1   **A global perspective on the trophic geography of sharks**

2

3   Christopher S. Bird [1, +*], Ana Veríssimo [2,3], Sarah Magozzi [1], Kátya G Abrantes [4], Alex

4   Aguilar [5], Hassan Al-Reasi [6], Adam Barnett [4], Dana M. Bethea [7], Gérard Biais [8], Asuncion

5   Borrell [5], Marc Bouchoucha [9], Mariah Boyle [10], Edward J. Brooks [11], Juerg

6   Brunnschweiler [12], Paco Bustamante [13], Aaron Carlisle [14], Diana Catarino [15], Stephane

7   Caut [16], Yves Cherel [17], Tiphaine Chouvelon [18], Diana Churchill [19], Javier Ciancio [20],

8   Julien Claes [21], Ana Colaço [15], Dean Courtney [7], Pierre Cresson [22], Ryan Daly [23, 24], Leigh

9   de Necker [25], Tetsuya Endo [26], Ivone Figueiredo [27], Ashley J. Frisch [28], Joan Holst Hansen

10   [29], Michael Heithaus [30], Nigel E. Hussey [31], Johannes Iitembu [32], Francis Juanes [33], Michael

11   J. Kinney [34], Jeremy J. Kiszka [35], Sebastian A. Klarian [36], Dorothée Kopp [37], Robert Leaf

12   [38], Li Yunkai [39], Anne Lorrain [40], Daniel Madigan [41], Aleksandra Maljković [42], Luis

13   Malpica-Cruz [43], Philip Matich [44, 45], Mark Meekan [46], Frederic Menard [47], Gui M.

14   Menezes [15], Samantha Munroe [48], Michael Newman [49], Yannis Papastamatiou [50, 51], Heidi

15   Pethybridge [52], Jeffrey D. Plumlee [53,54], Carlos Polo-Silva [55], Katie Quaeck-Davies[1],

16   Vincent Raoult [56], Jonathan Reum [57], Yassir Eden Torres-Rojas [58], David S. Shiffman [59],

17   Oliver N. Shipley [60], Conrad W. Speed [46], Michelle Staudinger [61], Amy Teffer [62],

18   Alexander Tilley [63], Maria Valls [64], Jeremy J. Vaudo [65], Tak-Cheung Wai [66], R. J. David

19   Wells [53, 54], Alex S.J. Wyatt [67], Andrew Yool [68], Clive N. Trueman[1]*.

20

21   1. Ocean and Earth Science, University of Southampton, National Oceanography Centre,

22   Southampton, SO14 3ZH, UK

23   +. Centre for Environment, Fisheries, & Aquaculture Sciences (CEFAS), Pakefield Road,

24   Lowestoft, NR33 0HT, UK (current address)

25   2. CIBIO - Research Center in Biodiversity and Genetic Resources, Campus Agrário de

26   Vairão, Rua Padre Armando Quintas, 4485-661 Vairão, Portugal

27   3. Virginia Institute of Marine Science, Route 1208, Greate Road, Gloucester Point VA

28   23062, U.S.A.

29   4. College of Science & Engineering, James Cook University, Cairns Qld 4878, Australia

30   5. IRBio; Institut de Recerca de la Biodiversitat and Department of Evolutionary Biology,

31   Ecology and Environmental Sciences, University of Barcelona, Avinguda Diagonal 643,

32   08028 Barcelona, Spain

33   6. Department of Biology, College of Science, Sultan Qaboos Univeristy, P.O. Box 36,

34   P.C. 123, Muscat, Oman

35   7. NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service, Southeast Fisheries Science Center, 3500

36   Delwood Beach Rd., Panama City, FL 32408, U.S.A

37   8. Ifremer, Unité Halieutique Gascogne Sud, Laboratoire Ressources Halieutiques de La

38   Rochelle, Place Gaby Coll, F-17137 L'Houmeau, France

39   9. Ifremer, Unité Littoral, Laboratoire Environnement Ressources Provence Azur Corse,

40   Zone Portuaire de Brégaillon, CS 20330, F-83 507 La Seyne sur Mer Cedex, France

41   10. FishWise, PO Box 233 Santa Cruz, CA 95061

42   11. Shark Research and Conservation Program, Cape Eleuthera Institute, Eleuthera,

43   Bahamas

44   12. Independent Researcher, Gladbachstrasse 60, CH-8044 Zurich, Switzerland

45   13. Littoral Environnement et Sociétés (LIENSs), UMR 7266 CNRS-Université de La

46   Rochelle, 2 Rue Olympe de Gouges, 17042 La Rochelle Cedex 01, France

47   14. Hopkins Marine Station of Stanford University, 120 Oceanview Blvd, Pacific Grove,

48   California, 93950, USA

49   15. MARE—Marine and Environmental Sciences Centre, Department of Oceanography

50   and Fisheries, University of the Azores, Rua Prof. Dr. Frederico Machado, Horta, Azores,

51   Portugal

52   16. Estación Biológica de Doñana, Consejo Superior de Investigationes Científicas

53   (CSIC), Apdo. 1056, 41080 Sevilla, Spain

54   17. Centre d'Etudes Biologiques de Chizé, UMR 7372 CNRS-Université de La Rochelle,

55   Villiers-en-Bois, France

56   18Unité Biogéochimie et Écotoxicologie, Laboratoire de Biogéochimie des Contaminants

57   Métalliques, rue de l'Ile d'Yeu, BP 21105, F-44311 Nantes Cedex 03, France

58   19. Florida International University, School of Environment, Arts and Society, Marine

59   Sciences Program, 3000 NE 151st, North Miami, FL 33181, USA

60   20. CESIMAR Centro Nacional Patagónico, CONICET (Consejo Nacional de

61   Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas), Blvd. Brown S/N, Puerto Madryn, 9120, Chubut,

62   Argentina

63   21. Laboratoire de Biologie Marine, Earth and Life Institute, Université catholique de

64   Louvain , 3 Place Croix du Sud, 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium

65   22. Ifremer, Unité Halieutique Manche Mer du Nord, Laboratoire Ressources Halieutiques

66   de Boulogne, 150 quai Gambetta, F-62200 Boulogne-sur-Mer, France

67   23. Port Elizabeth Museum at Bayworld, Humewood, Port Elizabeth, South Africa.

