

Understanding common dolphin and Australasian gannet feeding associations from an ethological and nutritional perspective

Karen A Stockin, Christophe Amiot, Laureline Meynier, Cameron Purvin, Gabriel E Machovsky-Capuska

▶ To cite this version:

Karen A Stockin, Christophe Amiot, Laureline Meynier, Cameron Purvin, Gabriel E Machovsky-Capuska. Understanding common dolphin and Australasian gannet feeding associations from an ethological and nutritional perspective. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 2022, 79 (7), pp.2032-2042. 10.1093/icesjms/fsac1333. hal-03944902

HAL Id: hal-03944902 https://hal.science/hal-03944902

Submitted on 18 Jan 2023 $\,$

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.

Understanding common dolphin and Australasian gannet feeding associations from an ethological and nutritional perspective

3		
4 5	Karen A. Stockin ^{1,#} , Christophe Amiot ^{2,3} , Laureline Meynier ¹ , Cameron Purvin ¹ , Gabriel E. Machovsky-Capuska ^{1,4}	
6		
7 8	¹ Cetacean Ecology Research Group, School of Natural Sciences, Massey University, Auckland 0745, New Zealand	
9	² UFR Science et Technologie, Nantes Université, 44000 Nantes, France	
10	³ BiodivAG, Angers Université, 49000 Angers, France	
11	⁴ Nutri Lens, East Ryde, NSW 2113, Australia	
12		
13	[#] Corresponding author email: <u>k.a.stockin@massey.ac.nz</u>	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18	ORCID	
19	Karen Stockin	https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2981-3983
20	Christophe Amiot	https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4788-0928
21	Laureline Meynier	https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3904-8920
22	Gabriel E. Machovsky-Capuska	https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8698-8424
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		
31		

32 Abstract

Prey detection and subsequent capture is considered a major hypothesis to explain feeding 33 associations between common dolphins and Australasian gannets. However, a current lack of 34 insight on nutritional strategies with respect to foraging behaviours of both species has until 35 now, prevented any detailed understanding of this conspecific relationship. Here we combine 36 stomach content analysis, nutritional composition of prey, a multidimensional nutritional 37 niche framework (MNNF) and videography to provide a holistic dietary, nutritional, and 38 39 behavioural assessment of the feeding association between dolphins and gannets in the Hauraki Gulf, New Zealand. Dolphins consumed 10 prey species, including grey mullet 40 41 (Mugil cephalus) as the most representative by wet mass (33.4%). Gannets preved upon six species, with pilchards (Sardinops pilchardus) contributing most of the diet by wet mass 42 (32.4%) to their diet. Both predators jointly preved upon pilchard, jack mackerel (*Trachurus* 43 spp.), arrow squid (genus Nototodarus) and anchovy (Engraulis australis). Accordingly, the 44 MNNF revealed a moderate overlap in the prey composition niche (0.42) and realized 45 nutritional niche (0.52) between dolphins and gannets. This suggests that both predators 46 coexist in a similar nutritional space, while simultaneously reducing interspecific competition 47 and maximizing the success of both encountering and exploiting patchily distributed prey. 48 Behavioural analysis further indicated that dolphin and gannets feeding associations are 49 likely to be mutually beneficial, with a carouselling foraging strategy and larger pod sizes of 50 dolphins, influencing the diving altitude of gannets. Our approach provides a new, more 51 52 holistic understanding of this iconic foraging relationship, which until now has been poorly understood. 53

54

55 Keywords: marine predators; mutualism, *Delphinus delphis*; *Morus serrator*; Hauraki Gulf;
56 foraging; multidimensional nutritional niche framework.

58 1. Introduction

Enhanced feeding capabilities (i.e., facilitation of prev detection and capturing of food items 59 60 that may be available to individuals) has been highlighted as a major hypothesis to explain heterospecific feeding associations (Morse, 1977). These temporary relationships are 61 regarded as a major adaptive advantage in marine environments, especially when prey is 62 patchily distributed and/or difficult to detect (Fauchald et al., 2000). From the tropics to 63 64 temperate and polar regions worldwide, heterospecific associations in marine environments 65 are widespread in various taxa including fish-octopus, fish-fish, seabirds-seabirds, seabirds-66 pinnipeds, seabirds-fish-cetaceans and seabirds-sharks-cetaceans-pinnipeds (reviewed in Gatti et al., 2021). Considerable attention has been given to the interactions between 67 cetaceans and seabirds globally (Evans, 1982; Camphuysen and Webb, 1999; Vaughn et al., 68 69 2007, 2010, 2011; Sutton et al., 2019; Towers and Gasco, 2020). However, quantifying the currencies of these relationships (e.g., behaviours involved, energetic budget, spatial and 70 temporal investment) in free ranging predators remains notoriously challenging. 71

To understand the nature of heterospecific feeding associations in wild, highly mobile 72 predators, models will benefit from information on species' properties that both influence 73 individual fitness and shape responses to their environment (i.e., functional traits) (Kearny et 74 al., 2010; Houlahan et al., 2017). Feeding related traits (e.g., food consumption, prey 75 76 composition, and ecological niche) and behavioural strategies (degree of sociability and 77 cooperation in foraging strategies) could provide fundamental insights to heterospecific feeding aggregations if studied in unison. Given that animal behaviour and physiological 78 characteristics relate to the acquisition of nutrients and energy (Raubenheimer et al., 2009), 79 80 an integrated standardize approach is required to understand the complexities of these interactions and provide transferable ecological fresh insights. By integrating behaviour, 81

nutrition and physiology, a multidimensional nutritional niche framework (MNNF,
Machovsky-Capuska et al., 2016a) provides a nutrient lens to the prey and diets consumed by
organisms within an ecological niche context (i.e., prey composition and realized nutritional
niches). Thus, understanding the nutritional requirements and foraging strategies of marine
vertebrate predators is important, in order to predict how a species interacts with different
trophic levels and their environment (Machovsky-Capuska and Raubenheimer, 2020).

88 Several studies on seabirds (Machovsky-Capuska et al., 2018; Machovsky-Capuska and Raubenheimer, 2020), predatory fish (Machovsky-Capuska and Raubenheimer, 2020), 89 90 turtles (Machovsky-Capuska et al., 2020a, Santos et al., 2020), cetaceans (Denuncio et al., 2017; Machovsky-Capuska and Raubenheimer, 2020; Machovsky-Capuska et al., 2020b), 91 92 pinnipeds (Machovsky-Capuska and Raubenheimer, 2020; Denuncio et al., 2021) and sharks 93 (Machovsky-Capuska and Raubenheimer, 2020; Grainger et al., 2020), have increasingly applied the MNNF to: (i) understand how marine predators adjust their foraging behaviour 94 and nutritional goals to environmental fluctuations (Machovsky-Capuska et al., 2018), (ii) 95 96 explore the nutritional consequences of consuming plastics and anthropogenic pollutants (Machovsky-Capuska et al., 2019, 2020a,b; Santos et al., 2020, 2021; Stockin et al., 2021 97 a,b), and (iii) disentangle the dynamics that facilitates coexistence with other sympatric 98 species (Denuncio et al., 2021), and examine how they are likely to interact with humans 99 (Grainger et al., 2020). 100

101 The Hauraki Gulf, North Island New Zealand, provides a quintessential coastal 102 environment characterised by heterospecific feeding associations involving dynamic bait ball 103 that often composed of pilchards (*Sardinops pilchardus*), anchovies (*Engraulis australis*) or 104 Jack mackerel (*Trachurus* spp.) (Stockin et al., 2008a; Wiseman et al., 2011; Purvin, 2015; 105 Gostischa et al., 2021). Among these multiple sympatric predator-prey interactions, common 106 dolphins (*Delphinus delphis;* hereafter dolphins) and Australasian gannets (*Morus serrator*; hereafter gannets) represent one of the most frequently observed associations during feeding
events (Burgess, 2006; Stockin et al., 2008a, b, 2009a; de la Brosse, 2010; Purvin, 2015) and
can serve as a model to understand the behavioural, ecological and evolutionary dimensions
of such interactions. While the local diet of both predators is well characterised (Meynier et
al., 2008a; Machovsky-Capuska et al., 2011a; Tait et al., 2014; Peters et al., 2020), a current
lack of insight on their nutritional strategies with respect to foraging behaviours has
prevented any detailed understanding of this conspecific relationship until now.

