Patchy zooplankton grazing and high energy conversion efficiency: ecological implications of sandeel behavior and strategy

Mikael van Deurs*, Asbjørn Christensen, Anna Rindorf

DTU Aqua National Institute of Aquatic Resources, Technical University of Denmark (DTU), Jægersborg Alle 1, Charlottenlund Castle, 2920 Charlottenlund, Denmark

ABSTRACT: Sandeels display strong site fidelity and spend most of their life buried in the seabed. This strategy carries important ecological implications. Sandeels save energy when they are not foraging, but in return are unable to move substantially and may therefore be sensitive to local depletion of prey. We studied zooplankton consumption and energy conversion efficiency of the lesser sandeel *Ammodytes marinus* in the central North Sea, using stomach data, length and weight-at-age data, bioenergetics, and hydrodynamic modeling. The results suggested the following. (1) Lesser sandeels in the Dogger area depend largely on relatively large copepods in early spring. (2) The lesser sandeel is an efficient converter, making secondary production into fish tissue available for higher trophic levels. Hence, changes in species composition towards a more herring-dominated system, as seen in recent times, may lead to a decrease in system transfer efficiency. (3) Sandeels leave footprints in the standing copepod biomass as far as 100 km from the edge of their habitat, but smaller and more isolated sandeel habitat patches have a much lower impact than larger patches, suggesting that smaller habitats can sustain higher sandeel densities and growth rates per area than larger habitats. We conclude that sandeel behavior and strategy have ecosystem implications.

KEY WORDS: Sand lance · Food web · Trophic transfer efficiency · Bioenergetics · Growth · Food consumption · North Sea · Dogger

Resale or republication not permitted without written consent of the publisher

INTRODUCTION

In marine ecosystems, the main flow of energy from secondary producers to larger fish, birds, and mammals is often channeled through just a few key species of small schooling fish, the so-called forage fishes (Cury et al. 2000). Forage fish is a functional group characterized by fast somatic growth, early maturation, planktivory, and schooling behavior, and represents a major energy resource to a wide variety of predators (Alder et al. 2008). In the central North Sea, the most important forage fishes are the lesser sandeel *Ammodytes marinus* (hereafter 'sandeel') and 2 clupeids, herring *Clupea harengus* and sprat *Sprattus sprattus*. These species act as major food-web energy conveyers, grazing vigorously on zoo-plankton and thereby converting secondary production into fish tissue, which is in turn available to marine predators higher in the food web. If the energy conversion efficiency of the forage fish community is high, more of the energy ingested in the form of secondary producers becomes available for production at higher trophic levels, and less will be lost through respiration. Energy conversion efficiency is therefore an important ecological aspect of the food web, and has been proposed as a major determinant of food-chain length (the energy-flow hypothesis) and predator production (e.g. Yodzis 1984, Rand & Stewart 1998, Trussell et al. 2006).

Although sandeels share the general characteristics of a forage fish, they possess several unique traits. Sandeels spend a large part of their juvenile and adult

life buried in the seabed in areas with well-oxygenated bottom substrate consisting of gravel or coarse sand (Reay 1970, Jensen et al. 2011). They remain buried throughout the diel cycle in winter, except during spawning around the beginning of the year. However, in early spring, they start to emerge every day to feed, and become one of the most abundant fish species in the water column of the North Sea for the following 3 to 4 mo (Macer 1966, Winslade 1974, MacLeod et al. 2007). When burrowed, sandeels are motionless and their metabolism is reduced to a minimum (e.g. Behrens et al. 2007, van Deurs et al. 2011a). This cryptic energy-saving behavior potentially renders sandeels more efficient as food-web energy conveyers compared to forage fish with more active behavior.

Another unique trait of sandeels is the high degree of site fidelity, resulting in a foraging behavior resembling that of central place foragers. Feeding takes place near their nightly burying habitat (e.g. Engelhard et al. 2008, van der Kooij et al. 2008, Jensen et al. 2011). Therefore, the movement of water and associated zooplankton relative to the fixed location of the sandeels is likely to greatly influence the food available to the sandeels and thus their impact on the local zooplankton. In contrast, fully pelagic forage fishes such as clupeids are able to move more freely in response to food density (Dragesund et al. 1997, Corten 2001) and can effectively graze continuously on the same copepod population for prolonged periods of time.

The aim of the present study was to explore the ecological implications of these 2 unique traits of sandeels, with particular focus on energy conversion efficiency and site fidelity. We studied lesser sandeels inhabiting the sand banks in the Dogger area located in the frontal region of the central North Sea (Fig. 1). First, the amount of zooplankton consumed by sandeels was estimated from stomach contents and bioenergetics. Second, the energy conversion efficiency from ingested zooplankton to fish tissue was calculated for sandeels. Third, the ecosystem effects of differential energy conversion efficiencies among forage fishes were analyzed. Lastly, the grazing pressure on local zooplankton communities was modeled by taking water movement and sandeel site fidelity into account.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sampling and data

Sandeel samples were collected during a data collection program carried out in cooperation between

Fig. 1. Study area showing sandeel *Ammodytes marinus* habitats (Jensen et al. 2011) (white patches), locations of the commercial hauls providing information on growth (clusters of grey dots), and locations of stomach sampling (black dots). Black surfaces are land (eastern UK)

the Danish Fisherman's Association and the Technical University of Denmark. Samples were taken at sea by the fishermen and immediately frozen. Samples were later transported, together with information on haul location and time, to the university for further analysis. In the laboratory, a subsample of each sample was measured and rounded down to the nearest half centimeter group. Ten sandeels per half centimeter group were randomly selected, and age was determined using otoliths. For further details, see Jensen et al. (2011). Mean length-at-age was estimated by combining length distributions with age-length keys. Age-length keys were produced separately for each distinct fishing ground and week using the method described by Rindorf & Lewy (2001). Condition was estimated as weight (g)/total length (cm)^b, where b = 3.06 is equal to the exponent of the power law function describing fish weight as a function of total length when all data is used. Only samples collected between 2001 and 2008 (a period of consistently high sampling intensity throughout the second quarter of the year) and from the major fishing grounds were used (Fig. 1).