68   24. Save Our Seas Foundation - D'Arros Research Centre (SOSF-DRC), Rue Philippe

69   Plantamour 20, CH-1201.

70   25. Department of Biological Sciences, Private Bag X3, Rondebosch 7701, Cape Town

71   7700, South Africa

72   26. School of Pharmaceutical Sciences, Health Sciences University of Hokkaido, 1757

73   Kanazawa, Ishikari- Tobetsu, Hokkaido 061–0293, Japan

74   27. Departamento do Mar, IPMA - Instituto Português do Mar e da Atmosfera, I.P.

75   Avenida de Brasília, 1449-006 Lisboa, Portugal

76   28. Reef HQ, Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, Townsville, QLD, 4810,

77   Australia

78   29. Aquatic biology, Department of Bioscience, Aarhus University, 8000 Aarhus C,

79   Denmark

80   30. School of Environment, Arts, and Society, Florida International University, North

81   Miami, Florida 33181

82   31. Biological Sciences, University of Windsor, 401 Sunset Avenue, Windsor, ON N9B

83   3P4, Canada

84   32. Department of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, University of Namibia, Henties Bay,

85   Namibia

86   33. Department of Biology, University of Victoria, Victoria, BC, Canada, V8W 3N5

87   34. Ocean Associates, Inc., Southwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine Fisheries

88   Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, La Jolla, CA, U.S.A.

89   35. Marine Sciences Program, Department of Biological Sciences, Florida International

90   University, North Miami, Florida

91   36. Centro de Investigacion para la Sustentabilidad, Facultad de Ecologia y Recursos

92   Naturales. Universidad Andres Bello. Republica 440, Santiago, Chile

93   37. Ifremer, Unité Sciences et Techniques Halieutiques, Laboratoire de Technologie et

94   Biologie Halieutique, 8 rue François Toullec, F-56325 Lorient, France

95   38. Division of Coastal Sciences, University of Southern Mississippi, 703 East Beach

96   Drive, Ocean Springs, MS 39564, U.S.A

97   39. College of Marine Sciences, Shanghai Ocean University, 999 Huchenghuan Rd,

98   Shanghai 201306, China

99   40. Institut de Recherche pour le Développement (IRD), R 195 LEMAR, UMR 6539

100   (UBO, CNRS, IRD, IFREMER), BP A5, 98848 Nouméa cedex, New Caledonia

101   41. Harvard University Center for the Environment, Harvard University, 26 Oxford Street,

102   Cambridge, MA 02138 USA

103   42. Department of Biological Sciences, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada

104   V5A 1S6

105   43. Earth to Ocean Research Group, Department of Biological Sciences, Simon Fraser

106   University, Burnaby, BC, Canada V5A 1S6

107   44. Marine Sciences Program, Florida International University, 3000 NE 151 St., North

108   Miami, Florida, 33181;

109   45. Texas Research Institute for Environmental Studies, Sam Houston State University,

110   2424 Sam Houston Ave., Huntsville, TX, 77341

111   46. Australian Institute of Marine Science, Indian Ocean Marine Research Centre, The

112 University of Western Australia (M096), Perth, WA, Australia

113 47. Aix Marseille Univ, Université de Toulon, CNRS, IRD, MIO, Marseille, France

114 48. Australian Rivers Institute, Griffith University, Nathan, Queensland, 4111, Australia.

115 49. Department of Environmental and Aquatic Animal Health, Virginia Institute of Marine

116 Science, College of William & Mary, P.O. Box 1346, Gloucester Point, VA 23062-1346,

117 USA

118 50. Florida International University, Department of Biological Sciences, 3000 NE 151st

119 street, North Miami, FL, 33180 USA

120 51. Scottish Oceans Institute, School of Biology, University of St. Andrews, St. Andrews,

121 Fife KY16 8LB, UK

122 52. CSIRO Oceans and Atmosphere, GPO Box 1538, Hobart, TAS 7000, Australia

123 53. Department of Marine Biology, Texas A&M University at Galveston, 1001 Texas

124 Clipper Rd, Galveston, TX 77553, USA

125 54. Department of Wildlife and Fisheries Sciences, Texas A&M University, College

126 Station, TX 77843, USA

127 55. Universidad de Bogotá Jorge Tadeo Lozano. Sede Santa Marta, Colombia. Facultad de

128 Ciencias Naturales e Ingeniería. Programa de Biología Marina

129 56. Department of Environmental and Life Sciences, University of Newcastle, NSW,

130 Australia.

131 57. Conservation Biology Division, Northwest Fisheries Science Center, National Marine

132 Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, 2725 Montlake

133 Blvd. E, Seattle, WA 98112, USA

134 58. Instituto de Ecología, Pesquerías y Oceanografía del Golfo de México (EPOMEX),

135 Universidad Autónoma de Campeche (UAC), Campus 6, Av. Héroe de Nacozari #480,

136 C.P. 24029 Campeche, Campeche, Mexico.

137 59. Earth to Oceans Group, Department of Biological Sciences, Simon Fraser University,

138 8888 University Drive, Burnaby, BC, Canada V5A 1S6

139 60. School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook,

140 NY 11794, USA

141 61. Department of Environmental Conservation, University of Massachusetts Amherst,

142 Amherst, MA USA, Department of the Interior Northeast Climate Science Center,

143 Amherst, MA USA

144 62. Department of Biology, University of Victoria, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada

145 63. WorldFish Timor-Leste, Av. Presidente Nicolau Lobato, Dili, Timor-Leste.

146 64. Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Centre Oceanogràfic de les Balears, Moll de Ponent

147 s/n, Apdo. 291, 07015 Palma, Spain

148 65. The Guy Harvey Research Institute, Nova Southeastern University, Dania Beach, FL

149   33004, USA

150   66. State Key Laboratory in Marine Pollution, City University of Hong Kong, Tat Chee

151   Avenue, Kowloon, Hong Kong SAR, China

152   67. Department of Chemical Oceanography, Atmosphere and Ocean Research Institute,

153   The University of Tokyo, Kashiwa, Japan

154   68. National Oceanography Centre Southampton, European Way, Southampton SO14

155   3ZH, UK

156

157   *Corresponding authors: Christopher S. Bird chrisbirdshark@gmail.com, Clive N.

