SCIENTIA MARINA 72(4) December 2008, 701-710, Barcelona (Spain) ISSN: 0214-8358 doi: 10.3989/scimar.2008.72n4701

Food habits of the broad nose skate, *Bathyraja* brachyurops (Chondrichthyes, Rajidae), in the south-west Atlantic

MAURO BELLEGGIA^{1,3,5}, EZEQUIEL MABRAGAÑA^{1,2}, DANIEL E. FIGUEROA¹, LORENA B. SCENNA^{1,3}, SANTIAGO A. BARBINI^{1,4} and JUAN M. DÍAZ DE ASTARLOA^{1,3,5}

 ¹ Laboratorio de Ictiología, FCEyN, Universidad Nacional de Mar del Plata (UNMdP), Funes 3350, Mar del Plata, B7602AYL, Argentina. E-mail: mbellegg@mdp.edu.ar, belleggia@inidep.edu.ar
 ² Museo del Mar, Colón 1114, Mar del Plata, B7600FXR, Argentina.
 ³ Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET), Argentina.
 ⁴ Comisión de Investigaciones Científicas del Gobierno de la Provincia de Buenos Aires (CIC), Argentina.
 ⁵ Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo Pesquero, Paseo Victoria Ocampo 1, Mar del Plata, B7602HSA, Argentina.

SUMMARY: Food habits of *Bathyraja brachyurops* were studied based on stomach content analyses of 346 specimens collected from research cruises carried out from 2003 to 2005 on the Argentinean continental shelf (36°S-55°S). A total of 265 stomachs (76.6%) contained food, and thirty-five taxonomic levels of prey were identified. The most important prey were fishes followed by isopods. Trophic level analysis revealed that *B. brachyurops* is a tertiary consumer throughout its life history. There were no differences between sexes and regions in the diet composition, but dietary shifts with ontogeny were found. The Levins' standardized index indicated wider niche breadth for small skates, whereas larger skate specimens showed a narrow niche breadth with a specialization in fishes.

Keywords: Bathyraja, Argentina, broad nose skate, elasmobranchs, trophic ecology.

RESUMEN: HÁBITOS ALIMENTARIOS DE LA RAYA DE COLA CORTA, *BATHYRAJA BRACHYUROPS* (CHONDRICHTHYES, RAJIDAE), EN EL ATLÁNTICO SUDOCCIDENTAL. – Se estudiaron los hábitos alimentarios de *Bathyraja brachyurops* en base al análisis de los contenidos estomacales de 346 ejemplares capturados en campañas de investigación realizadas durante el periodo 2003-2005 sobre la plataforma continental Argentina (36°S-55°S). Un total de 265 estómagos (76.6%) contenían alimento en los cuales se identificaron treinta y cinco ítems presa. Las presas más importantes fueron los peces, seguidos por los isópodos, ubicando a *B. brachyurops* como un consumidor terciario a lo largo de toda su historia de vida. No se hallaron diferencias en la composición de la dieta entre sexos y regiones, sin embargo se apreciaron cambios ontogenéticos en la alimentación. El índice de Levins' estandarizado indicó una mayor amplitud de nicho para las rayas de menor tamaño, mientras que los ejemplares de mayor tamaño mostraron una menor amplitud de nicho trófico y una especialización ictiófaga.

Palabras clave: Bathyraja, Argentina, raya de cola corta, elasmobranquios, ecología trófica.

INTRODUCTION

The skates of the family Rajidae are found worldwide in marine waters, and are distributed from shallow coastal shelves to abyssal regions (McEachran and Miyake, 1990). They are a significant link of food webs in benthic communities (Orlov, 1998) and may play influential roles in the food webs of demersal marine communities (Ebert and Bizzarro, 2007). *Bathyraja* is the most diverse genus of skates (Nelson,

2006; Ebert and Compagno, 2007) with eight species (*B. brachyurops, B. macloviana, B. albomaculata, B. magellanica, B. scaphiops, B. multispinis, B griseocauda* and *B. cousseauae*) present on the Argentinean continental shelf (Cousseau *et al.*, 2000; Menni and Stehmann, 2000; Díaz de Astarloa and Mabragaña, 2004). Of these, the broad nose skate *Bathyraja brachyurops* (Fowler, 1910) is widely distributed in Argentinean waters, from 36° to 55°S (Menni and López, 1984; Cousseau *et al.*, 2000).

Skates, like other cartilaginous fishes, are characterized by slow growth, late attainment of sexual maturity and lower fecundity than teleost fishes (Stevens et al., 2000). Their life history characteristics make them particularly sensitive to overexploitation and once overfished, populations of skates need more time to recover than populations of teleost fishes (Stevens et al., 2000; Stehmann, 2002). Skates are increasingly targeted in fisheries conducted on the Argentinean continental shelf (Massa and Hozbor, 2003); catches increased from 300 t in 1991 to 14856 t in 1998 (Cousseau et al., 2000). In Argentinean harbours they are commonly landed with no species differentiation under the common name "skates". Therefore, further studies on the biology and ecology of skates are needed for proper management of these fisheries.

Despite the local diversity of Bathyraja in Argentinean waters, few studies have focused on the feeding habits and ecology of species of this genus. The diet of five species of Bathyraja have been briefly described on the Argentinean continental shelf (Sánchez and Mabragaña, 2002), and only the feeding habits of the Patagonian skate B. macloviana have been thoroughly studied (Mabragaña et al., 2005; Scenna et al., 2006). Brickle et al. (2003) provided some data on diet composition of B. albomaculata, B. brachyurops and B. griseocauda around the Malvinas Islands. The diet composition of skate species of other genera have been studied in the region (Lucifora et al., 2000; Koen Alonso et al., 2001; Sánchez and Mabragaña, 2002; Braccini and Perez, 2005; Mabragaña et al., 2005; Mabragaña and Gilberto, 2007; San Martín et al., 2007). Although understanding a predator's trophic interactions is crucial for developing sustainable management strategies (Robinson et al., 2007), trophic relationships among skate species in Argentinean waters remain unknown.

The objectives of this paper were to describe the diet composition and trophic level of *B. brachy*-

urops on the Argentinean continental shelf, evaluate whether there is sexual, regional and ontogenetic variation in their feeding habits and determine their feeding strategy. This study provides the first detailed information on food habits of *B. brachyurops* in an extensive area of the south-west Atlantic in order to understand the role of the species in the food web of this region.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Sample collection

Specimens of *B. brachyurops* were collected from ten research cruises on the RVs "Dr. E. L. Holmberg" and "Capitán Oca Balda" of the Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo Pesquero (INIDEP, Mar del Plata, Argentina), between 2003 and 2005 on the Argentinean continental shelf (36°S-55°S) (Fig. 1). Skates were captured using a bottom trawl of 200 m mesh in the wing and 103 mm in the codend.

Disc width (DW) of each specimen was measured to the nearest millimetre and sex was recorded. Stomachs were excised, fixed in 4% formaldehyde and analyzed in the laboratory.

Diet composition

Prey items were identified to the lowest possible taxonomic level using keys, field guides (Bastida and Torti, 1973; Menni *et al.*, 1984; Boschi *et al.*, 1992; Cousseau and Perrotta, 2000) and reference collections at the Ichthiological Laboratory of the University of Mar del Plata. Each prey item was counted and weighed to the nearest 0.01 g using a digital top loading balance. Diet composition was assessed according to the percentage frequency of occurrence (%F), the percentage of wet weight (%W), the percentage of number (%N) and the Index of Relative Importance (IRI = %F (%N + %W)) (Pinkas *et al.*, 1971) expressed as a percentage (Cortés, 1997).