Here, we combine dietary analysis (i.e., stomach content analyses -SCA-), nutritional composition of prey, the MNNF with Bayesian multivariate ellipses and videography to provide a holistic dietary, nutritional, and ethological assessment of the feeding association between dolphins and gannets in the Hauraki Gulf, New Zealand. In particular, we aim to: i) compare the prey, diets, and niche breadths of dolphins and gannets through a nutritional lens, specifically by ii) exploring whether dolphin foraging behaviours influence gannet diving strategies.

121

122 **2. Materials and Methods**

123 *2.1. Study Area*

The Hauraki Gulf / Tīkapa Moana is a shallow coastal feature of the North Island of New 124 Zealand, which encompasses an area of ca. 4000 sq km and a maximum water depth ~60 m. 125 126 Surrounded by the Auckland region, the Hauraki Plains, the Coromandel Peninsula, and Great Barrier Island, this semi enclosed body of water is riddled with islands and shallow 127 reefs that extend into waters of the western Pacific Ocean. Water circulation in the gulf is 128 129 primarily driven by tides and wind (Heath, 1985; Gaskin and Rayner, 2013) and accordingly, has historically been an area of high primary productivity (Zeldis et al., 2004), subject to 130 large environmental fluctuations (Srinivasan et al., 2015). 131

133 2.2. Sampling procedures and stomach content analysis

During 2009 and 2010, the diet of adult (physically mature, >1.8m) dolphins (n=18) and adult, non-breeding gannets (n=22) were assessed using stomach content analyses of carcasses opportunistically collected as beachcast or dead floating in the waters of the Hauraki Gulf (36°51' S, 174°46' E), north of Auckland city. Only carcasses deemed to be of fresh or mild decomposition (Stockin et al 2009b) were included in this study.

Post-mortem sampling of gannets followed standardised avian protocols (Work, 2000). In summary, carcasses were typically stored frozen until subsequent examination. Upon dissection, individual prey items were extracted from the upper gastrointestinal tract including the oral cavity, oesophagus, and stomach. All ingested prey items were individually weighed to 0.1 g, and stomach contents subsequently rinsed through a 0.25-mm-mesh sieve until clean to extract diagnostic prey remains, predominantly fish otoliths and cephalopod beaks (Wingham, 1985; Duffy and Jackson, 1986).

Dolphins were examined post-mortem using standardised protocols (Stockin et al., 146 2009b). The gastrointestinal tract was ligated and the extracted for subsequent analysis. 147 Stomach contents of each dolphin were carefully rinsed through a 0.25 mm mesh sieve. 148 Diagnostic hard parts (predominately otoliths and cephalopod beaks with some jaw bones) 149 150 were identified to the lowest possible taxonomic level using the reference collection (Massey 151 University, following Meynier et al., 2008a) and published guides (Clarke, 1986; Smale et al., 1995). Prey size and mass for each species were further estimated at an accuracy of 152 0.5mm, using regression equations from the literature (Smale et al., 1995; Fea et al., 1999; Lu 153 154 and Ickeringill, 2002) based on otolith length (or width when the tip was broken), lower beak rostral length (LRL) for squid, or lower beak hood length (LHL) for octopods and sepiolids, 155 as outlined by Meynier et al. (2008a). Prey size and mass were then subsequently used to 156

estimate the percentage of total prey wet mass that the species contributed to the overall diet(M%, wet weight).

159

160 *2.3. Proximate composition analysis*

For prey species that contributed >1% wet mass to the diets of both dolphins and gannets, we 161 collected 30 individual samples from seven species for subsequent proximate composition 162 analyses. We further extracted proximate compositional data from Tait et al. (2004) for the 163 164 remaining three species (Table 1). Carbohydrates are known to constitute a negligible content on squid and marine fish species (Craig et al., 1978), thus we measured the proximate 165 composition of protein (P), lipid (L), water (W) and ash (A). Following Bligh and Dyer 166 (1959), we further measured total L (ether extract), whereas Kjeldahl analysis was used to 167 measured total nitrogen (N) and then converted to P (N x 6.25, AOAC 981.10, AOAC, 2005). 168 169 A convection oven at 125 °C was used to dry samples and estimate W from their moisture loss (AOAC 950.46; AOAC, 2002). Ash was measured by the ignition of samples in a 170 furnace at 550 °C (AOAC 920.153; AOAC, 2005). 171

172

173 2.4. Video footage collection and behavioural analysis

Behavioural analysis was performed on aerial video footage of dolphin and gannet feeding 174 associations in the Hauraki Gulf involving 13 feeding events (totalling 40 minutes min 175 duration) collected during 2010. Video footage was collected using a Canon XH A1S high-176 definition video camera (25 frames s⁻¹) with a 20 mm zoom lens, at a consistent height of 5 m 177 above the water surface on board the Dolphin Explorer, a 20 m commercial dolphin-watching 178 catamaran operated 4.5 h trips daily. Foraging events were also observed using 8 x 40 Pentax 179 180 handheld binoculars and characterised as follows: i) the species present (e.g., dolphins and gannets vs gannets only), ii) the number of foragers (gannets: <100 and \ge 100, and dolphins: 181

<100 and ≥ 100), iii) the number of workups they formed and iv) their different foraging
strategies (Table 2). The upper limit of both gannets and dolphins was considered when
making group size estimates, taking into consideration fission/fusion events (Burgess, 2006;
Stockin et al 2008a). All group size and behavioural observations were conducted by a single
observer to avoid inter observer bias.

Feeding events were defined as temporary groups of predators that assemble to 187 exploit patches of prey. Workups were defined as highly intense gannet diving events within 188 a confined spatiotemporal area in a feeding event (Purvin, 2015). Thus, it is possible that a 189 190 feeding event comprised several workups. The beginning of each workup, either in the presence or absence of dolphins, was marked by the initiation of the diving activity by 191 192 plummeting gannets from the air, until the birds stopped diving in the same area (Burgess, 193 2006). Following Neumann and Orams (2003) and Burgess (2006), the dolphin foraging 194 strategies were classified as: i) carouselling, when dolphins circulate the perimeter of the bait-ball keeping the fish stationary and densely concentrated at the water surface; ii) line-195 196 *abreast*, where a foraging group of dolphins cooperatively drives prey ahead of them, and iii) synchronous diving, in which many members of a foraging group dive simultaneously and 197 resurface in synchrony under fish schools. 198

Gannets were tracked at a constant zoom with the horizon included as a frame of reference to allow determination of the position of each individual relative to the horizontal plane (Land, 1999). Following Machovsky-Capuska et al. (2011b), a mean body length of 89 cm for adult gannets was used as a size reference for individual plunge diving height estimations recorded as either $< 5 \text{ m or} \ge 5 \text{ m}$ above the water surface. Dives were classified as "synchronous" when multiple gannets plunge from the air into the water simultaneously and "solo" when only one individual gannet was involved (Machovsky-Capuska, 2012).

207 2.5. Data analysis

Proportions-based Nutritional Geometry (PNG, Raubenheimer, 2011) combined with 208 Bayesian multivariate ellipses (Jackson et al., 2011) and the MNNF (Machovsky-Capuska et 209 210 al., 2016a) were used to explore the three-dimensional relationships between the wet mass proportions of P, L and W from prey species, diets and niches of both dolphins and gannets. 211 Following Machovsky-Capuska et al. (2016a), the variety of prey compositions eaten are 212 known as prey composition niche, whereas the diets composed by consuming different prey 213 are known as realized nutritional niches. To estimate the prey composition and realised 214 215 nutritional niche breadths of dolphins and gannets from proportional data, we combined the MNNF with standard ellipse areas for small sample sizes (SEAc, Syväranta et al., 2013), 216 following Machovsky-Capuska et al. (2018). 217

218 Differences in SEAc between dolphins and gannets (prey composition niches and realised nutritional niches) were assessed by producing a range of possible posterior estimates 219 (SEAb). These estimated resulted from 2×10^4 iterations with 2 chains, a burning of 1×10^3 220 221 and thinning of 10, using Markov chain Monte Carlo simulations combined with Bayesian inference (Grainger et al., 2020). The maxLikOverlap function was subsequently applied to 222 estimate the proportional overlap area between two ellipses (overlap ellipses were equal to 1 223 whereas distinctive ellipses were equal to 0) (SIBER package, Jackson et al., 2011). We 224 considered ≥ 0.60 as a significant overlap (Schoener, 1968 and Guzzo et al., 2013), >0.31 to 225 226 0.59 as moderate overlap and low overlap as ≤ 0.30 .

