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"We sat on a crate of oranges and thought what good men most biologists are, the tenors of the scientific world temperamental, moody, lecherous, loud laughing, and healthy. Once in a while one comes on the other kind - what used in the university to be called a "dry-ball" - but such men are not really biologists. They are the embalmers of the field, the picklers who see only the preserved form of life without any of its principle. Out of their own crusted minds they create a world wrinkled with formaldehyde. The true biologist. deals with life, with teeming boisterous life, and learns something from it, learns that the first rule of life is living. The dry-balls cannot possibly learn a thing every starfish knows in the core of its soul and in the vesicles between his rays. He must, so know the starfish and the student biologist who sits at the feet of living things, proliferate in all directions. Having certain tendencies, he must move along their lines to the limit of their potentiality. And we have known biologists who did proliferate in all directions: one or two have had a little trouble about it. Your true biolgoist will sing you a song as loud and as offkey as will a blacksmith, for he knows that morals ane too often diagnostic of prostatitis and stonach ulcers. Sometimes he may proliferate a little too much in all directions, but he is very good company, and at least he does not confuse a low hormone productivity with moral ethics."
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## ABSTRACT

Meristic variation was examined on elvers from the York River, Virginia and was compared to the existing literature. Types and frequency of occurrence of vertebral anomalies were noted. Meristic characters showed a wide latitudinal uniformity. Elver size and time of inshore migration are related to latitude with elvers in southern estuaries arriving earlier and being smaller.

Food habits and seasonality of the American eel were studied from three Virginia rivers. Abundance in trawl surveys was related to temperature with fewer eels being caught in the colder months. Polychaetes, crustaceans and bivalves were important in the diet of $A$. rostrata in brackish water. Considerable predation on the commercially important species, Mya arenaria and Callinectes sapidus, was observed.

Fecundity of the American eel was estimated from 21 specimens migrating from the Chesapeake Bay during November 1970. The relationship between total length and fecundity is log $y=-4.29514$ $+3.74418 \log x$, where $y$ is the fecundity and $x$ is the total length, and between total weight and fecundity is log $y=3.22990+1.11157$ $\log x$, where $y$ is the fecundity and $x$ is the total weight. Gonadal condition of migratory specimens was described. Chesapeake Bay specimens are more sexually mature at the time of migration than eels of more northerly estuaries.

Eleven reproductively maturing specimens of the American eel were collected during three independent off-shore trawling operations. Three females were taken on December 5, 1967 southeast of the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay in 10 to 13 fathoms, one male and one fenale on November 5, 1969 southeast of Cape Cod in 35 to 45 fathoms, and six females on December 22, 1971 east of Assateague Island in 5 fathoms. Morphometrical analysis showed that the specimens were within the range of the silver phase of Anguilla rostrata. The ova diameters of the 1967 specimens were within the range of eels migrating from the Chesapeake Bay during November 1970, but those of the 1969 specimen were smaller and consistent with Canadian reports. The 1971 females were more sexually mature, as judged by ova diameters, than any of the other specimens.

ASPEOES OF THE BIOLOGY AND SYSTFMATTOS OE THE AMERICAN EEL, ANGUILIA ROSIRETA (ITSUEUR)

## INTRODUCTION

Early studies of the European eel, Anguilla rostrata (L.), were composed of fact and fancy with the latter predominating. One of the prime reasons for this state of confusion was that until 1777 the gonads of the female or male eel had not been described. This lack of knowledge led investigators to postulate that eels were gererated from slime, horsehair, dew, etc. The discovery of the female gonad with the apparent lack of males led to the belief that eels were hermaphroditic or that they might even mate with water snakes. Syrski first described the testis in an eel in 1873 and thus ended the myths associated with sexuality in the European eel (for excellent brief histories of early investigations of the eel see Goode, 1881, or Bertin, 1956). At this time several facts were known about the biology of the European eel: male and female sexes did exist; in autumn large numbers of eels migrated from the river systems to spawn; in the spring, large numbers of unpigmented or slightly pigmented eels migrated into the river systems from the sea.

The task of gaining more knowledge on the biology of the eel was given to the Danish biologist and oceanographer Johannes Schmidt. His detailed investigations were reported in a series of papers from 1903 to 1935 which laid the groundwork for a taxonomic revision of the genus Anguilla which was published by Ege in 1939.

Schmidt was able to locate the spawning area of the European and Arnerican eels in the Sargasso Sea by means of larval distribution (1909, 1912, 1923).

According to Ege (1939) the genus Anguilla is composed of 16 species of which 14 are Indo-West Pacific in their distribution. There are two species of Anguilla in the North Atlantic: A. anguilla (L), the European eel, and $\underline{A}$. rostrata (Lesueur), the American eel. This was challenged by Tucker (1959) who stated that there is but one species in the North Atlantic, A. anguilla. He postulated that European eels need not and do not reach the spawning area, but perish en route. According to his theory, the eel populations of Europe are replenished by the transport of larvae across the North Atlantic by the Gulf Stream with the associated larval life causing the meristic variation generally used to distinguish the two species. Tucker believed that there was but one species with the two forms being ecophenotypes. This theory was challenged by a number of investigators ( $D^{\top}$ Ancona, 1959; Deelder, 1960; D'Ancona, 1960) with the most persuasive argument defending the two species concept being published by Bruun (1963). It is now generally accepted that there are two species in the North Atlantje.

Vladykov (1955) pointed out that much of the biology of the Eunopean eel is known but that the same cannot be said of the American eel. Many aspects of the biology of $\underline{A}$. rostrata are extrāpolations of the results of European investigators on $\underset{A}{ }$. anguill $\exists$. This is as true today as it was in 1955. Recently, studies on ab and growth, feeding habits and sex ratios have been done (Gray

Andrews, 1970; Ogden, 1971; Gray and Andrews, 1971) but there are still numerous gaps in our knowledge of the biology of the American eel.

The purpose of this investigation is to describe certain aspects of the biology of the American eel, $\underline{A}$. rostrata, from the lower Chesapeake Bay and to summarize and provide additional information to the present literature. Because of the wide scope of the study with the rather disjunct parts, it is divided into the appropriate sections with an overall summary.

## PART I.

Meristics and ventebnal anomalies of the American eel, Anguilla rostrata (Iresucur), with comments on elver behavion.

## INTRODUCTION

The taxonomic state of the North Atlantic members of the genus Anguilla was in a chaotic state prior to the work of Schmidt with morphological variations being designated species (see Ege, 1939 for a list of synonymies). Schmidt (1913, 1914, 1915) employed meristics to reduce the number of North Atlantic species to two: Anguilla rostrata (Lesueur), the American eel, and A. anguilla (L.), the European eel. Ege (1939) and Ladd (1958) provided additional meristic data on the American eel. Ladd (1958) noted many osteological deformities in the vertebral columns of elvers from Nova Scotia, New Hampshire and Chesapeake Bay.

The total length of elvers and the time of inshore migration into estuaries along the east coast of North America has been reported by Schmidt (1909), Vladykov (1966) and Smith (1968). Vladykov (1966) found an increase in elver size with an increase in latitude from Florida to Quebec and divided his results into three size groups: a southern group from Florida to Chesapeake Bay (nean size less than 53 mm ); an intermediate size group from Maryland to New Brunswick (mean size $55.5-56.9 \mathrm{~mm}$ ) and a northern group (mean size greater than 58.0 mm ).

The purposes of this report are: (A) to summarize and present additional meristic data on the American eel and to determine if latitudinal differences in meristics exist; (B) to describe
the frequency of occurrence and major types of vertebral deformities in elvers; (C) to report observations on elver behavior during migration and (D) to determine if the mean total length of inshore migrating elvers is a linear function of latitude rather than three separate size groups as presented by Vladykov (1966).

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

Stage VI-A elvers (Bertin, 1956), collected on March 15, 1970 with a fine mesh dip net in Bracken's Creek, a small tributary of the York River near Yorktown, Va., were preserved in 5\% phosphate buffered formalin. Temperatures were measured in the field with a stem thermometer and salinities were determined with an induction salinometer on samples returned to the laboratory.

Preserved elvers were rinsed in tap water, cleared in 5\% potassium hydroxide, stained with potassium hydroxide-alizarin red-S solution, transferred through a graded series of KOH-glycerin solutions and were then stored in $100 \%$ glycerin with thymol added to prevent fungal growth (Ladd, 1958). The following meristics of 100 randomly chosen cleared and stained elvers were counted under appropriate magnification by the method of Ege (1939): total, caudal and precaudal vertebrae; left and right pectoral fin rays; left and right branchiostegals; dorsal, anal and caudal fin rays. These and 100 additional randomly chosen specimens were examined for vertebral anomalies.

Analysis of variance was used to test for significant: diffrences between the number of left and right pectoral fin raye rs the number of left and right branchiostegals and to compare the
meristic results of the present study with existing data from the literature. This was done on an IBM 360 computer using the BMD-OIV program (Dixon, 1967).

Total length of the elvers was recorded to the nearest millimeter using vernier calipers. Additional elvers (USNM \#18734) of stage VI-A collected 15 to 16 April 1957 at Millsboro Dam, Indian River, Del. were examined for length frequency. Total lengths of individual elvers for these specimens and data from the literature were regressed against approximate latitude of capture using an IBM-1130 computer to provide an equation relating the size of inshore migrating elvers and latitude.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Notes on elver behavior:
Bracken's Creek connects Bracken's Pond and the York River and is about 2 to 5 meters wide, 0.3 to 1.5 meters deep and 100 meters long. The creek is formed by outflow of the pond over a dam about 1.5 meters in height. The rate of discharge, salinity and temperature are determined by the tidal stage of the York River and the pond level. Water temperature on the collection date (3-15-70) was $11^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ at the dam and $9^{\circ}$ in the lower stream. The salinity was freshwater at the base of the dam but $4 \%$ in the lower reaches of the creek at about $1 / 2$ flood tide.

Elvers swam in the current with no apparent difficulty. Most ronained concentrated out of the main current near the sides of the dar. Many individuals had burrowed into the substrate and urder nocks. Several individuais were scaling the moist ventical.
wall of the dam and a few had reached the top. They were probably successful in their attempt to colonize the pond. Individuals out of water demonstrated the behavior associated with aerial respiration as described by Berg and Steen (1965, 1966) for large specimens of the European eel, $\underline{A}$. anguilla. The elvers gulped air and kept their opercles closed, thus expanding their branchial chamber. Berg and Steen (1965) stated that yellow eels out of water obtained significant amounts of oxygen by this mechanism and by absorption through the skin. No data are available on the efficiency of this mechanism in elvers.