Prey were assigned to seven taxonomic categories (Pisces, Brachyura, Isopoda, Mollusca, Polychaeta, Anomura and Amphipoda) to analyze sexual, regional and ontogenetic variation in the diet. Regional dietary difference was assessed by comparing two study regions (Fig. 1): northern (35°S-43°S) and southern (43°S-55°S). The northern region is more influenced by the warm, salty waters of the Brazil Current which flows southward adjacent to the east-




FIG. 1. – Study area showing the location of sampling sites where Bathyraja brachyurops were collected on the Argentinean continental shelf. The rectangle in the inset represents the study area.

ern South American continental shelf. The southern region is characterized by the cold and relatively fresh subantarctic waters of the equatorward Malvinas Current (Boltovskoy, 1981; Olson *et al.*, 1988). Ontogenetic variations were determined by analyzing the following size classes: I (<400 mm DW), II (400-500 mm DW) and III (>500 mm DW).

To assess sample size sufficiency (Ferry and Caillet, 1996; Cortés, 1997), the order of stomachs sampled were randomized 100 times, and the mean cumulative diversity of stomach contents (Shannon-Wiener diversity index) plotted as a function of stomach number. Cumulative curves were built separately for each combination of specimen groups considered in the comparative analyses.

Diet comparisons

Similarity in the composition of the diet (%W and %N of each taxonomic category) between regions and size classes was assessed using the multivariate statistical software PRIMER v5 (Clarke and Warwick, 2001). Similarity matrices were constructed using the Bray-Curtis similarity coefficient. Two-

way nested analyses of similarities (ANOSIM) using regions and size classes as factors were used to determine whether the dietary composition of *B. brachyurops* was significantly influenced by location or ontogeny. One-way ANOSIMs were performed to identify any paired relationships. Similarity percentages (SIMPER) were used to identify which taxonomic categories characterized the dietary composition of each sample and which taxonomic categories made the greatest contributions to any dissimilarity.

Preliminary multivariate analysis indicated that there were no significant differences between the diets of females and males (ANOSIM %W: R statistic = 0.01, p = 0.069; ANOSIM %N: R statistic = 0.003, p = 0.254) and thus dietary data from both sexes were pooled for subsequent analyses.

Trophic level and feeding strategy

Trophic level (TL) was estimated to determine the position of *B. brachyurops* within the food web and was calculated following Cortés (1999) as:

$$TL = 1 + (\sum_{j=1}^{n} P_j \times TL_j)$$

where TL_j is the trophic level of each prey category j, P_j is the proportion of each prey category j (using %IRI) in the diet of *B. brachyurops*, and n is the total number of prey categories. The taxonomic categories used to calculate the standardized trophic level of *B. brachyurops* were Teleosts, Chondrichthyes, Cephalopoda, Mollusca (excluding cephalopods), Brachyura, Isopoda, Polychaeta, Anomura and Amphipoda. The trophic level of each prey category was obtained from Ebert and Bizarro (2007).

In order to analyze the feeding strategy of each size class of *B. brachyurops*, the graphic method proposed by Amundsen *et al.* (1996) was used by plotting the prey-specific abundance (%Pi) of each prey category against %F. Pi was calculated as the weight of prey category i, divided by the total weight of prey in the stomachs that contained prey category i, expressed as a percentage. Prey points located at the upper right of the diagram are indicative of specialization of the predator population. In contrast, all prey points located along or below the diagonal from the upper left to the lower right reflect a generalized feeding strategy of the predator population. Furthermore, the distribution of points along the diagonal from the lower left to the upper right corner provides

a measure of prey importance, with dominant prey at the upper and rare prey at the lower end.

Levins' measure (B) was used for calculating niche breadth of each size class of *B. brachyurops* using the following equation (Krebs, 1989):

$$B = 1 / \sum_{i=1}^{n} pi^{-2}$$

where p_i is the proportion of each prey category i in the diet and n is the total number of prey categories in the diet of *B. brachyurops*. The standardized Levins' index (B_{est} = (B - 1) / (n - 1)) was used to express niche breadth on a scale from 0 (a narrow niche breadth) to 1 (a broad niche breadth).

RESULTS

Diet composition

All the cumulative diversity curves reached an asymptote, which indicates that the sample sizes were sufficient for describing and comparing the diets (Fig. 2). A total of 346 skates was examined, of which 265 (76.6%) were found with stomachs containing prey items at different stages of digestion. Males (n=125) ranged from 245 to 567 mm DW, while females (n=140) ranged from 268 to 692 mm DW.

Thirty-five taxonomic levels of prey were identified (Table 1): 10 teleosts, 1 condrichthyan, 4 polychaetes, 4 molluscs and 16 crustaceans. The most important dietary component was teleosts, followed by crustaceans (isopods, amphipods and crabs).

Among identified teleosts, notothenids, Argentine hake (Merluccius hubbsi), and scorpaenids (Helicolenus dactylopterus) occurred most frequently and contributed most to the weight. The isopod Serolis schythei was the second most dominant prey among crustaceans in terms of %IRI (16.59%) and number (20.65%), and the third most important in terms of occurrence (22.26%) and weight (3.37%). Libidoclea granaria was the fourth most dominant prey among crustaceans according to %IRI (8.98%), and contributed the highest values of %F (24.91%) and %W (6.94%) in the diet of B. brachyurops. Amphipods were the second most dominant prey in terms of occurrence (23.4%), but the most important according to number (28.53%) and %IRI (20.89%). Unidentified Serolis spp. and Peltarion spinosolum were also important prey according to occurrence (22.26 and 12.83%), number (14.78 and 2.3%), weight (1.79 and 4.6%) and %IRI (11.44 and 2.74%) respectively. Molluscs (except Illex argentinus), polychaetes and chondrichthyans were not important in the diet (<1 %IRI).

Diet comparisons

Two-way nested analyses of similarities showed that there were no significant differences in overall diet between northern (n=118) and southern (n=147) populations (ANOSIM %W: R statistic = -0.037, p = 0.5; ANOSIM %N: R statistic = 0.037, p = 0.5). However, significant differences in the dietary composition of the size classes categorized according to percent of weight and percent of number were ob-




FIG. 2. – Cumulative prey diversity curves for each trophic group of *Bathyraja brachyurops* on the Argentinean continental shelf. The dark line indicates the mean diversity estimated by the Shannon-Wiener diversity index as a function of sample size, and the light lines indicate the standard deviations.

SCI. MAR., 72(4), December 2008, 701-710. ISSN 0214-8358 doi: 10.3989/scimar.2008.72n4701

TABLE 1. – Percentage of occurrence (%F), number (%N), wet weight (%W) and percentage of the Index of Relative Importance (%IRI) for each prey present in the diet of *Bathyraja brachyurops*.

