , $Ab_{cirripeds} = \text{rank3}$). As only prey that appeared in the stomachs contents are considered,
189 predator feeding strategy is assessed within the context of its trophic niche. Moreover, the
190 non-sampled prey in this study (e.g. nauplius crustacean stage) were excluded from the
191 analysis. Next, (3) the frequencies (i.e. number of occurrences observed from all the stomach
192 contents) of each combination Ni-ranks X Abi-ranks and Ni-ranks X \bar{W} -ranks were
193 calculated for each prey of a predator group. Finally, (4) the shape of the distribution was
194 tested using a Spearman rank test at $P < 0.05$. If these frequencies increased or decreased as a
195 function of the prey characteristic ranking (Ab or \bar{W}) the predation was considered to be
196 selective according to prey abundance (Ab) or mean weight (\bar{W}); otherwise the predation was
197 unselective with regard to the prey characteristic considered (Ab or \bar{W}).

198 Three different types of predation strategy were determined: (1) generalist, when the
199 Spearman correlation coefficient was not significant for either abundances or mean weights,

200 (2) opportunistic, when frequencies increased significantly with abundances, and (3)
201 specialist, when the highest frequencies were concentrated around a narrow mean weight (Fig.
202 2).

203

204

RESULTS

205

206

Interspecific feeding variability

207

Fish species showed different feeding ecology and strategy (Fig. 2; Tables 2 & 3).

208

Small marine pelagic fish *Sprattus sprattus* and *Engraulis encrasicolus* based their diet on

209

mesozooplankton, feeding mainly on the nauplius stage of crustaceans and on copepods of the

210

genus *Acartia*. However, their trophic niches did not overlap ($SI < 0.6$) and their predation

211

strategy was different: *E. encrasicolus* was an opportunist, i.e. among its food spectrum, this

212

species mainly consumed the most abundant prey in the system (e.g. *Acartia* in September),

213

whereas *S. sprattus* was a specialist, focusing on prey of a specific weight (size) range (e.g.

214

selection of cirriped larvae in September, not the most abundant prey).

215

Small estuarine resident species *Pomatoschistus minutus* and *Pomatoschistus microps*

216

also consumed a high quantity of mesozooplankton, but their diet varied from that of *S.*

217

sprattus and *E. encrasicolus* due to a high consumption of hyperbenthos, essentially mysid

218

Mesopodopsis slabberi and amphipods *Gammarus* spp (no overlap; $SI < 0.6$). The two species

219

of *Pomatoschistus* were seldom present together in the area studied and if they were, they

220

tended to show a trophic niche overlap (February, $SI > 0.8$). Both were characterized by

221

specialist feeding, essentially on the largest zooplankton (the copepod *Eurytemora affinis*) and

222

the smallest hyperbenthos (mysids *M. slabberi* and *N. integer*).

223

Finally, the feeding of marine demersal fish (e.g. *Dicentrarchus labrax*, *Dicentrarchus*

224

punctatus, *Argyrosomus regius* and *Merlangius merlangus*) was mainly characterized by

225 hyperbenthic prey such as the mysids *M. slabberi* and *Neomysis integer*, the amphipods
226 *Gammarus* spp. and the shrimps *Palaemon* spp.
227 The two species of *Dicentrarchus* did not have a trophic niche overlap and presented different
228 predation strategies, specialist for *D. labrax*, opportunistic for *D. punctatus*. In contrast to
229 *Dicentrarchus* spp., the trophic niches of *A. regius* and *M. merlangus* did sometimes overlap,
230 either together or with *P. minutus*. *M. merlangus* is a specialist predator, whereas *A. regius*
231 was able to feed on either a wide range of prey (generalist) or a narrow range of prey
232 (specialist).

233

234 **Temporal feeding variability**

235 Except for *P. microps*, all fish species showed a significant temporal feeding
236 variability (p-values of the permutation tests < 0.05):

237 - *E. encrasicolus* consumed a large quantity of mollusk eggs (40%) and nauplius larvae (44%)
238 in July, whereas it ate mostly the copepods *Acartia* (94%) in September and *E. affinis* (88%)
239 in November. Its feeding strategy was opportunistic whatever the season.

240 - *P. microps* based its feeding essentially on eggs (indeterminate and mollusk eggs,
241 respectively 40 and 24 %) in July and on *E. affinis* in November (55%), February (94%) and
242 April (62%). However, this species showed no significant temporal feeding variability (p-
243 value = 0.301). It was a specialist, focusing on prey from a specific weight (size) range
244 whatever the considered month.

245 - The feeding of *P. minutus* consisted of mollusk eggs (39%) and the mysid *M. slabberi* (22%)
246 in July, almost exclusively *M. slabberi* (60% for small individuals and 79% for large
247 individuals) in September, *M. slabberi* (37%) and *Gammarus* (21%) in November, mainly *E.*
248 *affinis* (84% for the small individuals and 82% for the large individuals) in February, and
249 finally *Gammarus* (82 or 64%) and *N. integer* (18 or 28%) in June. Both size classes of *P.*

250 *minutus* had specialist strategy, except in November when the numerous prey in their stomach
251 were the most abundant in the system (opportunism).
252 - Concerning the 2003 cohort of *A. regius*, the diet was dominated numerically by *M. slabberi*
253 (78%) in July, by the shrimps *Palaemon* in September (54%) and November (64%) and by *N.*
254 *integer* and *Gammarus* in April (respectively 44% and 28%) and June (31% and 59%). *A.*
255 *regius* oscillated between a generalist and a specialist feeding strategy.
256 - *D. labrax* fed essentially on the Amphipods *Gammarus* (24%) and the shrimps *Palaemon*
257 (32%) in February and on *Gammarus* (57%) and *N. integer* (14%) in April.
258 - The most abundant prey consumed by *M. merlangus* were *M. slabberi* (88%) in September
259 and *Palaemon* (50%) in November. *D. labrax* and *M. merlangus* always showed a specialist
260 feeding strategy.

261

262

Intraspecific feeding variability

263 Intra-specific feeding variability according to fish size was tested for *P. minutus* and
264 *A. regius*. No significant difference was observed between the diets of the two size groups for
265 *P. minutus* (p-values > 0.05) contrary to *A. regius*, e.g. only small specimens feeding on small
266 zooplankton. Moreover, whatever its size, *P. minutus* presented a specialist strategy whereas
267 *A. regius* exhibited generalist predation when small and specialist when large.

268

DISCUSSION

269

Sample representativeness

270

271

272

This study is based on analyses on the one hand of fish stomach contents and on the other hand of hyperbenthic invertebrate samples, all from the same estuarine area, i.e. the upstream part of the saline Gironde estuary.