Meristics:
Means and their $95 \%$ confidence intervals for the present study plus data from the existing literature are found in Table 1 and their frequency distributions are found in Appendix l. Analysis of variance showed no significant difference between the number of left and right branchiostegals ( $F=0.0416, \mathrm{df}=1$, 198) or the number of left and right pectoral fin rays ( $F=0.9152, \mathrm{df}=1$, 198) . Analysis of variance showed no significant mean differences in the following meristic characters between the literature data and those of the present study: right pectoral fin rays $(F=0.5046$, df $=3$, 387); anal fin rays $(\mathrm{F}=1.8326, \mathrm{df}=1,342$; right branchiostegals ( $F=0.3886, d f=2,950$ ) and precaudal vertebrae ( $F=$ l.01\%, $d f=4$, 892). Significant differences were found in the folloming characters: caudal vertebnae $(F=15.1905, \mathrm{df}=3$, 787); totai ventebrae ( $F=39.9350, \mathrm{df}=9,1744$ ) and caudal fin ray (f $\because 953, \mathrm{df}=1,511)$. ANOVA tables for all of the above ara in appendix 2.
Table 1. Surmary of meristic characters of the American eel, Anguilla rostrata.

| Total vertebrae | $\begin{gathered} \text { St. Lawrence } \\ \text { River (Schmidt, } \\ \text { 1913) } \end{gathered}$ | Weldon, No. Carolina (Schnidt, 1913) | Tilsbury, Mass. (Schmidt, 1913) | St. Croix Virgin Islands (Schmidt, 1913) | Gloucester, Mass. (Schmidt, 1913) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample size | 86 | 80 | 86 | 101 | 502 |  |
| $\bar{x} \pm \begin{gathered} \text { confidence } \\ \text { interval } \end{gathered}$ | $107.01 \pm 0.27$ | $107.29 \pm 0.30$ | $106.95 \pm 0.26$ | $107.23 \pm 0.24$ | $107.35 \pm 0.12$ |  |
| Range | 104-110 | 104-120 | 103-110 | 104-110 | 104-111 |  |
| Total vertebrae | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mass. (Ege, } \\ & 1939) \end{aligned}$ | Nova Scotia (Ladd, 1958) | New Hampshire (Ladd, 1958) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Virginia } \\ \text { (Ladd, 1958) } \end{gathered}$ | Virginia (Wenner, present study) | Total |
| Sample size | 99 | 298 | 296 | 99 | 99 | 1746 |
| $\bar{x} \pm \begin{gathered}\text { confidence } \\ \text { interval }\end{gathered}$ | $107.88 \pm 0.24$ | $107.14 \pm 0.15$ | $107.14 \pm 0.14$ | $107.13 \pm 0.21$ | $106.82 \pm 0.26$ | $107.14 \pm 0.06$ |
| Range | 104-110 | 104-110 | 104-110 | 104-109 | 103-109 | 103-111 |
| Precaudal vertebrae | Mass. (Ege, 1939) | Nova Scotia <br> (Ladd, 1958) | New Hampshire (Ladd, 1958) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Virginia } \\ & \text { (Ladd, 1958) } \end{aligned}$ | Virginia (Wenner, present study) | Total |
| Sample size | 99 | 298 | 301 | 100 | 99 | 897 |
| $\bar{x} \pm$ confidence <br> interval | $42.85 \pm 0.14$ | $42.71 \pm 0.09$ | $42.74 \pm 0.09$ | $42.83 \pm 0.15$ | $42.69 \pm 0.15$ | $42.77 \pm 0.04$ |
| Range | 41-45 | 41-45 | 41-46 | 41-44 | 41-44 | 41-46 |

Table l. (Cont.)

| Caudal vertebrae | Nova Scotia (Ladd, 1958) | New Hampshire (Ladd, 1958) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Virginia } \\ & \text { (Ladd, 1958) } \end{aligned}$ | Virginia (Wenner, present study) | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample size | 296 | 297 | 99 | 99 | 791 |
| $\overline{\mathrm{x}} \pm \underset{\text { interval }}{\substack{\text { infidence }}}$ | $63.43 \pm 0.13$ | $63.25 \pm 0.12$ | $63.31 \pm 0.20$ | $64.13 \pm 0.26$ | $64.31 \pm 0.08$ |
| Range | 60-68 | 60-66 | 61-66 | 61-67 | 61-68 |
| Left branchiostegals | West Gloucester, Mass. (Schmidt, 1914) | Mass. (Ege, 1939) | Virginia (Wenner, present study) | Total |  |
| Sample size | 746 | 100 | 100 | 946 |  |
| $\bar{x}+$ confidence <br> interval | $11.00 \pm 0.05$ | $11.03 \pm 0.14$ | $11.05 \pm 0.13$ | $11.02 \pm 0.04$ |  |
| Range | 9-13 | 10-13 | 9-13 | 9-13 |  |
| Right branchiostegals | West Gloucester, Mass. (Schmidt, 1914) | Mass. (Ege, 1939) | Virginia (Wenner, present study) | Total |  |
| Sample size | 752 | 101 | 100 | 953 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \bar{x} \pm \begin{array}{c} \text { confidence } \\ \text { interval } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | $11.02 \pm 0.05$ | $11.09 \pm 0.15$ | $11.06 \pm 0.14$ | $11.03 \pm 0.04$ |  |
| Range | 9-13 | 9-13 | 10-13 | 9-13 |  |

Table 1. (Cont.)

| Left pectoral fin rays | Virginia (Wenner, present study) | Total |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sample size | 100 | 100 |  |  |  |
| $\bar{x} \pm$ confidence interval | $16.51 \pm 0.21$ | $16.51 \pm 0.21$ |  |  |  |
| Range | 14-19 | 14-19 |  |  |  |
| Right pectoral fin rays | West Gloucester, Mass. (Schmidt, 1914) | St. Croix Virgin Islands (Schmidt, 1914) | Mass. (Ege, 1939) | Virginia (Wenner, present study) | Total |
| Sample size | 140 | 50 | 101 | 100 | 391 |
| $\bar{\chi} \pm$ confidence <br> interval | $16.78 \pm 0.16$ | $16.62 \pm 0.25$ | $16.71 \pm 0.22$ | $16.65 \pm 0.21$ | $16.71 \pm 0.10$ |
| Range | 14-20 | 15-19 | 14-20 | 14-19 | 14-20 |
| Caudal fia rays | West Gloucester, Mass. (Schmidt, 1914) | Virginia (Wenner, present study) | Total |  |  |
| Sample size | 413 | 100 | 513 |  |  |
| $\overline{\mathrm{x}} \pm$ confidence <br> interval | $9.91 \pm 0.04$ | $10.09 \pm 0.08$ | $9.95 \pm 0.04$ |  |  |
| Range | 8-12 | 9-12 | 8-12 |  |  |

Table 1. (Cont.)


The statistically significant difference between the numbers of caudal fin rays is probably not biologically significant. Schrnidt (1914) studied 413 specimens which had a mean caudal fin ray count of 9.92 while the present study included 100 specimens which had a mean of 10.09 . The difference of 0.17 fin rays between the two sample means is small and much significance cannot be attributed to it. The statistically significant differences in total and caudal vertebrae are attributed to the methodology of Ladd (1958). Schmidt (1913, 1914, 1915), Ege (1939) and the present study designated all vertebral elements beyond the last hour glass shaped centrum as one vertebrae whereas the last hour glass shaped centrum was the last countable vertebra for Ladd (1958). Ladd's mean counts from Nova Scotia, New Hampshire and Virginia were approximately 1 vertebra lower than the counts in other studies. To standardize methods or an overall summary of literature, one was added to each of Ladds values for total and caudal vertebrae while the values of the precaudal vertebrae were left unchanged.

Meristic characters show a wide latitudinal uniformity (Table 1) which presents strong evidence for the existence of one spawning population of the American eel. Good taxonomic characters used to define a species should show little variation both within a sample and between samples. For this reason, it is suggested that both dorsal and anal fin rays should not be used as taxonomic characters because of their variability (dorsal fin rays: mean $=$ 231.44, range 183-276; anal fin rays: mean $=199.12$, range 7 (27-29).

Vertebral anomalies:
Osteological deformities associated with the vertebral column were found in 78 of the 200 specimens examined. Most abnormalities (96\%) were in the caudal vertebrae. Hemal spine deformities were the most abundant. Fusion or partial fusion of vertebral centra occurred in $3 \%$ of the deformed specimens. Abnormalities in more than one vertebra in the same specimen (multiple anomalies) were present in $20 \%$ of the deformed specimens. The most typical deformities are shown in Figures 1 and 2.

Ladd (1958) found skeletal abnormalities in $56 \%$ of the 700 elvers of the American eel he examined. Most frequent were modifications and duplications of the neural and hemal spines. He stated that these could hardly be classified as abnormalities because they were so common. Gabriel (1944) found 26.9 to 31.1\% of laboratory cultured specimens of Fundulus heteroclitus possessed atnomal ventebrae, and was unable to correlate them with temperature, derelemental rates or genetic factors. The frequency of occurrence in wild populations was 2 to $3 \%$ and he attributed the high frequency in laboratory populations to "some physiological depressor present under laboratory conditions". Manion (1967) found skeletal abnormalities in ammocoetes from the Great Lakes region but not in sexually mature forms. Therefore, before accepting ladd's proposal (1958) that the high percentage of elvers with vertebral malformations can hardly be considered abnormal, the resident populations of eels in the rivers must be examined for their wesence. If the frequency of individuals with abnormal

Figure 1.
a. A cleared and stained elver of the American eel, A. rostrata, ready for meristic evaluation.
b. Malformed hemal spines, partially fused and fused vertebrae. Total length $=56.4 \mathrm{~mm}$. Vertebrae: total $=104$ (?); precaudal $=42$; caudal $=62$ (?). Fin rays: caudal $=10$; dorsal $=227$ anal $=$ 199; left pectoral $=$ I7; right pectoral $=18$. Branchiostegals: left $=$ 11; right $=11$.
c. Partially fused caudal vertebrae with a malformed hemal spine. Total length $=51.9 \mathrm{~mm}$. Vertebrae: total $=$ 109; precaudal $=43 ;$ caudal $=66$. Fin rays: caudal $=10 ;$ dorsal $=221 ;$ anal $=188 ;$ left pectoral $=17$; right pectoral $=$ 17. Branchiostegals: left $=11$; right $=11$.
d. Fused vertebrae, malformed hemal spines, malformed hypural plate. Total length $=49.8 \mathrm{~mm}$. Vertebrae: total $=95$ (countable) $;$ precaudal $=43 ;$ caudal $=52(?)$. Fin rays: caudal $=10 ;$ dorsal $=211 ;$ anal $=186 ;$ left pectoral $=15 ;$ right pectoral $=15$. Branchiostegals: left $=11 ;$ right $=11$.