Pisces Congridae Bassanago albescens 0.75 0.09 0.45 0.01 Merlucciuae Merluccius hubbsi 4.53 0.71 19.1 2.78 Macruronidae Macruronidae 0.38 0.04 1.87 0.02 Ophidilae Genypterus blacodes 0.38 0.04 1.87 0.02 Ophidilae Corranus magellanicus 0.38 0.04 1.22 0.01 Raneya brasiliensis 0.38 0.04 0.14 <0.01 Zoarcidae 1.13 0.18 0.15 0.01 Nototheniidae Patagonotothen spp. 10.94 6.41 26.01 11.01 Scorpaenidae Helicolenus dactylopterus 2.26 0.4 9.88 0.72 Sebastes capensis 0.38 0.04 0.24 <0.01 Unidentified teleosts 32.08 8.27 13.43 21.59 Chondrichthyes Rajidae Bathyraja brachyurops 0.38 0.04 0.37 <0.01 Polychaeta Nepthtyidae Lumbrineridae 1.89 0.75 0.02 0.05 Maldanidae 3.4 1.37 0.09 0.15 Unidentified polychaetes 3.02 0.44 0.2 0.01 Molusca Copada Volutidae 0.75 0.09 0.26 0.01 Outidentified crustaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 0.01 Muidentified crustaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 0.01 Gasteropoda Volutidae 0.38 0.04 0.26 <t< th=""><th>Prey items</th><th>%F</th><th>%N</th><th>%W</th><th>%IRI</th></t<>	Prey items	%F	%N	%W	%IRI	
Bassanago albescens 0.75 0.09 0.45 0.01 Merlucciidae $Merlucciidae$ $Macrorunus magellanicus$ 0.38 0.71 19.1 2.78 Macrorunus magellanicus 0.38 0.04 1.87 0.02 Ophidiidae 0.38 0.04 1.22 0.01 Raneya brasiliensis 0.38 0.04 1.22 0.01 Nototheniidae 0.38 0.04 0.14 <0.01 Zoarcidae 1.13 0.18 0.15 0.01 Nototheniidae 2.26 0.4 9.88 0.72 Sebastes capensis 0.38 0.04 0.24 <0.01 Unidentified teleosts 32.08 8.27 13.43 21.59 Chondrichthyes 8.36 0.04 0.24 <0.01 Polychaeta $8.90.75$ 0.02 0.05 Maldanidae 3.4 1.37 0.09 0.15 Unidentified polychaetes 3.02 0.44 0.2 0.01 MoluscaCephalopoda 112 0.01 <0.01 Crustaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 0.01 Unidentified crustaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 0.01 Arcturus spp. 4.53 5.13 0.34 0.77 Serolis paradoxa 1.51 0.75 0.02 0.01 Arcturus spp. 4.53 5.13 0.34 0.77 Serolis polaris 1.51 0.18 0.00 0.01 Serolis polaris	Pisces					
Bassanago albescens 0.75 0.09 0.45 0.01 Merlucciidae $Merlucciidae$ $Macrorunus magellanicus$ 0.38 0.71 19.1 2.78 Macrorunus magellanicus 0.38 0.04 1.87 0.02 Ophidiidae 0.38 0.04 1.22 0.01 Raneya brasiliensis 0.38 0.04 1.22 0.01 Nototheniidae 0.38 0.04 0.14 <0.01 Zoarcidae 1.13 0.18 0.15 0.01 Nototheniidae 2.26 0.4 9.88 0.72 Sebastes capensis 0.38 0.04 0.24 <0.01 Unidentified teleosts 32.08 8.27 13.43 21.59 Chondrichthyes 8.36 0.04 0.24 <0.01 Polychaeta $8.90.75$ 0.02 0.05 Maldanidae 3.4 1.37 0.09 0.15 Unidentified polychaetes 3.02 0.44 0.2 0.01 MoluscaCephalopoda 112 0.01 <0.01 Crustaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 0.01 Unidentified crustaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 0.01 Arcturus spp. 4.53 5.13 0.34 0.77 Serolis paradoxa 1.51 0.75 0.02 0.01 Arcturus spp. 4.53 5.13 0.34 0.77 Serolis polaris 1.51 0.18 0.00 0.01 Serolis polaris	Congridae					
Merlucciidae Marcuronidae 4.53 0.71 19.1 2.78 Macruronidae Macrorunus magellanicus 0.38 0.04 1.87 0.02 Ophidiidae 0.38 0.04 1.22 0.01 Raneya brasiliensis 0.38 0.04 0.14 <0.01 Zoarcidae 1.13 0.18 0.15 0.01 Nototheniidae $Patagonotothen$ spp. 10.94 6.41 26.01 11.01 Scorpaenidae 2.26 0.4 9.88 0.72 Helicolenus dactylopterus 2.26 0.4 9.88 0.72 Sebastes capensis 0.38 0.04 0.24 <0.01 Unidentified teleosts 32.08 8.27 13.43 21.59 Chondrichthyes Rajidae 3.4 1.37 0.09 0.5 Multanidae 3.4 1.37 0.09 0.5 Unidentified polychaetes 3.02 0.44 0.2 0.01 MoluscaCephalopoda 1189 0.75 0.02 0.05 Maldanidae 4.53 0.84 5.99 0.96 Loligo gahi 0.75 0.13 <0.01 <0.01 Unidentified cephalopods 6.79 0.84 2.25 0.65 Gasteropoda V V V V 0.01 Volutidae 0.75 0.09 0.26 0.01 Crostaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 0.01 Arcturus spp. 4.53 5.13 0.34 0.77 </td <td></td> <td>0.75</td> <td>0.09</td> <td>0.45</td> <td colspan="2">0.01</td>		0.75	0.09	0.45	0.01	
Merluccius hubbsi 4.53 0.71 19.1 2.78 Macruronidae 0.38 0.04 1.87 0.02 Ophidiidae 0.38 0.04 1.22 0.01 Raneya brasiliensis 0.38 0.04 0.14 <0.01 Zoarcidae 1.13 0.18 0.15 0.01 Nototheniidae 1.13 0.18 0.15 0.01 Patagonotothen spp. 10.94 6.41 26.01 11.01 Scorpaenidae $Helicolenus dactylopterus$ 2.26 0.4 9.88 0.72 Sebastes capensis 0.38 0.04 0.24 <0.01 Unidentified teleosts 32.08 8.27 13.43 21.59 ChondrichthyesRajidae $8athyraja brachyurops$ 0.38 0.04 0.37 <0.01 Polychaeta 2.64 0.62 0.01 0.05 1.89 0.75 0.02 0.05 Maldanidae 3.4 1.37 0.09 0.15 0.16 0.01 0.01 Mollusca $Cephalopoda$ 0.75 0.13 <0.01 <0.01 Muldentified crustaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 0.01 Amphipoda 23.40 28.25 0.53 20.89 Isopoda -7.92 1.41 0.26 0.41 Arcturus spp. 4.53 0.38 0.04 <0.01 Serolis paradoxa 1.51 0.13 <0.01 <0.01 Serolis polaris 1.51 0.14 <0.01						
MacruronidaeMacrorunus magellanicus 0.38 0.04 1.87 0.02 Ophidiidae $Genypterus blacodes$ 0.38 0.04 1.22 0.01 Raneya brasiliensis 0.38 0.04 0.14 <0.01 Zoarcidae 1.13 0.18 0.15 0.01 Nototheniidae $Patagonotothen spp.$ 10.94 6.41 26.01 11.01 Scorpaenidae 2.26 0.4 9.88 0.72 Helicolenus dactylopterus 2.26 0.4 9.88 0.72 Sebastes capensis 0.38 0.04 0.24 <0.01 Unidentified teleosts 32.08 8.27 13.43 21.59 Chondrichthyes 32.08 0.04 0.37 <0.01 Polychaeta $Nepthtyidae$ 2.64 0.62 0.01 0.05 Lumbrineridae 1.89 0.75 0.02 0.05 Maldanidae 3.4 1.37 0.09 0.15 Unidentified polychaetes 3.02 0.44 0.2 0.01 Mollusca $Cephalopoda$ 1.13 0.22 0.01 Curidae argentinus 4.53 0.84 5.99 0.96 Loligo gahi 0.75 0.09 0.26 0.01 Unidentified crustaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 Munidentified crustaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 Cristareans 0.38 0.04 <0.01 Crisl polaris 1.51 0.27 0.04 Nopt		4.53	0.71	19.1	2.78	