During the same sampling program, a total of 472 sandeel stomachs were analyzed. Stomachs were collected between 2006 and 2008 (in April, May, and June) from all over the Dogger area. Stomachs were removed, then gently dabbed on both sides with

tissue before being weighed (g wet weight). Approximately every third stomach was put aside after weighing for further diet analysis (preserved in 98% alcohol).

Amount of zooplankton consumed

Two approaches were used to estimate consumption by sandeels: stomach contents and bioenergetic calculation. The weight of the stomach contents was used to estimate consumption for the period in which the samples were taken. This is often seen as a more accurate method than bioenergetics modeling when growth is food-limited (Elliott & Persson 1978). In contrast, bioenergetic modeling provides the opportunity to estimate food consumption over longer periods in which the sampling of stomachs becomes increasingly labor-intensive. Before any estimates of consumption were made, a diet analysis was carried out to investigate the size distribution of copepods. This information was necessary to account for the different energy densities of different-sized copepods (e.g. Corner & O'Hara 1986).

Diet analysis

Stomach contents were spread evenly on a Petri dish with 2 to 3 mm of water. A sub-area of 4 cm^2 in the middle of the dish was photographed using a stereo-microscope. Copepods completely dominated the diet. Other organisms, such as annelids, crustacean larvae, amphipods, appendicularians, and fish eggs each constituted ~1% of the diet. Further analyses therefore focused on copepods. A reliable quantitative separation into copepod species was not possible due to the advanced stage of digestion of the stomach contents. Instead, Image Pro Plus software was used to digitally measure the length of all intact copepod prosomes, ignoring stomach contents in advanced stages of digestion. Laboratory experiments have shown that sandeels prefer fish larvae over copepods (Christensen 2010). Hence, to investigate whether a major proportion of sandeels' diet consists of fish larvae, we also examined the stomach contents for pieces of fish larvae.

Energy density of copepods of different sizes

Corner & O'Hara (1986) reported the monthly energy content of 4 North Sea copepod species in spring. Based on this data, copepods were given an energy density of 3200 J g^{-1} wet weight for individuals <1.3 mm, and 5600 J g^{-1} wet weight for larger copepods. Average energy density of the diet, e_d, was then determined from the proportion of large (>1.3 mm) copepods observed in the diet, P_{large}, as $e_d = 3200(1 - P_{large}) + 5600P_{large}$.

Daily ration estimated from stomach data

We assumed a simple Bajkov-type relationship between the amount of food consumed and the amount of food in the stomach (e.g. Eggers 1977), and calculated the weight-specific daily ration R_D (weight of daily food intake relative to body weight) as:

$$R_D = \frac{24\phi(T) \times W_S}{W^\star} \qquad (1)$$

$\phi(T)$ is the evacuation coefficient as a function of temperature, and was adopted from van Deurs et al. (2010). W_S is the net weight of the stomach (g wet weight) (total weight of the stomach minus the weight of the emptied stomach; weights of empty stomachs were estimated based on a curve fitted to 30 empty stomachs). $W^\star$ is the mean body weight of the fish, defined as the body weight halfway through the growth period. R_D was calculated for each fish separately to allow us to calculate the geometric mean and standard error for various length intervals and for early and late spring. Note that R_D is directly comparable to daily consumption as derived from bioenergetics described in the next section. Stomach data were only available for adults.

Bioenergetic modeling of consumption

Conventional bioenergetic calculations consider growth over time as a function of consumption, respiration, egestion, and excretion (e.g. Hansen et al. 1993). However, in the present study, the calculations were inverted in order to find the amount of energy required to obtain observed changes in growth and condition over time. Input values to the bioenergetics calculations were therefore observed total length (L, cm) and condition (K) on the first ($t1$) and last day of the year ($t2$) of the calculation period. Calculation periods for adults (Age 1 and Age 2) were taken as the entire growth period (April 1 to June 30), and early and late spring separately (April 1 to May 15 and May 15 to June 30), corresponding to the first

and second half of the growth period (Macer 1966, Winslade 1974, MacLeod et al. 2007). For juveniles (Age 0), we assumed a summertime growth period of 100 d (not split into early and late growth/spring as for the adults). L_{t1}, L_{t2}, K_{t1}, and K_{t2} for adults were determined by fitting a 4th-order polynomial to observed weekly mean length or weekly mean condition as a function of week (Figs. 2 & 3), except for early spring Age 2 fish, where we assumed $L_{t1(Age\ 2)} = L_{t2(Age\ 1)}$. Juveniles (Age 0) were poorly represented in the samples, since they metamorphose and settle to the sand banks after the main fishing season has ended. We therefore chose to define $L_{t1(juveniles)}$ and $L_{t2(juveniles)}$ as the size at metamorphosis (5 cm; Wright & Bailey 1996) and $L_{t2(juveniles)} = L_{t1(Age\ 1)}$, and values of $K_{t1(juveniles)}$ and $K_{t2(juveniles)}$ were assumed identical to those of Age 1 sandeels.