Figure 2.
a. Extra hemal spines on caudal vertebrae near hypural plate. Total length $=57.2 \mathrm{~mm}$. Vertebrae: total $=106 ;$ precaudal $=41 ;$ caudal $=65$. Fin rays: caudal $=10 ;$ dorsal $=235 ;$ anal $=199 ;$ left pectoral $=$ 17; right pectoral $=17$. Branchiostegals: left $=11 ;$ right $=11$.
b. Extra hemal spines fused together forming an arch around the dorsal aorta in the caudal vertebrae. Total length $=53.7 \mathrm{~mm}$. Vertebrae: total $=106 ;$ precaudal $=42 ;$ caudal $=64$. Fin rays: caudal $=10 ;$ dorsal $=238 ;$ anal $=227$; left pectoral $=17 ;$ right pectoral $=17 . \quad$ Branchiostegals: left $=12 ;$ right $=12$.
c. Possible fused caudal vertebrae, extra and fused neural and hemal spines. Total length $=56.2 \mathrm{~mm}$. Vertebrae: total $=108 ;$ precaudal $=43 ;$ otudal $=65$. Fin rays: caudal $=10 ;$ dorsal $=236 ;$ anal $=207$; left pectoral $=15 ;$ right pectoral $=15$. Branonostegals: left $=12 ;$ right $=11$.
d. Extra and fused hemal spines on a camal
vertebrae. Meristic data same as figure $2 a$.

vertebrae is much lower in these populations, it would demonstrate a selection pressure against these forms.

Elver size and latitude:
Iength frequency distribution of elvers collected near Yorktown, Va. is reported in Fig. 3. Their mean size was 55.6 mm . Vladykov (1966) concluded that elvers arrive earlier in the southern latitudes and that there is a gradient in size with more northern forms being larger. Table 2 sumarizes data of Schmidt (1909), Vladykov (1966), Smith (1968) and the present study. Length frequency distributions are in Appendix 3. When total lengths of the elvers from the locations of these studies were plotted against approximate latitude of capture, the data showed linearity over the range of values observed. The equation for the linear relationship between mean total length of elvers and latitude is $y=38.862$ $+0.415 x$, whene $y$ is the mean total length in mm and $x$ is latitude in degrees (Eig. 4). The correlation coefficient ( $r=0.5598$ ) shows that there is a significant relationship between latitude and mean total length. The underlying assumption of the model is that the leptocephalus larvae metamorphose at smaller sizes in more southerly locales thereby producing smaller elvers. A more reliable method of predicting elver size at the time of inshore migration would be to use the distance from the spawning grounds as the independent variable, but since its position is still in doubt (Vladykov, 1964), the use of latitude may give a reasonable approximation. These data do show that the sizt is elvers cannot be broken into three separate categories as implied by Vladykov (1966) but are merely points on a north-south continuum.

Table 2. Collection sites of elvers of $A$. rostrata from various investigators.

| \# | Collection Site | Latitude ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ) | Date of Collection | Sample Size | Mear Length (mm) | Investigator |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Everglades, Fla. | 25.43 | Jan. 19, 1966 | 32 | 49.4 | Smith, 1968 |
| 2 | Escambia River, Fla. | 30.56 | April 2-7, 1953 | 61 | 52.0 | Vladykov, 1966 |
| 3 | York River, Va. | 37.38 | March 17, 1970 | 137 | 55.6 | Present study |
| 4 | Patuxent River, Md. | 38.46 | April 20, 1960 | 213 | 52.9 | Vladykov, 1966 |
| 5 | Ocean City, Md. | 38.65 | April 14, 1960 | 201 | 55.7 | Vladykov, 1966 |
| 6 | Indian River, Del. | 38.66 | April 15, 1957 | 105 | 53.5 | Present study |
| 7 | Manasquan, New Jersey | 38.09 | May 28, 1960 | 236 | 55.5 | Vladykov, 1966 |
|  | Woods Hole, Mass. | 4J. 54 | March 1, 1872 | 19 | 56.9 | Schmidt, 1909 |
|  | New Brunswick, Canada | 45.07 | June 19, 1952 | 228 | 58.6 | Vladykov, 1966 |
|  |  |  | May 25, 1953 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | May 13, 1960 |  |  |  |
| 10 | Nova Scotia, Canada | 46.67 | May 25, 1953 | 362 | 58.6 | Vladykov, 1966 |
|  |  |  | May 10-12, 1960 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | June 1, 1955 |  |  |  |
| I1 | Quebec, Canada | 49.29 | June 29, 1945 | 31 | 58.3 | Vladykov, 1966 |



## PART II.

Food habits and seasonality of the American eel, Anguilla rostrata (Lesueur) from three Virginia rivers.

Food habits of the American eel in fresh water were studied by Godfrey (1967), Compton (1968) and Ogden (1970). Little work has been reported from estuaries except for the brief descriptions of Hildebrand and Schroeder (1927), Brinkley and Brown (1935) and Bigelow and Schroeder (1953). These last three studies were qualitative rather than quantitative.

Several investigators have studied the seasomality of the American eel in freshwater. Smith and Saunders (1955) reported that eels were generally not caught in fish traps during the winter in the Maritime Provinces of Canada. Compton (1968) found eels to be less abundant during the winter months in a tributary of the Delaware River. These authors attributed this decrease in winter to hibernation of eels in mud bottoms. Eales (1968) stated that in winter inactive eels "hole up" in localized areas.

The purpose of this report is to describe the seasonality of the American eel in brackish water and to provide qualitative and quantitative data on the food habits in those regions.

## METHODS AND MATERIALS

Monthly collections were made using a $30^{\circ}$ semi-balloon trawl with a $1 / 2$ inch stretch mesh cod-end liner by Virginia Institute of Marine Science personnel on the $\mathrm{R} / \mathrm{V}$ Pathfinder, on
the York and James rivers from January 1966 to December 1970 and on the Rappahannock River from January 1967 to December 1970. Stations were occasionally not sampled due to vessel maintenance or icing conditions on the rivers during extremely cold months. Tows were 7.5 to 15 min. long at previously selected stations (Fig. 5). Temperatures were measured with a stem thermometer, salinities with an induction salinometer and dissolved oxygen by Winkler titration on bottom samples.

In order to standardize catches for different trawl times, the number of eels caught was summed for each month and divided by the total number of hours trawled. $A \log _{10}(x+1)$ transformation for contagious distribution was then applied to the monthly values and arithmetic means of the lagarithms were calculated. The treatment of the data assumes a direct relationship between number caught and tow length, but the nature of the relationship is not known. The author was not responsible for the design of the sampling program.

Specimens for stomach analysis, collected during the April to October 1971 trawl survey, were frozen until being processed. Total length was recorded to the nearest millimeter and stomachs from 336 specimens were removed and placed in $10 \%$ phosphate buffered formalin. Contents were sorted, identified to species whenever possible, frequency of occurrence noted and volume estimated by water displacement to the nearest tenth of a milliliter. Each siphon of the bivalves Macoma sp. and Mya arenaria encountered was designated as one animal for the frequency of occurrence. Appendages of the blue crab, Callinectes sapidus, were also counted as one animal.

# Figure 5. Station locations for the seasonality and food habjes studies of the American eel. 



RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Hydrography:
Means, 95\% confidence limits and ranges of the hydrographic observations are found in Figures 6 through 8. Salinity varied widely at any given station during the sampling period. This is a typical estuarine situation with salinity being determined by tidal stage and amplitude, wind and fresh water run-off (Carriker, 1967). Dissolved oxygen concentrations are higher in the cooler months and decrease with increasing temperatures as expected. The Rappahannock River, a relatively unpolluted estuary, shows the lowest dissolved oxygen concentrations during the sumner months with values at the lower stations (R-11, R-15, R-20) sometimes going as low as 0.7 ppm .

Food Habits:
A total of 46 of the 67 stomachs from animals collected in the James River contained food while 51 of 85 and 133 of 184 contained food in the York and Rappahannock rivers respectively. Frequency of occurrence and displacement volumes of different food items for each station are in Table 3. Frequency of occurrence and percent volume displacement of major taxa are in Figures 9 and 10.

Crustaceans, bivalves and polychaetes made up the greatest part of the stomach contents of $\underline{A}$. rostrata in each river. Crustaceans were the most important numerically and volumetrically except in the Rappahannock River where the bivalves, Mya arenaria, Mulenia lateralis and Macoma sp. were more numerous

Figure 6. Means, $95 \%$ confidence limits and ranges of bottom hydrographic observations of the James River stations from January 1966 to December 1970.


Figure 7. Means, $95 \%$ confidence limits and ranges of bottom hydrographic observations of the York River stations from January 1966 to December 1970.


Figure 8. Mears, 95\% confidence limits and ranges of bottom hydrographic observations of the Rappahannock River stations from January 1967 to December 1970.