Levene's test for homoscedasticity and Shapiro-Wilk's test for normality were initially applied to the data. We converted P and L wet masses to energy (E) values using P = 17 kj/g and L = 37 kj/g (N.R.C., 1989). To explore whether the nutritional composition (logit transformed wet mass proportions of P, L, W, the protein to lipid ratio -P:L- and energy (E)) of prey and diets differ between predators, we fitted linear models (LMs) using the *lm* function (Bates et al., 2015) with the nutritional composition from prey and diets as theresponse.

Video footage of *feeding events* and *workups* was analysed frame-by-frame using 234 Avidemux v2.6. Possible correlations between characteristics of dolphin behaviours, group 235 sizes and gannet diving behaviours (height, degree of synchronization) were examined using 236 General Estimating Equations with binomial distribution (GEE's; geepack Package, Liang 237 238 and Zeger, 1986; Højsgaard et al., 2006). Following Pan (2001), we assessed model fit using the quasi likelihood under the independence model criterion (QIC), with the lowest value 239 240 model signalling the best fit. GEE tests were nested using *feeding event* and *workup* categories to account for the inability to identify individual gannets between workups and the 241 inherent correlation between gannet behaviours within the same group, by including an 242 243 additional variance component for correlation structure within the data clusters. Data are reported as mean and standard error. All analyses were performed using the statistical 244 software environment R4.1.2 (R Core Team, 2021). 245

246

247 **3. Results**

A total of 40 stomachs were examined including gannets (n=22) and dolphins (n=18). For all 248 the individuals examined, the presence of undigested prey in the upper gastrointestinal track 249 250 supports mortality of an acute as opposed to chronic nature (ie from a prolonged underlying health or disease mechanism; Stockin et al. 2009b). Non-breeding adult male (n=17) and 251 female (n=5) gannets were collected on the beach or dead floating on the water. While a 252 mixture of sexually immature (n=11) and mature (n=7) dolphins were included in this study, 253 all individuals were physically mature based on total body length. Sample size restricted our 254 255 ability to consider the effect of sex and year on diet.

256

257 3.1. Diet composition and nutritional niche breadths of dolphins and gannets

Dolphins consumed 10 prey species, with only 5 species contributing > 1% wet mass,
including grey mullet (*Mugil cephalus*) as the most representative by wet mass (33.40 %).
Gannets preyed upon six species that all contributed > 1% mass, with pilchards contributing
most to their diet by wet mass (32.38 %; Table 1). Across all the prey species consumed, both
predators ingested pilchard, jack mackerel, arrow squid (genus *Nototodarus*) and anchovy.

Prey consumed by dolphins had an energy content that ranged from 2.99 Kj/g to 5.84 263 Kj/g and a wet mass P:L = 2.58:1.0 to P:L = 15.25:1.0, whereas the prey consumed by 264 gannets ranged from 3.42 Kj/g to 5.11 Kj/g and wet mass P:L = 2.76:1.0 to 15.25:1.0 (Table 265 266 1, Fig. 1A). No differences were observed in the wet mass proportional composition of P (LM, $F_{1.66} = 0.30$, p = 0.59), L (LM, $F_{1,66} = 0.07$, p = 0.79), W (LM, $F_{1,66} = 0.38$, p = 0.54) 267 and PL (LM, $F_{1.66} = 0.01$, p = 0.91) or the total energy content (LM, $F_{1.66} = 0.16$, p = 0.69) of 268 269 the prey consumed by dolphins and gannets. A comparison of the prey composition niche 270 breath (SEAc) between predators demonstrated that dolphins (16.4) had a significantly broader niche breadth compared to gannets (6.9) (Probability $SEAb_{dolphin} > SEAb_{gannet} = 0.99$, 271 <0.05), with a 0.42 degree of overlap between niches (Fig. 1B). 272

The nutritional composition of diets of dolphins and gannets ranged from P:L =273 2.8:1.0 to 15.3:1.0 (Fig. 2A). The estimated wet mass composition of the diet of dolphins was 274 $17.79 \pm 0.35\%$ P, $2.91 \pm 0.41\%$ L, $77.80 \pm 0.69\%$ W and P:L = 10.38 ± 0.15 , whereas for 275 gannets, this was 17.55 \pm 0.20% P, 2.77 \pm 0.35% L, 78.39 \pm 0.42% W and a P:L = 10.22 \pm 276 277 1.25. A comparison of the diets between dolphins and gannets suggested no differences in the mass proportion of P (LM, $F_{1,38} = 0.11$, p = 0.74), L (LM, $F_{1,38} = 1.78$, p = 0.19), W (LM, 278 $F_{1,38} = 0.49$, p = 0.49) and the P:L (LM, $F_{1,38} = 0.87$, p = 0.36). The realised nutritional niche 279 280 breath (SEAc) of dolphins (3.0) was significantly narrower than the niche of gannets (5.7) (Probability $SEAb_{dolphin} < SEAb_{gannet} = 0.97, <0.05$), showing a 0.52 degree of niche overlap 281 282 between predator (Fig. 2B).

284 *3.2.* Foraging behaviours that shape dolphin and gannet interactions.

Behavioural analysis of the 40 min of video footage revealed 13 feeding events that included 16 independent work ups (Table 2), this accounting for a field effort of 3510 min (58 h). From the total number of workups recorded, 50% (n = 8) involved the presence of dolphins and gannets, and 50% (n = 8) involved gannets foraging alone. Group sizes of dolphin and gannet associations varied from < 100 individuals (33.3%, n = 3) to \geq 100 individuals (66.7%, n = 6).

During all workups, we recorded 1652 gannet dives, from which 79% (n = 1299) 291 were in the presence of dolphins and 21% (n = 353) with birds foraging alone. From the total 292 number of dives registered, 75,1% (n =1241) commenced at \geq 5 m above sea level, with only 293 24.9% (n = 412) of dives occurring at < 5m. The size of gannet diving groups was 294 significantly influenced by the presence of dolphins (GEE: Wald χ^2 = 53337.2, P < 0.0001). 295 However, no differences were observed in the heights and synchronization of gannet dives 296 with and without dolphin engagement (respectively, GEE: Wald χ^2 = 3.3, P = 0.07; Wald χ^2 = 297 0.0, P = 0.89). 298

Our analysis revealed that the foraging strategies of dolphins do affect gannet diving 299 behaviour. Specifically, the carouselling foraging strategy used by dolphins significantly 300 increased the proportion of gannet dives $\geq 5m$ (GEE: Wald $\chi^2 = 35.05$, P < 0.001, Table 3, 301 Fig. 3). Although not significant (GEE: Wald $\chi^2 = 3.47$, P = 0.06, Table 3), a similar trend 302 was also evident when dolphins adopted a line-abreast behaviour foraging strategy. No 303 relationship was observed between synchronous diving in dolphins and gannet diving heights 304 305 or between the different dolphin foraging strategies and the degree of synchronization of gannet dives (Table 3). Our findings also showed that dolphin group size influenced the 306

percentage of plunge diving heights performed by gannets (GEE, Wald $\chi^2 = 34.1$, p < 0.0001, Table 3, Fig. 4).