Macrorunus magellanicus 0.38 0.04 1.87 0.02 Ophidiidae $Genypterus blacodes$ 0.38 0.04 1.22 0.01 Raneya brasiliensis 0.38 0.04 0.14 <0.01 Zoarcidae 1.13 0.18 0.15 0.01 Nototheniidae $Patagonotothen$ spp. 10.94 6.41 26.01 11.01 Scorpaenidae $Patagonotothen$ spp. 2.26 0.4 9.88 0.72 Sebastes capensis 0.38 0.04 0.24 <0.01 Unidentified teleosts 32.08 8.27 13.43 21.59 ChondrichthyesRajidae 34 1.37 0.02 0.05 Raidae 1.89 0.75 0.02 0.05 Muldanidae 3.4 1.37 0.09 0.15 Unidentified polychaetes 3.02 0.44 0.2 0.01 MolluscaCephalopoda 1.13 0.22 0.01 <0.01 Unidentified cephalopods 6.79 0.84 2.25 0.65 Gasteropoda 2.340 28.25 0.53 20.89 Isopoda 1.13 0.22 0.01 0.01 Crislana spp. 7.92 1.41 0.26 0.41 Arcturus spp. 4.53 5.13 0.34 0.77 Serolis elliptica 0.38 0.09 0.01 <0.01 Serolis paradoxa 1.51 0.27 0.04 0.01 Serolis polaris 1.51 0.13 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-,</td> <td></td>				-,		
OphidiidaeOphidiidaeOutOutOutGenypterus blacodes0.380.041.220.01Raneya brasiliensis0.380.040.14<0.01		0.38	0.04	1.87	0.02	
Genypterus blacodes 0.38 0.04 1.22 0.01 Raneya brasiliensis 0.38 0.04 0.14 <0.01 Zoarcidae 1.13 0.18 0.15 0.01 Nototheniidae 1.13 0.18 0.15 0.01 Patagonotothen spp. 10.94 6.41 26.01 11.01 Scorpaenidae 2.26 0.4 9.88 0.72 Helicolenus dactylopterus 2.26 0.4 9.88 0.72 Sebastes capensis 0.38 0.04 0.24 <0.01 Unidentified teleosts 32.08 8.27 13.43 21.59 ChondrichthyesRajidae $Bathyraja brachyurops$ 0.38 0.04 0.37 <0.01 PolychaetaNepthtyidae 2.64 0.62 0.01 0.05 Lumbrineridae 1.89 0.75 0.02 0.05 Maldanidae 3.4 1.37 0.09 0.15 Unidentified polychaetes 3.02 0.44 0.2 0.01 MolluscaCephalopoda 0.75 0.13 <0.01 <0.01 Unidentified cephalopods 6.79 0.84 2.25 0.65 Gasteropoda 0.75 0.09 0.26 0.01 Unidentified crustaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 0.01 Amphipoda 23.40 28.25 0.53 20.89 Isopoda 0.38 0.04 <0.01 <0.01 Serolis polaris 1.51 0.18 0.03 <		0.00	0.0.	1107	0.01	
Raneya brasiliensis 0.38 0.04 0.14 < 0.01 Zoarcidae 1.13 0.18 0.15 0.01 Nototheniidae 11.3 0.18 0.15 0.01 Patagonotothen spp. 10.94 6.41 26.01 11.01 Scorpaenidae 2.26 0.4 9.88 0.72 Helicolenus dactylopterus 2.26 0.4 9.88 0.72 Sebastes capensis 0.38 0.04 0.24 <0.01 Unidentified teleosts 32.08 8.27 13.43 21.59 ChondrichthyesRajidae $Bathyraja brachyurops$ 0.38 0.04 0.37 <0.01 PolychaetaNepthtyidae 2.64 0.62 0.01 0.05 Lumbrineridae 1.89 0.75 0.02 0.05 Maldanidae 3.4 1.37 0.09 0.15 Unidentified polychaetes 3.02 0.44 0.2 0.01 MolluscaCephalopoda $112x$ argentinus 4.53 0.84 5.99 0.96 Loligo gahi 0.75 0.13 <0.01 <0.01 Volutidae 0.75 0.09 0.26 0.01 Odantocymbiola magellanica 0.75 0.09 0.26 0.01 Crustaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 <0.01 Amphipoda 23.40 28.25 0.53 20.89 Isopoda 1.51 0.18 0.03 0.01 Serolis polaris 1.51 0.18 0	1	0.38	0.04	1 22	0.01	
Zoarcidae1.130.180.150.01Nototheniidae $Patagonotothen$ spp.10.946.4126.0111.01Scorpaenidae $Helicolenus$ $dactylopterus$ 2.260.49.880.72Sebastes capensis0.380.040.24<0.01						
Nototheniidae10.946.4126.0111.01Scorpaenidae $Helicolenus dactylopterus$ 2.260.49.880.72Sebastes capensis0.380.040.24<0.01						
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		1.15	0.10	0.15	0.01	
ScorpaenidaeHImage Number of Nu		10.04	6.41	26.01	11.01	
Helicolenus dactylopterus2.26 0.4 9.88 0.72 Sebastes capensis 0.38 0.04 0.24 <0.01 Unidentified teleosts 32.08 8.27 13.43 21.59 ChondrichthyesRajidae 8.27 13.43 21.59 Bathyraja brachyurops 0.38 0.04 0.37 <0.01 PolychaetaNepthtyidae 2.64 0.62 0.01 0.05 Lumbrineridae 1.89 0.75 0.02 0.05 Maldanidae 3.4 1.37 0.09 0.15 Unidentified polychaetes 3.02 0.44 0.2 0.01 MolluscaCephalopoda $11ex$ argentinus 4.53 0.84 5.99 0.96 Loligo gahi 0.75 0.13 <0.01 <0.01 <0.01 Unidentified cephalopods 6.79 0.84 2.25 0.65 Gasteropoda V olutidae 0.75 0.09 0.26 0.01 <i>Odontocymbiola magellanica</i> 0.75 0.09 0.26 0.01 Amphipoda 23.40 28.25 0.53 20.89 Isopoda 1.51 0.27 0.04 0.01 <i>Cirolana</i> spp. 7.92 1.41 0.26 0.41 <i>Arcturus</i> spp. 4.53 5.13 0.34 0.71 <i>Serolis polaris</i> 1.51 0.18 0.03 0.01 <i>Serolis polaris</i> 1.51 0.18 0.01 <0.01 <i>Serolis spp.</i> <		10.94	0.41	20.01	11.01	
Sebastes capensis 0.38 0.04 0.24 < 0.01 Unidentified teleosts 32.08 8.27 13.43 21.59 ChondrichthyesRajidae 8.27 13.43 21.59 Bathyraja brachyurops 0.38 0.04 0.37 < 0.01 PolychaetaNepthtyidae 2.64 0.62 0.01 0.05 Lumbrineridae 1.89 0.75 0.02 0.05 Maldanidae 3.4 1.37 0.09 0.15 Unidentified polychaetes 3.02 0.44 0.2 0.01 MolluscaCephalopoda $11ex$ argentinus 4.53 0.84 5.99 0.96 Loligo gahi 0.75 0.13 <0.01 <0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 Unidentified cephalopods 6.79 0.84 2.25 0.65 0.65 0.38 0.001 <0.01 Crustaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 0.01 Amphipoda 23.40 28.25 0.53 20.89 1.50 0.38 0.04 <0.01 <0.01 Serolis paradoxa 1.51 0.27 0.04 0.01 $Serolis paradoxa$ 1.51 0.18 0.03 0.01 Serolis polaris 1.51 0.18 0.03 0.01 $Serolis polaris$ 1.51 0.18 0.01 0.01 Serolis polaris 0.51 0.75 0.09 0.1 0.01 $Sero$		2.26	0.4	0.88	0.72	
Unidentified teleosts 32.08 8.27 13.43 21.59 Chondrichthyes Rajidae Bathyraja brachyurops 0.38 0.04 0.37 < 0.01 Polychaeta Nepthtyidae 2.64 0.62 0.01 0.05 Lumbrineridae 1.89 0.75 0.02 0.05 Maldanidae 3.4 1.37 0.09 0.15 Unidentified polychaetes 3.02 0.44 0.2 0.01 Mollusca $Cephalopoda$ 1.13 0.75 0.13 < 0.01 < 0.01 Unidentified cephalopods 6.79 0.84 2.25 0.65 Gasteropoda 0.75 0.09 0.26 0.01 Volutidae 0.75 0.13 < 0.01 < 0.01 Amphipoda 23.40 28.25 0.53 20.89 Isopoda 1.13 0.22 0.01 0.01 Arcturus spp. 4.53 5.13 0.34 0.77 Serolis paradoxa 1.51 0.18 0.03 0.01 Serolis polaris 1.51 0.18 0.03 0.01 Serolis schythei 22.26 20.65 3.37 16.59 Serolis schythei 22.26 14.78 1.79 11.44 Anomura $Munida$ subrugosa 1.13 0.13 0.14 0.01 Munida spinosa 0.75 0.09 0.1 < 0.01 Munida spinosa 0.75 0.09 0.1 < 0.01 Munida spinosa 0.75 0.09 0.1						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $						