Table 3. Frequency of occurrence, volume displacement and species
composition of stomach contents of the American eel from
the James, York and Rappahannock rivers by station
location:

Table 3 (cont.)

| Station | Class | Species I | \# of Individuals | Volume (mI) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| J-32 | Pelecypoda | Mya arenaria | 5 | 0.4 |
|  | unidentified | materials and sediment |  | 1.6 |
|  | Crustacea | $\frac{\text { Gammarus }}{\text { daidentified }}$ | $68$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.0 \\ & 0.3 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | Insecta | plecoptera | 3 | 0.2 |
|  | Felecypoda | unidentified | 2 | 4.4 |
|  | Pisces | Alosa pseudoharengus | 7 | 24.1 |
|  | unidentified | materials and sediment |  | 3.6 |
| York River |  |  |  |  |
| Station | Class | Species In | \# of Individuals | Volume (mI) |
| Y-10 | Crustacea | Gammarus sp. | 24 | 0.5 |
|  |  | Crangon septemspinosus | S I | 1.0 |
|  |  | Callinectes sapidus | 1 | 3.1 |
|  |  | decapod | 1 | 0.1 |
|  |  | crustacean remains | - | 0.7 |
|  | Pelecypoda | Ensis directus | 1 | 0.7 |
|  |  | Mya arenaria | 4 | 2.5 |
|  | unidentified | materials and sediment |  | 1.9 |
| Y-15 | Polychaeta | Pectinaria gouldii | 6 | 4.1 |
|  | Crustacea | Ogyrides limicola | 2 | 0.1 |
|  |  | Crangon septemspinosus | S $\quad 2$ | 1.5 |
|  |  | Neopanope texana | 1 | 0.4 |
|  |  | Callinectes sapidus | 4 | 51.8 |
|  |  | decapod | 1 | 1.4 |
|  | Pelecypoda | Mya arenaris | 4 | 0.8 |
|  |  | unidentifieg | 1 | 0.4 |

Table 3. (Cont.)

| Station | Class | Species In | \# of Individuals | Volume (mI) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pisces | unidentified | 1 | 0.4 |
|  | unidentified | materials and sediment |  | 0.2 |
| Y-20 | Polychaeta | Pectinaria gouldii | 4 | 1.2 |
|  | Crustacea | Leptocheirus plumulosus | us 2 | trace |
|  |  | Monoculodes edwardsi | 3 | 0.1 |
|  |  | Gammarus Sp. | 6 | 0.1 |
|  |  | Edotea Eriloba | 1 | trace |
|  |  | Neopanope texana | 6 | 2.1 |
|  |  | Eurypanopeus depressus | 3 | 0.5 |
|  |  | Callinectes sapidus | 11 | 19.9 |
|  |  | crustacean remains | - | 0.4 |
|  | Pelecypoda | Ensis directus | 2 |  |
|  |  | Mya arenaria | 12 | $4.6$ |
|  |  | Gemmà gemma | 2 | trace |
|  |  | unidentified | 1 | 0.2 |
|  | unidentified | materials and sediment |  | 1.1 |
| Y-25 | Crustacea | Gammarus daiberi | 15 | 1.2 |
| P-30 | Crustacea | Neopanope texana | 1 | 0.1 |
|  |  | Callinectes sapidus | 1 | 0.2 |
|  |  | amphipod | 1 | trace |
| P-35 | Crustacea | Gammarus daiberi | 45 | 0.5 |
|  |  | Leptocheirus plumulosus | us 21 | 0.2 |
|  |  | amphipods | 2 | trace |
|  |  | Edotea triloba | 1 | trace |
|  |  | Eurypanopeus depressus | - 3 | $0.3$ |
|  |  | Callinectes sapidus | 1 | 1.4 |
|  | Pelecypoda | unidentified | 1 | 0.1 |
|  | unidentified | materials and sediment |  | 0.2 |
| P-50 | Crustacea | Gammarus sp. | 80 | 0.8 |
|  |  | Eurypanopeus depressus | 1 | 0.2 |
|  |  | crustacean remains | - | 0.1 |

Table 3 (cont.)

| Station | Class | Species | $\#$ of <br> Individuals <br> (ml) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Insecta | trichoptera larvae | 66 |
| Pelecypoda | unidentified | 1 | 1.7 |

Rappahannock River


Table 3 (Cont.)


Table 3 (Cont.)

| Station | Class | Species Ind | \# of Individuals | Volume (ml) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pelecypoda | Mya arenaria | 6 | 5.3 |
|  |  | $\overline{M a c o m a ~ s p . ~}$ | 1 | 0.4 |
|  |  | unidentified | 1 | 0.1 |
|  | unidentified | materials and sediment |  | 1.1 |
| R-40 | Crustacea | Gammarus sp. | 4 | 0.1 |
|  |  | Leptocheirus plumulosus | 52 | 1.1 |
|  |  | Edotea triloba | 1 | trace |
|  |  | Xanthid crab | 1 | 0.4 |
|  | Oligochaeta | unidentified | 7 | 0.1 |
|  | unidentified | materials and sediment | - | 0.4 |



## JAMES RIVER

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A=\text { CRUSTACEANS } \\
& B=P E L E C Y P O D S \\
& C=P O L Y C H A E T E S \\
& D=P I S C E S \\
& E=\text { INSECTS }
\end{aligned}
$$

YORK RIVER

RAPPAHANNOCK RIVER

Figure 10. Percent volume displacement of major taxa in stomachs of the American eel from the James, York and Rappahannock rivers.

and of a greater volume. Fish were of little importance in the diet. One eel, 513 mm in total length from the James River taken on September 14, 1971, had eaten six juvenile alewives, Alosa pseudoharengus, with fork lengths of $51,52,54,61$ and 65 mm . Smaller eels generally ingested smaller food items such as amphipods, isopods, molluscan siphons and appendages from soft blue crabs. Large eels ingested whole bivalves and whole large soft blue crabs. All size groups ate polychaetes.

The results of the food analyses suggest that the American eel may be a serious predator on commercially important invertebrates. The blue crab was a major food item in all rivers making up $33.3 \%$ of the total food volume in the James River, $68.2 \%$ in the York River and $15.9 \%$ in the Rappahannock River. The soft clam, Mya arenaria, made up $17.5 \%$ of the total food volume in the James River, $7.9 \%$ in the York River and $35 \%$ in the Rappahannock River. Mya arenaria is more abundant in the Rappahannock River than in the other rivers studied (Dexter Haven, personal communication) and this is reflected by the increased importance of this species in the diet of Rappahannock River eels. Mya arenaria is frequently used by commercial fishermen as bait for eel pots in localized areas.

The results of food analyses compare closely to those reported in 31 Chesapeake Bay eels ranging in size from 14.5 to 29 inches by Hildebrand and Schroeder (1927). They found the following in decreasing order of importance: crustaceans, annelids, fith, echinoderms, mollusks and eelgrass. Thirteen smalle: apamers contained mainly amphipods, isopods, whes and
one contained the siphon of a mollusk. Bigelow and Schroeder (1953) stated that the diet is primarily small fish, shrimps, crabs, lobsters and smaller crustaceans. Brinkley and Brown (1935) observed eels feeding at dark on juvenile alewives, Alosa pseudoharengus, and menhaden, Brevoortia tyrannus.

An interesting parallel can be drawn between food habits in freshwater and estuaries. Godfrey (1967), Compton (1968) and Ogden (1970) found insects to be important items in the diet of eels in freshwater. Also important were oligochaetes, bivalves and crustaceans. In the lower reaches of estuaries where numerous varieties of crustaceans replace insects as an important part of the benthic infauna and epifauna, crustaceans become more important dietary items. Polychaetes replace oligochaetes and bivalve mollusks still remain important.

Seasonality:
Histograms of the arithmetic mean of the $\log _{10}(x+1)$ transformed catch data are found in Figure ll. The number of eels caught during each monthly sampling varied greatly, but some trends are apparent. Catches were very low in all rivers during January and february. Numbers of eels caught increased in spring, varied in the summer and decreased with lower autumn water tenperatures. The increased variation during the summer and the apparent bimodal catch results of the James River could have been a result of increased ability of eels to avoid the net or migration from the channel to shallow water areas. Compton (1968) showed a similar pattern of abundance in a small tributary of the Delaware

Figure ll. Histograms of the arithmetic means of the $\log _{10}$ $(x+1)$ values for the number of eels caught per hour trawl time by months with the mean monthly bottom temperatures plotted below.

River by electrofishing. Further conclusions as to seasonal distribution from the present data are precluded because of gear selectivity and non-randomization of stations.

## PART III.

Fecundity and gonad observations on American eels, Anguilla rostrata (Lesueur), migrating from Chesapeake Bay, Virginia.

## INTRODUCTION

The fall migration of the American eel from Atlantic coast estuaries is well documented in the literature (Bigelow and Schroeder, 1953; Vladykov, 1955; Gray and Andrews, 1970). Gray and Andrews found that migratory eels leaving Newfoundland waters were more sexually mature, with ova of a greater diameter, than European silver eels (A. anguilla) reported by Rasmussen (1951). Wenner (see section IV) found that three silver eels captured southeast of the mouth of Chesapeake Bay on 5 December 1967 were more sexually mature than Newfoundland specimens and that the gonadal condition of one specimen collected southeast of cape cod on 7 November 1969 was consistent with the Canadian report. He also reported the capture of six females east of Assateague Island on 22 December 1971. These last specimens were more sexually mature than the others as judged by ova diameters. These findings appear to contradict Tucker's statement (1959) that European eels are more sexually advanced at the time of migration than American eels.

Bigelow and Schroeder (1953) reported that "eels (European) are the most prolific fish, ordinary females averaging 5 to 10 million eggs, and the largest one certainly 15 to 20 million". No data were presented. Vladykov (I955) stated that female American eels have from 10 to 20 million fges and Eales (1968) suggested that ecch female produces 15 to 20 million eggs.

These reports estimate fecundity but do not relate it to fish length or weight.

This report describes fecundity of the American eel
from the Chesapeake Bay region and gonadal condition of male and female silver eels migrating from the Chesapeake Bay.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Collection of specimens:
Migrating silver eels ( 52 males, 46 females) were obtained from commercial pound net fishermen at Cape Charles, Va. on 23 November 1970. Specimens were transported alive to the Virginia Institute of Marine Science and were maintained in a holding tank for one to three weeks prior to being sacrificed. Histological methods:

Animals were anesthetized in MS-222 (Sandoz Co.) (l gm: $500 \mathrm{ml})$. Total length was recorded to the nearest millimeter, and total weight to the nearest gram. Gonadal tissue from 20 males and 23 females was placed in Bouin's fixative, acetic acid-formalinalcohol solution (AFA fixative) and $10 \%$ phosphate buffered formalin. Tissues were dehydrated in a graded series of ethanol baths, embedded in Paraplast (Eisher Scientific Co.), sectioned at $8 u$ on a rotary microtome, stained with Harris hematoxylin and counter stained with eosin. Ovarian sections were viewed at l50X, 675X and 1500X. Ten ova sectioned through the nucleus were measured with an ocular micrometer at 150 X on each of ten specimens to
determine the gonadal state of the fish. Testicular sections were viewed at 675 X and 1500 X to determine the state of spermatogenesis.