309

310 4. Discussion

311

Interactions between marine apex predators may have a significant role on the structuring and 312 functioning of their communities (Ritchie and Johnson, 2009; Baum and Worm, 2009). Given 313 314 that both dolphins and gannets play a key role in driving ecological interactions (Stockin et al., 2008a; Machovsky-Capuska et al., 2016b) and serve as bio-monitor species (Srinivasan et 315 al., 2015; Stockin et al., 2021a,b), an understanding of the extent of these relations and their 316 317 ecological role, is important to preserve healthy marine ecosystems. Our study provides nutritional and ethological perspectives, that reveal how foraging strategies of dolphins, 318 shape these multispecies interactions while feeding on patchily distributed marine prey. 319

320

4.1. A nutritional lens to dolphin and gannet feeding associations

Current understanding of the diet of marine predators has been achieved using different 322 indirect techniques (e.g., stomach content analysis, faeces, regurgitations, stable isotopes, 323 fatty acids and DNA metabarcoding), that are known for their individual advantages and 324 limitations (reviewed in Young et al., 2015). However, linking such complementary 325 approaches offers the most robust means of gaining both dietary and foraging insights (Majdi 326 327 et al., 2018). Our analysis showed that most of the nutritional dietary intake of dolphins (88.6%, wet mass) is achieved by combining the proximate compositions of grey mullet, 328 pilchards and jack mackerel, whereas for gannets (91.5%, wet mass), this occurred via the 329 consumption of pilchard, yellow eye mullet, kahawai and anchovy. These results are 330 consistent with previous findings that suggest both predators' prey upon surface schooling 331 anchovy, pilchard and jack mackerel within the Hauraki Gulf (Tait et al., 2014; Peters et al., 332

2020). While vital to many marine predators coexisting in the area (Gostischa et al., 2021),
the availability of prey across the Hauraki Gulf is subject to the East Auckland Current, shelf
upwelling patterns and environmental oscillations that influence the nutrient production
(Zeldis et al., 2004). Thus, a lack of current information on stocks of jack mackerel, grey
mullet, and pilchard prevents a comprehensive understanding of the sustainability of these
marine predator populations within the region (Hauraki Gulf Forum, 2020).

Understanding the foraging strategies and nutritional requirements of marine 339 predators is critical to predict how these species adjust to changes in prey composition and 340 availability in heterogenous environments (Österblom et al., 2008; Machovsky-Capuska et 341 al., 2016b). While our results showed no differences in the nutritional composition of diets, 342 both predators relied on the consumption of species with high energy content, high %L and 343 344 low P:L. For instance, dolphins relied on grey mullet (4.8 Ki/g, 6.5%L and P:L= 2.6) and gannets on yellow eye mullet (5.1 Kj/g, 6.1%L and P:L=2.8), that were also mixed with low 345 energy content, low %L, High P:L prey to achieve their respective intakes. The ability to 346 347 combine nutritionally complementary prey (species with different P:L) to achieve similar diet intakes has previously been reported in gannets (Machovsky-Capuska et al., 2016b), mink 348 (Mustela vision, Mayntz et al., 2009), and juvenile white sharks (Carcharodon carcharias, 349 Grainger et al., 2020). Such findings are furthermore, consistent with prior studies that 350 suggest the likelihood that prey selection in aquatic predators is likely to be driven by 351 352 macronutrient balance instead of energy acquisition (Mayntz et al., 2009; Machovsky-Capuska et al. 2016b,c; Machovsky-Capuska and Raubenheimer, 2020). 353

Characterising the prey composition and realized nutritional niche breaths, provides novel insights in the degree of generalism of a species (Machovsky-Capuska et al., 2016a, 2018) and their ability to interact with multiple trophic levels (reviewed in Machovsky-Capuska and Raubenheimer, 2020; Denuncio et al., 2021). At a prey composition level,

358 dolphins showed a broader niche (16.4) comparatively to gannets (6.9), with several nonexclusive explanations available to explain this pattern. First, while both species are known to 359 predominantly consume small prey items (< 12.0 cm), dolphins also ingest larger fish (> 20.0 360 361 cm) that are highly profitable in terms of nutrients and energy intake (Meynier et al., 2008a,b; Machovsky-Capuska et al., 2018). Second, distinct morphological and evolutionary 362 differences between dolphin and gannet gastrointestinal systems (e.g., mouth and gut size) 363 that lead to differences in prey processing, digestion efficiency and retention time of nutrients 364 (Stevens and Hume, 1998). Third, a differential physiological ability to convert protein and 365 366 lipids into metabolized energy could potentially influence nutrient-specific foraging decisions as suggested in gannets (Machovsky-Capuska et al., 2016b; reviewed in Machovsky-Capuska 367 and Raubenheimer, 2020; Machovsky-Capuska et al., 2020b) and considered for different life 368 369 stages within dolphins (Meynier et al., 2008b; Spitz et al., 2010). Fourth, dolphins exhibit 370 oceanic, neritic and coastal foraging strategies (Meynier et al., 2008a; Meissner et al., 2015; Filby et al., 2013; Peters and Stockin, 2022; Dwyer et al., 2020), whereas gannets are coastal 371 372 predators (Wingham, 1985). Thus, this distinct ability to exploit the Hauraki Gulf likely plays an important role in the extent of their prey composition niches. At a realised nutritional 373 374 niche level, gannets (5.7) exhibit a broader niche breadth compared to dolphins (3.0). This is consistent with previous evidence which suggests gannets are nutritional generalists in both 375 the prey and diets they consume (Machovsky-Capuska et al., 2018). The greater degree of 376 377 selectively within dolphins may relate to the nutritional needs associated with reproduction and lactation (Young and Cockcroft, 1994). 378

Niche overlap has been suggested to discern the extent of species interactions, in which maximal tolerable intersection should be inversed to the intensity of competition (Pianka, 1974). A moderate overlap in the prey composition niche (0.42) and realized nutritional niche (0.52) between dolphins and gannets suggests that both predators coexist in a similar nutritional space, while reducing interspecific competition and maximizing the
success of encountering and exploiting patchily distributed prey (Pruitt et al., 2009;
Anderwald et al., 2011; Thiebault et al., 2014, 2016; Tremblay et al., 2014).

386

387 *4.2. The behavioural ecology of feeding associations*

388 Temporal feeding associations involving different species have greater benefit compared to 389 single species foraging events, if the species involved have a reduced resource overlap 390 decreasing the costs of competition (Pruitt et al., 2009).

391 Thus, the moderate niche observed here between dolphins and gannets likely enables behavioural interactions when foraging. While both species are constrained by their 392 respective morphologies and distinctive feeding mechanisms, gannets are suggested to take 393 394 advantage of dolphins which herd prey to the surface (Camphuysen and Webb, 1999; 395 Neumann and Orams, 2003). Our analysis showed that when dolphins carousel feed, gannets significantly increased their dive heights to $\geq 5m$. Carouselling serves as a particular foraging 396 397 strategy employed by dolphins for creating a visual and acoustic barrier (Neumann and Orams, 2003; Burgess, 2006). This strategy keeps fish stationary and densely packed in a 398 399 bait-ball at the surface, with individual dolphins patrolling the edges of the school while others dart through the centre of the bait ball, increasing feeding success (Burgess, 2006). 400 401 During this dolphin strategy, gannets are more likely to dive into these bait ball aggregations 402 (Neumann and Orams, 2003; Vaughn et al., 2007, 2010) by reaching high altitudes to visually detect prey from an aerial perspective (Lee and Reddish, 1981; Machovsky-Capuska et al., 403 2011a, 2012), using the initial momentum phase of V-shaped dives to capture fish from 404 405 within these dense stationary surface schools (Machovsky-Capuska et al., 2011b, 2013a).

406 Larger dolphin groups are expected to herd prey close to the surface for longer 407 periods of time, thus increasing their foraging efficiency (Acevedo-Gutiérrez, 2002;

408 Neumann and Orams, 2003; Vaughn et al., 2010). During the presence of larger groups of foraging dolphins (>100 individuals) workups further intensify gannet activity, as 409 characterised by high altitude U-shaped dives into dense schools, enabling high (95%) prey 410 411 capture success rates (Machovsky-Capuska et al., 2011a, 2013a). Animal borne GPS loggers showed that during single foraging trips from their colonies, gannets have a high diving 412 frequency of 4.8 dives per hour that are confined within small spatiotemporal areas 413 (Machovsky-Capuska et al. 2013b). It is therefore likely, that these high-performance diving 414 events could be associated with larger dolphin groups that enable gannets to undertake 415 416 successive multiple dives in a workup while fish schools remain concentrated (Thiebault et al., 2016). However, smaller dolphin group sizes involving fewer foragers, may lead to less 417 condensed bait-balls, increasing herding efforts and energetic feeding costs per dolphin 418 419 (Vaughn et al., 2011). Under these circumstances, gannets likely use shallow V-shaped dives 420 to assess prey density and subsequent deeper U-shaped dives to capture prey by underwater flapping, like gentoo penguins (Pygoscelis papua) strategies for maximizing the energetic 421 422 cost of feeding (Wilson et al., 1996; Machovsky-Capuska et al., 2013a).

