

1 **Prey exoskeletons influence the course of gastric evacuation in**
2 **Atlantic cod *Gadus morhua* L.**

3

4

5 C. S. COUTURIER*†, N. G. ANDERSEN‡, C. AUDET§ AND D. CHABOT*

6

7

8 *Ministère des Pêches et des Océans, Institut Maurice-Lamontagne, C.P. 1000, Mont-
9 Joli, QC, Canada, G5H 3Z4, ‡National Institute of Aquatic Resources, Technical
10 University of Denmark, North Sea Science Park, P. O. Box 101, DK-9850 Hirtshals,
11 Denmark, and §Institut des sciences de la mer de Rimouski, Université de Québec à
12 Rimouski, 310 Allée des Ursulines, Rimouski QC, Canada, G5L 3A1

13

14

15 Running headline:

16 GASTRIC EVACUATION OF CRUSTACEAN PREY

17

18

19 †Author to whom correspondence should be addressed. Tel.: (+47) 22855785; Fax: (+47)

20 22856041; email: christinecouturier@imbv.uio.no; present address: Physiology

21 Programme, Department of Molecular Biosciences, University of Oslo, 0316 Oslo,

22 Norway

23 **ABSTRACT**

24 This study examined the effects of prey exoskeleton characteristics on gastric evacuation
25 patterns in Atlantic cod *Gadus morhua*. Three distinct stages were highlighted in the
26 gastric evacuation of crustacean prey characterized by a robust exoskeleton. The
27 expectation that the three shrimps species (*Pandalus borealis*, *Pandalus montagui* and
28 *Eualus macilentus*) and the crab *Chionoecetes opilio* were evacuated from the stomach
29 at different rates was confirmed. The duration of all stages increased with increasing ash
30 (and carbonate) content of the fresh prey. It was concluded that thickness, chemical
31 composition and morphology of the prey exoskeleton all affected gastric evacuation:
32 duration of initial delay, overall evacuation rate and a decreased evacuation rate at the
33 end of the process. The power exponential function (PEF), with its shape parameter,
34 described well the course of evacuation for these prey types, especially the initial delay.
35 However, the PEF does not allow describing evacuation by the current stomach content
36 mass independently of meal size, which limits its usefulness in estimating consumption
37 rates of wild *G. morhua*. To predict and describe gastric evacuation of prey with a robust
38 exoskeleton, it is therefore suggested to expand the square root function with an initial
39 lag phase, coupled to the mechanistically based cylinder model of gastric evacuation.

40

41

42 Key words: carbonate and ash contents; crustacean prey; energy content; integument
43 thickness and morphology.

44

45 INTRODUCTION

46

47

48 Understanding trophic relationships, including consumption rates of predators, is an
49 important component of the science supporting ecosystem-based fisheries management.

50 Bioenergetics models use an energy-balance approach to estimate food consumption
51 based on the energy required for growth, reproduction, and metabolism. Apportionment of
52 consumed energy among prey species is subsequently accomplished according to the
53 mass contribution and energy density of the prey in stomachs that are representatively
54 sampled in the field (Benoit-Bird, 2004). Alternatively, the stomach contents data are
55 combined with gastric evacuation rates to determine prey consumption rates using more
56 or less explicit feeding patterns (Elliott & Persson, 1978; Sainsbury, 1986; Jarre *et al.*,
57 1991) or assuming that on average over time ingestion rate equals gastric evacuation rate
58 (Bajkov, 1935; Jones, 1978; Pennington, 1985). Often, the energy requirement of the
59 predator is not known and only the second approach can be used. In addition, the prey
60 composition in the stomach does not necessarily reflect the consumed one because of
61 differential evacuation rates (Karlsen & Andersen, 2012), which may be especially
62 pronounced for fishes preying on fish and crustacean prey (Bromley, 1994). In this case,
63 knowledge about the nature of evacuation of different prey types is, therefore, decisive to
64 avoid excessive bias even when using the bioenergetics approach to estimate food
65 consumption and prey mortality rates (Andersen, 2001; Andersen & Beyer, 2005a).

66

67

68 Although there have been some attempts at estimating the gastric evacuation rate in the
69 field (e.g. Arrhenius & Hansson, 1994; Worischka & Mehner, 1998; Darbyson *et al.*,

2003; Rindorf, 2004), most determinations of gastric evacuation rates have been obtained in the laboratory using a variety of methods (Talbot, 1985; Bromley, 1994). The majority of these studies focussed on commercial species, especially Atlantic cod *Gadus morhua* L. 1758 (Tyler, 1970; Jones, 1974; MacDonald *et al.*, 1982; dos Santos & Jobling, 1988; Temming & Herrmann, 2003; Andersen, 2012). The most examined factors affecting gastric evacuation rate are predator size, meal size, prey type and temperature (Bromley, 1994). The influence of prey characteristics (size, shape, energy density and resistance to digestive processes) have also been described (Jobling, 1987; dos Santos & Jobling, 1991; Singh-Renton & Bromley, 1996; Andersen, 2001, 2012; Karlsen & Andersen, 2012). Including these prey characteristics, the simple, mechanistically founded cylinder model suggested by Andersen & Beyer (2005*a,b*) is the only gastric evacuation model at present that is able to predict properly the evacuation of ingested prey fish. Based on surface considerations, it describes evacuation of ingested prey by the square root of their current mass in the stomach. Further, interactive effects on evacuation rate of size, shape, energy density and resistance to digestion of individual prey are inherent features of the model and have been validated by Andersen & Beyer (2005*b*, 2007) and Karlsen & Andersen (2012). However, a critical assumption is that the individual prey is considered as having constant energy density and resistance to the digestive processes throughout. While prey fish generally fulfil the proviso about prey homogeneity (Andersen & Beyer, 2005*a*), crustaceans with a robust exoskeleton that initially delays the digestive processes are evidently heterogeneous regarding their resistance to digestion. Crustaceans make up a large proportion of the diet of many piscivorous fishes. For instance, shrimp, in particular the northern shrimp *Pandalus borealis* Krøyer 1838, and snow crab *Chionoecetes opilio* Krøyer 1838 are important prey species of *G. morhua* in the Gulf of