158   Trueman trueman@noc.soton.ac.uk

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183   **Abstract**

184   **Sharks are a diverse group of mobile predators that forage across varied spatial**

185   **scales and have the potential to influence food web dynamics. Ecological**

186   **consequences of recent declines in shark biomass may extend across broader**

187   **geographic ranges if shark taxa display common behavioural traits. By tracking the**

188   **original site of photosynthetic fixation of carbon atoms ultimately assimilated into**

189   **muscle tissues of 5394 sharks from 114 species, we identify globally consistent**

190   **biogeographic traits in trophic interactions between sharks found in different**

191   **habitats. We show that populations of shelf-dwelling sharks derive a substantial**

192   **proportion of their carbon from regional pelagic sources, but contain individuals that**

193   **forage within additional isotopically diverse local food webs, such as those supported**

194   **by terrestrial plant sources, benthic production and macrophytes. In contrast,**

195   **oceanic sharks appear to use carbon derived from between 30 and 50 degrees of**

196   **latitude. Global-scale compilations of stable isotope data combined with**

197   **biogeochemical modelling generate hypotheses regarding animal behaviours that can**

198   **be tested with additional methodological approaches.**

199

200   **Introduction**

201   Sharks are one of the most speciose groups of predators on the planet and can be found

202   over a broad range of habitats in every ocean [1]. Globally, population declines have been

203   reported in many species of sharks, largely due to fishing pressures and habitat degradation

204   over the last century [2-4]. However, the impacts of these declines on broader ecosystem

205   structure and function remain uncertain [5-11]. Global-scale ecological consequences from

206   declining shark numbers are likely and may be apparent if shark taxa perform broadly

207   similar functions across different regions and habitat types, such that local effects scale

208   across wide geographic regions. In marine systems, the impact of an individual on the

209   wider ecosystem is strongly influenced by trophic interactions [12]. Thus, the composition

210   and spatial origin of diet plays an important part in shaping the ecological roles of

211   individuals, species, and functional groups. Here, we use the term 'trophic geography' to

212   refer to spatial aspects of feeding and nutrition. Broadly quantifying the trophic geography

213   of marine consumers is particularly challenging, because the spatial and temporal scales

214   over which individuals forage can extend for thousands of kilometres and over months to

215   years. Nevertheless, trophic geography provides critical information on how food webs are

216   structured and the biological connectivity of ecosystems.

217

218   Extensive use of stable isotope analysis in localised studies of marine food webs has

219   provided a wealth of published information on trophic ecology across broad geographic

5

220 regions, and numerous ecosystems within those regions. Of particular utility, the stable
221 isotopic composition of carbon (δ^{13}C) in marine food webs provides spatial and trophic
222 information on nutrient and biomass residence and translocation, because of the
223 predictable variation in δ^{13}C values with latitude and among different primary production
224 types, such as phytoplankton (-24‰ to -18‰), macrophytes (-27‰ to -8‰), and
225 seagrasses (-15‰ to -3‰) [13-15]. The carbon stable isotope composition of primary
226 producers is directly assimilated by consumers through feeding, and provides a
227 biochemical tracer linking a consumer to the basal source of carbon and/or latitudinal
228 origin of the food webs that support tissue growth [16]. The extent of fractionation of carbon
229 stable isotopes during photosynthesis by algal phytoplankton varies strongly with latitude,
230 and to a lesser extent with dissolved nutrient contents, due to temperature and latitude-
231 dependent variation in variables such as cell size, growth rates and the concentration and
232 isotopic composition of dissolved CO_2 [14,17]. The stable isotopic composition of algal
233 phytoplankton has been simulated using isotope-enabled biogeochemical models [17],
234 providing global-scale predictions of latitude-dependent variation in δ^{13}C values. Stable
235 isotope data can thus be used as an indicator of the latitudinal origin of carbon assimilated
236 by mobile marine consumers, providing insight into cross-ecosystem foraging without the
237 need to directly track movements of individual animals [13,16]. Sharks assimilating food
238 fuelled by primary production source(s) in one region but captured in an isotopically
239 distinct second region should exhibit anomalous isotopic compositions compared to
240 primary producers in the capture location. Here, we compare latitudinal trends in δ^{13}C
241 values observed in muscle tissues of sharks found on continental shelves, open oceans, and
242 deep-sea habitats, with those predicted for phytoplankton in the known capture locations to
243 establish global patterns of trophic geography in sharks.
244
245 We compile a global-scale database of δ^{13}C values of white muscle tissue from 5394
246 individual sharks from 114 species associated with continental shelves (neritic waters
247 <200m in depth), oceanic (open-ocean waters but mainly occurring <200m) and deep-sea
248 (continental slopes and seamounts ≥200m) habitats (Supplementary Table 1, Figure 1). We
249 compare observed shark δ^{13}C values ($\delta^{13}C_S$) to biomass-weighted annual average δ^{13}C
250 values predicted for phytoplankton ($\delta^{13}C_P$) within biogeographically distinct ecological
251 regions (Longhurst Biogeographical Provinces) corresponding to shark capture locations
252 (Figure 2). We test the null hypothesis that sharks feed exclusively within the
253 phytoplankton-derived food webs of their capture locations by comparing the observed
254 and predicted latitudinal trends in δ^{13}C values. Capture location $\delta^{13}C_P$ values are calculated
255 from a carbon-isotope-enabled global ocean-ecosystem model ([17], Figure 1). Global-scale

256   isoscapes are not available for sources of marine production other than phytoplankton, thus

257   we cannot discount the possibility that all sources of production show consistent latitudinal

258   gradients in $\delta^{13}C$ values. However, the isotopic offset between phytoplankton, seagrass,

259   macrophytes and benthic production varies substantially between sites [16]. Furthermore,

260   variables such as cell size, growth rates and dissolved CO_2 concentrations, have less

261   influence on the $\delta^{13}C$ values of alternative marine production sources [14]. We therefore

262   expect that $\delta^{13}C$ values of alternative primary production sources will vary more at the

263   local level, and varying contributions of different production sources within shark food

264   webs will predominantly influence the variance seen in shark $\delta^{13}C$ values. A detailed

265   description of the considerations and rationale behind the isotopic comparisons are given

266   in the supplementary material.