Rajidae Bathyraja brachyurops 0.38 0.04 0.37 < 0.01 Polychaeta Nepthyidae 2.64 0.62 0.01 0.05 Lumbrineridae 1.89 0.75 0.02 0.05 Maldanidae 3.4 1.37 0.09 0.15 Unidentified polychaetes 3.02 0.44 0.2 0.01 Mollusca $Cephalopoda$ $118x$ argentinus 4.53 0.84 5.99 0.96 Loligo gahi 0.75 0.13 <0.01 <0.01 Unidentified cephalopods 6.79 0.84 2.25 0.65 Gasteropoda 0.75 0.09 0.26 0.01 Crustaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 0.01 Unidentified crustaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 0.01 Maphipoda 23.40 28.25 0.53 20.89 Isopoda 0.38 0.04 <0.01 <0.01 <i>Cirolana</i> spp. 7.92 1.41 0.26 0.41 <i>Arcturus</i> spp. 4.53 5.13 0.34 0.77 Serolis polaris 1.51 0.18 0.03 0.01 Serolis polaris 1.51 0.18 0.03 0.01 Serolis spp. 22.26 20.65 3.37 16.59 Serolis spp. 22.26 1.478 1.79 11.44 Anomura $Munida$ subrugosa 1.13 0.13 0.14 0.01 Munida subrugosa 1.13 0.13 0.14 0.01 <td></td> <td>52.08</td> <td>0.27</td> <td>15.45</td> <td>21.39</td>		52.08	0.27	15.45	21.39	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
PolychaetaNepthtyidae 2.64 0.62 0.01 0.05 Lumbrineridae 1.89 0.75 0.02 0.05 Maldanidae 3.4 1.37 0.09 0.15 Unidentified polychaetes 3.02 0.44 0.2 0.01 MolluscaCephalopoda $11lex$ argentinus 4.53 0.84 5.99 0.96 Loligo gahi 0.75 0.13 <0.01 <0.01 Unidentified cephalopods 6.79 0.84 2.25 0.65 Gasteropoda V olutidae 0.75 0.09 0.26 0.01 Odontocymbiola magellanica 0.75 0.09 0.26 0.01 Crustaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 0.01 Amphipoda 23.40 28.25 0.53 20.89 Isopoda $Cirolana$ spp. 4.53 5.13 0.34 0.77 Serolis paradoxa 1.51 0.27 0.04 0.01 Serolis paradoxa 1.51 0.18 0.03 0.01 Serolis polaris 1.51 0.18 0.03 0.01 Serolis schythei 22.26 14.78 1.79 11.44 Anomura $Munida$ subrugosa 1.13 0.13 0.14 0.01 Brachyura $Libioclaea$ granaria 24.91 4.69 6.94 8.98 Peltarion spinosulum 12.83 2.3 4.6 2.74		0.20	0.04	0.27	< 0.01	
Nepthtyidae 2.64 0.62 0.01 0.05 Lumbrineridae 1.89 0.75 0.02 0.05 Maldanidae 3.4 1.37 0.09 0.15 Unidentified polychaetes 3.02 0.44 0.2 0.01 MolluscaCephalopoda $1llex argentinus$ 4.53 0.84 5.99 0.96 Loligo gahi 0.75 0.13 <0.01 <0.01 Unidentified cephalopods 6.79 0.84 2.25 0.65 Gasteropoda V olutidae 0.075 0.09 0.26 0.01 Odontocymbiola magellanica 0.75 0.09 0.26 0.01 Crustaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 0.01 Amphipoda 23.40 28.25 0.53 20.89 Isopoda -7.92 1.41 0.26 0.41 Arcturus spp. 4.53 5.13 0.34 0.77 Serolis paradoxa 1.51 0.27 0.04 0.01 Serolis polaris 1.51 0.18 0.03 0.01 Serolis schythei 22.26 20.65 3.37 16.59 Serolis schythei 22.26 14.78 1.79 11.44 Anomura -75 0.09 0.1 <0.01 Munida subrugosa 1.13 0.13 0.12 0.01 Munida spinosa 0.75 0.09 0.1 <0.01 Brachyura -113 0.13 0.14 0.01 Brachyura -113 <td></td> <td>0.38</td> <td>0.04</td> <td>0.57</td> <td>< 0.01</td>		0.38	0.04	0.57	< 0.01	
Lumbrineridae 1.89 0.75 0.02 0.05 Maldanidae 3.4 1.37 0.09 0.15 Unidentified polychaetes 3.02 0.44 0.2 0.01 MolluscaCephalopoda $1000000000000000000000000000000000000$		244	0.00	0.01	0.05	
Maldanidae 3.4 1.37 0.09 0.15 Unidentified polychaetes 3.02 0.44 0.2 0.01 Mollusca 2.001 3.02 0.44 0.2 0.01 Cephalopoda $1llex$ argentinus 4.53 0.84 5.99 0.96 Loligo gahi 0.75 0.13 <0.01 <0.01 Unidentified cephalopods 6.79 0.84 2.25 0.65 Gasteropoda 0.75 0.09 0.26 0.01 Volutidae 0.75 0.09 0.26 0.01 Crustaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 0.01 Amphipoda 23.40 28.25 0.53 20.89 Isopoda 0.792 1.41 0.26 0.41 Arcturus spp. 4.53 5.13 0.34 0.77 Serolis plitica 0.38 0.04 <0.01 <0.01 Serolis polaris 1.51 0.18 0.03 0.01 Serolis polaris 1.51 0.18 0.03 0.01 Serolis spp. 22.26 20.65 3.37 16.59 Serolis spp. 22.26 14.78 1.79 11.44 Anomura $Munida$ subrugosa 1.13 0.13 0.12 0.01 Munida spinosa 0.75 0.09 0.1 <0.01 Brachyura $Libioclaea granaria$ 24.91 4.69 6.94 8.98 Peltarion spinosulum 12.83 2.3 4.6 2.74						
Unidentified polychaetes 3.02 0.44 0.2 0.01 MolluscaCephalopodaIllex argentinus 4.53 0.84 5.99 0.96 Loligo gahi 0.75 0.13 <0.01 <0.01 Unidentified cephalopods 6.79 0.84 2.25 0.65 Gasteropoda V olutidae 0.75 0.09 0.26 0.01 Crustaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 0.01 Mmphipoda 23.40 28.25 0.53 20.89 Isopoda $Cirolana$ spp. 7.92 1.41 0.26 0.41 Arcturus spp. 4.53 5.13 0.34 0.77 Serolis paradoxa 1.51 0.27 0.04 0.01 Serolis polaris 1.51 0.18 0.03 0.01 Serolis sophythei 22.26 20.65 3.37 16.59 Serolis sepp. 22.26 14.78 1.79 11.44 Anomura $Munida$ subrugosa 1.13 0.13 0.12 0.01 Munida spinosa 0.75 0.09 0.1 <0.01 Brachyura 1.13 0.13 0.14 0.01 Brachyura $Libidoclaea granaria$ 24.91 4.69 6.94 8.98						
Mollusca Cephalopoda 4.53 0.84 5.99 0.96 $Loligo gahi$ $Illex argentinus$ 4.53 0.84 5.99 0.96 $Loligo gahi$ 0.75 0.13 <0.01 <0.01 Unidentified cephalopods 6.79 0.84 2.25 0.65 Gasteropoda Volutidae 0.75 0.09 0.26 0.01 <i>Odontocymbiola magellanica</i> 0.75 0.09 0.26 0.01 Crustaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 0.01 Amphipoda 23.40 28.25 0.53 20.89 Isopoda $Cirolana$ spp. 7.92 1.41 0.26 0.41 Arcturus spp. 4.53 5.13 0.34 0.77 Serolis paradoxa 1.51 0.27 0.04 0.01 Serolis paradoxa 1.51 0.18 0.03 0.01 Serolis schythei 22.26 20.65 3.37 16.59 Serolis vemae 0.38 0.09 0.01 < 0.01 Serolis spp. 22.26 14.78 1.79 11.44 Anomura $Munida$ subrugosa 1.13 0.13 0.14 0.01 Munida subrugosa 1.13 0.13 0.14 0.01 Brachyura $Libidoclaea granaria$ 24.91 4.69 6.94 8.98 Peltarion spinosulum 12.83 2.3 4.6 2.74						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		3.02	0.44	0.2	0.01	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$						