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

285

286

As in the saline areas of other European estuaries (Mees et al. 1995, Mc Lusky & Elliott 2004), hyperbenthic invertebrate samples are characterized by a low specific diversity and high densities, features which vary significantly over time. In previous investigations, temporal variability has been linked to fluctuations in environmental factors (David et al. 2005, Lobry et al. 2006). In addition, the specific compositions observed in 2003 (Lobry et al. 2006, David 2006) were similar to those observed in other Gironde estuary studies (e.g. Castel 1981, Sorbe 1981, Mees et al. 1995): the copepods consisted predominantly of *E. affinis* in the spring and *Acartia* spp. in summer; the suprabenthos consisted of *N. integer* in the spring and *M. slaberry* and *Gammarus* spp. in summer, which was similar to other European estuaries (Mees et al. 1993, Soetaert & van Rijswijk 1993, Mouny et al. 2000, Mouny & Dauvin 2002). The study area was also representative for zooplankton and estuarine suprabenthos, which were fairly homogenous (David, 2006). Thus the samples collected give a good picture of hyperbenthic prey availability in the brackish part of the estuary for the pelagic and demersal fish selected, i.e. those feeding mainly on these communities.

287

288

289

290

291

For some fish species chosen, few specimens were collected and/or had a non-empty stomach content, e.g. *Sprattus sprattus*, *Dicentrarchus punctatus*. Moreover, these samples were sometimes collected from only one particular trawl, i.e. concerned only a small part of the study area. However, for various reasons these data have been taken into consideration in this study:

292 - These species showed a low intra-group feeding variability, which can be explained by the
293 characteristic of consumed hyperbenthic communities, i.e. few species, high densities. The
294 statistical minimum of 5 individuals would therefore appear sufficient to define the diet of
295 these species.

296 - In the brackish part of the Gironde estuary, there was no significant spatial variability in the
297 prey communities either in composition or density (David et al. 2005, David 2006). Whatever
298 the location of the fish samplings, analysis of their stomach contents was representative of the
299 feeding strategy in the area studied.

300 - The choice of these species allowed us to make strategy comparisons between fish
301 exhibiting ecological and feeding similarities, e.g. *S. sprattus* and *Engraulis encrasicolus*, *D.*
302 *punctatus* and *Dicentrarchus labrax*, and provided assumptions on the structuring
303 mechanisms of fish communities in an estuarine environment.

304

305 **Inter- and intraspecific fish feeding variability**

306 Fish stomach content analyses provide more than just a snapshot of what and how
307 much an individual has ingested at a given moment: they give essential information to help
308 understand species feeding requirements and strategies.

309 Investigation of the diet compositions of the eight main pelagic and demersal fish
310 species during the study period in the Gironde estuary enables us to show an interspecific
311 feeding variability. Despite the differences in taxa, geographical distribution and
312 environmental conditions, similar feeding requirements have been observed in other estuarine
313 or marine systems: small pelagic fish, *S. sprattus* and *E. encrasicolus*, are zooplanktivores
314 (e.g. Plounevez & Champalbert 1999, Maes & Ollevier 2002), demersal fish, represented by
315 *Argyrosomus regius*, *D. labrax*, *D. punctatus* and *Merlangius merlangus*, consume
316 hyperbenthos (Moore & Moore 1976, Ktari et al. 1978, Cabral & Ohmert 2001, Laffaille et al.

317 2001) and *Pomatoschistus minutus* and *P. microps* eat both mesozooplankton and
318 hyperbenthic prey (Salgado et al. 2004, Leitão et al. 2006). This interspecific feeding
319 variability could be linked to different body structures, i.e. ecotrophomorphology or
320 ecomorphology (Wootton 1990). Morphological characteristics (e.g. position, shape and size
321 of the mouth, shape and ability to protrude the jaw, body form and size) determine position in
322 the water column, locomotive abilities and the size of prey intake (e.g. Schafer et al. 2002).

323 This study highlights the fact that species which have ecological and trophic
324 similarities (e.g. *S. sprattus* and *E. encrasicolus* or *D. labrax* and *D. punctatus*) do not
325 necessarily show diet overlap. Moreover, they present different feeding strategies. For
326 example, the small pelagic fish *S. sprattus* is a specialist, whereas *E. encrasicolus* shows
327 opportunistic predation strategies, and the demersal fish *D. labrax* is a specialist whereas *D.*
328 *punctatus* is an opportunist. This feeding strategy variability could narrow diet overlap,
329 minimize interspecific competition and allow the co-occurrence of these species (Oscoz et al.
330 2006).

331 For species presenting ecological and morphological similarities and the same feeding
332 strategies:

- 333 - either there is no feeding niche overlap. These cases occur when the species considered do
334 not belong to the same size class, e.g. *P. minutus* and *P. microps* in November and February,
335 *A. regius* and *M. merlangus* in September. Salgado et al. (2004) have already highlighted a
336 decrease in feeding overlap between these two *Pomatoschistus* species due to an increased
337 difference in length.
- 338 - or there is a feeding overlap when the resource is not limited, e.g. *P. minutus* and *P. microps*
339 in February, *A. regius* and *M. merlangus* in November, the time of year when the environment
340 is very poor in species numbers, but those that are present remain abundant, thus limiting any
341 feeding competition.

342 Feeding variability according to size was tested only for *P. minutus* and *A. regius*, and
343 not for any other species, either because too few samples per species were available or
344 because their size distribution was too uniform. No significant feeding variation was observed
345 between the two size classes of *P. minutus* (small size < 40mm; large size \geq 40 mm). For this
346 species, a dietary shift has already been highlighted for individuals with a total length greater
347 than 50 mm, with a progressive disappearance of copepods and a considerable increase in
348 larger prey (Hamerlynck & Cattrijsse 1994, Salgado et al. 2004). This size range (\geq 50 mm)
349 has not been differentiated in this study because of the small number of specimens. A
350 variation in feeding according to fish length was observed for *A. regius* but also for *M.*
351 *merlangus* with their growth in time. Their diets varied, with larger fish showing an increased
352 consumption of larger prey. Body size effects on feeding shifts have already been identified
353 for these predators (Quéro & Vayne 1987, Pederson 1999, Cabral & Ohmert 2001) as well as
354 for *S. sprattus* (Arrhenius 1996, Casini et al. 2004), *E. encrasicolus* (Conway et al. 1998) and
355 *D. labrax* (Kennedy & Fitzmaurice 1972, Labourg & Stequert 1973). Diet variations
356 according to fish size have already been explained by the evolution in morphology, especially
357 by the increase in predator gape width and swimming speed with the increase in predator size
358 (e.g. Garrison & Link 2000a, Pasquaud et al. 2004). The relative body-size of the component
359 species has often been identified as a major determinant of food web structure (Warren &
360 Lawton 1987). Garrison & Link (2000b) suggest that different size classes within a species
361 may therefore be considered functionally as different species in terms of trophic dynamics.
362 These diet changes are particularly marked when different ontogenetic stages are considered
363 (e.g. Garrison & Link 2000a, Woodward & Hildrew 2002) but these have not been
364 highlighted in this work.
365 The study of feeding strategies according to fish size reveals different behaviors for *A. regius*
366 (generalist/specialist) and *P. minutus* (specialist/opportunist). Marshall & Elliott (1996), who

367 studied the feeding ecology of the main fish species recorded in the Humber estuary (United
368 Kingdom), also emphasized specialization by the largest specimens for some species and an
369 increase in niche breadth with size for other species.