Individual food consumption in terms of energy (C_E, J) for a given age-class and period was calculated as:

$$C_E = \frac{\Delta E_s + \Delta E_R + M}{0.7} \qquad (2)$$

where ΔE_s and ΔE_R are the change in body energy (J) attributable to structural growth (length growth) and energy reserves (condition increase), respectively, taking place over the calculation period, M is metabolism (J ind.$^{-1}$ h^{-1}) (see Eq. 3), and 0.7 is the universal assimilation efficiency for fish (Ciannelli et al. 1998). ΔE_s and ΔE_R were calculated from the change in mass of structural tissue (Δm_s, g) and energy reserves (Δm_R, g) over the time period: $\Delta E_s = 4500\Delta m_s$ and $\Delta E_s = 4500\Delta m_s$, where the coefficients 4500 and 8600 represent energy densities (J g^{-1}) of structural tissue and energy reserves, respectively. Energy density of structural tissue was derived from Hislop et al. (1991, their Table 2) (data from March/April when reserves of lesser sandeel are at their minimum), and energy density of reserves from van Deurs et al. (2011a). Δm_s and Δm_R were calculated as $\Delta m_s = (K_{t1}L_{t2}^{3.06}) - (K_{t1}L_{t1}^{3.06})$ and $\Delta m_R = (K_{t2}L_{t2}^{3.06}) - (K_{t1}L_{t2}^{3.06})$. The exponent 3.06 corresponds to the b exponent mentioned in 'Sampling and data'. The latter equation is more accurate when K_{t1} approaches $K_{minimum}$. $C_{E(late\ spring)}$ was therefore approximated from $C_{E(entire\ growth\ period)} - C_{E(early\ spring)}$ rather than using the equation.

Metabolism M (used in Eq. 2) was modeled as the standard metabolic rate (SMR, J ind.$^{-1}$ h^{-1}) plus the metabolic cost of swimming during the daily foraging period. Specific dynamic action (the metabolic cost associated with digesting a meal) is accounted for in the assimilation coefficient in Eq. (2). Standard meta-


Fig. 2. *Ammodytes marinus*. Length during the growth period of adult lesser sandeels (black: Age 1; grey: Age 2). Curves were created by fitting a 4th-order polynomial to data. Vertical dashed line represents the split between early and late spring (Week 18 is included in late spring)


Fig. 3. *Ammodytes marinus*. Condition factor (weight/length$^{3.06}$) during the growth period of adult lesser sandeels (black: Age 1; grey: Age 2). Curves were created by fitting a 4th-order polynomial to data. Vertical dashed line represents the split between early and late spring (Week 18 is included in late spring)

bolic rate in the period $t1$ to $t2$ is simply 24SMR × $(t2 - t1)$, where $t1$ and $t2$ are given as days of the year. The metabolic cost of swimming was estimated as the product of the hours spent swimming per day (β), an activity multiplier (α), and the duration of the calculation period $t1$ to $t2$: αSMR$\beta \times (t2 - t1)$, where α was given the default value 3.3 (from: van Deurs et al. 2010). This activity multiplier is in agreement with Boisclair & Sirois (1993). The duration of the daily activity period was set to $\beta = 10$ h, in accordance with laboratory experiments (van Deurs et al. 2011b).

Together, this resulted in an estimate of M in the calculation period $t1$ to $t2$ of:0

$$M = 24\,\text{SMR}[t2 - t1] + 33\,\text{SMR}[t2 - t1] \quad (3)$$

SMR was modeled as a function of body mass and temperature and was adopted directly from van Deurs et al. (2011a): SMR $= 1.36W^{0.8} \times (0.08T - 0.25)$, where W is the weight of the fish (g wet weight) (here defined as the weight halfway through the calculation period, back-calculated from Figs. 2 & 3 using $W = K \times L^{3.06}$). T is the mean sea surface temperature during the calculation period as provided by the Danish Meteorological Institute.

Weight-specific daily consumption (C_W, in proportion of body weight) was estimated as:

$$C_W = \frac{C_B / W^\star}{(t2 - t1)} \quad (4)$$

where C_B is the total biomass consumed per individual during the calculation period (g ind.$^{-1}$) calculated as: $C_B = C_E / e_d$, where e_d corresponds to the energy content of the diet (from 'Energy density of copepods of different sizes'). $W^\star$ is the mean body weight of the fish defined as the body weight halfway through the growth period.

Population-level consumption rate per surface area (C_P, g wet weight d^{-1} m^{-2}) was estimated as:

$$C_P = \frac{C_B \times N \times (t2 - t1)}{15 \times 10^9} \quad (5)$$

where C_B corresponds to the definition given under Eq. (4). N is the average stock number for the period 2001 to 2008 and for the sandeel stock assessment Area 1 (corresponding to the Dogger area) in ICES (2011a), and 15×10^9 is roughly the combined surface area (m^{-2}) of sandeel habitats in the Dogger area (Jensen et al. 2011).