Unidentified cephalopods Gasteropoda Volutidae 6.79 0.84 2.25 0.65 Gasteropoda Volutidae $0dontocymbiola magellanica$ 0.75 0.09 0.26 0.01 CrustaceansUnidentified crustaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 0.01 Amphipoda 23.40 28.25 0.53 20.89 Isopoda $cirolana$ spp. 7.92 1.41 0.26 0.41 Arcturus spp. 4.53 5.13 0.34 0.77 Serolis elliptica 0.38 0.04 <0.01 <0.01 Serolis polaris 1.51 0.18 0.03 0.01 Serolis sophythei 22.26 20.65 3.37 16.59 Serolis sephythei 22.26 14.78 1.79 11.44 Anomura $Munida$ subrugosa 1.13 0.13 0.12 0.01 Munida spinosa 0.75 0.09 0.1 <0.01 Brachyura $Libioclaea granaria$ 24.91 4.69 6.94 8.98 Peltarion spinosulum 12.83 2.3 4.6 2.74						
Gasteropoda Volutidae Odontocymbiola magellanica 0.75 0.09 0.26 0.01 Crustaceans Unidentified crustaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 0.01 Amphipoda 23.40 28.25 0.53 20.89 Isopoda 23.40 28.25 0.53 20.89 Cirolana spp. 7.92 1.41 0.26 0.41 Arcturus spp. 4.53 5.13 0.34 0.77 Serolis elliptica 0.38 0.04 <0.01 <0.01 Serolis polaris 1.51 0.18 0.03 0.01 Serolis vemae 0.38 0.09 0.01 <0.01 Serolis sepp. 22.26 20.65 3.37 16.59 Serolis vemae 0.38 0.09 0.01 <0.01 Serolis spp. 22.26 14.78 1.79 11.44 Anomura $Munida$ subrugosa 1.13 0.13 0.12 0.01 Munida spinosa 0.75 0.09 0.1 <0.01 Brachyura $Libidoclaea granaria$ 24.91 4.69 6.94 8.98 Peltarion spinosulum 12.83 2.3 4.6 2.74						
Volutidae Odontocymbiola magellanica 0.75 0.09 0.26 0.01 Crustaceans Unidentified crustaceans 1.13 0.22 0.01 0.01 Amphipoda 23.40 28.25 0.53 20.89 Isopoda 7.92 1.41 0.26 0.41 Arcturus spp. 4.53 5.13 0.34 0.77 Serolis elliptica 0.38 0.04 <0.01 <0.01 Serolis polaris 1.51 0.27 0.04 0.01 Serolis schythei 22.26 20.65 3.37 16.59 Serolis vemae 0.38 0.09 0.01 <0.01 Serolis spp. 22.26 14.78 1.79 11.44 Anomura $Munida$ subrugosa 1.13 0.13 0.12 0.01 Munida subrugosa 1.13 0.13 0.14 0.01 Brachyura $Libidoclaea$ granaria 24.91 4.69 6.94 8.98 Peltarion spinosulum 12.83 2.3 4.6 2.74		6.79	0.84	2.25	0.65	
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $						
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $						
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		0.75	0.09	0.26	0.01	
Amphipoda 23.40 28.25 0.53 20.89 IsopodaCirolana spp. 7.92 1.41 0.26 0.41 Arcturus spp. 4.53 5.13 0.34 0.77 Serolis elliptica 0.38 0.04 <0.01 <0.01 Serolis paradoxa 1.51 0.27 0.04 0.01 Serolis polaris 1.51 0.18 0.03 0.01 Serolis vemae 0.38 0.09 0.01 <0.01 Serolis spp. 22.26 20.65 3.37 16.59 Serolis seps. 22.26 14.78 1.79 11.44 AnomuraMunida subrugosa 1.13 0.13 0.12 0.01 Munida spinosa 0.75 0.09 0.1 <0.01 BrachyuraLibidoclaea granaria 24.91 4.69 6.94 8.98 Peltarion spinosulum 12.83 2.3 4.6 2.74						
Isopoda Cirolana spp.7.921.410.260.41Arcturus spp. 4.53 5.13 0.34 0.77 Serolis elliptica 0.38 0.04 <0.01 <0.01 Serolis paradoxa 1.51 0.27 0.04 0.01 Serolis polaris 1.51 0.18 0.03 0.01 Serolis schythei 22.26 20.65 3.37 16.59 Serolis sendis spp. 22.26 14.78 1.79 11.44 Anomura $Munida subrugosa$ 1.13 0.13 0.12 0.01 Munida subrugosa 1.13 0.13 0.14 0.01 Brachyura $Libidoclaea granaria$ 24.91 4.69 6.94 8.98 Peltarion spinosulum 12.83 2.3 4.6 2.74	Unidentified crustaceans				0.01	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Amphipoda	23.40	28.25	0.53	20.89	
Arcturus spp. 4.53 5.13 0.34 0.77 Serolis elliptica 0.38 0.04 <0.01 <0.01 Serolis paradaxa 1.51 0.27 0.04 0.01 Serolis polaris 1.51 0.18 0.03 0.01 Serolis schythei 22.26 20.65 3.37 16.59 Serolis vemae 0.38 0.09 0.01 <0.01 Serolis spp. 22.26 14.78 1.79 11.44 AnomuraMunida subrugosa 1.13 0.13 0.12 0.01 Munida spinosa 0.75 0.09 0.1 <0.01 BrachyuraLibidoclaea granaria 24.91 4.69 6.94 8.98 Peltarion spinosulum 12.83 2.3 4.6 2.74	Isopoda					
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Cirolana spp.					
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Arcturus spp.	4.53	5.13	0.34	0.77	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Serolis elliptica	0.38	0.04	< 0.01	< 0.01	
$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	Serolis paradoxa	1.51	0.27	0.04	0.01	
$\begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	Serolis polaris	1.51	0.18	0.03	0.01	
Serolis vemae 0.38 0.09 0.01 < 0.01 Serolis spp. 22.26 14.78 1.79 11.44 Anomura 1.13 0.13 0.12 0.01 Munida subrugosa 1.75 0.09 0.1 < 0.01		22.26	20.65	3.37	16.59	
Serolis spp. 22.26 14.78 1.79 11.44 Anomura Munida subrugosa 1.13 0.13 0.12 0.01 Munida spinosa 0.75 0.09 0.1 < 0.01		0.38	0.09	0.01	< 0.01	
Anomura 1.13 0.13 0.12 0.01 Munida subrugosa 1.13 0.13 0.12 0.01 Munida spinosa 0.75 0.09 0.1 < 0.01		22.26	14.78	1.79	11.44	
Munida subrugosa 1.13 0.13 0.12 0.01 Munida spinosa 0.75 0.09 0.1 < 0.01						
Munida spinosa 0.75 0.09 0.1 < 0.01 Munida spp. 1.13 0.13 0.14 0.01 Brachyura Libidoclaea granaria 24.91 4.69 6.94 8.98 Peltarion spinosulum 12.83 2.3 4.6 2.74		1.13	0.13	0.12	0.01	
Munida spp. 1.13 0.13 0.14 0.01 Brachyura Libidoclaea granaria 24.91 4.69 6.94 8.98 Peltarion spinosulum 12.83 2.3 4.6 2.74						
BrachyuraLibidoclaea granariaPeltarion spinosulum12.832.34.62.74						
Libidoclaea granaria24.914.696.948.98Peltarion spinosulum12.832.34.62.74		1.15	0.15	0.1 1	0.01	
Peltarion spinosulum 12.83 2.3 4.6 2.74		24 91	4 69	6 94	8 98	
Unidentified brachyurans 12.05 2.5 4.0 2.74 Unidentified brachyurans 0.38 0.13 0.01 0.01	Poltarion spinosulum					
	Unidentified brachvurans					
	Chidentified brachy draits	0.50	0.15	< 0.01	< 0.01	