370

371 **Temporal feeding variability**

372 In relation to the naturally variable environmental conditions, estuarine biological
373 communities exhibit distinctive temporal patterns at both low (David et al. 2005, David et al.
374 2006) and high trophic levels (see, for instance, Elliott & Hemingway 2002, Lobry et al.
375 2006), suggesting that the resilience of estuarine ecosystems is linked to the temporal trophic
376 structure and perhaps to fish species' ability to adapt their diet according to available prey in
377 the environment.

378 As in other estuarine systems (e.g. Hajisamae et al. 2003, Hampel et al. 2005, West et
379 al. 2006, Reum & Essington 2008), the present work emphasizes a temporal variability in
380 estuarine fish diets and thus in trophic topology. The use of the cross-calculation method
381 enabled us to identify how fish exploit the trophic resources according to time. As a result,
382 most species were identified as specialist, whatever the month being considered. This study
383 therefore invalidates the common hypothesis that estuarine fish are generally opportunists
384 (e.g. Moore & Moore 1976, Cabral & Ohmert 2001, Laffaille et al. 2001, Baldó & Drake
385 2002, Elliott & Hemingway 2002). Only a minority of the pelagic and demersal fish
386 community in the Gironde estuary - characterized by the marine juveniles *E. encrasicolus* and
387 *D. punctatus* and by resident species *P. minutus* - were found to feed on the predominant
388 abundant prey which differed from month to month.

389 This difference in conclusions, specialist vs opportunist, can be explained by the
390 precision of the method used for this study, as it enabled us to test whether, among all the
391 prey that can be the most abundant in the system, a particular weight (size) range is selected.

392 In the estuarine context where specific diversities are low and densities are high, the use of
393 this method to draw conclusions about fish feeding strategy would seem particularly
394 appropriate.

395 It is interesting to note that this study reveals the specialist feeding strategy of *P.*
396 *microps* and *P. minutus*, always described as opportunistic fish in the literature (e.g. Pilh
397 1985, Pasquaud et al. 2004, Leitão et al. 2006). Nevertheless, the dietary analysis for both size
398 and time emphasizes the capacity of *P. minutus* to adapt its feeding strategy according to prey
399 availability. We can assume that the other resident species *P. microps* is able to adapt too.

400 This study highlights the specialist feeding strategy of the *S. sprattus*, *M. merlangus*
401 and *D. labrax* species, whatever the month considered. This strategy had already been shown
402 for *S. sprattus*, which may have a major impact on the zooplankton community (Brooks &
403 Dodson 1965, Rudstam et al. 1994, Casini et al. 2004). Thus, a decrease in the abundance of
404 these three marine juvenile species or their absence from the system could be linked to a
405 decrease in/disappearance of their preferential prey, associated with an increase in
406 competition pressure (prey availability). For *S. sprattus*, a decrease in its zooplanktonic prey
407 as well as trophic competition pressure from *E. encrasicolus* could explain its departure from
408 the study area in November. The temporal segregation of *M. merlangus* and *D. labrax*,
409 species that show feeding similarities, could also support this hypothesis. An ability to avoid
410 niche overlap by spatio-temporal segregation has already been shown for these two species in
411 relation to other fish species (Bromley et al. 1997, Cabral & Ohmert 2001). These results
412 suggest a structuring of the fish communities according to prey-predator relationships.

413 However, as suggested by the prey abundances, shrimps are probably not limited in
414 winter. The absence of *M. merlangus* and *A. regius* - also specialist but trending towards
415 generalist - in February could be correlated with the environmental conditions, especially low
416 salinities and low water temperatures (Quéro & Vayne 1987, Pasquaud 2006). These

417 observations suggest that the fish assemblages in that brackish part of the estuary are
418 structured more by abiotic factors than by trophic relationships during this period of the year.
419 In other studies (e.g. Costa & Elliott 1991, Thiel et al. 1995, Kupschus & Tremain 2001,
420 Harrison & Whitfield 2006, Lobry et al. 2006) this estuarine fish community structuring has
421 also been related to environmental variables, especially temperature and salinity, which
422 depend on temporal variations in water flow (Lobry et al. 2006).

423 The estuarine fish communities are structured in time both by environmental
424 conditions and trophic relationships (Marshall & Elliott 1996, Kimmerer 2002) but we can
425 hypothesize that these structuring factors do not take effect on the same spatial scales as
426 suggested by Martino & Able (2003): “large-scale patterns in the structure of estuarine fish
427 assemblage are primarily a result of individual species’ responses to dominate environmental
428 gradients, as well as ontogenetic migrations, whereas smaller-scale patterns appear to be the
429 result of habitat associations that are most likely driven by foraging, competition, and/or
430 predator avoidance”. This remark confirms theoretical views on community structure which
431 maintain that physiological tolerances to environmental factors set up the community
432 framework, while biotic interactions refine species distribution patterns within this structure
433 (Weinstein et al. 1980, Menge & Olson 1990) and underlines the need to consider the spatial
434 feeding variability which was not studied in this work.

435

436

CONCLUSIONS

437 Analysis of fish stomach contents gave a picture of the temporal patterns of the
438 Gironde estuary fish food web, describing interspecific and intraspecific trophic relationships
439 and the dynamics of the food web structure. Comparisons of the relative abundance of prey in
440 the stomach contents, numerical abundance of these prey in the environment and mean

441 weight, appear particularly relevant for studying fish feeding strategy in estuaries and
442 assessing the trophic functions provided by this system for these species.

443 This study highlights a strong trophic dynamism and suggests a resource partitioning
444 dependent on predator/prey size (according to predator/prey life cycle), prey availability and
445 predator presence (according to predator life cycle and environmental conditions).
446 Optimization of available trophic resource use, a key element in estuarine resilience (Elliott &
447 Quintino 2007), is possible due to the temporal adaptation of this structural trophic web. This
448 trophic dynamism could play a major role in the stability/resilience of this ecosystem (cf.
449 Link 2002), as suggested by recent statements in the biodiversity-stability debate (see for
450 instance Navarrete & Berlow 2006, Elliott & Quintino 2007).