Conversion efficiency of sandeels

The energy conversion efficiency during the growth period CE$_{\text{growthperiod}}$ (% of ingested energy that is converted to fish tissue via structural growth or reserve accumulation) was calculated as:

$$\text{CE}_{\text{growthperiod}} = \frac{\Delta E_s + \Delta E_R}{C_E} \times 100 \quad (6)$$

where ΔE_s, ΔE_R, and C_E are taken from Eq. (2). In the literature, energy conversion efficiency is either given specifically for the growth period or the entire year. For zooplanktivorous fishes in seasonal environments, the annual value is expected to be lower,

since some of the reserve accumulated during the growth period fuels metabolism outside the growth period. To allow a comparison, we also estimated annual energy conversion efficiency for sandeels. This was done by including the metabolic cost of overwintering in Eq. (6) as follows: CE$_{\text{annual(sandeel)}}$ = $(\Delta E_s + \Delta E_R - \text{Cost of overwintering})/C_E \times 100\,\%$, where Cost of overwintering $= 18.69L_{t2}^{2.66}$ (J) (derived from van Deurs et al. 2011a, their Table 2).

Ecosystem effects

To explore the potential ecosystem effects of the contribution of sandeels to the forage fish community, we calculated the combined annual energy conversion efficiency of the North Sea forage fish community (sandeels and clupeids) for each year from 1974 to 2010 as:

$$\text{CE}_{\text{(foragefish)}} = \frac{B_{\text{(sandeel)}} \times \text{CE}_{\text{(sandeel)}} \times B_{\text{(clupeid)}} \times \text{CE}_{\text{(clupeid)}}}{B_{\text{(foragefish)}}} \quad (7)$$

where CE is conversion efficiency and B is the stock biomass in a given year ($B_{\text{(clupeid)}}$ includes both herring and sprat). Stock biomasses of all species were derived from the multispecies model (SMS) of the North Sea (Lewy & Vinther 2004, ICES 2011b). CE$_{\text{(foragefish)}}$ was calculated using either annual values or growth period-specific CE values. CE$_{\text{growthperiod(sandeel)}}$ and CE$_{\text{annual(sandeel)}}$ are calculated above 'Conversion efficiency of sandeels' (we used the average across age-classes). The growth period-specific value for clupeids was derived from values for Atlantic herring *Clupea harengus* given in Varpe et al. (2005) and De Silva & Balbontin (1974), resulting in CE$_{\text{growthperiod(clupeids)}}$ = 15 %. Annual values were not available for Atlantic herring, sprat, or any closely related species. We therefore chose 10 % for the purpose of these calculations, assuming herring spent accumulated reserves during overwintering and spawning migration.

Grazing pressure on local zooplankton communities

Grazing pressure and local gradients in copepod concentrations resulting from patchy distribution of sandeels were investigated using a simple logistic grazing/production model coupled to a 3-dimensional operational ocean circulation model, the Danish Meteorological Institute hydrodynamical operational model, BSHCmod. Details of performance and model

results verification of this model are reported in Larsen et al. (2007) and She et al. (2007a,b).

The grazing/production model was formulated as a differential equation:

$$\frac{\Delta c}{\Delta t} = \lambda c \left(1 - \frac{c}{c_0}\right) - (\mu_{sandeel} + \mu_0)c \qquad (8)$$

where $\Delta c / \Delta t$ is the change in copepod concentration c for a given time interval t, c_0 is the copepod carrying capacity (given as a concentration) of the system in the absence of grazing, λ is 1/(production time scale), $\mu_{sandeel}$ is grazing pressure exerted by sandeels, and μ_0 is a background grazing level provided by other grazers in the region. The first term on the right-hand side of the equation can be interpreted as the copepod production p, and provides a production time scale $(1/\lambda)$ and a copepod concentration (c) that equals carrying capacity of the system (c_0) in the absence of grazing. The second term on the right-hand side of the equation is the grazing term. The equation was parameterized by assuming (1) a copepod vertical distribution (δ) of 0 to 8 m from the surface; (2) production maximum $= 0.5 c_0$; (3) a regional characteristic copepod production $p\delta = 1.5$ g wet weight m^{-2} d^{-1} and copepod concentration $c\delta = 15$ g wet weight m^{-2} (Nielsen & Munk 1998; see also Berggreen et al. 1988); (4) total grazing (sandeels plus other) equals total copepod production; and (5) grazing rate of sandeels $(\mu_{sandeel}\delta c)$ equals the sum of $C_{P(Age\ 1)}$ plus $C_{P(Age\ 2)}$ from Eqn. (5).

The differential equation was solved using Eulerian forward simulations performed by solving mass balance equations for each grid cell (6 × 6 nautical miles) on a computational grid. Mass fluxes over grid cells were derived from spatially and temporally varying water currents provided by the circulation model. The Eulerian simulation period was April 2007 to June 2007 (corresponding to the growth period for adult sandeels). The computational grid was restricted to the Dogger area (53.5 to 56°N and 1 to 5°E), and Dirichlet boundary conditions were applied. Information about the geographical distribution of sandeel habitat (Christensen et al. 2009, Jensen et al. 2011) was used to constrain grazing to defined grid cells within the computational grid. As a simplification, spatio-temporal variation in sandeel consumption rate and copepod production rate were neglected.

Grazing pressure was quantified as (1) the average fraction of the copepod biomass grazed by sandeels inside sandeel habitats relative to the total grazing of copepods inside sandeel habitats: $\rho_1 = \mu_{sandeel}/(\mu_{sandeel} + \mu_0)$ (averaged over the simulation), and (2) the bulk grazing ratio averaged over the entire simulation area: $\rho_2 =$ Sandeel grazing/Total grazing (averaged over the simulation). Lastly, the spatial heterogeneity scale in copepod concentrations, resulting from patchy distribution of grazing sandeels, was investigated by depicting the average copepod concentration (averaged over the entire simulation period) for each grid cell in a color gradient map.