served (ANOSIM %W: R statistic = 0.14, p = 0.001; ANOSIM %N: R statistic = 0.137, p = 0.01).

Pairwise comparisons within ANOSIM in terms of %W and %N showed significant differences between size class I (n= 92) and size class II (n= 96) and size class III (n= 77), but not between size class II and size class III. According to the ANOSIM test, larger differences occurred between size classes I and III (Table 2). SIMPER analyses showed that the

TABLE 2. – One-way ANOSIM results for *Bathyraja brachyurops* between diets of different size classes analyzed according to percent of weight and percent of number.

	ANOSIM %W	<i>p</i> - value <i>A</i>	<i>p</i> - value		
Size I vs. Size II Size I vs. Size III Size II vs. Size II			0.14 0.194 0.001 Global R = p = 0.0		

average dissimilarity between size class I and size class II was high (76.45% by %W and 79.4% by %N). This is mainly due to differences in the importance of isopods and fishes in the diet of the two size classes, although crabs also contributed considerably to the dietary dissimilarity (Table 3). Average dissimilarity between size class I and size class III categorized by %W and %N were 79.33% and 82.13% respectively. SIMPER identified isopods, fishes and crabs as the prey categories responsible for these differences (Table 3).

The diet of size class I consisted largely of isopods. Individuals of size class II fed more frequently on fishes, followed by crabs. In size class III, fish was the most important prey category, followed by amphipods. Fish prey became increasingly important in the diet of larger specimens of *B. brachyurops* (Table 4).

Trophic level and feeding strategy

The trophic level of *B. brachyurops* was 4.16. The three size classes had similar values and were all tertiary consumers (TL size class I = 4.14, TL size class II = 4.12 and TL size class III = 4.19). However, %Pi-%Fplots showed a pronounced and progressive change in diet of B. brachyurops with increased size, from a mixed dietary composition in the smallest skates to one dominated almost entirely by fishes in size classes II and III. Individuals of size classes II and III fed mainly on teleosts but small proportions of other prey categories were included in the diet of some specimens (Fig. 3, Table 4). The niche breadths in both classes were narrow (Fig. 3). Conversely, the graphical method proposed by Amundsen et al. (1996) demonstrated a more mixed feeding strategy for individuals of size class I, with a certain preference for isopods (Fig. 3, Table 4). Furthermore, the niche breadth value of small skates of B. brachyurops was wider (Fig. 3), which suggests a more generalized feeding strategy.

Percent of Weight Prey categories	Mean ± S.D. Dissimilarity	Contribution to dissimilarity %	Cumulative percentage		
Size I vs. Size II (76.45%)					
Isopoda	25.22 ± 1.15	32,99	32,99		
Pisces	24.17 ± 1.15	31,61	64,6		
Brachyura	17.65 ± 0.85	23,08	87,69		
Polichaeta	3.17 ± 0.33	4,15	91,84		
Size I vs. Size III (79.33%)					
Pisces	27.49 ± 1.21	34,65	34,65		
Isopoda	25.39 ± 1.14	32,01	66,66		
Brachyura	15.11 ± 0.74	19,05	85,71		
Squids	4.32 ± 0.35	5,44	91,16		
Percent of Number					
Prey categories	Mean ± S.D. Dissimilarity	Contribution to dissimilarity	Cumulative percentage		
Size I vs. Size II (79,40%)					
Isopoda	24.52 ± 1.18	30,87	30,87		
Pisces	20.07 ± 1.01	25,27	56,15		
Brachyura	15.20 ± 0.79	19,15	75,29		
Amphipoda	10.84 ± 0.63	13,65	88,94		
Polychaeta	4.48 ± 0.42	5,64	94,58		
Size I vs. Size III (82.13%)			,		
Isopoda	24.79 ± 1.15	30,18	30,18		
Pisces	22.05 ± 1.07	26,85	57,03		
Brachyura	12.74 ± 0.70	15,21	72,54		
Amphipoda	11.72 ± 0.68	14,26	86,81		
Polychaeta	5.54 ± 0.43	6,74	93,55		

TABLE 3. – The contribution of prey categories to observed dietary differences among *B. brachyurops* size classes determined by SIMPER analyses. Prey categories are listed in descending order of percentage contribution and only categories contributing >2% to the observed differences are shown.