451 In spite of their adaptation capacity, most fish species exhibited a specialist feeding
452 strategy. In the Gironde estuary there are few invertebrate species. We can imagine that the
453 loss of one species will affect the fish trophic web structure and hence the resilience of the
454 system. Comparative spatial studies are envisaged, i.e. intra-system studies, or comparisons
455 with other estuaries or marine systems, to examine whether our conclusions can be
456 generalized, to give a better understanding of the mechanisms of prey-predator structuring
457 and to ascertain the degree of marine fish species dependence on estuarine systems.

458 This study has enabled us to go beyond the structural aspects of biological
459 communities and access functional aspects, in accordance with some recent recommendations
460 by de Jonge et al. (2006) and Elliott & Quintino (2007) concerning the implementation of
461 monitoring programs in estuarine areas. In addition, this approach provides the data needed to
462 develop and/or validate trophic models (i.e. Lobry et al. 2008) in order to identify keystone
463 species (Libralato et al. 2006) and predict the evolution of these systems.

464

465 *Acknowledgements.* We would like to thank B. Ballion, R. Le Barh, J.-F. Bigot, F. Daverat,
466 M. Lepage and everyone who took part in sampling surveys. This investigation was supported
467 by the French Institute of Agricultural and Environmental Engineering Research (Cemagref),
468 the Regional Council of Aquitaine and the Ecology and Economics of the Garonne basin
469 programme.

470

LITERATURE CITED

- 471 Arrhenius F (1996) Diet composition and food selectivity of O-group herring (*Clupea*
472 *harengus* L) and sprat (*Sprattus sprattus* L) in the northern Baltic Sea. ICES J Mar Sci
473 53:701-712
- 474 Azémar F, Boulêtreau S, Lionard M, Muylaert K, Vyverman W, Meire P, Tackx M (2007)
475 Looking for general trends in trophic interactions among estuarine micro- and
476 mesozooplankton. J Plankton Res 29:135-147
- 477 Baird D, Ulanowicz RE (1993) Comparative-Study on the Trophic Structure, Cycling and
478 Ecosystem Properties of 4 Tidal Estuaries. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 99:221-237
- 479 Baldó F, Drake P (2002) A multivariate approach to the feeding habits of small fishes in the
480 Guadalquivir Estuary. J Fish Biol 61:21-32
- 481 Bromley PJ, Watson T, Hislop JRG (1997) Diel feeding patterns and the development of food
482 webs in pelagic 0-group cod (*Gadus morhua* L.), haddock (*Melanogrammus aeglefinus* L.),
483 whiting (*Merlangius merlangus* L.), saithe (*Pollachius virens* L.), and Norway pout
484 (*Trisopterus esmarkii* Nilsson) in the northern North Sea. ICES J Mar Sci 54:846-853
- 485 Brooks JL, Dodson SI (1965) Predation, body size and composition of plankton. Science
486 150:28-35
- 487 Cabral HN, Ohmert B (2001) Diet of juvenile meagre, *Argyrosomus regius*, within the Tagus
488 estuary. Cah Biol Mar 42:289-293
- 489 Casini M, Cardinale M, Arrhenius F (2004) Feeding preferences of herring (*Clupea harengus*)
490 and sprat (*Sprattus sprattus*) in the southern Baltic Sea. ICES J Mar Sci 61:1267-1277

- 491 Castel J (1981) Aspects de l'étude écologique du plancton de l'estuaire de la Gironde. *Oceanis*
492 6:535-577
- 493 Chessel D, Dufour A-B, J. T (2004) The ade4 package - I : One-table methods, R News. In,
494 Vol 4, p 5-10
- 495 Conway DVP, Coombs SH, Smith C (1998) Feeding of anchovy *Engraulis encrasicolus*
496 larvae in the northwestern Adriatic Sea in response to changing hydrobiological conditions.
497 *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 175:35-49
- 498 Cortès E (1997) A critical review of methods of studying fish feeding based on analysis of
499 stomach contents: application to elasmobranch fishes. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci* 54:726-738
- 500 Costa MJ, Elliott M (1991) Fish usage and feeding in two industrialised estuaries - the Tagus,
501 Portugal, and the Forth, Scotland. In: Elliott M, Ducrotoy JP (eds) *Estuaries and coasts :*
502 *spatial and temporal intercomparisons.* Olsen and Olsen, Fredensborg, Denmark, p 289-297
- 503 Dauvin JC, Ruellet T (2009) The estuarine quality paradox: Is it possible to define an
504 ecological quality status for specific modified and naturally stressed estuarine ecosystems?
505 *Mar Poll Bull* 59:38-47
- 506 David V (2006) Variabilité spatio-temporelle du zooplancton dans l'estuaire de la Gironde et
507 implications au sein du réseau trophique planctonique. PhD Thesis, Université de Bordeaux I
- 508 David V, Sautour B, Chardy P, Leconte M (2005) Long-term changes of the zooplankton
509 variability in a turbid environment: The Gironde estuary (France). *Estuarine Coastal and Shelf*
510 *Science* 64:171-184

- 511 David V, Sautour B, Galois R, Chardy P (2006) The paradox high zooplankton biomass-low
512 vegetal particulate organic matter in high turbidity zones: What way for energy transfer? J
513 Exp Mar Biol Ecol 333:202-218
- 514 de Jonge VN, Elliott M, Brauer VS (2006) Marine monitoring: Its shortcomings and
515 mismatch with the EU water framework directive's objectives. Mar Poll Bull 53:5-19
- 516 Elliott M, Hemingway K (eds) (2002) Fishes in Estuaries, Vol. Blackwells, London
- 517 Elliott M, Quintino V (2007) The Estuarine Quality Paradox, Environmental Homeostasis and
518 the difficulty of detecting anthropogenic stress in naturally stressed areas. Mar Poll Bull
519 54:640-645
- 520 Garrison LP, Link JS (2000a) Dietary guild structure of the fish community in the Northeast
521 United States continental shelf ecosystem. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 202:231-240
- 522 Garrison LP, Link JS (2000b) Fishing effects on spatial distribution and trophic guild
523 structure of the fish community in the Georges Bank region. ICES J Mar Sci 57:723-730
- 524 Hajisamae S, Chou LM, Ibrahim S (2003) Feeding habits and trophic organization of the fish
525 community in shallow waters of an impacted tropical habitat. Estuar Coast Shelf Sci 58:89-98
- 526 Hamerlynck O, Cattrijsse A (1994) The food of *Pomatoschistus minutus* (Pisces, Gobiidae) in
527 Belgian coastal waters, and a comparison with the food of its potential competitor *P. lozanoi*.
528 J Fish Biol 44:753-771
- 529 Hampel H, Cattrijsse A, Elliott M (2005) Feeding habits of young predatory fishes in marsh
530 creeks situated along the salinity gradient of the Schelde estuary, Belgium and The
531 Netherlands. Helgoland Marine Research 59:151-162