Treatment of ova:
Individual ovaries were excised from an additional
21 fish, and wet weight was recorded to the nearest 0.1 gm. After three months storage in Gilson's solution (Bagneal, 1967), the eggs were not completely dislodged from the ovarian connective tissue. Egg clusters were completely broken up by a 3 to 5 min treatment with a sonic cleaner (Varian Aerograph corp., Walnut Creek, Calif.). The resultant eggs suspensions were diluted to 500 or 1000 ml and 3 one-ml aliquots were removed from the well mixed suspensions. Eggs in each aliquot were counted in a gridded. Sedgewick-Rafter chamber at l50x. Since the eggs were slightly irregular in shape, the longest horizontal diameter of the first fifty eggs from each egg suspension were measured with an ocular micrometer at the same magnification. The maturity index (gonad weight in $g m / t o t a l$ weight in $g m$ ) was calculated for each specimen.

Statistical analysis:
The number of eggs and the wet weight of the left and right ovaries were compared using paired 't' tests (Sokal and Rohlf, l969). Egg diameters from the ovaries treated with Gilson's solution were compared between ovaries and among fish by a factorial design (Guenther, 1964). Regression analysis was performed by an IBM 1130 computer and the $95 \%$ confidence intervals about regression were calculated according to Sokal and Rohlf (1969).

RESULTS

Fecundity:
Treating the egg clusters with the sonic cleaner did not alter the total egg count. Tissue from an individual ovary in Gilson's solution was exposed to the sonic cleaner for $0,3,5,8$ and 15 minutes. Three l-ml aliquots were removed from the well mixed suspension at the end of each time period and counted to determine if the sonic cleaner destroyed a significant number of eggs. Individual egg counts were plotted against exposure time and a regression equation was calculated for the values. The slope of the equation was then evaluated by a 't'. test (Sokal and Rohlf, 1969) and was not significantly different from zero (t = 0.2340, df = 13).

No significant differences existed between the left and right ovarian weights ( $t=0.8471$, $\mathrm{df}=20$ ) and the number of eggs in the left and right ovaries ( $t=0.9829$, $d f=20$ ). The values of the maturity index ranged from 0.0265 to 0.0625 with the mean and $95 \%$ confidence interval being $0.0481 \pm 0.004$.

Preliminary data plots showed that the relationships between total length and gonad weight and between total weight and gonad weight were linear over the ranges of values observed. The regressions of fecundity on total length and fecundity on total weight were curvilinear and were made linear by a logarithmic transformation. Regression equations, correlation coefficients and coefficients of determination are in Table 4 and their graphic representations gith $95 \%$ confidence belts about regession are in Figures 12, 13,14 and 15.
Table 4. Regression equations, correlation coefficients and coefficients of determination of
gonadal observations and fecundity of migrating female silver eels from the Chesapeake
Bay, November 1970 .
Relationship
Determination

| $y$ | $=-59.17978+0.13412 x$ | 0.8847 | 78.27 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| $y$ | $=-4.40673+0.06139 x$ | 0.9764 | 95.34 |
| $\log y$ | $=-4.29514+3.74418 \log x$ | 0.8844 | 78.22 |
| $\log y$ | $=3.22990+1.11157 \log x$ | 0.9595 | 92.06 |

total length - gonad weight
total weight - gonad weight
total length - fecundity
total weight - fecundity



Figure 14. Regression relationship between total weight and fecundity with $95 \%$ confidence belt about the regression for female silver eels migrating from Chesapeake Bay, November 1970.


Figure 15. Regression relationship between total length and fecundity with $95 \%$ confidence belt about the regression for female silver eels migrating from Chesapeake Bay, November 1970.


An analysis of varjance demonstrated a significant difference in mean ova diameter among fish (F = 1.18.00, $d f=20$, 2058), but not between left and right ovaries ( $F=0.333$, $\mathrm{df}=1$, 2058). Mean ova diameter and its $95 \%$ confidence intervals were $0.244 \pm 0.004 \mathrm{~mm}$. The frequency distribution of the egg diameters from all fish is depicted in Figure 16 and all fecundity data is found in Appendix 3.

Histological results:
The preferred fixative for gonadal sections was Bouin's. AFA gave good nuclear detail with less loss of cytoplasmic inclusions than Bouin's, but the cells were distorted and reduced in volume. Ten percent phosphate buffered formalin was completely unsatisfactory because tissue tended to harden in it and crack when sectioned. The following descriptions are based upon gonadal tissue placed in Bouin's fixative.

Most eggs were spherical with a centrally located nucleus. A large number of vesicles were present in the cytoplasm, presumably representing regions of lipid concentration which were leached out during histological preparation. Extremely basophilic inclusions were observed throughout the cytoplasm in many of the larger oocytes, but they appeared more concentrated toward the periphery of the cell. These inclusions resembled yolk granules in Brevoortia patronus oocytes described by combs (1969). The nuclear membrane was evident and the nucleoplasm was slightly basophilic. Deep staining basophilic inclusions were seen around the inner side of the nuclear membrane (Figure $17 a, b, c$ ). Developmental stages of the oocytes varied. A small fraction of the

Figure 16. Frequency distribution of ova diameters of Gilson's solution treated specimens of the American eel.


Figure 17.
a. Longitudinal section of ovarian tissue from a migratory silver eel. Total length of specimen $=645 \mathrm{~mm}$; total weight $=545 \mathrm{gm}$. Horizontal diameter of oocyte in center of field $=0.24 \mathrm{~mm}$ with a mean horizontal diameter of 10 oocytes $=0.21 \mathrm{~mm}$. Note large amount of adipose tissue between developing oocytes. Bouin's fixation, Harris-hematoxylin-eosin stain.
b. Cross section of an oocyte from a migratory silver eel. Total length of sepcimen $=613 \mathrm{~mm}$; total weight $=424 \mathrm{gm}$. Horizontal diameter of oocyte $=0.22 \mathrm{~mm}$. Mean horizontal diameter of $l 0$ oocytes $=0.22 \mathrm{~mm}$. Note the thin layer of connective tissue surrounding the oocyte, developing vitelline membrane, yolk granules around the periphery of the oocyte, cytoplasmic vesicles devoid of contents which were presumably lipids lost in histological preparation and basophilic inclusions around the inner margin of the nuclear membrane referred to by Combs (1969) in Brevoortia patronus oocytes as proto-vitellonucleoli. Bouins fixation, Harris-hematoxylin-eosin stain.

こ. Cross section of an oocyte from a migratory silver eel; total length of specimen $=624 \mathrm{~mm}$; total weight $=550 \mathrm{gm}$. Horizontal diameter of oocyte $=0.26 \mathrm{~mm}$. Mean horizontal diameter of 10 oocytes $=0.27 \mathrm{~mm}$. Note large iipid vesicles and more densely packed yolk granules. Bouin's fixation, Harris-hematoxylin-eosin stain.
d. Cross section of the testis from a migratory silver eel; total length $=378 \mathrm{~mm}$; total weight $=91 \mathrm{gm}$. Distance across field $=0.25 \mathrm{~mm}$. Note nests of secondary spermatagonia as defined by Hyder (1969). Bouin's fixations, Harris-hematoxylin-eosin stain.

oocytes was characterized by a cuboidal shape, smaller size and an extremely basophilic cytoplasm. Whether or not these cells would have continued to develop into mature oocytes is conjecture. Testicular sections (Figure l7d) showed nests of secondary spermatogonia as defined by Hyder (1969).

## DISCUSSION

Fecundity estimates of American eels from Chesapeake Bay are lower than those stated by Bigelow and Schroeder (1953), Vladykov (1955) or Eales (1968). This lower estimate was not caused by the destruction of eggs by the sonic cleaner because exposure time did not affect counts. The largest female studied was 724 mm in length and weighed 755 gm . This specimen has an observed fecundity of $2,561,000$. The possibility that larger specimens have fecundity estimates closer to the stated values of previous authors cannot be positively excluded because the predictive value of a regression line is strictly valid only over the range of observed values.

The gonads of female silver eels migrating from the Chesapeake Bay comprise a mean of $4.81 \%$ of the total weight of the animal. This value probably increases as the migratory females approach the Sargasso Sea. The maturity index was significantly correlated with the mean ova diameter in the 21 specimens used for fecundity studies $(r=0.80925$, coefficient of determination $=65.49$ ). This relationship is obvious because as more material is incorporated into the individual eggs, thereby increasing thein diameter, the gmadal weight increeses thus
elevating the maturity index. Maturity indices of specimens of different estuarine origins along a latitudinal gradient should be examined to make a more valid comparison of gonadal condition of migratory forms.

The horizontal diameters of eggs treated with Gilson's solution agreed closely with those determined by sectioning tissue fixed in Bouin's (means and $95 \%$ confidence intervals: Bouin's: $0.246 \pm 0.0014 \mathrm{~mm} ;$ Gilșon's: $0.244 \pm 0.004 \mathrm{~mm})$. These diameters are larger than those reported by Gray and Andrews (1970) for the American eel migrating from Newfoundland waters where the mean value was 0.165 (range: $0.109-0.214 \mathrm{~mm}$ ). Rasmussen (1951) stated that the average egg diameter of migratory European eel, A. anguilla, is from 0.1 to 0.2 mm while Brunn et al (1949) reported three untreated $\underline{A}$. anguilla in an endocrinological study as having ova diameters of $0.18,0.13$ and 0.12 mm . From these data, it is concluded that migratory silver American eels leaving Chesapeake Bay are closer to sexual maturity than specimens leaving more northerly estuaries, and also more advanced than $A$. anguilla migrating from continental Europe (Table 5). This is in direct contradiction with the hypothesis (Tucker, 1959) that the European eel is much more sexually advanced than the American eel at the onset of migration.