94 St. Lawrence, Canada (Waiwood & Majkowski, 1984; Savenkoff *et al.*, 2006; Chabot *et*
95 *al.*, 2008).

96

97

98 Depending on the amounts of chitin and minerals (mostly calcium carbonate),
99 invertebrate exoskeletons may be very robust (Welinder, 1974) and act as a chemical and
100 physical barrier against the actions of gastric juices and grinding by gastric muscular
101 contractions (Jones, 1974; MacDonald *et al.*, 1982; Bromley, 1994). Andersen (2001)
102 confirmed that the evacuation rate of brown shrimp *Crangon crangon* with a relatively
103 tough exoskeleton is slower than that of fish prey of similar energy density. In contrast,
104 krill *Meganyctiphanes norvegica* (Sars 1857) characterized by a thin, flexible integument
105 was evacuated at the same rate as fish, which suggests that the digestion rate depends on
106 thickness, composition and morphology of the armour (dos Santos & Jobling, 1992;
107 Andersen, 1999). Evacuation of prey with a tough exoskeleton is typically characterized
108 by an initial period in which decomposition of the prey progresses slowly, followed by a
109 second phase of a significantly higher evacuation rate (dos Santos & Jobling, 1992;
110 Bromley, 1994; Berens & Murie, 2008).

111

112

113 To date, gastric evacuation of different crustacean prey types have never be compared
114 and explained by the nature of the exoskeleton. Using crustacean prey with different
115 levels of armour, the aim of the present study was to examine how the course of gastric
116 evacuation (gastric evacuation pattern) is related to prey exoskeleton characteristics.
117 Four characteristics were quantified (chitin, ash, carbonate contents and energy density)
118 and two functions were used to describe evacuation of the crustacean meals in *G.*

119 *morhua*. The power exponential is a flexible function, which enables a mathematical
120 description of initial impediment of gastric evacuation due to prey armament (Elashoff *et*
121 *al.*, 1982; dos Santos, 1990). The general power function (Temming & Andersen, 1994;
122 Andersen, 1998) was used to examine the overall deviation of the observed evacuation
123 patterns from that of a homogeneous prey (the square root function).

124

125

126

127 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

128

129

130 **PREDATOR FISH AND PREY**

131

132

133 *Gadus morhua* were trawled in the Baie des Chaleurs, Québec (48° 21' N; 64° 24' W) in
134 July 2002. They were kept indoors under natural photoperiod and artificial light (< 22
135 lux) in 13 m³ tanks at the Maurice-Lamontagne Institute, Mont-Joli (Québec, Canada).
136 Water temperature (2–11° C) and salinity (25-31) followed the natural cycle of the water
137 intake. *Gadus morhua* were fed twice a week with a maintenance ration of capelin
138 *Mallotus villosus* (Müller 1776) corresponding to *c.* 3 % of body mass per meal.

139

140

141 Four types of prey representing a gradient in their integument resistance to digestion
142 were used: three species of shrimp having a relatively thin exoskeleton (*P. borealis*,
143 striped pink shrimp *Pandalus montagui* Leach 1814, Greenland shrimp *Eualus*

144 *macilentus* Krøyer 1841) and *C. opilio* with a fairly robust exoskeleton. Shrimps were
145 caught in the St Lawrence estuary (48° 29' N; 68° 50' W) in October 2002. They were
146 stored at -80° C. Juvenile *C. opilio* were caught from April to June 2002 in the Baie
147 Sainte-Marguerite, Gulf of St Lawrence (50° 07' N; 66° 38' W). They were kept alive in
148 730 l tanks at $4.0 \pm 0.2^\circ$ C and fed twice a week with chopped *M. villosus* and *P.*
149 *borealis*, sometimes with the addition of two species of krill (*Euphausia pacifica* Hansen
150 1911 and *M. norvegica*) kept frozen at -20° C.

151

152

153 The size of the experimental prey was chosen from the size of prey found in *G. morhua*
154 stomachs collected in the field (D. Chabot, unpubl. data). Experimental meals consisted
155 of whole specimens, weighed and measured individually (*E. macilentus* were not
156 measured).

157

158

159 EXPERIMENTAL SET-UP AND PROTOCOL

160

161

162 The experimental set-up consisted of twelve circular 730 l tanks (diameter 1.15 m, depth
163 0.70 m). The tanks were supplied with sand-filtered recirculated sea water ($1-2 \text{ l min}^{-1}$).
164 The water temperature was maintained at $4.0 \pm 0.2^\circ$ C and continuous air bubbling
165 ensured oxygen saturation close to 100 %. Each tank was divided into two compartments
166 by plastic netting. Each compartment contained one cod, providing 24 cod per
167 experiment.

168

169

170 One month before the beginning of the experiments, *G. morhua* of similar size (Table I)
171 were transferred into experimental tanks to acclimatize to the experimental conditions.
172 Here, they were trained for at least two weeks to feed voluntarily on the experimental
173 prey.

174

175

176 Four experiments were completed using one prey type per experimental meal. Shrimps
177 were thawed just before meal preparation. Dos Santos (1990) showed that frozen prey
178 tend to be evacuated slightly more rapidly than fresh ones, but he did not find any
179 significant difference for shrimps. Pre-test showed that snow crabs could not be offered
180 alive as they were hiding away in the experimental tanks, between the plastic netting and
181 the drain pipe. Thus, prior to be offered to cod, snow crabs were plunged into fresh water
182 and killed by osmotic shock without being damaged (unlike freezing, which tends to
183 make the legs brittle). All prey were gently dabbed to remove excess water prior to
184 weighing. Additional meals were prepared and refrozen at -80°C for subsequent
185 analyses of prey composition.