- 532 Harrison TD, Whitfield AK (2006) Temperature and salinity as primary determinants
533 influencing the biogeography of fishes in South African estuaries. *Estuarine Coastal and Shelf*
534 *Science* 66:335-345
- 535 Hooper DU, Chapin FS, Ewel JJ, Hector A, Inchausti P, Lavorel S, Lawton JH, Lodge DM,
536 Loreau M, Naeem S, Schmid B, Setälä H, Symstad AJ, Vandermeer J, Wardle DA (2005)
537 Effects of biodiversity on ecosystem functioning: A consensus of current knowledge. *Ecol*
538 *Monogr* 75:3-35
- 539 Hurlbert ST (1978) The measurement of niche overlap and some relatives. *Ecology* 59:67-77
- 540 Hynes HBN (1950) The food of freshwater sticklebacks (*Gasterosteus aculeatus* and
541 *Pygosteus pungitius*) with a review of methods used in studies of the food of fishes. *J Anim*
542 *Ecol* 19:36-58
- 543 Hyslop EJ (1980) Stomach contents analysis - a review of methods and their application. *J*
544 *Fish Biol* 17:411-429
- 545 Irigoien X, Castel J (1995) Feeding Rates and Productivity of the Copepod *Acartia bifilosa* in
546 a Highly Turbid Estuary - the Gironde (Sw France). *Hydrobiologia* 311:115-125
- 547 Kennedy M, Fitzmaurice P (1972) The biology of the bass, *Dicentrarchus labrax*, in Irish
548 waters. *J mar biol Ass UK* 52:557-597
- 549 Kimmerer WJ (2002) Effects of freshwater flow on abundance of estuarine organisms:
550 physical effects or trophic linkages? *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 243:39-55
- 551 Ktari MH, Bouain A, Quignard JP (1978) Régime alimentaire des loups (Poissons,
552 Téléostéens, Serranidae) *Dicentrarchus labrax* (Linné, 1778) et *Dicentrarchus punctatus*

- 553 (Bloch, 1892) des côtes tunisiennes. Bulletin de l'Institut National Scientifique et Technique
554 d'Océanographie Pêches Salammbô 5:5-15
- 555 Kupschus S, Tremain D (2001) Associations between fish assemblages and environmental
556 factors in nearshore habitats of a subtropical estuary. J Fish Biol 58:1383-1403
- 557 Labourg PJ, Stequert B (1973) Régime alimentaire du bar *Dicentrarchus labrax* L. des
558 réservoirs à poissons de la région d'Arcachon. Bull Ecol 4:187-194
- 559 Laffaille P, Lefeuvre J-C, Schricke M-T, Feunteun E (2001) Feeding ecology of 0-group sea
560 bass, *Dicentrarchus labrax*, in salt marshes of Mont Saint Michel Bay (France). Estuaries
561 24:116-125
- 562 Leitão R, Martinho E, Neto JM, Cabral H, Marques JC, Pardal MA (2006) Feeding ecology,
563 population structure and distribution of *Pomatoschistus microps* (Kroyer, 1838) and
564 *Pomatoschistus minutus* (Pallas, 1770) in a temperate estuary, Portugal. Estuarine Coastal and
565 Shelf Science 66:231-239
- 566 Libralato S, Christensen V, Pauly D (2006) A method for identifying keystone species in food
567 web models. Ecol Modelling 195:153-171
- 568 Lin H, Shao K, Jan R, Hsieh H, Chen C, Hsieh L, Hsiao Y (2007) A trophic model for the
569 Danshuei River Estuary, a hypoxic estuary in northern Taiwan. Mar Poll Bull 54:1789-1800
- 570 Link J (2002) Does food web theory work for marine ecosystems? Mar Ecol Prog Ser 230:1-9
- 571 Livingston RJ (2002) Trophic organization in coastal systems, Vol. CRC Press
- 572 Lobry J, David V, Pasquaud S, Lepage M, Sautour B, Rochard E (2008) Diversity and
573 stability of an estuarine trophic network. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 358:13-25

- 574 Lobry J, Lepage M, Rochard E (2006) From seasonal patterns to a reference situation in an
575 estuarine environment: Example of the small fish and shrimp fauna of the Gironde estuary
576 (SW France). *Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science* 70:239-250
- 577 Lobry J, Mourand L, Rochard E, Elie P (2003) Structure of the Gironde estuarine fish
578 assemblages: a comparison of European estuaries perspective. *Aquat Living Resour* 16:47-58
- 579 Macdonald JS, Green RH (1983) Redundancy of variables used to describe importance of
580 prey species in fish diets. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci* 40:635-637
- 581 Maes J, Ollevier F (2002) Size structure and feeding dynamics in estuarine clupeoid fish
582 schools: field evidence for the school trap hypothesis. *Aquat Living Resour* 15:211-216
- 583 Marshall S, Elliott M (1996) The structure of the fish assemblage in the Humber estuary,
584 United Kingdom. *Publicaciones Especiales Instituto Espanol de Oceanografia* 21:231-242
- 585 Martino EJ, Able KW (2003) Fish assemblages across the marine to low salinity transition
586 zone of a temperate estuary. *Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science* 56:969-987
- 587 Mc Lusky DS, Elliott M (2004) *The Estuarine Ecosystem: ecology, threats and management,*
588 *Vol. Oxford University Press, Oxford*
- 589 Mees J, Fockedey N, Hamerlynck O (1995) Comparative study of the hyperbenthos of three
590 European estuaries. *Hydrobiologia* 311:153-174
- 591 Menge BA, Olson AM (1990) Role of scale and environmental factors in regulation of
592 community structure. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 5:52-57