RESULTS

Zooplankton consumption

During early spring, larger copepods dominated the stomach contents of adult sandeels. Copepods with prosome lengths around 2.25 mm were the most important. Juvenile sandeels were not available for stomach sampling. In late spring, smaller copepods dominated in terms of numbers, but biomass-wise, relatively large copepods (>1.5 mm) were still the more important food source (Fig. 4).

There was a large degree of similarity between daily consumption (C_W; bioenergetic approach) and daily ration (R_D; stomach data) (Fig. 5). Both methods resulted in lower estimates of consumption in late spring compared to early spring. Parameter values used in the bioenergetics calculations are summarized in Table 1. At the individual level, juvenile sandeels (summer) had higher weight-specific consumption compared to adults (spring), but lower absolute consumption due to their lower weight. For adults, consumption rates were highest during early spring (Table 2).

Conversion efficiency

The consumed secondary production was converted to sandeel biomass with an energy conversion efficiency of 32 to 56% within the growth period. Energy conversion efficiency was lowest for Age 2 in late spring, and in general, highest during early spring. Annual energy conversion efficiencies were considerably lower (Table 2).

The sensitivity of the model to the activity multiplier (α), daily activity period (β), timing of the growth period ($t2 - t1$), and temperature (T) was low. Estimated consumption and energy conversion efficiency varied no more than 5% in response to decreasing or increasing these parameter values by 15%, except for T, which varied between 5 and 8% depending on the age of the fish (8% for Age 2).

Fig. 4. *Ammodytes marinus*. Size composition of copepods in the diet of lesser sandeels in (A,B) early spring and (C,D) late spring. Relative diet size distributions are ex-pressed in (A,C) numbers and (B,D) biomass


Fig. 5. *Ammodytes marinus*. Comparison of weight-specific daily consumption (in proportions of body weight) estimated from stomach contents (R_D) and bioenergetic calculations (C_W). Black symbols: geometric mean of R_D (±SE) for each of 4 length groups and early spring (●) and late spring (▲) separately. Open symbols: C_W in early spring (○) and late spring (△). C_W for Age 1 and Age 2 adults during early spring corresponded to length groups 11–12 and 13–14 cm, and was therefore placed accordingly on the graph. Likewise, Age 1 and Age 2 corresponded to length groups 12–13 and 14–15 cm during late spring

Ecosystem effects

The results suggest that the proportion of sandeels in the forage fish community has ecosystem implications, although the extent depends on whether calculations are based on growth period efficiency or annual efficiency. The combined forage fish energy conversion efficiency (of the growth period) varied markedly between 1974 and 2010, and decreased by 35% in the period 2003 to 2005 (a period of low sandeel stock biomass) compared to the average level from 1974 to 2000. This was approximately halved (17%) when annual efficiencies were used (Fig. 6).

Grazing pressure on local zooplankton communities

The grazing pressure exerted by sandeels relative to total copepod grazing was estimated to be $\rho_1 = 0.697$ (SD = 0.032) inside sandeel habitats, and $\rho_2 = 0.367$ (SD = 0.031) for the study area as a whole (including the spaces between sandeel habitats). Assuming that sandeels are evenly distributed within sandeel habitats, copepod concentrations drifting over sandeel habitats with a large surface area or dense habitat clusters were effectively diluted (by grazing), and distinct local gradients in copepod concentrations appeared with a heterogeneity length scale of ~100 km (Fig. 7).

DISCUSSION

In the present study, we estimated the food consumption and energy conversion efficiency for lesser sandeels inhabiting the Dogger area in the North Sea. Based on this information, we demonstrated the ecological implications of (1) fluctuating proportions of sandeels in the forage fish community, and (2) sandeel habitat patchiness.

Daily ration estimated from stomach data agreed well with daily consumption estimated from bioenergetics, although during late spring, the stomach data gave values that were generally lower than values derived from bioenergetics. The difference was particularly pronounced in late spring, indicating that the fish length at the end of this period was under-

Table 1. *Ammodytes marinus*. Parameter values used in the bioenergetic calculations. Condition factor and length of fish at the beginning and end of the calculation period (K_{t1}, K_{t2}, L_{t1}, and L_{t2}), the first and last day-of-the-year of the calculation period ($t1$ and $t2$), mean water temperature (T), and energy density of prey (e_d). Values used when calculating the entire growth period, and values used when modeling the first half (early spring) and second half (late spring) separately, are presented

Input parameter	Age 0 Entire	Age 1 Entire	Age 1 Early	Age 1 Late	Age 2 Entire	Age 2 Early	Age 2 Late
K_{t1}	0.0021	0.0021	0.0021	0.00275	0.00195	0.00195	0.0027
K_{t2}	0.0029	0.0029	0.00275	0.0029	0.00285	0.0027	0.00285
L_{t1}	5	10.8	10.8	12.1	13.2	13.2	14.2
L_{t2}	10.8	13.2	12.1	13.2	14.6	14.2	14.6
$t1$	150	80	80	123	80	80	123
$t2$	250	165	123	165	165	123	165
T	14	10	8	12	10	8	12
e_d	5150	5350	5550	5150	5350	5550	5150