186

187

188 *Gadus morhua* were fed their meal ($t = 0$ h) and at predetermined time intervals ($t = 6,$
189 $12, 24, 48, 72, 96, 120, 144$ h) their stomach contents were recovered by dissection or by
190 stomach flushing following anaesthetization (metomidate hydrochloride, 5×10^{-3} g l $^{-1}$).
191 Stomach flushing was realised with a Tygon[®] tubing (ID = 5 mm, OD = 7 mm)
192 connected to a sea water supply system ($c. 1.4$ l min $^{-1}$). The tubing was introduced into
193 the cod stomach while the fish was held inclined above a filter (mesh size 120 μm). The

194 stomach content was collected, rinsed under fresh water, gently dabbed on a paper towel
195 and frozen at -80°C for later analyses on composition. The fish was then weighed and
196 measured. It was generally used for more than one experiment and a minimum of two
197 weeks was allowed for recovery between experimental trials.

198

199

200 Preliminary tests were performed to confirm the efficiency of stomach flushing.

201 Moreover, to ensure that recovery was complete during the evacuation experiments, the
202 number of ingested prey items was noted and flushing was continued until all prey were
203 recovered.

204

205

206 PREY COMPOSITION

207

208

209 Preserved meals and stomach contents were dried 72 h at 65°C or freeze-dried 48 h to
210 determine their water content. Tests showed no difference between these two techniques.

211 Energy density of dried samples was determined by bomb calorimetry (PARR 1261;

212 www.parrinst.com). Values obtained were corrected for carbonates content (Paine, 1966)

213 as well as nitric acid produced during combustion (Golley, 1961). Ash content was

214 determined by weighing the remains of the sample after 24 h at 500°C (Atkinson &

215 Wacasey, 1976). Carbonate content was determined as the difference in mass after an

216 additional 5 h of heating at 900°C (Paine, 1966).

217

218

219 Chitin content was assayed on whole prey (stomach contents did not provide enough
220 material to allow any assay). Chitin was determined in 2012 on *P. borealis* and *P.*
221 *montagui* captured in summer of 2011 and kept alive until the determinations, and on *C.*
222 *opilio* captured in 2012, frozen at sea and processed shortly after. No *E. macilentus* were
223 available for chitin determination. The chitin assay method of Spinelli *et al.* (1974) was
224 modified by Martin Poirier (ABK Gaspésie Inc., Quebec). Briefly, samples were dried
225 and reduced to powder by pestle, deproteinated in a 2 % NaOH solution during 90 min at
226 90° C, and then filtered and demineralised using a 5 % HCl solution during 16 h at
227 ambient temperature. After another filtration, samples were rinsed with acetone to
228 remove lipids and dried at 105° C during 16 h. Chitin content was the difference in mass
229 before and after the treatments.

230

231

232 Water, ash, carbonate and chitin contents were expressed as percentages of wet mass and
233 transformed before statistical analyses (arcsine of the square root values; Sokal & Rohlf,
234 1995). Differences between prey types were tested using one-way ANOVA followed by
235 post-hoc comparison (Tuckey HSD). Significance was accepted at $P < 0.05$. The
236 relationship between ash and carbonate contents was determined by linear regression.

237

238

239 GASTRIC EVACUATION PATTERNS

240

241

242 Gastric evacuation of the four prey species was described by two functions that
243 previously have been used to describe heterogeneous prey. The power exponential
244 function

245

$$246 \quad S_t = S_0 2^{-(\eta t)^\varphi} \quad (1)$$

247

248 is able to describe deviations from an exponential evacuation including an initial slow
249 evacuation, which is particularly relevant for prey with a robust exoskeleton (dos Santos
250 & Jobling, 1992). S_0 (g) is the mass of the ingested meal, S_t (g) is the recovered stomach
251 content mass, and t (h) is the elapsed time. The two parameters η and φ determine the
252 evacuation rate (η^{-1} represents the time at which S_0 has halved) and the shape of the
253 evacuation curve ($\varphi = 1$: simple exponential evacuation; $\varphi > 1$: initial delay of
254 evacuation; $\varphi < 1$: initial acceleration).

255

256

257 The shape of the evacuation curve described by the general power function

258

$$259 \quad S_t = [S_0^{1-\alpha} - (1-\alpha)\rho t]^{(1-\alpha)^{-1}} ; \quad 0 \leq t \leq S_0^{1-\alpha}(1-\alpha)^{-1}\rho^{-1} \quad (2)$$

260

261 depends on the shape (power) parameter α , while ρ is the rate parameter. An estimate of
262 α close to 0.5 (the square root version) obtained by use of this function to data on
263 evacuation of a prey indicates that the prey can be considered homogeneous as regards
264 the prey characteristics influencing evacuation rate. Lower values have been obtained
265 from crustacean prey with a robust exoskeleton as well as gadoid fish prey with a large,
266 fat liver. In contrast, higher values were estimated from small fish prey with a large

267 proportion of easily digestible parts relative to their more compact trunk (Andersen &
268 Beyer, 2005*b*).

269
270

271 The parameters of equations (1) and (2) were estimated by non-linear regression (the
272 iterative Marquard method; SAS Institute Inc.; www.sas.com) with the modifications for
273 the general power function as described by Andersen (1998). The data set from each
274 experiment was truncated at the time of first occurrence of an empty stomach (Andersen,
275 1984; Olson & Mullen, 1986).