- 593 Moore JW, Moore IA (1976) The basis of food selection in some estuarine fishes. Eels,
594 *Anguilla anguilla* (L.), whiting, *Merlangius merlangus* (L.), sprat, *Sprattus sprattus* (L.) and
595 stickleback, *Gasterosteus aculeatus* (L.). J Fish Biol 9:375-390
- 596 Mouny P, Dauvin JC (2002) Environmental control of mesozooplankton community structure
597 in the seine estuary (English Channel). Oceanol Acta 25:13-22
- 598 Mouny P, Dauvin JC, Zouhiri S (2000) Benthic Boundary Layer fauna from the Seine Estuary
599 (eastern English Channel, France): spatial distribution and seasonal changes. J mar biol Ass
600 UK 80:959-968
- 601 Navarrete SA, Berlow EL (2006) Variable interaction strengths stabilize marine community
602 pattern. Ecol Lett 9:526-536
- 603 Oscoz J, Leunda PM, Miranda R, Escala MC (2006) Summer feeding relationships of the co-
604 occurring *Phoxinus phoxinus* and *Gobio lozanoi* (Cyprinidae) in an Iberian river. Folia Zool
605 55:418-432
- 606 Pasquaud S (2006) Les relations trophiques : éléments de structuration des peuplements
607 ichthyologiques en milieu estuarien - Application à l'estuaire de la Gironde. These de doctorat,
608 Université de Bordeaux 1
- 609 Pasquaud S, Elie P, Jeantet C, Billy I, Martinez P, Girardin M (2008) A preliminary
610 investigation of the fish food web in the Gironde estuary, France, using dietary and stable
611 isotope analyses. Estuar Coast Shelf Sci 78:267-279
- 612 Pasquaud S, Girardin M, Elie P (2004) Diet of gobies of the genus *Pomatoschistus* (*P.*
613 *microps* and *P. minutus*), in the Gironde estuary (France). Cybium 28:99-106

- 614 Pasquaud S, Lobry J, Elie P (2007) Facing the necessity of describing estuarine ecosystems: a
615 review of food web ecology study techniques. *Hydrobiologia* 588:159-172
- 616 Pederson J (1999) Diet comparison between pelagic and demersal whiting in the North Sea. *J*
617 *Fish Biol* 63:197-212
- 618 Pilh L (1985) Food selection and consumption of mobile epibenthic fauna in shallow marine
619 areas. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 22:169-179
- 620 Plounevez S, Champalbert G (1999) Feeding behaviour and trophic environment of *Engraulis*
621 *encrasicolus* (L.) in the Bay of Biscay. *Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science* 49:177-191
- 622 Quéro J-C, Vayne J-J (1987) Le maigre, *Argyrosomus regius* (Asso, 1801) (Pisces,
623 Perciformes, Sciaenidae) du Golfe de Gascogne et des eaux plus septentrionales. *Revue des*
624 *travaux de l'Institut de Pêches Maritimes* 49:35-66
- 625 Reum JCP, Essington TE (2008) Seasonal variation in guild structure of the Puget Sound
626 demersal fish community. *Estuaries and Coasts* 31:790-801
- 627 Rudstam LG, Aneer G, Hildén M (1994) Top-down control in the pelagic Baltic ecosystems.
628 *Dana* 10:105-129
- 629 Salgado JP, Cabral HN, Costa MJ (2004) Feeding ecology of the gobies *Pomatoschistus*
630 *minutus* (Pallas, 1770) and *Pomatoschistus microps* (Kroyer, 1838) in the upper Tagus
631 estuary, Portugal. *Sci Mar* 68:425-434
- 632 Salomon J-N (2002) L'inondation dans la basse vallée de la Garonne et l'estuaire de la
633 Gironde lors de la "tempête du siècle" (27-28 décembre 1999). *Géomorphologie : relief,*
634 *processus, environnement* 2:127-134

- 635 Sautour B, Castel J (1995) Comparative spring distribution of zooplankton in three macrotidal
636 European estuaries. *Hydrobiologia* 311:139-151
- 637 Schafer LN, Platell ME, Valesini FJ, Potter IC (2002) Comparisons between the influence of
638 habitat type, season and body size on the dietary compositions of fish species in nearshore
639 marine waters. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 278:67-92
- 640 Soetaert K, Van Rijswijk P (1993) Spatial and temporal patterns of the zooplankton in the
641 Westerschelde estuary. *Marine ecology process series* 97:47-59
- 642 Sorbe J-C (1981) La macrofaune vagile de l'estuaire de la Gironde : distribution et migration
643 des espèces, modes de reproduction et régimes alimentaires. *Océanis* 6:579-562
- 644 Sottolichio A (1999) Modélisation de la dynamique des structures turbides (bouchon vaseux
645 et crème de vase) dans l'estuaire de la Gironde. Thèse de doctorat, Université de Bordeaux I
- 646 Tank A, Wijngaard JB, Konnen GP, Bohm R, Demaree G, Gocheva A, Mileta M, Pashiardis
647 S, Hejkrlik L, Kern-Hansen C, Heino R, Bessemoulin P, Muller-Westermeir G, Tzanakou M,
648 Szalai S, Palsdottir T, Fitzgerald D, Rubin S, Capaldo M, Maugeri M, Leitass A, Bukantis A,
649 Aberfeld R, Van Engelen AFV, Forland E, Miletus M, Coelho F, Mares C, Razuvaev V,
650 Nieplova E, Cegnar T, Lopez JA, Dahlstrom B, Moberg A, Kirchhofer W, Ceylan A,
651 Pachaliuk O, Alexander LV, Petrovic P (2002) Daily dataset of 20th-century surface air
652 temperature and precipitation series for the European Climate Assessment. *International*
653 *Journal of Climatology* 22:1441-1453
- 654 Thiel R, Sepulveda A, Kafemann R, Nellen W (1995) Environmental-Factors as Forces
655 Structuring the Fish Community of the Elbe Estuary. *J Fish Biol* 46:47-69

- 656 Wallace H, Ramsay JS (1983) Reliability in measuring diet overlap. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci*
657 40:347-351
- 658 Wallace RK (1981) An assessment of Diet-Overlap Indexes. *Trans Am Fish Soc* 110:72-76
- 659 Warren PH, Lawton JH (1987) Invertebrate Predator-Prey Body Size Relationships - an
660 Explanation for Upper-Triangular Food Webs and Patterns in Food Web Structure. *Oecologia*
661 74:231-235
- 662 Weinstein MP, Weiss SL, Walters MF (1980) Multiple determinants of community structure
663 in shallow marsh habitats, Cape Fear River Estuary, North Carolina, USA. *Mar Biol* 58:227-
664 243
- 665 West JB, Bowen GJ, Cerling TE, Ehleringer JR (2006) Stable isotopes as one of nature's
666 ecological recorders. *Trends Ecol Evol* 21:408-414
- 667 Wolff M, Koch V, Isaac V (2000) A Trophic Flow Model of the Caeté Mangrove Estuary
668 (North Brazil) with Considerations for the Sustainable Use of its Resources. *Estuar Coast*
669 *Shelf Sci* 50:789-803
- 670 Woodward G, Hildrew AG (2002) Body-size determinants of niche overlap and intraguild
671 predation within a complex food web. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 71:1063-1074
- 672 Wootton RJ (1990) *Ecology of Teleost Fishes.*, Vol. Chapman & Hall, London

673 Captions

674

675 Fig. 1. Location of sampling stations – stars: fish, circles: shrimps (lines represent the four
676 transects) - in the Gironde estuary.