267

268   **Results**

269   Carbon isotope values of shark muscle ($\delta^{13}C_S$) co-vary negatively with latitude for oceanic

270   and shelf sharks, but the relationship between latitude and $\delta^{13}C_S$ values differs among

271   habitats (Figure 2). In continental shelf waters, latitudinal trends observed in shark muscle

272   were similar to those estimated from biochemical models. The observed rate of change in

273    $\delta^{13}C$ values per degree of latitude was -0.11 for sharks and -0.13 for plankton, although

274   these rates were statistically distinguishable (ANCOVA $F_{11.864}$, p=0.0006).

275

276   The average isotopic offset between plankton and shelf sharks (the difference in intercept

277   values between the best fit linear regressions) is 4.6‰, close to the expected trophic offset

278   of 4.5‰, given that the median trophic level for sharks is estimated at 4.1 [18], and the mean

279   isotopic difference between sharks and their prey, i.e. trophic discrimination factor for

280    $\delta^{13}C$, is 1.1‰ (Supplementary Table 2). Best-fit generalised additive models (GAMs)

281   indicate that the largest amount of deviance in $\delta^{13}C_S$ in shelf sharks is explained by latitude

282   (42.0%), with very little effect of shark size (3.1%), and a combined explanatory deviance

283   of 46.7% (Supplementary Table 3). Regional biogeography among continental shelf sharks

284   are not ubiquitous though, and across all latitudes, the range of $\delta^{13}C_S$ values within a given

285   single-species population of shelf sharks is higher than that of oceanic or deep-sea sharks

286   (Figure 2).

287

288   Conversely, while oceanic and shelf sharks were sampled from a similar latitudinal range,

289   the observed latitudinal trends in $\delta^{13}C_S$ values from oceanic sharks are less steep than those

290   predicted for phytoplankton from the corresponding Longhurst Biogeographic Province

291   (ANCOVA: $F_{205.63}$, p<0.001; Figure 2). Irrespective of capture latitude, the observed range

292 of $\delta^{13}C_S$ values in oceanic sharks was small (-17.22 ± 0.99‰) across the sampling range.
293 The lack of covariance of $\delta^{13}C_S$ with latitude suggests oceanic sharks assimilate the
294 majority of their carbon from a relatively restricted latitudinal range, although temporal
295 differences in habitat use and $\delta^{13}C$ values of prey coupled with relatively slow isotopic
296 turnover rates of muscle in elasmobranchs could potentially mask variability driven by
297 latitude (discussed further in supplementary methods). Best-fit GAM models indicate that
298 only 20.2% and 4.8% of the deviance in oceanic shark muscle isotope values is explained
299 by latitude and shark size, respectively (Supplementary Table 3).

301 Despite the concentration of deep-sea samples from the North Atlantic, latitudinal trends
302 in $\delta^{13}C_S$ for deep-sea sharks do not co-vary with latitude (R^2 = <0.001, p = 0.314) or with
303 $\delta^{13}C_P$ (ANCOVA: $F_{1581.9}$, p<0.001; Figure 2), displaying patterns similar to those seen in
304 oceanic sharks. Body size explained 25.3% and depth of capture 17.6% of the deviance in
305 carbon isotope compositions of deep-sea sharks (Supplementary Table 3), which implies
306 that their trophic ecology is strongly depth and size-structured, consistent with other fishes
307 from continental slopes [19].

309 **Discussion**
310 Carbon stable isotope compositions estimated from phytoplankton and those measured in
311 shelf sharks ($\delta^{13}C_S$) express similar latitudinal trends. The observed similarity in latitudinal
312 isotopic trends between phytoplankton and sharks is consistent with our null hypothesis
313 that shelf shark populations are supported primarily by phytoplanktonic production close
314 to their capture location.

316 Shelf sharks display relatively high intraspecific variability in carbon stable isotope
317 compositions compared to oceanic and deep-sea populations (Figure 2). Thus while
318 population median isotopic compositions imply that the bulk of food assimilated by shelf
319 sharks is supported by phytoplankton production, it appears that individuals within
320 populations assimilate nutrients from a range of isotopically-distinct sources. Shelf, and
321 particularly coastal, ecosystems provide access to a wider diversity of ecological and
322 isotopic niches than oceanic ecosystems, including food webs supported by seagrasses,
323 benthic production, macroalgae and coral [13,20]. In most shelf habitats, pelagic
324 phytoplankton yields more negative $\delta^{13}C$ values than alternative carbon sources [13].
325 Foraging within alternative, more isotopically positive, coastal food webs will tend to
326 produce less negative $\delta^{13}C$ values than predicted based on local phytoplankton. We infer
327 that at the population level, shelf sharks act as generalist predators, but populations of at

328   least some of those species are composed of specialist individuals that forage within
329   distinct food webs during the timescale of isotopic turnover (likely 1-2 years [21]). The
330   range of $\delta^{13}C_S$ values observed within populations of shelf sharks is greater in latitudes
331   lower than around 40 degrees (Figure 2), potentially indicating greater reliance on food
332   webs supported by a range of non-phytoplankton based resources such as seagrasses and
333   coral reefs in less productive tropical settings. These hypotheses related to the range of
334   primary production sources fuelling shark populations could be further tested using
335   essential amino acid carbon isotope fingerprinting [22].

336

337   Pairing stable isotope analysis with more traditional habitat use methodologies could
338   improve the resolution of shark behaviour on continental shelves. Tracking studies
339   demonstrate that while spatial residency and/or repeated return-migrations (philopatry) are
340   common traits among sharks that use continental shelves, some species are capable of
341   undertaking large oceanic migrations (e.g. white and tiger sharks), and philopatry is still
342   under investigation [23]. Some species, identified *a priori* here as shelf sharks (i.e. tiger,
343   white, bull sharks etc.), use multiple habitats and undertake offshore migrations in excess
344   of 1000 km [24]. The isotopic compositions of sharks classified as mixed habitat species
345   diverge in latitudes lower than 35° (Figure 2). Among studies of species capable of
346   utilising multiple habitats, the majority of populations surveyed displayed $\delta^{13}C$ values
347   more consistent with obligate shelf sharks than oceanic sharks (Supplementary Figure 2).
348   This suggests that while some shelf shark species may be highly migratory, the carbon
349   supporting tissue growth is largely assimilated from foraging within shelf areas.