276
277

278 The goodness of fit of two evacuation functions were evaluated using r^2 values.
279 Candidate functions were compared using Akaike Information Criteria corrected for
280 small sample size (AICc) and normalized relative likelihoods w (Akaike weights;
281 Burnham & Anderson, 2002). As a general rule of thumb, the confidence set of candidate
282 functions (analogous to a confidence interval for a mean estimate) include those with w_i
283 within 10 % of the highest, where w_i is interpreted as the weight of evidence
284 (probability) that model i is the best approximating model given the data and set of
285 candidate models . AICc denotes the amount of information lost when using a model to
286 approximate the “true” model and is estimated as $n \ln(\text{RSS } n^{-1}) + 2kn(n - k - 1)^{-1}$
287 (adjusting for small sample sizes), where n is the number of observations, RSS the
288 residual sums of squares from the non-linear regression, and k the number of parameters
289 (including the error term). $w_i = \exp(-0.5\Delta_i) [\sum \exp(-0.5 \Delta_j)]^{-1}$, where $\Delta_i = \text{AICc}_i -$
290 AICc_{\min} and AICc_{\min} is the lowest AICc value obtained (for a detailed explanation of the
291 methods, see Burnham & Anderson, 2002)

292

293

294

295 **RESULTS**

296

297

298 **PREY COMPOSITION**

299

300

301 Contents of water and ash differed between shrimp and crab, but were relatively similar

302 among the three species of shrimp. Hence, the water content was significantly different

303 among prey types ($F_{[3,37]} = 29.2$; $P < 0.001$), being the lowest in *C. opilio* (Table II). Ash

304 and carbonate contents also varied significantly among prey species (ash: $F_{[3,37]} = 3658$;

305 $P < 0.001$; carbonate: $F_{[2,22]} = 1341$; $P < 0.001$). The contents of ash and carbonates in *C.*

306 *opilio* were three times higher than the contents found in the three shrimp species.

307 Among the latter, *P. borealis* and *P. montagui* had similar ash and carbonate contents,

308 which were higher than those of *E. macilentus* (Table II). A strong linear relationship

309 was obtained between ash and carbonate contents using the values from the three

310 species:

311

$$312 \quad C_c = 0.39A_c - 0.27 \quad (3)$$

313

314 where C_c and A_c are carbonate and ash contents (% wet mass) ($r^2 = 0.998$, $P < 0.001$, $n =$

315 25).

316

317

318 The energy densities of the prey species used in the present study differed ($F_{[3,37]} = 34$;
319 $P < 0.001$). The energy density of *C. opilio* was lower than that of the three shrimp
320 species, which showed similar values. The chitin content was measured for three prey
321 species and they differed significantly ($F_{[2,29]} = 426.6$; $P < 0.001$): the chitin content of *C.*
322 *opilio* was twice as high as that of the two shrimp *P. borealis* and *P. montagui*, but *P.*
323 *borealis* had a slightly but significantly lower chitin content than *P. montagui*.

324

325

326 CHANGES IN STOMACH CONTENT COMPOSITION DURING EVACUATION

327

328

329 The remaining amount of material in the stomach after 72 h of evacuation was usually
330 insufficient to perform analyses of the composition.

331

332

333 The water content of all prey increased slightly during the first 6 h in the stomach (Fig.
334 1a). Subsequently, the water content kept increasing slightly during digestion for *C.*
335 *opilio* and *P. borealis* but not for *E. macilentus* and *P. montagui*. Larger changes were
336 observed for the ash content, which decreased exponentially in the stomachs with *C.*
337 *opilio* (Fig. 1b) dropping sharply to half of the initial value within 48 h and decreasing
338 more slowly during the remainder of the evacuation period. The ash content in fresh
339 shrimp was substantially lower as described above, and it decreased at a much lower rate
340 during evacuation.

341

342

343 The decrease in carbonate of stomach contents (not shown) was similar to that of ash
344 content. Accordingly, the relationship between these two variables remained strong in
345 the stomachs ($r^2 = 0.98$, $n = 57$):

346

$$347 \quad C_c = 0.38A_c - 0.03 \quad (4)$$

348

349

350 The energy density of shrimp decreased about 1 kJ g^{-1} during the first 12 h of
351 evacuation, and levelled off until the shrimp was completely evacuated (Fig. 1c). Data on
352 crab fluctuated around the initial value and were more variable, probably due to scarce
353 data.

354

355

356 GASTRIC EVACUATION PATTERNS

357

358

359 Gastric evacuation of *C. opilio* lasted more than 144 h (Fig. 2). An initial period of 24 h
360 with no significant evacuation was followed by an exponential decrease of the remaining
361 prey mass. At the final stage of evacuation, the stomach contents were principally
362 composed of soft pieces of exoskeleton that were most likely composed of chitin. A
363 confirmatory assay was, however, not performed. For the three species of shrimp, the
364 first empty stomach appeared 96 h after food intake (Fig. 3).

365

366

367 For all prey, r^2 values for the power exponential function were higher than the
368 corresponding ones obtained by use of the general power function because the former
369 function was able to describe the initial delay of evacuation (Table III). Accordingly, the
370 normalized relative likelihood w of the general power function was below 10 % of the
371 value obtained by use of the power exponential (crab, < 1%; shrimp, < 3-6%; shrimp
372 combined, < 0.01 %). So, there was a strong weight of evidence in favour of the power
373 exponential function being the best explanatory model for all species (Table III).

374

375

376 The estimates of the shape parameter ϕ in the power exponential function were
377 significantly higher than 1 (95% C.I. in Table III) for all crustacean prey (i.e. gastric
378 evacuation was initially delayed relative to a pure exponential decay function). The
379 species specific estimates of ϕ were significantly different (ANOVA: $F_{3,59} = 3.29$; $P <$
380 0.05). Subsequently, *post hoc* comparison (Tuckey HSD) showed that the value
381 estimated from *C. opilio* was significantly different from those obtained from the three
382 shrimp species indicating a longer lasting initial delay for evacuation of the crab prey.
383 The estimates of the rate parameter η obtained from shrimp prey were likewise similar,
384 and they were significantly higher than the value estimated from crab. Moreover, the
385 estimates of η^{-1} indicated that half the meal is evacuated within 20–24 h for shrimp prey,
386 whereas 57 h was needed for the crab. The value of the shape parameter ϕ was positively
387 correlated with initial contents of ash and carbonate in the prey.

388

389

390 The shape parameter α of the general power function was negative for *C. opilio* pointing
391 to the long delay period and the poor performance of the general power model to

392 describe the course of evacuation (Fig. 2). In contrast, this function with a power value
393 around 0.5 (square root) gave a fair description of evacuation of the individual shrimp
394 species (Table III and Fig. 3).