The eggs are presumed to be pelagic and about 1 mm in diameter when spawned (Bertin, 195E). The presence of large cytoplasmic vesicles devoid of contents in nistological preparations indicates the large amount of lipid materials in the egg. combs (1969) described the peripheral displacement of the nucleus and
Table 5. Comparative data of gonadal conditions of female silver Atlantic eels.

| Species | Location | $\bar{x}$ ova Diameter (mm) | Range <br> (mm) | $\begin{gathered} \bar{x} \\ \text { Maturity } \end{gathered}$ <br> Index |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. rostrata | Newfoundland (Gray \& Andrews, 1970) | 0.165 | 0.109-0.214 | ------ |
| A. rostrata | Southeast of Cape Cod (Wenner, 1972) | 0.172 | 0.12-0.27 | ------ |
| A. rostrata | East of Assateague Island (Wenner, 1972) | 0.356 | 0.25-0.45 | 0.0587 |
| A. rostrata | Southeast of Chesapeake Bay (Wenner, 1972) | 0.275 | -0.17-0.37 | ------ |
| A. rostrata | Chesapeake Bay (present study) | 0.244 | 0.17-0.37 | 0.0481 |
| A. anguilla | Danish waters (?) (Rasmussen, 1951) | ----- | 0.10-0.20 | ------ |
| A. anguilla | Danish waters (?) (Bruun, 1949) | --- | 0.12-0.18 | ------ |

the formation of a centrally located oil globule in the pelagic eggs of Brevoortia patronus. This aggregation of oil droplets in the eggs of $A$. rostrata was not demonstrated in the specimens observed but cannot be ruled out. A similar flotation mechanism may be employed as the spawning grounds are approached.

Histological sections showed that all male specimens had small, rather undeveloped testis markedly immature by comparison to a male $A$. anguilla (Bertin, 1956) and those of $\underline{A}$. anguilla brought to a spawning condition by Boetius and Boetius (1967). The organs of Syrski were small and vascularized and it was evident that much development must take place before spawning. Excellent gross morphological descriptions of the ovaries and testis of the European eel miy be found in the original descriptions of Goode (1881).

PART IV.
Occurrence of the silver phase of the Anerican eel, Anguilla rostrata (Lesueur), in waters overlying the eastern North American Contincntal Shelf.

## INTRODUCTION

The American eel is a catadromous fish residing in estuaries and river systems from West Greenland (Jensen, 1926), Labrador (Backus, 1957), eastern Newfoundland, and the northern side of the Gulf of St. Lawrence south to the Gulf of Mexico, Panama, the West Indies to the northern coast of South America (Bigelow and Schroeder, 1953). The complex life cycle has been summarized by Bigelow and Schroeder (1953), Vladykov (1955), Bertin (1956) and Eales (1968).

Although the annual fall migration of reproductively maturing specimens has been well documented, their capture in offshore waters has not been reported. This communication reports the capture of 3 eels in 1967, 2 eels in 1969 and 6 eels in 1971 in waters overlying the continental shelf of the northeastern United States.

## METHODS AND MATERIALS

The 1967 migratory eels were captured in an Atlantic Western trawl during a $I$ hour tow by the Sea Breeze, a commercial trawler chartered by the Vixginia Institute of Marine Science. The 1969 specimens were collected with a \#36 Yankee tram equipped with a $1 / 2$ inch stretch mesh ad end liner aboard the $R / i$ Inhatross IV during groundfish investigations of the U.S. Bureau of Commercial

Fisheries. The 1971 specimens were collected during a 45 min tow with a 50 ft trawl equipped with a 1 inch stretch mesh cod end liner aboard the Cynthia, a commercial trawler chartered by the National Marine Fisheries Service Laboratory at Oxford, Maryland. The 1967 and 1969 bottom temperatures were taken from bathythermograph tracings while the 1971 bottom temperatures were taken by a stem thermometer; 1967 and 197l bottom salinities were determined by an induction salinometer.

Vertebrae were counted from $X$-ray photographs, and morphometrics of the preserved specimens were taken using the method of Ege (1939). The 1971 specimens were frozen after capture. After thawing, the individual ovaries were removed and weighed to the nearest 0.1 gram prior to formalin fixation. The maturity index (Gonad weight/total weight) was calculated for these specimens. The longest horizontal diameter of 100 eggs from each ovary was measured at l50X magnification. Previous statistical analysis of ova diameters from specimens migrating from the Chesapeake Bay showed no significant differences between ovaries (see section III). Therefore, the ova diameters from both ovaries of individual fish were pooled and tested for significant differences between fish by analysis of variance (Guenther, 1964).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Hydrographic data and sites of capture are found in Table E; morphometrics and vertebral counts are in Table 7. Frequency distributions of ova from the three collection dates are found in Figure 18.
Table 6. Location and hydrographic data of off-shore specimens of Anguilla rostrata.

| Specimen code | Date |  |  | Location |  |  | Depth (fms) | Temperature ( ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ ) |  | Salinity (\%) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Longitu |  | Latitude |  | Surface | Bottom | Surface | Bottom |
| A | 7 | Nov |  | $41^{\circ} 40.5$ |  | $69^{\circ} 39^{\prime} \mathrm{W}$ | 45 | 10.8 | 8.5 |  |  |
| B | 7 | Nov |  | $41^{\circ} 38^{\prime}$ | N | $69^{\circ} 42^{\prime} \mathrm{W}$ | 30 | 10.8 | 9.0 | - |  |
| C | 5 | Dec |  | $35^{\circ} 51^{\prime}$ | N | $75^{\circ} 30^{\prime} \mathrm{W}$ | 10 | 10.7 | 10.7 | 31.66 | 30.94 |
| D | 5 | Dec |  | $35^{\circ} 41^{\prime}$ | N | $75^{\circ} 18^{\prime} \mathrm{W}$ | 12 | 11.3 | 11.4 | 31.58 | 31.81 |
| E | 5 | Dec |  | $35^{\circ} 25^{\prime}$ | N | $75^{\circ} 18^{\prime} \mathrm{W}$ | 13 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 31.14 | 32.21 |
| F-K | 22 | Dec |  | $37^{\circ} 51^{\prime}$ | N | $75^{\circ} 19^{\prime} \mathrm{W}$ | 5 | 8.0 | 8.0 | 28.43 | 30.97 |



| Specimen | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | Chesap | ke Bay |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ¢ | $0^{*}$ |
| Predorsal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Length (mm) | 221 | 126 | 168 | 195 | 187 | 220 | 223 | 218 | 203 | 217 | 212 |  |  |
| Predorsal Lericth |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Tota Length } \\ \times 100 \% \end{gathered}$ | 34.3 | 33.8 | 32.8 | 33.7 | 33.3 | 33.4 | 34.4 | 33.2 | 32.9 | 35.6 | 33.8 | $\begin{array}{r} 30.8- \\ 36.7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 29.1- \\ 35.6 \end{array}$ |
| PredorsalHead Length (mm) | 143 | 74 | 119 | 117 | 116 | 133 | 137 | 131 | 119 | 140 | 138 |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Predorsal- } \\ & \text { Hot } \\ & \begin{array}{l} \text { Watalemgth } \\ \times 100 \% \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | 22.3 | 19.8 | 23.2 | 20.2 | 20.7 | 20.2 | 21.1 | 19.9 | 19.3 | 23.0 | 22.0 | $\begin{array}{r} 17.5- \\ 24.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16.0 \\ 24.1 \end{array}$ |
| Preanal- <br> Predorsal <br> Length (mm) | 45 | 32 | 49 | 42 | 45 | 64 | 57 | 64 | 49 | 56 | 45 |  |  |
| Preanal- <br> Predorsal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Length x 100\% | 7.0 | 8.6 | 9.6 | 7.2 | 8.0 | 9.7 | 8.8 | 9.7 | 7.9 | 9.1 | 7.2 | $\begin{aligned} & 4.5- \\ & 11.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.4- \\ & 11.8 \end{aligned}$ |

Table 7. (Cont.)

| Specimen | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | Chesapeake Bay |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ㅇ | $0^{*}$ |
| Head Length (mm) | 78 | 52 | 70 | 78 | 71 | 87 | 86 | 87 | 84 | 77 | 74 |  |  |
| Head Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Total Length } \\ \times 100 \% \end{gathered}$ | 12.1 | 13.9 | 13.7 | 13.5 | 12.6 | 13.2 | 13.3 | 13.2 | 13.6 | 12.6 | 11.8 | $\begin{array}{r} 10.5- \\ 13.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 11.2- \\ 14.1 \end{array}$ |
| Gape Length (mm) | 17.2 | 11.3 | 17.9 | 21.8 | 17.4 | 21.5 | 24.5 | 18.5 | 18.8 | 18.1 | 19.4 |  |  |
| Gape Length |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Head Leriyth } \\ \times 100 \% \end{gathered}$ | 22.0 | 21.7 | 25.6 | 27.9 | 24.5 | 24.7 | 28.5 | 21.2 | 22.4 | 23.5 | 26.2 | $\begin{array}{r} 19.7- \\ 32.1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16.7- \\ 26.9 \end{array}$ |
| Horizontal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Diameter of the eye (mm) | 8.5 | 6.5 | 8.0 | 9.6 | 7.9 | 10.2 | 10.0 | 9.7 | 11.1 | 8.8 | 9.0 |  |  |
| Diameter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gape Length } \\ & \times 100 \% \end{aligned}$ | 49.4 | 57.5 | 44.7 | 44.0 | 45.4 | 47.4 | 40.8 | 52.4 | 59.0 | 48.6 | 46.4 | $\begin{array}{r} 34.2- \\ 68.8 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 42.0- \\ 100.0 \end{array}$ |

Figure 18. Frequency distribution of ove diameters from offshore specimens of the Mmerican eel, $A$. rostrata.


The conclusion that all of the off-shore specimens were silver eeis was based on external morphology and coloration and gonadal condition. The horizontal diameter of the eye expressed as percent of the gape length of all fish ( $\bar{x}=48.7 \%$; range, $44.0-$ 59.0) was statistically greater ( $\mathrm{F}=13.973$; $\mathrm{df}=1.165$ ) than values obtained for 156 female yellow eels ( $\bar{x}=41.8 \%$; range, 30.759.1) collected from Chesapeake Bay sub-estuaries (Wenner, unpublished observations). The dorsal aspect of the pectoral fins and the caudal fin were darkly pigmented and the lateral line was prominent in all off-shore specimens. The general body coloration was that of a "silver" eel, or as Vladykov (1955) described migratory American eels, a "bronze" eel. The gross appearance of the gonads of all specimens showed a stage of maturity that resembled the gonadal state of eels migrating from the Chesapeake Bay.