350

351   In contrast to shelf sharks, stable carbon isotope compositions of oceanic sharks and local
352   phytoplankton do not co-vary, and oceanic shark populations sampled within these studies
353   show similar carbon isotope values across all reported capture latitudes (Figure 2). The
354   limited isotopic variability seen in oceanic sharks could reflect either derivation of the
355   majority of nutrients from a restricted latitudinal range, or extensive foraging across large
356   latitudinal gradients to produce a consistent average value. In both cases consumption of
357   carbon with relatively low $\delta^{13}C$ values (i.e. from higher latitudes) is needed to explain the
358   relatively ^{13}C depleted values seen in sharks caught at low latitudes. Oceanic sharks are not
359   commonly found in latitudes greater than *c.*50° N or S [25], limiting the potential to balance
360   diet sources with more positive $\delta^{13}C$ values. We therefore infer that the majority of carbon
361   assimilated was relatively ^{13}C depleted and is consistent with phytoplankton-based food
362   webs (including mesopelagic food webs) from intermediate latitudes between *c.*30-50
363   degrees from the equator. The uncertainty surrounding the predictions of baseline $\delta^{13}C_P$,

364 capture locations, and isotopic turnover rates limit our ability to identify preferential
365 foraging latitudes. Oceanic sharks could also potentially be intercepting migratory prey
366 that has originated from a restricted latitudinal range, such as squid [26]. Regardless of the
367 mechanism(s), our data imply that intermediate latitude areas may provide globally
368 important sources of energy and nutrients for the oceanic shark populations sampled in
369 these studies.

370

371 Our inferences of regionally-restricted foraging areas are consistent with latitudinal trends
372 in oceanic productivity and satellite telemetry studies of several oceanic shark species [27,28].
373 Pelagic ecosystems at intermediate latitudes are typically characterized by strong thermal
374 gradients that act to concentrate ocean productivity in frontal and eddy systems
375 (Supplementary Figure 3) which subsequently attract and support oceanic consumers
376 including cetaceans, fishes, seabirds and marine turtles [27,29,30]. Tracking data from some
377 oceanic shark species show high residency within intermediate latitudes [28,30,31], and our
378 interpretation of the stable isotope data supports these predictions of centralised foraging
379 locations. Migrations away from productive foraging grounds may provide optimal habitat
380 for behaviours such as breeding, pupping, and avoiding intraspecific competition and
381 harassment [28,32]. Oceanic sharks have distributional ranges spanning ocean basins [33].
382 Therefore, recognising that most of the carbon assimilated into their muscle tissues is
383 derived from photosynthesis occurring in a relatively limited latitudinal region highlights
384 the global importance of regional food webs. More observations of oceanic sharks and/or
385 potentially migratory prey from tropical waters are required to test our hypotheses of
386 centralised foraging.

387

388 Similar latitudinal isotopic gradients are observed between oceanic and deep-sea sharks,
389 which may imply a shared nutrient resource supporting sharks in both habitats
390 (Supplementary Figure 4). Deep-sea sharks rely on the vertical flux of nutrients derived
391 mainly from surface phytoplanktonic production [19], and may therefore be expected to
392 closely track the stable isotopic composition of surface production. However, the
393 concentration of deep-sea shark samples from the North Atlantic Ocean (74%) make it
394 difficult to determine the tropho-spatial dynamics of this group, because the ameliorating
395 effects of the Gulf Stream suppresses latitudinal variation in $\delta^{13}C_P$ (Figure 1). Latitudinal
396 trends are further complicated by the strong effect of body size and depth (Supplementary
397 Table 3), whereby some species of deep-sea shark express bathymetric segregations by
398 size [34]. While movement data for most deep-sea shark species is limited, some larger
399 species undertake long-distance migrations possibly linked to ontogeny, but may also
400 undertake diel vertical migrations linked with foraging [35,36]. More research is needed to

401 fully understand the trophic geography of deep-sea sharks and their functional roles in

402 deep-sea ecosystems.

403

404 **Concluding Remarks**

405 Nearly a quarter of all chondrichthyan species are evaluated as threatened on the IUCN

406 Red List of Threatened Species, raising concerns on the future of many populations and

407 the resulting effects such declines may have on ecosystem function [2,4,7,37]. Concurrent

408 declines in species with shared trophic geographies help identify common risks associated

409 with fishing or climate change. While it is beyond the scope of this study, and these data,

410 to predict the effects of further removal of sharks from the oceans, we generate questions

411 that warrant further investigation, specifically (1) many shark species foraging in shelf

412 environments are typically classed as generalist consumers, but our data suggest that

413 populations are commonly comprised of individuals that forage in distinct food webs

414 supported by a range of different carbon sources. Such behavioural specialisation within

415 generalist populations could in theory reduce within-species competition by partitioning

416 resources and habitats, but the role of individual specialisation in regulating shark

417 population densities is unclear. (2) Oceanic sharks appear to predominantly forage on

418 carbon resources from a restricted latitudinal range in sub-tropical regions characterised by

419 relatively high productivity. We hypothesise that sharks migrate away from highly

420 productive regions into warmer waters to engage in alternative behavioural strategies such

421 as reproduction, but the mechanisms and drivers underpinning latitude-restricted foraging

422 in oceanic sharks remain unknown. Global patterns of trophic geography in other large

423 mobile marine predators are generally unknown, but may reveal the role mobile animals

424 play in distributing nutrients and connecting ecosystems across the global ocean, and help

425 to predict population responses to changes in local productivity.

426

427 We have provided evidence suggesting that on a global scale, sharks typically forage

428 within spatially restricted, regional seascapes. Conservation of shelf marine environments

429 is increasingly addressed through the creation of marine protected areas (MPAs) [38]. MPAs

430 may be effective measures for protecting locally-resident shelf shark species, providing

431 they encompass the range of adjacent habitats and core areas utilized by these shark

432 populations [39,40]. Although the distributional ranges for most oceanic sharks are expansive,

433 core intermediate latitudes appear to be important for the provision of nutrients and

434 energy. Productive intermediate latitudes are also targeted by pelagic fisheries, which

435 increase the susceptibility of oceanic sharks to exploitation [28]. Establishing management

436 and protective strategies that encompass all critical habitats utilised by a species is

11

437 complex. However, our results suggest that oceanic sharks may benefit from global
438 strategies that mitigate deleterious impacts on intermediate-latitude food webs and from
439 fishing practices that minimise shark mortality in these areas [27,28].