Dolphin and gannet feeding associations have typically been described as 423 424 unidirectional in benefit to gannets, with dolphins spending energy to concentrate bait balls near the surface and gannets diving within their aerobic capacity (Evans, 1982; Camphuysen 425 426 and Webb, 1999). However, the evidence presented herein suggests that feeding associations 427 between dolphins and gannet may be substantially more beneficial to both predators than previously considered (Burgess, 2006; Astarloa et al., 2019; Gostischa et al., 2021). For 428 example, as large seabirds (89 cm, Machovsky-Capuska et al., 2011b), gannets can use 429 underwater wing flapping momentum to reach 23 mts in 42 s during U-shaped dives (Green 430 et al., 2009). Such agility not only provides significant opportunity to capture up to five fish 431 within a dive (Machovsky-Capuska et al., 2011b), but notably prevents prey from 432

successfully regrouping subsurface. Secondly, omnidirectional coordinated attacks on prey
have been suggested to increase capture success for dolphins (Vaughn et al., 2007, 2010).
Lett et al. (2014) developed modelling techniques that quantified these predator-prey
dynamics, confirming the field-based patterns observed here in the wild.

The question of sampling effort is particularly relevant to demonstrating the 437 nutritional and behavioural interactions between dolphins and gannets. From a nutritional 438 perspective, the definition of niche encompasses all resources needed to maintain a 439 population during their different life cycle phases (Pulliam 2000), and the sampling regime in 440 441 our study provided a unique representation on how these predators overlap in their main prey items consumed, prey composition niche breadths and realized niche breadths. The proposed 442 results are consistent with previous studies that also estimated the nutritional niche ranges of 443 444 common dolphins and gannets (Machovsky-Capuska et al., 2018; Machovsky-Capuska and Raubenheimer, 2020; Machovsky-Capuska et al., 2020b), although additional sampling might 445 of course, provide further resolution. Regarding the behavioural findings presented here, 446 447 there are considerable challenges of collecting behavioural data on dynamic predators foraging in the wild (Machovsky-Capuska et al., 2016c; Hughey et al., 2018). The use a 448 commercial tourism catamaran as a platform of opportunity to collect such behavioural data 449 further adds to the challenge. Nonetheless, historical studies from this same platform have a 450 451 well-established value to address scientific questions on free ranging marine predators related 452 to their behavioural ecology (de la Brosse, 2010; Meissner et al., 2015; Purvin, 2015; Gostischa et al., 2021) and the influence of climate change in their habitat use (Srinivasan et 453 al., 2015), among others. While the use of an opportunistic platform can present several 454 455 trade-offs, we are confident that our sampling regime had sufficient resolution to provide reliable and unique holistic understanding to support the mutualistic nature of the foraging 456 457 interactions between free ranging dolphin and gannets.

458 By combining indirect diet estimates with proximate composition analysis and Bayesian ellipses under the MNNF, our study not only overcame potential individual 459 methodological limitations to estimate the prey composition and nutritional niches breadths 460 461 of two marine predators, but further provided fresh insight on the ability of these species to coexist in the wild, while foraging in nutritionally complex marine environments. Our 462 ethological assessment indicated that dolphin and gannets feeding associations are likely 463 mutually beneficial, with dolphin behaviour and pod size influencing gannet diving heights 464 and prey capture success. We conclude, that our approach offers significant advantages to 465 466 understanding the iconic foraging relationships, here between dolphins and gannets. Such findings offer potential to not only to explore wider cetacean-bird interactions (Vaughn et al., 467 2007, 2010, 2011; Sutton et al., 2019; Towers and Gasco, 2020) but also better understand 468 469 cooperative feeding between different cetacean species (Clua and Grosvalet 2001; Wiseman 470 et al., 2011; Zaeschmar et al., 2013).

471

472 Acknowledgements

KAS is supported by a Royal Society Te Aparangi Rutherford Discovery Fellowship (2019-473 2024). Nutritional analyses were funded by a Massey University Research Fund (MURF) 474 grant awarded to KAS. The project was conducted under research permits issued to Massey 475 University by the New Zealand Department of Conservation. Access to carcasses was kindly 476 477 supported by Mana Whenua and facilitated via the New Zealand Department of Conservation under AK-26359-FAU (gannets) 39239-MAR (dolphins). Nutritional analyses were 478 completed at the Nutritional Laboratory, Massey University, New Zealand. Ethological data 479 480 was supported by Auckland Whale and Dolphin Safaris who provided vessel access to video foraging activities analysed herein. 481

483 Author statements

KAS and GEMC contributed to the conception, design of the study and manuscript preparation. GEMC and CP collected the field data. CA with the assistance from GEMC and KS analysed the data and designed the figures and tables. LM contributed with unpublished data and manuscript formatting. KAS and GEMC created the Supplementary material. All authors discussed the contents of the manuscript and contributed to manuscript editing and revision.

490

491 **Declaration of Competing Interest**

- 492 All authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or
- 493 financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.
- 494

495 **References**

- Acevedo-Gutiérrez, A. 2002. Group behavior. in Perrin, W.F., Würsig, B., Thewissen, J.G.M.
 (Eds). Encyclopedia of marine mammals. Academic Press, San Diego, CA. pp. 537-544.
- Anderwald, P., Evans, P.G., Gygax, L., Hoelzel, A.R., 2011. Role of feeding strategies in
 seabird-minke whale associations. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 424, 219-227.
 https://doi.org/10.3354/meps08947
- 501
- AOAC, 2002. Official Methods of Analysis of AOAC International, 17th ed. Association ofOfficial Analytical Chemists, Washington, DC.
- 504

AOAC, 2005. Official Methods of Analysis of AOAC International, 18th ed. Association of
Official Analytical Chemists, Arlington, Virginia.

Astarloa, A., Louzao, M., Boyra, G., Martinez, U., Rubio, A., et al., 2019. Identifying main
interactions in marine predator–prey networks of the Bay of Biscay. ICES J. Mar. Sci. 76,
2247-2259. <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsz140</u>

- 511
- Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., Walker, S., 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models
 using lme4. arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.5823. <u>https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1406.5823</u>
- 514
 515 Baum, J.K., Worm, B., 2009. Cascading top- down effects of changing oceanic predator
 516 abundances. J. Anim. Ecol., 78, 699-714. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2009.01531.x
- 517
- Bligh, E.G., Dyer, W.J., 1959. A rapid method of total lipid extraction and purification. Can.
 J. Biochem. Physiol. 37, 911-917. https://doi.org/10.1139/o59-099

- 520
- 521 Burgess, E.A., 2006. Foraging ecology of common dolphins (*Delphinus* sp.) in the Hauraki 522 Gulf, New Zealand. PhD thesis. Massey University, New Zealand. pp. 143.
- 523
 524 Camphuysen, C. J., Webb, A., 1999. Multi-species feeding associations in North Sea
 525 seabirds: jointly exploiting a patchy environment. Ardea-Wageningen, 87, 177-198.
 526
- 527
- 528 Clarke, M.R., 1986. A handbook for the identification of cephalopod beaks. Oxford, United529 Kingdom, Clarendon Press. pp.273.
- 530
 531 Clua, E. and Grosvalet F., 2013. Mixed-species feeding aggregation of dolphins, large tunas
 532 and seabirds in the Azores. Aqua. Liv Res. 14, 11 18. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0990533 7440(00)01097-4
- 534
- Craig, J.F., Kenley, M.J., Talling, J.F., 1978. Comparative estimations of the energy content
 of fish tissue from bomb calorimetry, wet oxidation and proximate analysis. Freshw. Biol. 8,
 585-590. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2427.1978.tb01480.x</u>
- 538