395

396

397 **DISCUSSION**

398

399

400 This study confirmed the expectation that the three shrimps and *C. opilio* were evacuated
401 from the stomach at different rates by *G. morhua*. These prey differ in energy density
402 that is known to influence evacuation rate negatively (Windell, 1966; Grove et al., 1978;
403 dos Santos & Jobling, 1988; Andersen, 1999). However, *C. opilio* had the lowest energy
404 density and should have been evacuated most rapidly if energy density was the only prey
405 characteristic influencing the evacuation rate. In contrast, the protecting effect of the
406 heavy exoskeleton of *C. opilio* is expected to delay the evacuation relative to that of
407 shrimp. The shrimps were totally evacuated in *c.* 72 h, whereas it took twice as long for
408 *C. opilio* to be evacuated. Hopkins & Larson (1990) obtained similar results. They
409 compared gastric evacuation patterns of four prey types in black and yellow rockfish
410 *Sebastes chrysomelas* (Jordan & Gilbert 1881), including two prey species with
411 exoskeleton, the purple shore crab *Hemigrapsus nudus* (Dana 1851) and the Franciscan
412 bay shrimp *Crangon franciscorum* Stimpson 1856. In their study, the shrimp was
413 evacuated in 30 hours, whereas the crab was evacuated in 50 hours, but no data on prey
414 energy density was provided.

415

416

417 The present data demonstrated three distinct stages of evacuation of prey with an
418 exoskeleton. In the first stage, the evacuation was slow, presumably because the
419 exoskeleton prevented stomach enzymes from attacking the prey (dos Santos & Jobling,
420 1992; Bromley, 1994). Then, the gastric evacuation rate increased significantly, and in
421 the final stage of evacuation, the evacuation slowed down again.

422

423

424 In the first stage of evacuation, the exoskeleton probably has a dual effect on digestion of
425 the prey. Pepsin and other gastric enzymes are activated in an acidic environment
426 (Jobling, 1986). During fasting, pH of the gastric juice is neutral but decreases after
427 intake of food because of HCl secretion. The buffer capacity of carbonates contained in
428 the exoskeleton might raise the pH value and delay enzyme activation, which would
429 explain partly why the delay in the first stage of evacuation seems to be directly
430 correlated with prey carbonate (and ash) contents. To rigorously test this hypothesis, pH
431 should be measured in stomach contents during evacuation, which was impossible in this
432 study, because stomach flushing was used to collect stomach contents.

433

434

435 The other property of the exoskeleton is the barrier effect (Bromley, 1994). It protects the
436 rest of the body from the digestive processes in the stomach, and evacuation seems to
437 begin when breaks occur in the more fragile parts of the exoskeleton, such as the joints.
438 Once gastric juices have penetrated into the internal soft tissues, the digestion and,
439 subsequently, the evacuation rate rapidly increases. For prey without exoskeleton like
440 fish, gastric evacuation begins as soon as the prey is ingested (dos Santos & Jobling,
441 1992). The initial delay in evacuation of shrimps only lasted for a few hours (Fig. 3). As

442 described above, the shrimp exoskeleton is less resistant (lower ash and chitin contents)
443 than in crab. It was observed that the cephalothorax of shrimp was separated from the
444 abdominal part early in the course of digestion (~6 h). This separation made digestion of
445 flesh possible after only a short lag. The situation was different for *C. opilio*, which did
446 not appear to be altered much during the first 24 h following ingestion (Fig. 2); this could
447 be related to the thicker exoskeleton merged to form a compact carapace and/or to the
448 carbonate heavy encrustations that harden the exoskeleton and perhaps delay enzyme
449 activation by their buffering action as described above. The latter is also indicated by the
450 significant loss of carbonate and ash contents to around half the value of fresh crab
451 during this initial stage of evacuation (Fig. 1). The present results confirm that energy-
452 poor minerals, as estimated by ash contents, are quickly evacuated from the stomach
453 (Hopkins & Larson, 1990).

454

455

456 In the second stage of evacuation, the evacuation rate of crab was significantly lower
457 than that obtained from combined data on the three shrimp species as reflected in the
458 estimates of the power exponential rate parameter η (Table III). The rates for crab and
459 shrimp were 0.26 g h^{-1} and 0.45 g h^{-1} at the time of halving of the prey body mass, and
460 0.26 g h^{-1} and 0.51 g h^{-1} at their respective maximum values. The energy densities of the
461 prey were quite similar after the initial stage of evacuation (Fig. 1). This could be
462 explained by the initial heavy loss of carbonates in *C. opilio*. The high level of
463 carbonates in fresh *C. opilio* also explain the low energy density of these (Table II).
464 Therefore, differences in energy density could not explain the differential evacuation
465 rates in the second stage of evacuation, which seems to be caused by prey specific
466 resistance to digestion (Andersen, 2001). Whereas the compact carapace of the crab only

467 gradually opened up and did not fragment until late in the evacuation period, the
468 exoskeleton of shrimp quickly broke up in smaller fragments leaving larger surfaces of
469 the inner soft tissues exposed to the enzymatic and mechanical processes in the stomach.

470

471

472 In the final stage of evacuation, mainly chitin was recovered from the stomach. The
473 chitin contents of remaining prey in the stomachs were not quantified. However,
474 visually, it appeared that for both shrimp and crab prey, remains of chitin was the last
475 evacuated prey component. Dissecting stomachs from bluegill sunfish, *Lepomis*
476 *macrochirus* Rafinesque 1819, Windell (1966) also observed that other organic matter in
477 the exoskeleton was digested first, whereas chitin stayed longer in the stomach, i.e. until
478 the pieces were small enough to pass through the pylorus as chitin was considered a non-
479 digestible material. However, the gastric mucosa of some fish, including *G. morhua*,
480 secretes chitinases and chitobiasis to hydrolyse chitin in β -N-acetyl-D-glucosamine
481 (Danulat & Kausch, 1984). Thus, *G. morhua* can digest chitin, but the process is likely
482 slower than for the other prey constituents. At the end of the evacuation, only pieces of
483 softened exoskeleton parts without minerals remained in the stomach. The slow digestion
484 of chitin explains why the estimated evacuation curves level off in the final stage of
485 evacuation and, therefore, are of an exponential nature subsequent to the initial delay.