440

441 Electronic tagging has revolutionized shark spatial ecology, providing detailed records of
442 the movement of individual animals [23,30]. Tracking the movement of nutrients can
443 compliment information on individual animal movements by providing a link between the
444 presence of an animal in an area and the importance of that area for provisioning,
445 enhancing our knowledge of the extent and scale of connectivity between oceanic habitats.
446 Locating ecologically-relevant provisioning areas may also assist effective design and
447 placement of marine protected areas, particularly in open ocean and deep-water habitats.

448

449 **Methods**
450 Raw carbon stable isotope data (bulk tissue $\delta^{13}C$ values) were compiled from 54
451 publications and 7 unpublished datasets yielding measurements from 5602 individual
452 sharks of 117 species. Where possible, information such as location, body size, sample
453 size, lipid extraction method, and date were reported. The majority of studies were only
454 able to provide a general area of capture and the mapped locational assignment was taken
455 as the median of the latitudinal and longitudinal ranges of these areas. Likewise, some
456 studies sampled landing docks so were only able to provide the area of that landing dock.
457 The locations provided by these studies were of the landing docks and it was assumed that
458 fishers were catching sharks in waters in the vicinity of the landing port. Species habitat
459 preferences were categorised using published information from their prospective papers
460 (Supplementary Table 1) and on the advice of the corresponding authors. Species that had
461 multiple habitat descriptions were classified as shelf sharks. Examples of this are
462 *Hexanchus* spp, which are classified here as shelf sharks (n=198). Although typically
463 quoted as deep-sea sharks, all species in this study occur consistently over the shelf so
464 were not considered as obligate deep-sea shark species.

465

466 Samples from two plankivorous species (*Rhinocodon typus*: *n* = 26; [41,42], *Megachasma*
467 *pelagios:* n=*2; Wyatt unpublished*), from ecotourism provisioning sites (*Carcharhinus*
468 *perezii*; n = 23; [43]), and from a riverine study (*Carcharrhinus leucas*; n = 125; [44]) were
469 excluded as the study focuses on marine predators under natural conditions. Within the
470 studies comprising the dataset, five chemical treatments were used (none: *n* = 2386; water
471 washed: 1407; 2:1 chloromethanol: 748; cyclohexane: 696; and petroleum ether: 157).
472 Tests for lipid extraction effects were not significant and it is assumed that any effect
473 associated with chemical pre-treatment methods are spatially averaged across the data.

474   Samples with a C:N ratio greater than 10 were removed as it is highly unlikely that the

475    $\delta^{13}C$ value of these samples represents muscle protein. A further 314 samples with C:N

476   ratios ranging between 4-10 were subjected to mathematical correction for lipid influences

477   on $\delta^{13}C$ values [45]. All other values were used under the assumption that published values

478   were representations of true isotopic composition of muscle protein. The data compiled

479   will form the "Chondrichthyan Stable Isotope Data Project" and we invite the utilisation of

480   these data and addition of new data to help build on the global geographic trends observed

481   here.

482

483   For each major ocean, annual mean sea surface temperature (SST) and chlorophyll *a*

484   concentrations (Chl *a*) were derived from the moderate-resolution imaging

485   spectroradiometer (MODIS) 9km AQUA night time sea surface temperatures and 9km

486   MODIS AQUA CHL-a concentration data (NASA Oceancolor) for the median sampling

487   year for the shark data, 2009 (Supplementary Figure 3). Environmental data extraction was

488   constrained to oceanic waters within areas highlighted on the map (Supplementary Figure

489   3).

490

491   *$\delta^{13}C$ baseline predictions*

492   A mechanistic model predicting the spatio-temporal distribution of global $\delta^{13}C$ values of

493   particulate organic matter ($\delta^{13}C_P$) was used to interpret shark isotope data [17]. Briefly, the

494   model estimates $\delta^{13}C$ values in phytoplankton from ocean carbon chemistry,

495   phytoplankton composition and phytoplankton growth rate variables output from the

496   NEMO-MEDUSA biogeochemical model system at 1 degree and monthly resolution.

497   Biomass weighted annual average phytoplankton $\delta^{13}C$ values together with associated

498   spatial and temporal standard deviations were averaged across Longhurst Biogeochemical

499   Provinces (Figure 1). Model-predicted baseline $\delta^{13}C$ values were then inferred for the

500   capture location for each individual shark data point.

501

502   *Mathematical models*

503   The relationship between latitude and carbon stable isotope composition for both

504   phytoplankton ($\delta^{13}C_P$) and shark muscle ($\delta^{13}C_S$) was modelled using linear regression

505   (Figure 2, Table 1). For phytoplankton, we recovered the median and standard deviation of

506   annual average $\delta^{13}C_P$ values simulated within each Longhurst Province with a

507   corresponding shark sample. We then ran 500 repeated (Monte Carlo) linear regressions to

508   account for the spatial variation in predicted $\delta^{13}C_P$ values within each biogeographic

509   province. We predicted null hypothesis shark isotope compositions by adding 4.6 per mille

13

510   (reflecting 4.1 as the median trophic level of sharks and using published experimental

511   studies of trophic discrimination factors for $\delta^{13}C$ values in elasmobranch tissues of 1.1 per

512   mille (Supplementary Table 2) to the intercept of each of the 500 simulated regression

513   models. ANCOVA analyses were run to compare the slopes of regressions within a given

514   habitat and between comparable variables between habitats ($\delta^{13}C_S$, $\delta^{13}C_P$). ANOVA with

515   post-hoc Tukey HSD were used to test for significant differences between population

516   carbon ranges among habitats.

517

518   Generalised additive models (GAMs) were developed to describe latitudinal trends in

519    $\delta^{13}C_S$. Specific habitat models were used to determine the amount of deviance that could

520   be explained by single and multiple explanatory variables including distance from the

521   equator and predicted $\delta^{13}C_P$ (Supplementary Table 3). A depth parameter was also added

522   to the deep-sea shark models. $\delta^{13}C_P$ values were modelled separately from corresponding

523   capture locations as a function of distance from the equator. By comparing the amount of

524   deviance explained within both the $\delta^{13}C_S$ and $\delta^{13}C_P$ models, it was possible to determine

525   how much of the predicted $\delta^{13}C_P$ patterns were captured within $\delta^{13}C_S$ values. All models

526   were limited to two smoothing knots in order to make models comparable and

527   interpretable. Model comparisons were drawn using Akaike's information criterion (AIC)

528   to determine the most parsimonious model. Final models were visually inspected using

529   standard residual q-q plots to assess model suitability. All data analysis were performed in

530   R-cran (https://cran.r-project.org) and mapping visualisations in QGIS

531   (http://www.qgis.org).