An analysis of variance showed a highly significant difference ( $F=969.60, \mathrm{df}=9$, 1990) in ova diameters between fish. All morphometric values fell within the ranges of values for silver Anguilla nostrata leaving Chesapeake Bay during November 1970 (see Table 7). The ova diameters of the 1957 fish were also within the ranges of ova diameters of fish migrating from the bay ( $\bar{x}=0.27$ with a range from $0.17-0.37 \mathrm{~mm}$; see section III). The date of capture chosely coincides with the peak of the eel fishery in lower Chesardase Bay, but the possibility of a different estuarine origin cannot be excluded.

Gray and Andrews (1970) reported ovd diameters ranging from 0.109 to 0.214 mm with a mean of 0.165 mm in silver eels leaving Newfoundland waters. These values are close to those of
the 1969 female silver eel collected southeast of cape cod ( $\bar{x}=0.17$, range, $0.12-0.27 \mathrm{~mm}$ ). The 1971 eels had larger ova and greater maturity indices than any other specimens encountered in this study. The gonads comprised a mean of $5.78 \%$ of the total weight and the ova had a mean diameter of 0.356 with a range from 0.25 to 0.45 mm .

Although the 1971 specimens are more sexually mature as judged by ova diameters, their estuarine origin and the gonadal condition at the time of entrance into the sea is uncertain. Vladykov (1955) states "the exact routes of the eels in the sea and their behavior are not yet known". The possibility that migratory eels follow the coastline down to some region and then cross the Gulf Stream to reach the spawning grounds cannot be ruled out. It appears that eels from the Chesapeake Bay have larger eggs when they enter the sea and migrate later in the season than eels of more northerly estuaries. Consequently, fish from different estuaries may reach the spawning at approximately the same time and the same reproductive state.

## SUMMARY

Meristic variation of the American eel, Anguilla rostrata (Lesueur) was studied. A compilation of the results of this study and the literature yielded the following mean values: total vertebrae $=$ I07.14; precaudal vertebrae $=42.79$; caudal vertebrae $=$ 64.31; left branchiostegals $=11.02$; right branchiostegals $=11.03$; left pectoral fin rays $=16.51 ;$ right pectoral fin rays $=16.71$; caudal fin rays $=9.95$; dorsal fin rays $=231.44$; anal fin rays $=$ 199.12. Because of the wide variation in the numbers of dorsal and anal fin rays, it was suggested that they are of little taxonomic value.

Osteological deformities associated with the vertebral column were noted in $39 \%$ of the specimens examined. Ninety-six percent of the deformities were in the caudal vertebrae. Most abnormalities were in the structure of the neural and hemal spines with only $3 \%$ of the abnormal specimens having fused or partially fused vertebral centra.

The mean size of stage VI-A elvers sampled on March 17, 1970 in a small creek flowing into the York River, Va. was 55.6 mm . Mean lengths of elvers from the present study and those from the literature were regressed on latitude of capture and the equation is $y=38.862+0.415 x$, where $x$ is the latitude of capture and $y$ is the mean total length. $31.34 \%$ of the variation in size was associated with latitude. Elvers of southern latitudes entered
estuaries earlier and were smaller.
Seasonality of the American eel was studied in the brackish regions of the James, York and Rappahannock rivers. Monthly catches of eels showed a great deal of variability over the sampling period, but a temperature related trend was observed. Eels are fewer in number or absent in trawl catches during the winter months and are greater in number during the warmer months. Food habits of the American eel were studied from the brackish regions of the James, York and Rappahannock river's during the period from April to October, 1971. Crustaceans, pelecypods and polychaetes were the most important food items from all three rivers. Predation on the commercially important species, Mya arenaria and Callinectes sapidus, was apparent from all rivers with the blue crab making up $33.3 \%$ of the diet by volume in the James River, $68.2 \%$ in the York River and $15.9 \%$ in the Rappahannock River. Mya arenaria was a more important item by volume in the Rappahannock River eels (35\%) than in the James River eels (17.5\%) or in the York River eels (7.1\%). This is consistent with the known abundance of the soft clam in the study area.

Fecundity of the American eel was estimated from 21 specimens migrating from the Chesapeake Bay in November 1970. The total weight and fecundity reiationship is $\log y=3.22990+1.11157$ $\log x$, where $y$ is the total fecundity and $x$ is the total weight in grams, and the total length and fecundity relationship is $\log y=$ $-4.29514+3.74418 \log x$, where $y$ fecundity and $x$ is the total length in millimeters. The mean maturity index (gonad weight/total weight) for female eels was 0.0481 wh a range from 0.0265 to 0.0625
and showed a significant correlation with mean ova diameter. Ova diameters of the Chesapeake Bay specimens were greater than those of silver eels leaving Newfoundland waters and from available data it is proposed that a latitudinal gradient in sexual maturity exists at the time of migration, with the more northerly forms being less sexually advanced at the onset of migration. Results of this investigation do not support Tucker's hypothesis that European silver eels, Anguilla anguilla, are more sexually advanced than American silver eels at the time of the onset of the spawning migration.

Eleven reproductively maturing specimens of the American eel were collected during three independent off-shore trawling operations. Three females were taken on December 6, 1967 southeast of the mouth of Chesapeake Bay in 10 to 13 fathoms, one male and one female on November 5, 1969 southeast of Cape Cod in 35 to 45 fathoms and six females on December 22, 1971 east of Assateague Island in 5 fathoms of water. Morphometrical analysis showed that the specimens were within the range of the "silver" phase of Anguilla rostrata. The ova diameters of the 1967 specimens were within the range of eels migrating from the Chesapeake Bay during November 1970 while those of the 1969 female were smaller and consistent with reports of eels migrating from Newfoundland waters.

APPENDICES
Appendix 1. Frequency distributions of meristic characters of the American eel, A. rostrate.
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Appendix 1 (Cont.)

| Left <br> Branchiostegals | West Gloucester, <br> Mass. Schmidt, <br> 1914) | Mass. <br> (Ege, 1939) | Virginia <br> (Present Study) | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 | 9 | 1 | 4 | 14 |
| 12 | 159 | 22 | 16 | 197 |
| 11 | 416 | 56 | 64 | 536 |
| 10 | 152 | 21 | 15 | 188 |
| 9 | 10 | - | 1 | 11 |

Appendix 1 (Cont.)

| Right <br> Branchiostegals | West Gloucester, <br> Mass. (Schmidt, <br> 1914) | Mass. <br> (Ege, 1939) | Virginia <br> (Present Study) | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 | 12 | 1 | 1 | 14 |
| 12 | 170 | 30 | 22 | 222 |
| 11 | 406 | 48 | 58 | 512 |
| 10 | 153 | 21 | 19 | 193 |
| 9 | 11 | 1 | - | 12 |

Appendix 1 (Cont.)

| Left Pectoral <br> Ein Rays | Virginia <br> (Present Study) | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 19 | 3 | 3 |
| 1.8 | 12 | 12 |
| 17 | 36 | 36 |
| 16 | 34 | 34 |
| 14 | 12 | 12 |

Appendix $I$ (Cont.)

| Right Pectoral <br> Fin Rays | West Gloucester, <br> Mass. <br> (Schmidt, <br> 1914) | St. Croix, <br> Virgin Islands <br> (Schmidt, 1914) | Mass. <br> (Ege, 1939) | Virginia <br> (Present <br> Study) | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 2 |
| 19 | 5 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 12 |
| 18 | 22 | 5 | 22 | 17 | 66 |
| 17 | 58 | 23 | 28 | 34 | 143 |
| 16 | 44 | 16 | 37 | 36 | 133 |
| 15 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 29 |
| 14 | 1 | - | 3 | 2 | 6 |



Appendix 1 (Cont.)

| Dorsal Fin Rays | $\begin{gathered} \text { Virginia } \\ \text { (Present Study) } \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 276 | 1 | 1 |
| 260 |  |  |
| 259 |  | - |
| 258 | 1 | 1 |
| 257 | 2 | 2 |
| 256 | 2 | 2 |
| 255 |  |  |
| 254 |  |  |
| 253 |  |  |
| 252 |  |  |
| 251 |  |  |
| 250 |  |  |
| 249 |  |  |
| 248 | 1 | 1 |
| 247 | 1 | 1 |
| 246 | 4 | 4 |
| 245 |  |  |
| 244 |  |  |
| 243 | 2 | 2 |
| 242 | 4 | 4 |
| 241 | 4 | 4 |
| 240 | 1 | 1 |
| 239 | 2 | 2 |
| 238 | 4 | $n$ |

Appendix $I$ (Cont.)
Dorsal Fin
Rays

Virginia
Total
(Present Study)
2372
236 7 ..... 7
235 3 ..... 3
234 6 ..... 6
233 3 ..... 3
232 2 ..... 2
231 5 ..... 5
230 ..... 2 ..... 2
229 2 ..... 2
228 6 ..... 6
227 4 ..... 4
226 2 ..... 2
225 2 ..... 2
224 2 ..... 2
223
222
221 ..... 3 ..... 3
220 2 ..... 2
219
218 5 ..... 5
217 1 ..... 1
216 ..... 3 ..... 3
215214

Appendix 1 (Cont.)

| Dorsal Fin <br> Rays | Virginia <br> (Present Study) | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 213 | 2 | - |
| 212 | 2 | 2 |
| 211 | 1 | 2 |
| 210 |  | 1 |
| 209 |  | 1 |
| 208 |  | 1 |
| 207 | 1 | 1 |
| 206 | 1 | 1 |
| 201 |  | 1 |
| 183 |  | 1 |
| 201 |  | 1 |

## Appendix 1. (Cont.)

| Anal Fin | West Gloucester, | Virginia |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rays | Mass. (Schmidt, | (Present <br> Study) | Total |
|  | $1914)$ |  |  |
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1
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2
2
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2
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1
5
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7
2116
39
$210 \quad 6$
28
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$\begin{array}{llll}207 & 7 & 4 & \text { ll }\end{array}$

| Anal Fin Rays | West Gloucester, Mass. (Schmidt, 1914) | Virginia <br> (Present Study) | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 206 | 8 | - | 8 |
| 205 | 8 | - | 8 |
| 204 | 8 | 3 | 11 |
| 203 | 9 | 3 | 12 |
| 202 | 12 | 3 | 15 |
| 201 | 10 | 8 | 18 |
| 200 | 11 | 4 | 15 |
| 199 | 8 | 7 | 15 |
| 198 | 11 | 6 | 17 |
| 197 | 10 | 2 | 12 |
| 196 | 7 | 1 | 8 |
| 195 | 10 | 4 | 14 |
| 194 | 9 | 2 | 11. |
| 193 | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| 192 | 6 | 5 | 11 |
| 191 | 10 | 3 | 13 |
| 190 | 10 |  | 10 |
| 189 | 3 | - | 3 |
| 188 | 6 | 3 | 9 |
| 187 | 5 | 3 | 8 |
| 186 | 4 | 2 | 6 |
| 185 | 6 | 1 | 7 |
| 184 | 5 |  | 5 |