- de la Brosse, N., 2010. Dynamics of mother-offspring common dolphin (*Delphinus* sp.)
 engaged in foraging activities in the Hauraki Gulf, New Zealand. MSc thesis. Massey
 University, Auckland, New Zealand. pp. 94.
- Denuncio, P., Paso Viola, M.N., Machovsky-Capuska, G.E., Raubenheimer, D., Blasina, G.,
 et al. 2017. Population variance in prey, diet and their macronutrient composition in an
 endangered marine mammal, the Franciscana dolphin. J. Sea Res. 129, 70-79.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.seares.2017.05.008</u>
- 547
- Denuncio, P., Gana, J.C., Giardino, G.V., Rodríguez, D.H., Machovsky-Capuska, G.E., 2021.
 Prey composition and nutritional strategies in two sympatric pinnipeds. J. Exp. Mar. Biol.
 Ecol. 545, 151629. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2021.151629</u>
- 551
 552 Duffy, D.C., Jackson, S., 1986. Diet studies of seabirds: a review of methods. Col.
 553 Waterbirds 9, 1-17. <u>https://doi.org/10.2307/1521138</u>
- 554
- Dwyer, S.L., Pawley, D.M., Clement, D.M., Stockin, K.A., 2020. Modelling habitat use
 suggests static spatial exclusion zones are a non-optimal management tool for a highly
 mobile marine mammal. Mar. Biol. 167:62. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-020-3664-4</u>
- Evans, P.G.H., 1982. Associations between seabirds and cetaceans: a review. Mamm. Rev.
 12,187-206. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2907.1982.tb00015.x</u>
- Fauchald, P., Erikstad, K.E., Skarsfjord, H., 2000. Scale- dependent predator-prey
 interactions: the hierarchical spatial distribution of seabirds and prey. Ecology 81, 773-783.
 https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658(2000)081[0773:SDPPIT]2.0.CO;2
- Fea, N.I., Harcourt, R.G., Lalas, C. 1999. Seasonal variation in the diet of New Zealand fur
 seals (*Arctocephalus forsteri*) at Otago Peninsula, New Zealand. Wildl. Res. 26, 147–160.
 https://doi.org/10.1071/WR98024
- 569

- Filby, N.E., Bossley, M., Stockin, K.A., 2013. Behaviour of free-ranging short-beaked
 common dolphins (*Delphinus delphis*) in Gulf St. Vincent, South Australia. Aust. J. Zool. 61,
 291-30. <u>https://doi.org/10.1071/ZO12033</u>
- 574 Gaskin, C.P., Rayner, M.J., 2013. Seabirds of the HG: Natural History. Research and 575 Conservation. Strategic Plan, Hauraki Gulf Forum.
- 576

573

- 577 Gatti, R.C., Ugarkovic, P., Tiralongo, F., 2021. New evidence of a fish-bird interspecific 578 feeding association between the European seabass and the European shag in the 579 Mediterranean Sea. Aquat. Ecol. 55, 1113-1119. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10452-021-09868-z</u> 580
- Gostischa, J., Massolo, A., Constantine, R., 2021. Multi-species feeding association dynamics 581 driven Sci. 582 by a large generalist predator. Front. in Mar. 1558. https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2021.739894 583
- Grainger, R., Peddemors, V.M., Raubenheimer, D., Machovsky-Capuska, G.E., 2020. Diet
 composition and nutritional niche breadth variability in juvenile white sharks (*Carcharodon carcharias*). Front. in Mar. Sci. 7, 422. <u>https://doi.org/10.3389/fmars.2020.00422</u>
- Green, J.A., White, C.R., Bunce, A., Frappell, P.B., Butler, P.J., 2009. Energetic
 consequences of plunge diving in gannets. Endang. Species Res. 10, 269–279.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.3354/esr00223</u>
- 592
 593 Guzzo, M.M., Haffner, G.D., Legler, N.D., Rush, S., Fisk, A.T., 2013. Fifty years later:
 594 trophic ecology and niche overlap of a native and non-indigenous fish species in the western
 595 basin of Lake Erie. Biol. Invasions 15, 1695-1711. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-012-0401-</u>
 596 <u>z</u>
- 598 Kearney, M., Simpson, S.J., Raubenheimer, D., Helmuth, B., 2010. Modelling the ecological from functional Philos. Trans. Soc. 365. 3469-83. 599 niche traits. R. Β. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2010.0034 600
- Hauraki Gulf Forum, 2020. State of our Gulf 2020. Auckland Council, Auckland.
- Heath, R.A., 1985. A review of the physical oceanography of the seas around New Zealand.
 N. Z. J. Mar. Freshw. 9, 79-124. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/00288330.1985.9516077</u>
- Højsgaard, S., Halekoh, U., Yan, J., 2006. The R package geepack for generalized estimating
 equations. J. Stat. Softw. 15, 1-11. <u>https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v015.i02</u>
- 609

- Houlahan, J.E., McKinney, S.T., Anderson, T.M., McGill, B.J., 2017. The priority of
 prediction in ecological understanding. Oikos 126, 1-7. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.03726</u>
- 612
- Hughey, L.F., Hein, A.M., Strandburg-Peshkin, A., Jensen, F.H., 2018. Challenges and
 solutions for studying collective animal behaviour in the wild. Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B 373,
 20170005. http://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2017.0005
- 616
- Jackson, A.L., Inger, R., Parnell, A.C., Bearhop, S., 2011. Comparing isotopic niche widths
- among and within communities: SIBER-Stable Isotope Bayesian Ellipses in R. J. Anim.
- 619 Ecol. 80, 595-602. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2011.01806.x</u>

- 620
- Land, M.F. (1999). The roles of head movements in the search and capture strategy of a tern (Aves, Laridae). J. Comp. Physiol. A 184, 265-272. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s003590050324</u>
- Lee, D.N., Reddish, P.E., 1981. Plummeting gannets: a paradigm of ecological optics. Nature
 293, 293-294. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/293293a0</u>
- 626
- Lett, C., Semeria, M., Thiebault, A., and Tremblay, Y., 2014. Effects of successive predator
 attacks on prey aggregations. Theor. Ecol. 7, 239-252. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s12080-014-</u>
 0213-0
- 630
- Liang, K.Y., Zeger S.L., 1986. Longitudinal data analysis using generalized linear models.
 Biometrika 73, 13-22. <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/73.1.13</u>
- Lu, C.C., Ickeringill R., 2002. Cephalopod beak identification and biomass estimation
 techniques: tools for dietary studies of southern Australian finfishes. Museum Victoria
 Science Reports No. 6. Melbourne, Australia. pp. 65.
- Machovsky-Capuska, G.E., 2012. Hunting between the air and the water: the Australasian
 gannet (*Morus serrator*). PhD thesis. Massey University, Auckland, New Zealand. pp.150.
- Machovsky-Capuska, G.E., Dwyer, S.L., Alley, M.R., Stockin, K.A., Raubenheimer, D.,
 2011a. Evidence for fatal collisions and kleptoparasitism while plunge- diving in Gannets.
 Ibis 153, 631-635. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1474-919X.2011.01129.x</u>
- 644 645 Machovsky-Capuska, G.E., Vaughn, R.L., Würsig, B., Katzir, G., Raubenheimer, D., 2011b. Dive strategies and foraging effort in the Australasian gannet Morus serrator revealed by 646 videography. Ecol. 647 underwater Mar. Prog. Ser. 442, 255-261. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps09458 648
- 649
- Machovsky-Capuska, G.E., Howland, H.C., Raubenheimer, D., Vaughn-Hirshorn, R.,
 Würsig, B., Hauber, M.E., Katzir, G., 2012. Visual accommodation and active pursuit of prey
 underwater in a plunge-diving bird: the Australasian gannet. Proc. R. Soc. B., 279, 4118<u>https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2012.1519</u>
- 654 655
- Machovsky-Capuska, G.E., Vaughn-Hirshorn, R.L., Würsig, B., Raubenheimer D., 2013a.
 Can gannets define their diving profile prior to submergence? Notornis 60, 255-257.
- 658
- Machovsky-Capuska, G.E., Hauber, M.E., Libby, E., Wikelski, M.C., Schuckard, R., et al., 2013b. Foraging behaviour and habitat use of chick-rearing Australasian gannets in New
- 661 Zealand. J Ornithol. 155, 379-387. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10336-013-1018-4
- 662
- Machovsky-Capuska, G.E., Senior, A.M., Simpson, S.J., Raubenheimer, D., 2016a. The
 multidimensional nutritional niche. Trends Ecol. Evol. 31,355–65.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2016.02.009</u>
- 666
- Machovsky-Capuska, G.E., Senior, A.M., Benn, E.C., Tait, A. H., Schuckard, R., et al., 2016b. Sex-specific macronutrient foraging strategies in a highly successful marine predator:
- 669 The Australasian gannet. Mar. Biol. 163, 75. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-016-2841-y