Table 2. *Ammodytes marinus*. Food consumption derived from the bioenergetic calculations. Total amount of energy consumed per individual during the calculation period (C_E), daily consumption relative to body mass (C_W), population-level consumption rate per surface area (C_P), and energy conversion efficiency during the growth period (CE$_{growthperiod}$) and for the entire year (CE$_{annual}$).

| Measures of consumption	Early spring Age 1	Early spring Age 2	Late spring Age 1	Late spring Age 2	Summer Age 0 (juvenile)
C_E (J)	31080	49287	33119	33220	44964
C_W (in proportion of body weight)	0.027	0.024	0.022	0.016	0.061
C_P (g wet weight m^{-2} d^{-1})	0.89	0.23	1.02	0.17	1.31
CE$_{growthperiod}$ (%)	56	54	40	32	47
CE$_{annual}$ (%)	22	18	16	11	25

Fig. 6. Inter-annual variation in (A) forage fish biomass in the North Sea separated into clupeids (black shading) and *Ammodytes marinus* (grey shading), and (B) energy conversion efficiency (CE) calculated for the forage fish community as a whole using either CE$_{growthperiod}$ (black line) or CE$_{annual}$ (grey line)

estimated. This could be caused by size-selective burial, where longer sandeels with a high condition factor tended to enter the sediment earlier than smaller sandeels (Pedersen et al. 1999). However, the overestimation is considerably less than experienced in previous studies of forage fish, where the bioenergetic

calculations provided estimates 2 to 4 times higher than methods based on stomach contents (Arrhenius & Hansson 1994, Maes et al. 2005).

The weight-specific consumption of 1.6 to 2.7% of body weight for adults was considerably lower than reported for other forage fishes (i.e. clupeids). Biomass and production estimates for pelagic planktivorous fishes in the North Sea have suggested a daily weight-specific consumption of 4% (Greenstreet et al. 1997). Average daily weight-specific consumption for adult Norwegian spring spawning herring during its growth period is roughly 7% (derived from values in Varpe et al. 2005). Likewise, Age 0 herring and sprat consume between 3.6 and 11% of their body weight per day (De Silva & Balbontin 1974, Arrhenius 1998, Maes et al. 2005), a range which contains the value estimated here for juvenile sandeel (6.1%). Relatively lower consumption rates, in particular for adults, may relate to the foraging strategy of sandeels, which resembles that of a central place forager. Compared to migratory fish such as herring that can move to areas of high food concentration (Dragesund et al. 1997, Corten 2001), sandeels have a rather limited foraging range, as they are obliged to stay near suitable burying habitat. Both stomach data and bioenergetics showed that food consumption decreased from early to late spring, indicating that food limitation was more important in late spring/early summer, when copepods were smaller.

In line with the present findings, Macer (1966) found the diet of lesser sandeels on Dogger Bank to consist predominantly of copepods. Genus and species were not identified in the present study, yet the size distributions show a clear change in diet composition from early to late spring. In early spring, copepods smaller than 1 mm were absent, and size distribution peaked around 2 mm, suggesting a major contribution from late *Calanus* stages. *Calanus* is the only genus common to the North Sea that reaches an average length >1.5 mm (Pitois et al. 2009), and *C. finmarchicus* tend to reach a maximum in abundance earlier in the season than other common North Sea species (Fransz et al. 1991).

Fig. 7. *Ammodytes marinus*. Simulation of grazing impact from patchily distributed sandeels in the Dogger area: (left) spatial heterogeneity in grazing impact depicted as copepod concentration relative to carrying capacity (c/c_0) (averaged over the simulation period April 1 to July 1); (upper right) 2-dimensional cross-sections corresponding to lines A and B in the left-hand (color) graph; (lower right) grazing impact in a given grid cell as a function of relative sandeel habitat coverage within a radius of 45 km. Sandeel habitat is represented by 10 × 10 km square cells

During the growth period, lesser sandeels converted consumed secondary production to sandeel tissue with an energy conversion efficiency of ~50 %, resulting in an annual average of 20 %. This finding is consistent with what has been found for other species of sandeel: 38 % for *Ammodytes personatus* in growth experiments (Sun et al. 2010), and an annual efficiency of 20 % for *A. dubius* based on comparable bioenergetics calculations (Gilman 1994). These values imply that sandeel is more energy-efficient than, for example, clupeids, where 17 % has been reported during the growth period for Norwegian spring-spawning herring using comparable methodology (Varpe et al. 2005), and 5 to 12 % for North Sea herring in growth experiments (De Silva & Balbontin 1974). The present study's estimates of energy conversion efficiency derived from bioenergetics can be considered accurate, or in the worst case, a slight underestimation, as stomach data resulted in lower consumption rates than those found using bioenergetics. It should, however, be noted that the excess metabolic cost of spawning activity was not accounted for when converting from growth period efficiency to annual efficiency. The behavior of lesser sandeels during spawning has never been docu-

mented, although the general consensus is that the individual sandeel only leaves the sediment for a brief period to spawn, and that spawning migration behavior is absent. Hence, the energetic cost associated with spawning activity is most likely small, and the sensitivity analysis showed that results changed only by 5 % when daily activity in the model was raised by 15 %.