486

487

488 The duration of all stages increased with increasing ash (and carbonate) content of the
489 fresh prey. Increasing proportionally to the ash content, the duration of the first stage
490 was, however, most affected as indicated by the higher estimate of the shape parameter φ
491 of the power exponential function obtained from crab as compared to those for shrimps

492 (Table III). Estimates of ϕ for brown shrimp *Crangon crangon* (L. 1758) fed to whiting
493 *Merlangius merlangus* (L. 1758) (data from Andersen, 2001) and blue-leg swimming
494 crab *Liocarcinus depurator* (L. 1758) fed to *G. morhua* (N. G. Andersen, unpubl. results)
495 corroborated the present findings (Fig. 4). Together with an estimate of 1.33 obtained
496 from *P. borealis* by dos Santos & Jobling (1992), values between 1.30 and 1.60 for *C.*
497 *crangon* were in line with the estimates of 1.45–1.53 obtained from the three shrimp
498 species in the present study. The estimated value 3.15 of the shape parameter for *L.*
499 *depurator* of 9.6 g body mass was higher than the estimate of 2.13 obtained from *C.*
500 *opilio* (Fig. 4). This may be ascribed to the three times larger body mass of *L. depurator*
501 and the consequently thicker carapace. Accordingly, Berens & Murie (2008) found ϕ
502 values of 2.28 to 3.07 for iridescent swimming crab *Portunus gibbesii* (Stimpson 1859)
503 ranging from 2.8 g to 11.7 g body mass and fed to gag *Mycteroperca microlepis* (Goode
504 & Bean 1879).

505

506

507 Estimates of the shape parameter ϕ obtained from experiments on *M. merlangus*
508 evacuating krill *M. norvegica* with low ash content, small body size (0.20 g) and a thin
509 flexible exoskeleton (data from Andersen, 2001) were generally lower (1.09–1.26) than
510 those obtained from shrimp (Fig. 4). The values were in most cases significantly higher
511 than 1, which in terms of the power exponential function indicated an initial delay of
512 evacuation. This was not obvious as demonstrated by, for example, evacuation data on
513 *M. norvegica* from which a value of 1.26 ± 0.14 (estimate \pm 95 % C.I.) was obtained for
514 ϕ [Fig. 5(a)]. Similarly, data on lesser sandeel *Ammodytes tobianus* L. 1758 of 4.0 g body
515 mass fed to *G. morhua* from Andersen (2012) produced values between 1.19 and 1.27,
516 all significantly higher than 1 (Fig. 4). This prey fish is particularly homogeneous as

517 regards prey characteristics influencing evacuation rate (Andersen & Beyer, 2005a), and
518 it is consistently evacuated according to the square root function without an initial delay.
519 This was also the case for the data on *A. tobianus* as exemplified by the data subset that
520 gave the value 1.25 ± 0.13 (estimate \pm 95 % C.I.) of φ [Fig. 5(b)]. The evacuation of *M.*
521 *norvegica* likewise closely followed the square root function suggesting that this prey
522 type can be considered homogeneous [Fig. 5(a)]. Thus, whereas the evacuation curve
523 described by the power exponential function deviated significantly from that of the
524 simple exponential with regard to an initial delay, it was not necessarily so when it was
525 compared with the square root function (Fig. 5). Values of φ significantly higher than 1,
526 should therefore not uncritically be interpreted as an initial delay of evacuation.

527

528

529 In conclusion, resistance of the exoskeleton (thickness, composition or morphology) was
530 the prey characteristic differentiating the crustacean prey. This was reflected in the
531 duration of the initial delay of evacuation as well as in the overall evacuation rate. The
532 remnants of robust exoskeletons furthermore slowed down the evacuation process
533 towards the end of evacuation relative to what should be expected from the course of the
534 square root function. These effects of robust exoskeletons provided an exponential
535 course of evacuation with an initial delay that was well described by the power
536 exponential function.

537

538

539 Unfortunately, unlike the square root function, the power exponential function cannot
540 describe evacuation by the current mass of stomach contents and, in particular, it cannot
541 work independently of meal size (dos Santos & Jobling, 1995). The general power model

542 with a shape parameter close to that of the square root function provided, however, a
543 reasonable description of the evacuation of shrimp (Table III and Fig. 3). This was in
544 accordance with the results of Andersen & Beyer (2005b), who successfully used the
545 cylinder model to predict evacuation of mixed meals composed of shrimp and fish prey.
546 Nevertheless, it is evident that the longer lasting initial delay of evacuation of *C. opilio*
547 (and probably crab and lobster in general) due to its thick carbonate encrusted carapace,
548 should be considered in mathematical descriptions of evacuation patterns and rates. This
549 may be realized by ignoring the very low evacuation rates of minor contents of chitin at
550 the end of evacuation and splitting the course of evacuation into two stages: an initial
551 period with slow evacuation (if appropriate data are available for the quantification) or,
552 alternatively, with no evacuation at all, followed by a period of faster evacuation,
553 probably according to the square root function. Surface considerations, prey
554 characteristics and the square root function being inherent features, the cylinder model of
555 gastric evacuation (Andersen & Beyer, 2005b) should qualify for the purpose.

556

557

558 The present study was due to financial support from the Canadian Strategic Science Fund
559 and the EU funding agency through the Gadolife project “Growth dynamics and
560 regulation of energy allocation in gadoids of different life strategies and in different
561 environments”. The authors would like to thank B. Sainte-Marie, Y. Lambert, R. Miller,
562 B. Chenard, M. Péloquin, S. Champagne and Luc Beaudin from the Maurice
563 Lamontagne Institute for their technical help and assistance.