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545   References

546   1   Ebert, D. A., Fowler, S. L., Compagno, L. J. & Dando, M. *Sharks of the*
547   *world: A fully illustrated guide.* (Wild Nature Press, 2013).
548   2   Ferretti, F., Worm, B., Britten, G. L., Heithaus, M. R. & Lotze, H. K.
549   Patterns and ecosystem consequences of shark declines in the ocean.
550   *Ecology letters* **13**, 1055-1071 (2010).
551   3   Worm, B. *et al.* Global catches, exploitation rates, and rebuilding
552   options for sharks. *Marine Policy* **40** 194-204 (2013).
553   4   Dulvy, N. K. *et al.* Extinction risk and conservation of the world's sharks
554   and rays. *eLife* **3**, 1-34 (2014).
555   5   Kitchell, J. F., Essington, T. E., Boggs, C. H., Schindler, D. E. & Walters, C.
556   J. The role of sharks and longline fisheries in a pelagic ecosystem of the
557   central Pacific. *Ecosystems* **5**, 202-216 (2002).
558   6   Myers, R. A., Baum, J. K., Shepherd, T. D., Powers, S. P. & Peterson, C. H.
559   Cascading effects of the loss of apex predatory sharks from a coastal
560   ocean. *Science* **315**, 1846-1850 (2007).
561   7   Heithaus, M. R., Frid, A., Wirsing, A. J. & Worm, B. Predicting ecological
562   consequences of marine top predator declines. *Trends in Ecology &*
563   *Evolution* **23**, 202-210 (2008).
564   8   Heupel, M. R., Knip, D. M., Simpfendorfer, C. A. & Dulvy, N. K. Sizing up
565   the ecological role of sharks as predators. *Marine Ecology Progress*
566   *Series* **495**, 291-298 (2014).
567   9   Grubbs, R. D. *et al.* Critical assessment and ramifications of a purported
568   marine trophic cascade. *Scientific Reports* **6**, 20970 (2016).
569   10   Roff, G. *et al.* The ecological role of sharks on coral reefs. *Trends in*
570   *Ecology & Evolution* **31**, 395-407 (2016).
571   11   Ruppert, J. L., Fortin, M.-J. & Meekan, M. G. The ecological role of sharks
572   on coral reefs: Response to Roff *et al. Trends in Ecology & Evolution,* **8**,
573   586-587 (2016).
574   12   McCann, K., Hastings, A. & Huxel, G. R. Weak trophic interactions and
575   the balance of nature. *Nature* **395**, 794-798 (1998).
576   13   Fry, B. & Sherr, E. B. in *Stable Isotopes in Ecological Research*   (eds P. W.
577   Rundel, J. R. Ehleringer, & K. A. Nagy) 196-229 (Springer New York,
578   1989).
579   14   Laws, E. A., Popp, B. N., Bidigare, R. R., Kennicutt, M. C. & Macko, S. A.
580   Dependence of phytoplankton carbon isotopic composition on growth
581   rate and $[CO_2)$aq: Theoretical considerations and experimental results.
582   *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* **59**, 1131-1138 (1995).
583   15   McMahon, K. W., Hamady, L. L. & Thorrold, S. R. A review of
584   ecogeochemistry approaches to estimating movements of marine
585   animals. *Limnology and Oceanography* **58**, 697-714 (2013).
586   16   Hobson, K. A. Tracing origins and migration of wildlife using stable
587   isotopes: A review. *Oecologia* **120**, 314-326 (1999).
588   17   Magozzi, S., Yool, A., Vander Zanden, H. B., Wunder, M. B. & Trueman, C.
589   N. Using ocean models to predict spatial and temporal variation in
590   marine carbon isotopes. *Ecosphere* **8**, e01763 (2017).
591   18   Cortés, E. Standardized diet compositions and trophic levels of sharks.
592   *ICES Journal of Marine Science: Journal du Conseil* **56**, 707-717 (1999).
593   19   Trueman, C. N., Johnston, G., O'Hea, B. & MacKenzie, K. M. Trophic

594   interactions of fish communities at midwater depths enhance long-
595   term carbon storage and benthic production on continental slopes.
596   *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **281**, p. 20140669
597   (2014).
598   20   Briand, M. J., Bonnet, X., Guillou, G. & Letourneur, Y. Complex food webs
599   in highly diversified coral reefs: Insights from δ^{13}C and δ^{15}N stable
600   isotopes. *Food Webs* **8**, 12-22 (2016).
601   21   Kim, S. L., del Rio, C. M., Casper, D. & Koch, P. L. Isotopic incorporation
602   rates for shark tissues from a long-term captive feeding study. *The*
603   *Journal of Experimental Biology* **215**, 2495-2500 (2012).
604   22   McMahon, K. W., Thorrold, S. R., Houghton, L. A. & Berumen, M. L.
605   Tracing carbon flow through coral reef food webs using a compound-
606   specific stable isotope approach. *Oecologia* **180**, 809-821 (2016).
607   23   Chapman, D. D., Feldheim, K. A., Papastamatiou, Y. P. & Hueter, R. E.
608   There and back again: A review of residency and return migrations in
609   sharks, with implications for population structure and management.
610   *Annual Review of Marine Science* **7**, 547-570 (2015).
611   24   Lea, J. S. *et al.* Repeated, long-distance migrations by a philopatric
612   predator targeting highly contrasting ecosystems. *Scientific reports* **5,**
613   p11202 (2015).
614   25   Camhi, M. D., Pikitch, E. K. & Babcock, E. A. *Sharks of the open ocean:*
615   *biology, fisheries and conservation*. Vol. 15 (John Wiley & Sons, 2009).
616   26   Ichii, T., Mahapatra, K., Sakai, M. & Okada, Y. Life history of the neon
617   flying squid: Effect of the oceanographic regime in the North Pacific
618   Ocean. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **378**, 1-11 (2009).
619   27   Scales, K. L. *et al.* On the front line: Frontal zones as priority at-sea
620   conservation areas for mobile marine vertebrates. *Journal of Applied*
621   *Ecology*, **51**, 1575-1583 (2014).
622   28   Queiroz, N. *et al.* Ocean-wide tracking of pelagic sharks reveals extent
623   of overlap with longline fishing hotspots. *Proceedings of the National*
624   *Academy of Sciences* **113**, 1582-1587 (2016).
625   29   Tittensor, D. P. *et al.* Global patterns and predictors of marine
626   biodiversity across taxa. *Nature* **466**, 1098-1101 (2010).
627   30   Block, B. A. *et al.* Tracking apex marine predator movements in a
628   dynamic ocean. *Nature* **475**, 86-90 (2011).
629   31   Hazen, E. L. *et al.* Predicted habitat shifts of Pacific top predators in a
630   changing climate. *Nature Clim. Change* **3**, 234-238 (2013).
631   32   Campana, S. E. *et al.* Migration pathways, behavioural thermoregulation
632   and overwintering grounds of blue sharks in the northwest Atlantic.
633   *PloS One* **6**, e16854 (2011).
634   33   Compagno, L. J. *Sharks of the world: An annotated and illustrated*
635   *catalogue of shark species known to date*. Vol. 2 (Food & Agriculture
636   Org., 2001).
637   34   Moura, T. *et al.* Large-scale distribution of three deep-water squaloid
638   sharks: Integrating data on sex, maturity and environment. *Fisheries*
639   *Research* **157**, 47-61 (2014).
640   35   Veríssimo, A., McDowell, J. R. & Graves, J. E. Population structure of a
641   deep-water squaloid shark, the Portuguese dogfish (*Centroscymnus*
642   *coelolepis*). *ICES Journal of Marine Science: Journal du Conseil* **68**, 555-