- Machovsky-Capuska, G.E., Coogan, S.C., Simpson, S.J., Raubenheimer, D., 2016c. Motive
 for killing: What drives prey choice in wild predators? Ethology 122, 703-711.
 https://doi.org/10.1111/eth.12523
- Machovsky-Capuska, G.E., Miller, M.G., Silva, F.R., Amiot, C., Stockin, K.A., et al., 2018.
 The nutritional nexus: linking niche, habitat variability and prey composition in a generalist
 marine predator. J. Anim. Ecol. 87, 1286-1298. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.12856</u>
- Machovsky-Capuska, G.E., Amiot, C., Denuncio, P., Grainger, R., Raubenheimer, D., 2019.
 A nutritional perspective on plastic ingestion in wildlife. Sci. Total Environ. 656, 789-796.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.11.418
- 682
- Machovsky-Capuska, G.E., Raubenheimer, D., 2020. Nutritional ecology of vertebrate
 marine predators. Annu. Rev. Mar. Sci. 12, 361-387. <u>https://doi.org/10.1146/annurevmarine-</u>
 <u>010318-095411</u>
- 686
- Machovsky-Capuska, G.E., Andrades, R., Santos, R.G., 2020a. Debris ingestion and nutritional niches in estuarine and reef green turtles. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 153, 110943.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2020.110943</u>
- Machovsky-Capuska, G. E., von Haeften, G., Romero, M. A., Rodríguez, D. H., Gerpe, M. S.
 2020b. Linking cadmium and mercury accumulation to nutritional intake in common
 dolphins (*Delphinus delphis*) from Patagonia, Argentina. Environ. Pollut. 263, 114480.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2020.114480
- Majdi, N., Hette-Tronquart, N., Auclair, E., Bec, A., Chouvelon, T., et al., 2018. There's no
 harm in having too much: a comprehensive toolbox of methods in trophic ecology. *Food Webs* 17:e00100. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fooweb.2018.e00100</u>
- 699

- Mayntz, D., Nielsen, V.H., Sørensen, A., Toft, S., Raubenheimer, D., et al., 2009. Balancing
 of protein and lipid intake by a mammalian carnivore, the mink, *Mustela vison*. Anim. Behav.
 77, 349-355. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2008.09.036</u>
- 703
- Meissner, A.M., Christiansen, F., Martinez, E., Pawley, M.D.M., Orams, M.B., Stockin,
 K.A., 2015. Behavioural effects of tourism on oceanic common dolphins, *Delphinus* sp., in
 New Zealand: the effects of Markov analysis variations and current tour operator compliance
 with regulations. *PLoS ONE* 10:e0116962. <u>https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0116962</u>
- 708
- Meynier, L., Stockin, K.A., Bando, M.K.H., Duignan, P.J., 2008a. Stomach contents of
 common dolphin (*Delphinus* sp.) from New Zealand waters. N. Z. J. Mar. Freshw. Res. 42,
 257-268. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/00288330809509952</u>
- 712
- Meynier, L., Pusineri, C., Spitz, J., Santos, M.B., Pierce, G.J., Ridoux, V., 2008b.
 Intraspecific dietary variation in the short-beaked common dolphin *Delphinus delphis* in the
 Bay of Biscay: importance of fat fish. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 354, 277-287.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.3354/meps07246</u>
- 717
- Morse, D.H., 1977. Feeding behaviour and predator avoidance in heterospecific groups.
 BioScience 27, 332-339. <u>https://doi.org/10.2307/1297632</u>

720			
721	Neumann, D.R., Orams, M.B., 2003. Feeding behaviours of short-beaked common dolphins,		
722	Delphinus delphis, in New Zealand. Aquat. Mamm. 29, 137-149.		
723			
724	N.R.C., 1989. Recommended Dietary Allowances, 10th ed. Washington, DC.		
725	https://doi.org/10.17226/1349		
726			
727	Österblom, H., Olsson, O., Blenckner, T., Furness, R.W., 2008. Junk-food in marine		
728	ecosystems. Oikos 117, 967-977. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0030-1299.2008.16501.x		
729			
730	Pan, W., 2001. Akaike's information criterion in generalized estimating equations.		
731	Biometrics, 57, 120-125. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0006-341X.2001.00120.x		
732			
733	Peters, K.J., Stockin, K.A., 2022. Cetacean sighting records in the New Caledonia Basin,		
734	Tasman Sea, New Zealand. N. Z. J. Mar. Freshw. Res. 56, 135-149.		
735	https://doi.org/10.1080/00288330.2020.1867201		
736			
737	Peters, K.J., Bury, S.J., Betty, E.L., Parra, G.J., Tezanos-Pinto, G., Stockin, K.A., 2020.		
738	Foraging ecology of the common dolphin <i>Delphinus delphis</i> revealed by stable isotope		
739	analysis. Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 652, 173-186. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps13482		
740			
741	Pianka, E.R., 1974. Niche overlap and diffuse competition. PNAS, 71, 2141-2145.		
742	https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.71.5.2141		
743			
744	Pruitt, J.N., Taylor, J., Troupe, J.E., 2009. Foraging benefits and limited niche overlap		
745	promote a mixed species association between two solitary species of spider. Behaviour 1153-		
746	1170. https://www.jstor.org/stable/40296120		
747			
748	Pulliam, H. R., 2000. On the relationship between niche and distribution. Ecol. Lett. 3, 349-		
749	361. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1461-0248.2000.00143.x		
750	501. https://doi.org/10.1010/j.1101.0210.2000.00115.x		
751	Purvin, C.M., 2015. The influence of multi-species feeding associations on the foraging		
752	behaviour of Australasian gannets (<i>Morus serrator</i>) in the Hauraki Gulf, New Zealand. MSc		
753	thesis. Massey University, Auckland, New Zealand. pp. 108.		
754	inesis. Massey eniversity, Adexiand, New Zealand. pp. 100.		
755	R Core Team, 2021. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R		
756	Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. https://www.R-project.org/		
757	Toundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <u>https://www.ix-project.org/</u>		
758	Raubenheimer, D., 2011. Toward a quantitative nutritional ecology: the right-angled mixture		
759	triangle. Ecol. Monogr. 81, 407-427. https://doi.org/10.1890/10-1707.1		
760	trangle. Lett. Wonogr. 61, $+67^{-}+27^{-}$ <u>mtps://doi.org/10.1090/10-1707.1</u>		
761	Raubenheimer, D., Simpson, S.J., Mayntz, D., 2009. Nutrition, ecology and nutritional		
762			
763	6		
764	<u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.15052455.2007.01522.x</u>		
765	Ritchie, E.G., Johnson, C.N., 2009. Predator interactions, mesopredator release and		
766	biodiversity conservation. Ecol. Lett., 12, 982-998. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1461-		
767	0248.2009.01347.x		
768			
100			

- Santos, R.G., Andrades, R., Demetrio, G.R., Kuwai, G.M., Sobral, M.F., de Souza Vieira, J.,
- 770 Machovsky-Capuska, G.E., 2020. Exploring plastic-induced satiety in foraging green turtles.
- Environ. Pollut. 265, 114918. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2020.114918</u>
 772
- Santos, R.G., Machovsky-Capuska, G.E., Andrades, R., 2021. Plastic ingestion as an
 evolutionary trap: Toward a holistic understanding. Science, 373, 56-60.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abh0945</u>
- 776
- Schoener, T.W., 1968. The Anolis lizards of Bimini: resource partitioning in a complex fauna. Ecology 49, 704-726. <u>https://doi.org/10.2307/1935534</u>
- Smale, M.J., Watson, G., Hetch T., 1995. Otolith atlas of southern African marine fishes.
 Ichthyol. Monog. 1, 1-244. <u>https://doi.org/10.2307/1447685</u>
- Spitz, J., Mourocq, E., Leauté, J.P., Quéro, J.C., Ridoux, V., 2010. Prey selection by the
 common dolphin: fulfilling high energy requirements with high quality food. J. Exp. Mar.
 Biol. Ecol. 390, 73-77. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jembe.2010.05.010</u>
- 786