564

565

566 **References**

567

568

569 Andersen, N. G. (1984). Depletion rates of gastrointestinal content in common goby
570 (*Pomatoschistus microps* (Kr.)). Effects of temperature and fish size. *Dana* **3**, 31–42.

571

572

573 Andersen, N. G. (1998). The effect of meal size on gastric evacuation in whiting. *Journal*
574 *of Fish Biology* **52**, 743–755. doi: 10.1006/jfbi.1997.0617

575

576

577 Andersen, N. G. (1999). The effects of predator size, temperature, and prey
578 characteristics on gastric evacuation in whiting. *Journal of Fish Biology* **54**, 287–301.

579 doi: 10.1006/jfbi.1998.0865

580

581

582 Andersen, N. G. (2001). A gastric evacuation model for three predatory gadoids and
583 implications of using pooled field data of stomach contents to estimate food rations.

584 *Journal of Fish Biology* **59**, 1198–1217. doi: 10.1006/jfbi.2001.1731

585

586

587 Andersen, N. G. (2012). Influences of potential predictor variables on gastric evacuation
588 in Atlantic cod *Gadus morhua* feeding on fish prey: parameterization of a generic model.

589 *Journal of Fish Biology*. doi: 10.1111/j.1095-8649.2011.03195.x

590

591

592 Andersen, N. G. & Beyer, J. E. (2005a). Gastric evacuation of mixed stomach contents
593 in predatory gadoids: an expanded application of the square root model to estimate food
594 rations. *Journal of Fish Biology* **67**, 1413–1433. doi: 10.1111/j.1095-8649.2005.00835.x
595
596
597 Andersen, N. G. & Beyer, J. E. (2005b). Mechanistic modelling of gastric evacuation in
598 predatory gadoids applying the square root model to describe surface-dependent
599 evacuation. *Journal of Fish Biology* **67**, 1392–1412. doi: 10.1111/j.1095-
600 8649.2005.00834.x
601
602
603 Andersen, N. G. & Beyer, J. E. (2007). How are prey fishes of multiple meals evacuated
604 from the stomach of a piscivorous fish? *Journal of Fish Biology* **71**, 219–234. doi:
605 10.1111/j.1095-8649.2007.01486.x
606
607
608 Arrhenius, F. & Hansson, S. (1994). In situ food consumption by young-of-the-year
609 Baltic Sea herring *Clupea harengus*: a test of predictions from a bioenergetics model.
610 *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **110**, 145–149.
611
612
613 Atkinson, E. G. & Wacasey, J. W. (1976). Caloric values of zoobenthos and
614 phytobenthos from the Canadian Arctic. p. 24: Department of the environment, fisheries
615 and marine service, research and development directorate.
616

617

618 Bajkov, A. D. (1935). How to estimate the daily food consumption of fish under natural
619 conditions. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* **65**, 288–289.

620

621

622 Benoit-Bird, K. J. (2004). Prey caloric value and predator energy needs: foraging
623 predictions for wild spinner dolphins. *Marine Biology* **145**, 435–444.

624

625

626 Berens, E. J. & Murie, D. J. (2008). Differential digestion and evacuation rates of prey in
627 a warm-temperate grouper, gag *Mycteroperca microlepis* (Goode & Bean). *Journal of*
628 *Fish Biology* **72**, 1406–1426.

629

630

631 Bromley, P. J. (1994). The role of gastric evacuation experiments in quantifying the
632 feeding rates of predatory fish. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries* **4**, 36–66.

633

634

635 Burnham, K. P. & Anderson, D. R. (2002). *Model selection and multimodel inference: a*
636 *practical information-theoretic approach*. New York, USA: Springer.

637

638

639 Chabot D., Sainte-Marie B., Briand K. & Hanson J.M. (2008). Atlantic cod and snow
640 crab predator-prey size relationship in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Canada. *Marine*
641 *Ecology Progress Series*, **363**, 227–240.

642

643

644 Danulat, E. & Kausch, H. (1984). Chitinase activity in the digestive tract of the cod,
645 *Gadus morhua* (L.). *Journal of Fish Biology* **24**, 125–133.

646

647

648 Darbyson, E., Swain, D. P., Chabot, D. & Castonguay, M. (2003). Diel variation in
649 feeding rate and prey composition of herring and mackerel in the southern Gulf of St
650 Lawrence. *Journal of Fish Biology* **63**, 1235–1257.

651

652

653 Elashoff, J. D., Reedy, T. J. & Meyer, J. H. (1982). Analysis of gastric emptying data.
654 *Gastroenterology* **83**, 1306–1312.

655

656

657 Elliott, J. M. & Persson, L. (1978). The estimation of daily rates of food consumption for
658 fish. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **47**, 977–991.

659

660

661 Golley, F. B. (1961). Energy values of ecological materials. *Ecology* **42**, 581–584.

662

663

664 Grove, D. J., Loizides, L. G. & Nott, J. (1978). Satiation amount, frequency of feeding
665 and gastric emptying rate in *Salmo gairdneri*. *Journal of Fish Biology* **12**, 507–516.

666

667

668 Hopkins, T. E. & Larson, R. J. (1990). Gastric evacuation of three food types in the black
669 and yellow rockfish *Sebastes chrysomelas* (Jordan and Gilbert). *Journal of Fish Biology*
670 **36**, 673–681.

671

672

673 Jarre, A., Palomares, M. L., Soriano, M. L., Sambilay, V. C. & Pauly, D. (1991). Some
674 new analytical and comparative methods for estimating the food consumption of fish.
675 *ICES Marine Science Symposia* **193**, 99–108.

676

677

678 Jobling, M. (1986). Mythical models of gastric emptying and implications for food
679 consumption studies. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* **16**, 35–50.

680

681

682 Jobling, M. (1987). Influences of food particle size and dietary energy content on
683 patterns of gastric evacuation in fish: test of physiological model of gastric emptying.
684 *Journal of Fish Biology* **30**, 299–314.