677

678 Fig. 2. Examples of the cumulated frequencies of the relative abundance (N) ranks (Y axis)
679 versus prey abundances (Ab) or mean weights (\bar{W}) in the environment for each predation
680 strategy: *Argyrosomus regius* in July 2003 for generalist species (i.e. Spearman correlation
681 coefficients were not significant for Ab and \bar{W}), *Engraulis encrasicolus* in September 2003
682 for opportunistic species (i.e. frequencies significantly increased with Ab), *Pomatoschistus*
683 *minutus* in July 2003 for specialist species (i.e. the highest frequencies were concentrated
684 around a narrow \bar{W} value). Prey abbreviations: cir: cirriped larvae, mol: mollusc larvae, pol:
685 polychaete larvae, Ac: *Acartia* spp., Eaff: *Eurytemora affinis*, mysis: mysis larvae, Nint:
686 *Neomysis integer*, Msla: *Mesopodopsis slabberi*, mysid: other mysids, crev: shrimps, amp:
687 amphipods essentially *Gammarus* spp., isop: isopods. Rg1, Rg2, Rg3 are the first, second and
688 third N-ranks; n is the number of stomach contents used to calculate frequencies. Significant
689 positive correlations between N-rank frequencies and an increase/decrease in the prey
690 characteristic frequencies are shown on the right. Spearman rank correlation was applied to
691 each of the cumulative series of the positive %N ranks, from the first and total N-rank; (**
692 significant trend).




Fig. 1




Fig. 2

Table 1. Functional guilds (EG: Ecological guild; TG: Trophic guild) and number of fish used for stomach content analyses for each sampled month; N: number of sampled stations for fish, shrimp and zooplankton. ER: Truly estuarine resident fish, MS: Marine seasonal migrant fish, MJ: Marine juvenile migrant fish, P: Planktivore, IS: Invertebrate feeder, IF: Invertebrate and fish feeder.

			July-03	Sept-03	Nov-03	Feb-04	April-04	June-04
Fish	EG	TG						
N			5	5	5	5	5	5
<i>Sprattus sprattus</i>	MS	P		5				
<i>Engraulis encrasicolus</i>	MS	P	27	9	6			
<i>Pomatoschistus microps</i>	ER	IS	20		10	11	15	
<i>Pomatoschistus minutus</i> (S)	ER	IS		15		21		15
<i>Pomatoschistus minutus</i> (L)	ER	IS	30	25	20	6		20
<i>Dicentrarchus labrax</i>	MJ	IF	6	5	9	26	11	
<i>Dicentrarchus punctatus</i>	MJ	IF					5	
<i>Argyrosomus regius</i> (S)	MS	IF	68					15
<i>Argyrosomus regius</i> (L)	MS	IF		29	36		20	40
<i>Merlangius merlangus</i>	MS	IF		5	8			
Shrimp								
N			12	12	12	12	12	12
Zooplankton								
N			23	22	16	12	16	16

Table 2. Relative abundance diet composition (%N) of the main pelagic and demersal fish according to size and time in the upstream area of the saline Gironde estuary.

	July 2003				September 2003					
	<i>Engraulis encrasicolus</i>	<i>Pomatoschistus microps</i>	<i>Pomatoschistus minutus</i>	<i>Argyrosomus regius</i>	<i>Engraulis encrasicolus</i>	<i>Sprattus sprattus</i>	<i>Pomatoschistus minutus</i>	<i>Pomatoschistus minutus</i>	<i>Argyrosomus regius</i>	<i>Merlangius merlangus</i>
Size range (TL ; mm)	38-127	27-37	40-73	30-104	45-77	60-115	23-39	40-65	130-235	90-102
Number of full stomach	18	15	17	68	9	5	8	20	29	5
Zooplankton										
Eggs		40								
Nauplius larvae	44.4		2.8		2.4	54.4				
Mysis larvae				1.7						
Mollusc eggs	39.6	24.4	38.9	0.3						
Mollusc larvae	1.5									
Polychaete larvae				0.2						
Cirriped larvae	8.3	11.1	2.8			0.3				
Copepods										
<i>E. affinis</i>		13.3				3.9	10	3.4		
<i>Acartia</i> spp.	4.4			4.7	94	41.7	10			5.9
Copepods ind.								3.4		
Hyperbenthos										
Mysidacea										
<i>Neomysis integer</i>	1.5		11.1	4.3				10.3		
<i>Mesopodopsis slabberi</i>	0.8	2.2	22.2	78.5	3.6		60	79.3	22.2	88.2
Mysids ind.		2.2	8.3				10			
Isopoda										
<i>Synidotea laticauda</i>		2.2					10		6.4	
Isopods ind.			2.8							
Amphipoda										
<i>Gammarus</i> spp.		2.2	5.6	0.2				3.4		
Decapoda natantia										
<i>Palaemon</i> spp.				0.3					54.1	
<i>Crangon crangon</i>			2.8	9.5					9.2	
Nekton										
Teleost fishes				0.2				8.3		5.9
Benthos										
Annelida polychaeta										
<i>Nereis succinea</i>		2.2	2.8							
Other										
Pollen		0.1								

	November 2003					February 2004			
	<i>Engraulis encrasicolus</i>	<i>Pomatoschistus microps</i>	<i>Pomatoschistus minutus</i>	<i>Argyrosomus regius</i>	<i>Merlangius merlangus</i>	<i>Pomatoschistus microps</i>	<i>Pomatoschistus minutus</i>	<i>Pomatoschistus minutus</i>	<i>Dicentrarchus labrax</i>
Size range (TL ; mm)	42-62	27-38	41-65	130-249	114-150	26-50	26-38	41-60	80-447
Number of full stomach	6	9	11	36	6	11	21	5	21
Zooplankton									
Eggs		38.5				4.2	1.4	15.4	
Copepods									
<i>Eurytemora affinis</i>	88.3	55.1				94	84.2	82.3	7.4
<i>Acartia</i>	7.4								
Copepods ind.		1.3					13.7		
Hyperbenthos									
Mysidacea									
<i>Neomysis integer</i>			5.3	5.4					
<i>Mesopodopsis slabberi</i>	3.2		36.8	10	10	0.6	0.2		
<i>Schistomysis</i> spp.				1					
Mysids ind.	1.7	1.3	15.8	2.7					0.8
Isopoda									
<i>Synidotea laticauda</i>			15.8	3.6					
Amphipoda									
<i>Gammarus</i> spp.			21.5	1.8	10	1.2	0.4	2.3	24.4
Amphipods ind.									2.16
Decapoda natantia									
<i>Palaemon</i> spp.				64.5	50				31.6
<i>Crangon crangon</i>				10	18.2				6.1
Nekton									
Teleost fishes			5.3	1	10				
Epibenthos									
Isopoda									
<i>Cyathura carinata</i>		1.3							
<i>Sphaeroma serratum</i>									3.5
Amphipoda									
<i>Corophium volutator</i>		2.6							19.8
Decapoda brachyura									
<i>Pachygrapsus marmoratus</i>									1.5
<i>Rhithropanopeus harrisi</i>									0.8
Crabs ind.									0.8
Annelida polychaeta									
<i>Nereis</i> spp.									0.8
Polychaetes ind.					4.5				