782

- Srinivasan, M., Dassis, M., Benn, E., Stockin, K.A., Martinez, E., Machovsky-Capuska, G.E.,
 2015. Using non-systematic surveys to investigate effects of regional climate variability on
 Australasian gannets in the Hauraki Gulf, New Zealand. J Sea Res. 99, 74-82.
 <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.seares.2015.02.004</u>
- 792 Syväranta, J., Lensu, A., Marjomäki, T.J., Oksanen, S., Jones, R.I., 2013. An empirical evaluation of the utility of convex hull and standard ellipse areas for assessing population 793 794 niche widths from stable isotope data. PLoS ONE. 8. e56094. 795 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0056094
- 797 Stevens, C.E., Hume, I. D., 1998. Contributions of microbes in vertebrate gastrointestinal
 798 tract to production and conservation of nutrients. Physiol. Rev. 78, 393-427.
 799 <u>https://doi.org/10.1152/physrev.1998.78.2.393</u>
- 800 Stockin, K.A., Pierce, G.J., Binedell, V., Wiseman, N., Orams, M.B., 2008a. Factors 801 802 affecting the occurrence and demographics of common dolphins (Delphinus sp.) in the Zealand. 803 Hauraki Gulf. New Aquat. Mamm. 34, 200-211. 804 https://doi.org/10.1578/AM.34.2.2008.200
- Stockin, K.A., Lusseau, D., Binedell, V., Wiseman, N., Orams, M.B., 2008b. Tourism affects
 the behavioural budget of the common dolphin (*Delphinus* sp.) in the HG, New Zealand.
 Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser. 355, 287-295. <u>https://doi.org/10.3354/meps07386</u>
- 809

- Stockin, K.A., Binedell, V., Wiseman, N., Brunton, D.H., Orams, M.B., 2009a. Behaviour of
 free- ranging common dolphins (*Delphinus* sp.) in the HG, New Zealand. Mar. Mamm. Sci.
 25, 283-301. <u>https://doi.org/10.1071/ZO12033</u>
- 813
- Stockin, K.A., Duignan, P.J., Roe, W.D., Meynier, L., Alley, M., Fettermann, T., 2009b.
- 815 Causes of mortality in stranded common dolphins (*Delphinus* sp.) from New Zealand waters
- 816 between 1998 and 2008. Pac. Conserv. Biol. 15, 217-227. <u>https://doi.org/10.1071/PC090217</u>
- 817

Stockin, K.A., Pantos, O., Betty, E.L., Pawley, M.D.M., Doake, F., et al., 2021a. Fourier
transform infrared (FTIR) analysis identifies micro plastics in stranded common dolphins
(*Delphinus delphis*) from New Zealand waters. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 173, 113084.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2021.113084

- Stockin, K.A., Yi, S., Northcott, G.L., Betty, E.L., Machovsky-Capuska, G.E., et al., 2021b.
 Per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS), trace elements and life history parameters of
 mass-stranded common dolphins (*Delphinus delphis*) in New Zealand. Mar. Pollut. Bull. 173,
 112896. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpolbul.2021.112896</u>
- Sutton, A.L., Jenner, K.C.S., Jenner, M.M., 2019. Habitat associations of cetaceans and
 seabirds in the tropical eastern Indian Ocean. Deep Sea Res. Part II. 166, 171-186.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2018.06.002</u>
- Tait, A.H., Raubenheimer, D., Stockin, K.A., Merriman, M., Machovsky-Capuska, G.E.,
 2014. Nutritional geometry and macronutrient variation in the diets of gannets: the challenges
 in marine field studies. Mar. Biol. 161, 2791e2801. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-014-2544-</u>
 1
- 835 836

827

- Thiebault, A., Mullers, R.H., Pistorius, P.A., Tremblay, Y., 2014. Local enhancement in a
 seabird: reaction distances and foraging consequence of predator aggregations. Behav. Ecol.
 25, 1302-1310. https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/aru132
- 840
- Thiebault, A., Semeria, M., Lett, C., & Tremblay, Y. (2016). How to capture fish in a school?
 Effect of successive predator attacks on seabird feeding success. J. Anim. Ecol. 85, 157-167.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2656.12455</u>
- 844

Towers, J.R., Gasco, N., 2020. Giant petrels (*Macronectes* spp.) prey on depredating sperm
whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*) Polar Biol. 43, 919-924. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s00300-</u>
020-02687-2

- 848
- Tremblay, Y., Thiebault, A., Mullers, R., Pistorius, P., 2014. Bird-borne video-cameras show
 that seabird movement patterns relate to previously unrevealed proximate environment, not
 prey. PLoS ONE 9: e88424. <u>https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0088424</u>
- 852
- Vaughn, R.L., Shelton, D.E., Timm, L.L., Watson, L.A., Würsig, B., 2007. Dusky dolphin
 (*Lagenorhynchus obscurus*) feeding tactics and multi-species associations. N. Z. J. Mar.
 Freshw. Res. 41, 391-400. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/00288330709509929</u>
- 856
- Vaughn, R., Würsig, B., Packard, J., 2010. Dolphin prey herding: prey ball mobility relative
 to dolphin group and prey ball sizes, multispecies associates, and feeding duration. Mar.
 Mammal. Sci. 26, 213-225. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-7692.2009.00317.x</u>
- 860
- Vaughn, R.L., Muzi, E., Richardson, J.L., Würsig, B., 2011. Dolphin bait-balling behaviours 861 862 in relation to prey ball escape behaviours. Ethology 117. 859-871. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0310.2011.01939.x 863 864
- Wilson, R.P., Culik, B.M., Peters, G., Bannasch, R., 1996. Diving behaviour of gentoo
 penguins, (*Pygoscelis papua*): factors keeping dive profiles in shape. Mar. Biol. 126, 153162. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00571387

871

- Wingham, E.J., 1985. Food and feeding range of the Australasian gannet *Morus serrator*(Gray). Emu 85, 231-239. https://doi.org/10.1071/MU9850231
- Wiseman, N., Parsons, S., Stockin, K.A., Baker, C.S., 2011. Seasonal occurrence and distribution of Bryde's whales in the Hauraki Gulf, New Zealand. Mar. Mamm. Sci. 27, E253-E267. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-7692.2010.00454.x</u>
- 875

878

- Work, T.M. 2000. Avian necropsy manual for biologists in remote refuges. Honolulu: US
 Geological Survey, National Wildlife Health Center, Hawaii Field Station. pp. 30.
- Young, D.D., Cockcroft, V.G., 1994. Diet of common dolphins (*Delphinus delphis*) off the
 south- east coast of southern Africa: opportunism or specialization?. J. Zool. 234, 41-53.
 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7998.1994.tb06055.x
- 882
 883 Young, J.W., Hunt, B.P., Cook, T.R., Llopiz, J.K., Hazen, E.L., et al. 2015. The
 884 trophodynamics of marine top predators: current knowledge, recent advances, and challenges.
 885 Deep-Sea Res. II 113,170-187. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2014.05.015
- 886
- Zaeschmar, J.R., Dwyer, S.L. & Stockin K.A., 2013. Rare observations of false killer whales
 (Pseudorca crassidens) cooperatively feeding with common bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in the Hauraki Gulf, New Zealand. Marine Mammal Science 29:555-562.
 <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-7692.2012.00582.x</u>
- 891
- Zeldis, J.R., Walters, R.A., Greig, M.J.N., Image, K., 2004. Circulation over the northeastern
 New Zealand continental slope, shelf and adjacent HG, from spring to summer. Cont. Shelf
 Res. 24, 543–561. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csr.2003.11.007