685

686

687 Jones, R. (1974). The rate of elimination of food from the stomachs of haddock
688 *Melanogrammus aeglefinus*, cod *Gadus morhua* and whiting *Merlangius merlangus*.
689 *Journal du Conseil international pour l'Exploration de la Mer* **35**, 225–243.

690

691

692 Jones, R. (1978). Estimates of food-consumption of haddock (*Melanogrammus*
693 *aeglefinus*) and cod (*Gadus morhua*). *Journal du Conseil international pour*
694 *l'Exploration de la Mer* **38**, 18–27.

695
696

697 Karlsen, J. D. & Andersen, N. G. (2012). Does the cylinder model of gastric evacuation
698 predict observed evacuation of mixed meals of prey of contrasting geometries in a
699 piscivorous fish? *Journal of Fish Biology* **80**, 166–180. doi: 10.1111/j.1095-
700 8649.2011.03160.x

701
702

703 MacDonald, J. S., Waiwood, K. G. & Green, R. H. (1982). Rates of digestion of different
704 prey in Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*), ocean pout (*Macrozoarces americanus*), winter
705 flounder (*Pseudopleuronectes americanus*), and American plaice (*Hippoglossoides*
706 *platessoides*). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **39**, 651–659.

707
708

709 Olson, R. & Mullen, A. (1986). Recent developments for making gastric evacuation and
710 daily ration determinations. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* **16**, 183–191.

711
712

713 Paine, R. T. (1966). Endothermy in bomb calorimetry. *Limnology and Oceanography* **11**,
714 126–128.

715
716

717 Pennington, M. (1985). Estimating the average food consumption by fish in the field
718 from stomach contents data. *Dana* **5**, 81–86.
719
720
721 Rindorf, A. (2004). Estimation of evacuation rates in the field. *Journal of Fish Biology*
722 **65**, 262–281. doi:10.1111/j.1095-8649.2004.00450.x
723
724
725 Sainsbury, K. J. (1986). Estimation of food consumption from field observations of fish
726 feeding cycles. *Journal of Fish Biology* **29**, 23–36.
727
728
729 dos Santos, J. (1990). *Aspects of the eco-physiology of predation in Atlantic cod (Gadus*
730 *morhua L.)*. Ph. D. Thesis, University of Tromsø, Norway.
731
732
733 dos Santos, J. & Jobling, M. (1988). Gastric emptying in cod, *Gadus morhua* L.: effects
734 of food particle size and dietary energy content. *Journal of Fish Biology* **33**, 511–516.
735
736
737 dos Santos, J. & Jobling, M. (1991). Factors affecting gastric evacuation in cod, *Gadus*
738 *morhua* L., fed single-meals of natural prey. *Journal of Fish Biology* **38**, 697–713.
739
740

741 dos Santos, J. & Jobling, M. (1992). A model to describe gastric evacuation in cod
742 (*Gadus morhua* L.) fed natural prey. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* **49**, 145–154.
743
744
745 dos Santos, J. & Jobling, M. (1995). Test of a food consumption model for the Atlantic
746 cod. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* **52**, 209–219.
747
748
749 Savenkoff C., Castonguay M., Chabot D., Fréchet A., Hammill M.O. & Morissette L.
750 (2006). Main prey and predators and estimates of mortality of Atlantic cod (*Gadus*
751 *morhua*) in the northern Gulf of St. Lawrence during the mid-1980s, mid-1990s, and
752 early 2000s. *Canadian Technical Report of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, **2666**, vi +
753 32.
754
755
756 Singh-Renton, S. & Bromley, P. J. (1996). Effects of temperature, prey type and prey
757 size on gastric evacuation in small cod and whiting. *Journal of Fish Biology* **49**, 703–
758 713.
759
760 Sokal, R. R. & Rohlf, F. J. (1995). *Biometry: the principles and practice of statistics in*
761 *biological research*. New York, USA: W.H. Freeman and Company.
762
763

764 Spinelli, J., Lawrence, L. & Wieg, D. (1974). Composition, processing, and utilization of
765 red crab (*Pleuroncodes planipes*) as an aquacultural feed ingredient. *Journal of the*
766 *Fisheries Research Board of Canada* **31**, 1025–1029.

767

768

769 Talbot, C. (1985). Laboratory methods in fish feeding and nutritional studies. In *Fish*
770 *Energetics: new perspectives* (Tytler, P. & Calow, P., eds.), pp. 125–154. Baltimore,
771 Maryland: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

772

773

774 Temming, A. & Andersen, N. G. (1994). Modelling gastric evacuation without meal size
775 as a variable. A model applicable for the estimation of daily ration of cod (*Gadus*
776 *morhua* L.) in the field. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* **51**, 429–438.

777

778

779 Temming, A. & Herrmann, J.-P. (2003). Gastric evacuation in cod, prey-specific
780 evacuation rates for use in North sea, Baltic sea and Barents sea multi-species models.
781 *Fisheries Research* **63**, 21–41.

782

783

784 Tyler, A. V. (1970). Rates of gastric emptying in young cod. *Journal of the Fisheries*
785 *Research Board of Canada* **27**, 1177–1189.

786

787

788 Waiwood, K. G. & Majkowski, J. (1984). Food consumption and diet composition of
789 cod, *Gadus morhua*, inhabiting the southwestern Gulf of St. Lawrence. *Environmental*
790 *Biology of Fishes* **11**, 63–78.

791

792

793 Welinder, B. S. (1974). The crustacean cuticle - I. Studies on the composition of the
794 cuticle. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology* **47**, 779–787.

795

796

797 Windell, J. T. (1966). Rate of digestion in the bluegill sunfish. *Investigations of Indiana*
798 *Lakes & Streams* **7**, 185–214.

799

800

801 Worischka, S. & Mehner, T. (1998). Comparison of field-based and indirect estimates of
802 daily food consumption in larval perch and zander. *Journal of Fish Biology* **53**, 1050–
803 1059.

804