The high energy conversion efficiency of sandeels was also evident at the system level, suggesting that the relative proportion of sandeels in the forage fish community has important implications for the ecosystem. For example, during the period of reduced sandeel biomass in 2003 to 2005, our calculations indicated a reduction in the forage fish conversion efficiency of 15 to 35 % compared to the average level up until 2000. This result implies that the production available for higher trophic levels (i.e. birds and Atlantic cod) is reduced when clupeids dominate the forage fish community, provided total forage fish consumption is bottom-up-controlled, as suggested by Frederiksen et al. (2006).

Population-level consumption rates of 1.2 g wet weight d^{-1} m^{-2} is close to the daily copepod production rate reported for the Dogger area in May

(1.5 g wet weight d^{-1} m^{-2}) (Nielsen & Munk 1998). However, hydrodynamic simulations showed that the average grazing pressure for the study area was only moderate when the spaces between sandeel habitats were included. The simulations further suggested that sandeels effectively leave footprints in the standing copepod biomass as far as 100 km from the edge of their habitats, but also that smaller and more isolated sandeel patches have much less influence on the copepod biomass. The latter finding indicates that small habitats can sustain higher densities of sandeels or higher growth rates, provided that sandeel feeding rate is limited by search time (i.e. higher copepod concentration leads to higher feeding rates). Hence, if adult sandeels do not move between habitats, as Jensen et al. (2011) concluded, sandeel carrying capacity for the Dogger area as a whole depends on how recruits are being distributed among habitats during the larval and juvenile phase (i.e. high carrying capacity is achieved if small habitats receive more recruits per area than large habitats).

In conclusion, these results suggest that the lesser sandeel in the North Sea Dogger area represents a rapid and efficient converter of secondary production to fish tissue readily available to higher trophic levels, although this may be partly counterbalanced by the greater mobility of clupeids, because large patches of zooplankton may remain unused if they are too far from suitable sandeel habitat. Hence, changes in species composition towards a more herring-dominated system, as seen in recent times, could potentially lead to a decrease in system-level energy transfer efficiency.

LITERATURE CITED

Alder J, Campbell B, Karpouzi V, Kaschner K, Pauly D (2008) Forage fish: from ecosystems to markets. Annu Rev Environ Resour 33:153–166

Arrhenius F (1998) Variable length of daily feeding period in bioenergetics modeling: a test with 0-group Baltic herring. J Fish Biol 52:855–860

Arrhenius F, Hansson S (1994) *In situ* food consumption by young-of-the-year Baltic Sea herring *Clupea harengus*: a test of predictions from a bioenergetics model. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 110:145–149

Behrens JW, Stahl HJ, Steffensen JF, Glud RN (2007) Oxygen dynamics around buried lesser sandeels *Ammodytes tobianus* (Linnaeus 1785): mode of ventilation and oxygen requirements. J Exp Biol 210:1006–1014

Berggreen U, Hansen B, Kiørboe T (1988) Food size spectra, ingestion and growth of the copepod *Acartia tonsa* during development: implications for determination of copepod production. Mar Biol 99:341–352

Boisclair D, Sirois P (1993) Testing assumptions of fish bioenergetics models by direct estimation of growth, consumption, and activity rates. Trans Am Fish Soc 122: 784–796

Christensen V (2010) Behavior of sandeels feeding on herring larvae. Open Fish Sci J 3:164–168

Christensen A, Mosegaard H, Jensen H (2009) Spatially resolved fish population analysis for designing MPAs: influence on inside and neighbouring habitats. ICES J Mar Sci 66:56–63

Ciannelli L, Brodeur RD, Buckley TW (1998) Development and application of a bioenergetics model for juvenile walleye pollock. J Fish Biol 52:879–898

Corner EDS, O'Hara SCM (1986) The biological chemistry of marine copepods. Clarendon Press, Oxford

Corten A (2001) Northern distribution of North Sea herring as a response to high water temperatures and/or low food abundance. Fish Res 50:189–204

Cury P, Bakun A, Crawford R, Jarre A, Quinones R, Shannon L, Verheye H (2000) Small pelagics in upwelling systems: patterns of interaction and structural changes in 'wasp-waist' ecosystems. ICES J Mar Sci 57:603–618

De Silva SS, Balbontin F (1974) Laboratory studies on food intake, growth and food conversion of young herring, *Clupea harengus* (L.). J Fish Biol 6:645–658

Dragesund O, Johannessen A, Ulltang O (1997) Variation in migration and abundance of Norwegian spring spawning herring (*Clupea harengus* L.). Sarsia 82:97–105

Eggers MD (1977) Factors in interpreting data obtained by diel sampling of fish stomachs. J Fish Res Board Can 34: 290–294

Elliott JM, Persson L (1978) Estimation of daily rates of food consumption for fish. J Anim Ecol 47:977–991

Engelhard GH, van der Kooij J, Bell ED, Pinnegar JK, Blanchard JL, Mackinson S, Righton DA (2008) Fishing mortality versus natural predation on diurnally migrating sandeels *Ammodytes marinus.* Mar Ecol Prog Ser 369: 213–227

Fransz H, Colebrook J, Gamble J, Krause M (1991) The zooplankton of the North Sea. Neth J Sea Res 28:1–52

Frederiksen M, Edwards M, Richardson AJ, Halliday NC, Wanless S (2006) From plankton to top predators: bottom-up control of a marine food web across four trophic levels. J Anim Ecol 75:1259–1268

Gilman S (1994) An energy budget for northern sand lance, *Ammodytes dubius*, on Georges Bank, 1977-1986. Fish Bull 92:647–654