	April 2004				June 2004			
	<i>Pomatoschistus microps</i>	<i>Dicentrarchus labrax</i>	<i>Dicentrarchus punctatus</i>	<i>Argyrosomus regius</i>	<i>Pomatoschistus minutus</i>	<i>Pomatoschistus minutus</i>	<i>Argyrosomus regius</i>	<i>Argyrosomus regius</i>
Size range (TL ; mm)	33-39	83-140	92-135	125-260	21-39	40-55	30-52	118-263
Number of full stomach	11	8	5	20	11	19	14	38
Zooplankton								
Eggs								0.8
Mysis larvae							2.7	0.7
Copepods								
<i>Eurytemora affinis</i>	62.2						18.9	
<i>Acartia</i> spp.	8.2							
Copepods ind.		7.1						
Ichthyoplankton							20.3	
Hyperbenthos								
Mysidacea								
<i>Neomysis integer</i>	5.4	14.3	17.6	44.1	17.6	28	36.5	31.4
<i>Mesopodopsis slabberi</i>			69.4	4.1			8.2	0.3
Mysids ind.	5.4			1.4				0.13
Isopoda								
<i>Synidotea laticauda</i>		7.1	2.3	2.7				0.5
<i>Sphaeroma serratum</i>							4.5	
Amphipoda								
<i>Gammarus</i> spp.	18.9	57.1	8.2	27.6	82.3	64	9.5	59.2
<i>Corophium volutator</i>				3.4				
<i>Bathyporeia</i> spp.			1.2					
Amphipods ind.						8		
Decapoda natantia								
<i>Palaemon</i> spp.				6.9				0.5
<i>Crangon crangon</i>		7.1		10.3				5.1
Nekton								
Teleost fishes		7.1						1.6
Benthos								
Annelida polychaeta								
<i>Nereis succinea</i>			1.2					0.4

Table 3. Predation strategy for each fish species according to size and time. Results were deduced from the form of N frequencies of prey versus abundances (Ab) and mean weights (\bar{W}). Three different types of food behavior were determined: (1) opportunistic when frequencies increased significantly with Ab, (2) generalist when the Spearman correlation coefficient was null, (3) specialist when the highest frequencies were concentrated around a narrow \bar{W} (cf. Fig. 2). See Fig. 2 for the definition of prey abbreviations. ns: non-significant trend; * significant trend.

	July 2003	September 2003	November 2003	February 2004	April 2004	June 2004
Environment						
Available prey	10	11	5	5	9	10
Prey densities	7.8 ind L ⁻¹	3.1 ind L ⁻¹	5.0 ind L ⁻¹	10.7 ind L ⁻¹	18.6 ind L ⁻¹	13.1 ind L ⁻¹
<i>E. encrasicolus</i>						
Size (mm, replicates)	38-127 (18)	47-77 (9)	47-62 (6)			
Prey number (range)	6 (naup-Nint)	4 (naup-Msla)	4 (Ac-mysid)			
Spearman test	*	*	*			
Predation strategy	OPPORTUNIST	OPPORTUNIST	OPPORTUNIST			
<i>S. sprattus</i>						
Size (mm, replicates)		60-115 (5)				
Prey number		4 (naup-Eaf)				
Spearman test		ns				
Predation strategy		SPECIALIST				
<i>P. microps</i>						
Size (mm, replicates)	27-37 (15)		27-38 (9)	26-50 (11)	33-39 (11)	
Prey number	9 (eggs-pol)		6 (eggs-isop)	4 (eggs-amp)	5 (Ac-amp)	
Spearman test	ns		ns	ns	ns	
Predation strategy	SPECIALIST		SPECIALIST	SPECIALIST	SPECIALIST	
<i>P. minutus</i>						
•Small size		23-39 (8)		26-38 (21)		21-39 (11)
Prey number		5 (Ac-isop)		5 (eggs-amp)		2 (Nint-amp)
Spearman test		ns		ns		ns
Predation strategy		SPECIALIST		SPECIALIST		SPECIALIST
•Large size	40-73 (17)	40-65 (20)	41-65 (11)	41-60 (5)		40-55 (19)
Prey number	9 (mol-shr)	5 (cops-amp)	5 (Msla-fish)	3 (eggs-amp)		3 (Nint-amp)
Spearman test	ns	ns	*	ns		*
Predation strategy	SPECIALIST	SPECIALIST	OPPORTUNIST	SPECIALIST		OPPORTUNIST
<i>A. regius</i>						
•Small size	30-104 (68)					30-52 (14)
Prey number	9 (mol-fish)					7 (Eaff-fish)
Spearman test	ns					ns
Predation strategy	GENERALIST					GENERALIST
•Large size		130-235 (25)	130-249 (36)		125-260 (20)	118-263 (38)
Prey number		4 (Msla-fish)	6 (Msla-fish)		6 (Msla-shr)	9 (eggs-fish)
Spearman test		ns	ns		ns	ns
Predation strategy		SPECIALIST	SPECIALIST		GENERALIST	SPECIALIST
<i>M. merlangus</i>						
Size (mm, replicates)		90-102 (5)	114-150 (6)			
Prey number		3 (Ac-fish)	5 (Msla-fish)			
Spearman test		ns	ns			
Predation strategy		SPECIALIST	SPECIALIST			
<i>D. labrax</i>						
Size (mm, replicates)				80-147 (21)	83-140 (8)	
Prey number				7 (Eaf-crab)	5 (cops-fish)	
Spearman test				ns	ns	
Predation strategy				SPECIALIST	SPECIALIST	
<i>D. punctatus</i>						
Size (mm, replicates)					95-135 (8)	
Prey number					5 (Msla-pol)	
Spearman test					*	
Predation strategy					OPPORTUNIST	