563 (2011).

36   Rodríguez-Cabello, C., González-Pola, C. & Sánchez, F. Migration and diving behavior of *Centrophorus squamosus* in the NE Atlantic. Combining electronic tagging and Argo hydrography to infer deep ocean trajectories. *Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers* **115**, 48-62 (2016).

37   Heupel, M. & Simpfendorfer, C. Importance of environmental and biological drivers in the presence and space use of a reef-associated shark. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **496**, 47-57 (2014).

38   Edgar, G. J. *et al.* Global conservation outcomes depend on marine protected areas with five key features. *Nature* **506**, 216-220 (2014).

39   Heupel, M. R. *et al.* Conservation challenges of sharks with continental scale migrations. *Frontiers in Marine Science* **2**, 12 (2015).

40   White, T. D. *et al.* Assessing the effectiveness of a large marine protected area for reef shark conservation. *Biological Conservation* **207**, 64-71 (2017).

41   Borrell, A., Aguilar, A., Gazo, M., Kumarran, R. P. & Cardona, L. Stable isotope profiles in whale shark (*Rhincodon typus*) suggest segregation and dissimilarities in the diet depending on sex and size. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* **92**, 559-567 (2011).

42   Hussey, N. E. *et al.* Expanded trophic complexity among large sharks. *Food Webs* **4**, 1-7 (2015).

43   Maljković, A. & Côté, I. M. Effects of tourism-related provisioning on the trophic signatures and movement patterns of an apex predator, the Caribbean reef shark. *Biological Conservation* **144**, 859-865 (2011).

44   Matich, P., Heithaus, M. R. & Layman, C. A. Contrasting patterns of individual specialization and trophic coupling in two marine apex predators. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **80**, 294-305 (2011).

45   Kiljunen, M. *et al.* A revised model for lipid-normalizing $\delta^{13}C$ values from aquatic organisms, with implications for isotope mixing models. *Journal of Applied Ecology* **43**, 1213-1222(2006).

699

700 **Author Contributions:** C.S.B, C.N.T (concept and design); C.S.B, C.N.T, A.V (project
701 leaders); C.S.B, C.N.T (writers); C.S.B, C.N.T, S.M, A.Y (data analysis and
702 interpretation); C.S.B, C.N.T, A.V, K.G.A, A.A, H.A-R, A.B, D.M.B, G.B, A.B, M.B,
703 M.B, J. B, P.B, A.C, D.C, J.C, J.C, A.C, D.C, P.C, R.D, L.N, T.E, I.F, A.J.F, J.H.H, M.H,
704 N.E.H, J.I, F.J, M.J.K, J.J.K, D.K, R.L, Y.L, S.A.K, A.L, D.M, A.M, L.M.C, P.M, M.M,
705 F.M, G.M.M, S.M, M.N, Y.P, H.P, J.D.P, C.P-S, K.Q, V.R, J.R, Y.E.T-R, D.S.S, C.W.S,
706 M.S, A.T, A.T, M.V, J.J.V, T-K. W, R.J.D.W, A.S.J.W (data contribution and/or sample
707 provision); C.S.B, C.N.T (corresponding authors). All authors have read, provided
708 comments and approved the final manuscript.

709

710 **Competing Financial Interests:** The authors declare no competing interests.

711

712

713

714

715

716

717

718

719

720

721

722

748

749

750

751

752

753

754

755

756   **Table 1:** Regression coefficients for modelled particulate organic matter (POM)
757    $\delta^{13}C$ ($\delta^{13}C_P$), estimated $\delta^{13}C$ ($\delta^{13}C_E$) and observed $\delta^{13}C$ shark muscle ($\delta^{13}C_S$)
758   values from Figure 2. Lettered figures are statistically similar as determined from
759   an ANCOVA.

760

$\delta^{13}C_P$ - soild				$\delta^{13}C_S$ - dashed			
intercept	slope	R^2	p	intercept	slope	R^2	p
-16.87	-0.13	0.61	<0.001	-12.54	-0.11	0.37	<0.001
-17.75	-0.11	0.80	<0.001	-16.55	-0.03	0.17	<0.001
-16.74	-0.12	0.67	<0.001	-17.55	<-0.01	<0.001	0.314

761

762

763

764

765

766

767

a)

b)

Shelf

Oceanic

Deep-sea

$\delta^{13}C$ (‰)

Distance from Equator (Degrees)

n=3231

n=676

n=1478

$\delta^{13}C$ range (‰)

A

B

B

Shelf   Oceanic   Deep-sea

Estimated $\delta^{13}C$

Shark $\delta^{13}C$

POM $\delta^{13}C$