Greenstreet SPR, Bryant AD, Broekhuizen N, Hall SJ, Heath MR (1997) Seasonal variation in the consumption of food by fish in the North Sea and implications for food web dynamics. ICES J Mar Sci 54:243–266

Hansen MJ, Boisclair D, Brandt SB, Hewett SW, Kitchell JF, Lucas MC, Ney JJ (1993) Applications of bioenergetics models to fish ecology and management: where do we go from here? Trans Am Fish Soc 122:1019–1030

Hislop JRG, Harris MP, Smith JGM (1991) Variation in the calorific value and total energy content of the lesser sandeel (*Ammodytes marinus*) and other fish preyed on by seabirds. J Zool (Lond) 224:501–517

ICES (International Council for the Exploration of the Sea) (2011a) ICES WGNSSK Report of the working group on the assessment of the demersal stocks in the North Sea and Skagerrak. ICES CM 2011/ACOM:13. ICES, Copenhagen

ICES (International Council for the Exploration of the Sea) (2011b) ICES WGSAM working group on multispecies assessment methods. ICES CM 2011/SSGSUE:10. ICES, Copenhagen

Jensen H, Rindorf A, Wright PJ, Mosegaard H (2011) Inferring the location and scale of mixing between habitat areas of lesser sandeel through information from the fishery. ICES J Mar Sci 68:43–51

Larsen J, Hoyer JL, She J (2007) Validation of a hybrid optimal interpolation and Kalman filter scheme for sea surface temperature assimilation. J Mar Syst 65:122–133

Lewy P, Vinther M (2004) Modelling stochastic age-length-structured multi-species stock dynamics. ICES CM 2004/FF:20, p 1–33. ICES, Copenhagen

Macer CT (1966) Sandeels (Ammodytidae) in the south-western North Sea: their biology and fishery. Fish Investig Ser II Mar Fish GB Minist Agric Fish Food 24:1–55

MacLeod CD, Santos MBA, Reid RJ, Scott BE, Pierce GJ (2007) Linking sandeel consumption and the likelihood of starvation in harbour porpoises in the Scottish North Sea: Could climate change mean more starving porpoises? Biol Lett 3:185–188

Maes J, Tackx M, Soetaert K (2005) The predation impact of juvenile herring *Clupea harengus* and sprat *Sprattus sprattus* on estuarine zooplankton. Hydrobiologia 540: 225–235

Nielsen TG, Munk P (1998) Zooplankton diversity and the predatory impact by larval and small juvenile fish at the fisher banks in the North Sea. J Plankton Res 20: 2313–2332

Pedersen SA, Lewy P, Wright P (1999) Assessments of the lesser sandeel (*Ammodytes marinus*) in the North Sea based on revised stock divisions. Fish Res 41:221–241

Pitois SG, Shaw M, Fox CJ, Frid CLJ (2009) A new fine-mesh zooplankton time series from the Dove sampling station (North Sea). J Plankton Res 31:337–343

Rand PS, Stewart DJ (1998) Prey fish exploitation, salmonine production, and pelagic food web efficiency in Lake Ontario. Can J Fish Aquat Sci 55:318–327

Reay PJ (1970) Synopsis of the biological data on North Atlantic sand eels of the genus *Ammodytes*. FAO Fish Synop 82. FAO, Rome

Rindorf A, Lewy P (2001) Analyses of length and age distributions using continuation-ratio logits. Can J Fish Aquat Sci 58:1141–1152

She J, Berg P, Berg J (2007a) Bathymetry impacts on water exchange modeling through the Danish Straits. J Mar Syst 65:450–459

She J, Hoyer JL, Larsen J (2007b) Assessment of sea surface temperature observational networks in the Baltic Sea and North Sea. J Mar Syst 65:314–335

Sun Y, Liu Y, Liu X, Tang O (2010) The influence of particle size of dietary prey on food consumption and ecological conversion efficiency of young-of-the-year sand lance, *Ammodytes personatus.* Deep-Sea Res II 57:1001–1005

Trussell GC, Ewanchuk PJ, Matassa CM (2006) The fear of being eaten reduces energy transfer in a simple food chain. Ecology 87:2979–2984

van der Kooij J, Scott BE, Mackinson S (2008) The effects of environmental factors on daytime sandeel distribution and abundance on the Dogger Bank. J Sea Res 60:201–209

van Deurs M, Christensen A, Frisk C, Mosegaard H (2010) Overwintering strategy of sandeel ecotypes from an energy/predation trade-off perspective. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 416:201–214

van Deurs M, Hartvig M, Steffensen JF (2011a) Critical threshold size for overwintering sandeels (*Ammodytes marinus*). Mar Biol 158:2755–2764

van Deurs M, Behrens JW, Warnar T, Steffensen JF (2011b) Primary versus secondary drivers of foraging activity in sandeel schools (*Ammodytes tobianus*). Mar Biol 158: 1781–1789

Varpe O, Fiksen O, Slotte A (2005) Meta-ecosystems and biological energy transport from ocean to coast: the ecological importance of herring migration. Oecologia 146: 443–451

Winslade P (1974) Behavioural studies on the lesser sandeel *Ammodytes marinus* (Raitt) II. The effect of light intensity on activity. J Fish Biol 6:577–586

Wright PJ, Bailey MC (1996) Timing of hatching in *Ammodytes marinus* from Shetland waters and its significance to early growth and survivorship. Mar Biol 126: 143–152

Yodzis P (1984) Energy flow and the vertical structure of real ecosystems. Oecologia 65:86–88