Appendix 1 (Cont.)

| Anal Fin Rays | West Gloucester, Mass. (Schmidt, 1914) | Virginia <br> (Present Study) | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 183 | 4 | 1 | 5 |
| 182 | 2 | 2 | 4 |
| 181 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 180 |  |  |  |
| 179 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 178 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 177 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 176 | 1 |  | 1 |
| 175 |  | - | - |
| 174 |  | 1 | 1 |
| 173 |  | 1 | 1 |
| 172 |  |  |  |
| 171 |  |  |  |
| 170 |  |  |  |
| 169 |  | - | - |
| 168 | - | 1 | 1 |
| 167 | 1 | - | 1 |

Appendix 2. Analysis of variance table testing for significant differences between left and
right branchiostegals. Treatment groups: left branchiostegals; right branchios-
tegals. Data from York River, Virginia (present study).

| ANOVA TABLE |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source of Variation | Suns of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | ' F $^{\prime}$ Ratio |
| Between Groups | 0.0200 | 1 | 0.0200 | 0.04164 ns. |
| Within Groups | 95.2598 | 198 | 0.4811 |  |
| Total | 95.2798 | 199 |  |  |

$\begin{aligned} & \text { Appendix 2. (Cont.) Analysis of variance table testing for a significant difference between } \\ & \text { left and right pectoral fin rays. Treatment groups left pectoral fin rays; } \\ & \text { right pectoral fin rays. Data from York River, Virginia (present study). }\end{aligned}$
ANOVA TABLE

| Source of Variation | Sums of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | ' $F^{\prime}$ ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Between Groups | 0.9787 | 1 | 0.9787 | 0.9152 ns. |
| Within Groups | 211.7380 | 198 | 1.0694 |  |
| Total | 212.7187 | 199 |  |  |


ANOVA TABIE

| Source of Variation | Sums of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | ' $F^{\prime}$ ratio |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Between Groups | 499.6753 | 9 | 55.5195 | $35.935 \% \% \%$ |
| Within Groups | 2694.4341 | 1744 | 1.5450 |  |
| Total | 3194.1094 | 1753 |  |  |

Appendix 2. (Cont.) Analysis of variance table testing for significant differences between
various reports of right branchiostegal counts. Treatment groups: West
Gloucester, Massachusetts (Schmidt, 1915); Massachusetts (Ege, 1939); York
River, Virginia (present study).

Appendix 2. (Cont.) Analysis of variance table testing for significant differences between various reports of anal fin ryy counts. Treatment groups: West Gloucester, Massachusetts (Schmidt, 1915); York River, Virginia (present study).
ANOVA TABLE

| Source of Variation | Sums of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | ' $F$ ' ratio |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Between Groups | 195.2676 | 1 | 195.2676 | 1.8326 ns. |
| Within Groups | 36440.7031 | 342 | 106.5518 |  |
| Total | 36635.9688 | 343 |  |  |

Appendix 2. (Cont.) Analysis of variance table testing for significant differences between West Gloucester, Virginia (present study). Massachusetts (Schmidt, 1915); York River,
ANOVA TABLE

| Source of Variation | Sums of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | ' $F$ ' ratio |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Between Groups | 2.4583 | 1 | 2.4583 | $14.9153 * * *$ |
| Within Groups | 84.2233 | 511 | 0.1648 |  |
| Total | 86.6816 | 512 |  |  |

Appendix 2. (Cont.) Analysis of variance table testing for significant differences between Massachusetts (Ege, reports of precaudal vertebrae. Treatment groups: York River, Virginia (present study).

| ANOVA TABLE |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Source of Variance | Sums of Squares | Degrees of Freedom | Mean Square | ' $F^{\prime}$ ratio |
| Between Groups | 1.2930 | 1 | 1.2930 | 2.4364 ns. |
| Within Groups | 104.0191 | 196 | 0.5307 |  |
| Total | 105.3121 | 197 |  |  |


Appendix 3. (Cont.)
总
(mm) $\begin{array}{r}25.43 \\ \text { Smith }\end{array}, ~$

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Length } \\ & (m n i) \end{aligned}$ | Latitude and Source |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 25 \cdot 43^{\circ} \\ & \text { Smith, } \\ & 1968 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 30.56^{\circ} \\ \text { Vladykov, } \\ 1966 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37.38^{\circ} \\ & \text { Present } \\ & \text { Study } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38.46^{\circ} \\ \text { Vladyov, } \\ 1966 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38.65^{\circ} \\ \text { vladykov, } \\ 1966 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38.66^{\circ} \\ & \text { Present } \\ & \text { Study } \end{aligned}$ |
| 59 |  | - | 9 | 5 | 12 | 1 |
| 60 |  |  | 9 | 2 | 10 |  |
| 61 |  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 |  |
| 62 |  | - | - |  | 1 |  |
| 63 |  | 1 | 3 |  | 1 |  |
| 64 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 66 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 68 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 69 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 70 | - | - | - | - | - | - |

Appendix 3. (Cont.)

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Length } \\ & (\mathrm{mn}) \end{aligned}$ | Latitude and Source |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 38.09^{\circ} \\ \text { vladykov, } \\ 1966 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 41.54^{\circ} \\ \text { Schmidt, } \\ 1909 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 45.07^{\circ} \\ \text { Vladykov, } \\ 1966 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 46.67^{\circ} \\ \text { Vladykov, } \\ 1966 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 49.29^{\circ} \\ \text { Vladykov, } \\ 1966 \end{gathered}$ |
| 46 | - | - | - | - | - |
| 47 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 48 | - |  |  |  |  |
| 49 | 2 |  | - |  |  |
| 50 | 4 |  | 1 |  |  |
| 51 | 6 | - | 3 | - | - |
| 52 | 11 | 3 | 11 | 3 | 1 |
| 53 | 29 | 1 | 12 | 6 | - |
| 54 | 34 | 1 | 25 | 14 | 1 |
| 55 | 37 | 3 | 29 | 15 | 2 |
| 56 | 32 | 3 | 32 | 48 | 3 |
| 57 | 31 | 2 | 28 | 44 | 4 |
| 58 | 23 | 1 | 23 | 58 | 9 |


Appendix 4. Fecundity and gonadal observations on silver eels migrating from the Chesapeake Bay,

| Total | Total | Ovarian Weight | Number of Eggs | Maturity | Mean Ova Diameter (mm) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Length | Weight | $(\mathrm{gm})$ | $\left(x i 0^{2}\right)$ | Index | Left Right Total |  |
| $(\mathrm{mm})$ | $(\mathrm{gm})$ | Left | Right | Left | Right |  |


| 653 | 567 | 16.4 | 16.4 | 10940 | 10630 | 0.0573 | 0.285 | 0.288 | 0.287 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 590 | 370 | 10.2 | 10.4 | 07600 | 08980 | 0.0557 | 0.297 | 0.292 | 0.295 |
| 676 | 510 | 15.4 | 12.2 | 09720 | 08650 | 0.0541 | 0.282 | 0.285 | 0.283 |
| 715 | 740 | 19.4 | 19.9 | 11530 | 13720 | 0.0531 | 0.268 | 0.272 | 0.270 |
| 694 | 701 | 23.4 | 20.4 | 10810 | 10470 | 0.0625 | 0.319 | 0.311 | 0.315 |
| 617 | 411 | 09.0 | 09.6 | 06410 | 06090 | 0.0452 | 0.269 | 0.269 | 0.269 |
| 618 | 416 | 11.5 | 11.9 | 08370 | 07450 | 0.0562 | 0.288 | 0.293 | 0.291 |
| 514 | 236 | 04.6 | 04.9 | 04850 | 05985 | 0.0402 | 0.246 | 0.242 | 0.244 |
| 533 | 264 | 06.8 | 07.4 | 04060 | 04060 | 0.538 | 0.277 | 0.280 | 0.278 |
| 506 | 176 | 02.8 | 02.9 | 02750 | 02210 | 0.0324 | 0.256 | 0.248 | 0.252 |
| 554 | 327 | 07.8 | 06.8 | 05320 | 05560 | 0.0446 | 0.261 | 0.255 | 0.258 |
| 622 | 506 | 12.9 | 10.3 | 07430 | 07320 | 0.0456 | 0.264 | 0.260 | 0.262 |
| 493 | 247 | 04.0 | 04.0 | 03730 | 03640 | 0.0324 | 0.247 | 0.243 | 0.245 |


| Total Length | Total Weight | Ovarian Weight (gm) |  | Number of Eggs$\left(x 10^{2}\right)$ |  | Maturity Index | Mean Ova Left |  | Diameter Right | $\begin{aligned} & (\mathrm{mm}) \\ & \text { Total } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (mm) | (gm) | Left | Right | Left | Right |  |  |  |  |  |
| 581 | 409 | 12.4 | 11.5 | 07790 | 06150 | 0.0584 | 0.285 |  | 0.291 | 0.288 |
| 677 | 327 | 07.0 | 05.6 | 05210 | 04810 | 0.0385 | 0.248 |  | 0.262 | 0.255 |
| 687 | 695 | 17.7 | 16.0 | 13570 | 11720 | 0.0485 | 0.265 |  | 0.268 | 0.267 |
| 724 | 755 | 21.2 | 21.3 | 12930 | 12680 | 0.0563 | 0.272 |  | 0.261 | 0.267 |
| 536 | 345 | 08.3 | 08.5 | 04280 | 04060 | 0.0487 | 0.285 |  | 0.280 | 0.283 |
| 553 | 308 | 06.9 | 07.0 | 05860 | 05910 | 0.0451 | 0.278 |  | 0.271 | 0.275 |
| 487 | 157 | 04.5 | 04.3 | 01970 | 0.2160 | 0.0560 | 0.266 |  | 0.264 | 0.265 |
| 498 | 166 | 02.3 | 02.1 | 02080 | 02295 | 0.0265 | 0.246 |  | 0.262 | 0.254 |
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