TABLE 4. – Percentage of occurrence (%F), number (%N), wet weight (%W) and percentage of the Index of Relative Importance (%IRI) for each taxonomic category present in the diet of different *Bathyraja brachyurops* size classes.

Prey categories	Size class I $(n = 92)$			Size class II $(n = 96)$			Si	Size class III $(n = 77)$				
, ,	%F	%N	%W	%IRI	%F	%N	ŵW	%IRI	%F	%N	ŵW	%IRI
Pisces	31.52	10.06	50.61	22.29	62.50	28.50	72.96	69.40	62.34	18.83	87.62	79.02
Polychaeta	18.48	5.57	0.90	1.39	4.17	1.47	0.70	0.10	5.19	1.16	0.08	0.08
Mollusca	7.61	0.63	1.58	0.20	4.17	0.65	0.94	0.07	9.09	1.86	3.40	0.57
Amphipoda	18.48	18.86	1.39	4.36	13.54	25.08	0.47	3.79	19.48	44.86	0.35	10.49
Isopoda	63.04	59.82	28.54	64.93	30.21	30.78	3.43	11.31	15.58	24.87	1.75	4.94
Anomura	3.26	0.64	0.80	0.05	2.08	0.33	0.24	0.01	3.90	0.74	0.20	0.04
Brachyura	28.26	4.41	16.18	6.78	40.63	13.19	21.26	15.32	28.57	7.67	6.60	4.86

DISCUSSION

Stomach content analysis of *Bathyraja brachyurops* showed that it is a piscivorous predator that feeds largely on benthic and demersal fishes on the Argentinean continental shelf. Other benthic invertebrates are present in the diet but in lower proportions. The dominance of fishes and cephalopods in the diet of large individuals of larger skate species has been reported by several authors (Ebert *et al.*, 1991; Smale and Cowley, 1992; Orlov, 1998; Lucifora *et al.*, 2000; Koen Alonso *et al.*, 2001; Brickle *et al.*, 2003). Koen Alonso *et al.* (2001) noted that smaller specimens of the long nose skate *Dipturus chilensis* in the Argentinean Sea preyed on benthic crustaceans, whereas larger individuals foraged mostly on fishes and molluscs. A general pattern for the feeding habits of skates was suggested by Braccini and Perez (2005), in which small individuals (either smaller species or young individuals of larger species) prey mainly on crustaceans and thus are secondary consumers (TL<4), while larger individuals feed on fishes and cephalopods and thus are tertiary consumers that occupy higher trophic levels (TL>4). Nevertheless, no differences were found between the trophic levels of the three size classes of *B. brachyurops* analyzed here, which ranged between 4.12 and 4.19. Ebert and Bizarro (2007) estimated the trophic level for 60 skate species, based on quantitative data obtained from different studies.




FIG. 3. – Prey-specific abundance (%*Pi*) plotted against frequency of occurrence (%Fi) of prey categories of *Bathyraja brachyurops* from the south-west Atlantic. (a) <400 mm DW (n= 92), (b) 400-500 mm DW (n= 96), (c) >500 mm DW (n= 77), and (d) Standardized Levins' measure for the three size classes considered.

Values ranged from 3.48 (*Rajella caudaspinosa*) to 4.22 (*D. chilensis*) and the greatest values for species of *Bathyraja* were 4.09 (*B. griseocauda*) and 4.08 (*B. brachyurops*). In our study the trophic level of *B. brachyurops* was 4.16 and thus conformed to the feeding pattern hypothesis as a tertiary consumer which occupies trophic positions similar to other upper trophic level predators e.g. marine mammals, seabirds (Wetherbee and Cortés, 2006), large teleosts and some shark species (Ebert and Bizzarro, 2007).

One case of cannibalism was found in our study and this behaviour has been observed in other skates (Ellis *et al.*, 1996). Ebert *et al.* (1991) analyzed the diet of several species of skates from the south eastern Atlantic, including one species of the genus *Bathyraja* (*B. smithii*), and found, similarly to the present study, that the most important prey were crustaceans and teleosts. In this study the most frequently consumed teleosts that contributed most to the diet in terms of weight were *Patagonotothen* spp., Argentine hake, and scorpaenids (*Helicolenus dactylopterus*). The Argentine hake is the most important demersal fishing resource on the Argentinean shelf (Bezzi *et al.*, 2004). Furthermore, the Argentine hake is consumed by a lot of organisms, such as *Illex argentinus* (Santos and Haimovici, 1997), *Squalus acanthias* (García de la Rosa and Sánchez, 1997), *Dipturus chilensis* (Lucifora *et al.*, 2000; Koen Alonso *et al.*, 2001), dusky dolphins *Lagenorynchus obscurus* (Alonso *et al.*, 1998) and 20 other fish species (García de la Rosa and Sánchez, 1997), which prey on different stages of ontogeny.

There were no sexual differences in the dietary composition of *B. brachyurops*, which indicates that males and females consume similar prey and occupy similar trophic roles. Similar findings have been reported in other studies (Braccini and Perez, 2005; Scenna *et al.*, 2006; San Martín *et al.*, 2007). Conversely, sexual differences in the diet have been found in other skate species of *Bathyraja* in the western Bering Sea (e.g. *B. parmifera*, *B. aleutica*, *B. maculata*, *B. matsubarai*, *B. minispinosa*) (Orlov, 2001). Sexual heterodonty has been investigated in *B. brachyurops* and it was found that females have wider, more rounded teeth on both the upper and lower jaws than males (Belleggia, 2007). Dental sexual dimorphism was originally proposed to be a result of

feeding segregation among sexes (Du Buit, 1978). It is also well known that elasmobranchs exhibit complex reproductive behaviour in which the teeth are used by males for firmly gripping the female during copulation (Price, 1967; McEachran, 1977; Kajiura *et al.*, 2000). Males and females of *B. brachyurops* have a similar diet, which suggests that differences in tooth morphology could be related more to reproductive behaviour than to feeding.

Although all size classes of B. brachyurops occupy similar trophic roles and are tertiary consumers (TL>4), ontogenetic shifts in the diet composition were found in this work. Small specimens of B. brachyurops predominantly fed upon isopods, whereas fishes and crabs became important in the diet of larger skates. Small individuals of B. brachyurops that occurred around Malvinas Islands mostly foraged on benthic gammarid amphipods and isopods, whereas larger skates consumed fish and cephalopods (Brickle et al., 2003). Orlov (1998) found that larger species of Bathyraja in the northern Pacific (B. aleutica, B. maculata, B. parmifera, and B. matsubarai) preyed on large crustaceans, cephalopods and fishes, while smaller species (B. interrupta, B. minispinosa and B. violacea) fed on benthic invertebrates. Ontogenetic changes in the diet composition of skates have been reported for several other species (Pedersen, 1995; Skjaeraasen and Bergstad, 2000; Brickle et al., 2003), and may be attributed to morphological constraints (McEachran et al., 1976) or may simply reflect differences in the foraging ability of larger individuals. Dietary changes associated with the ontogeny of B. brachyurops may, in part, explain how food resources within a given area are partitioned to minimize competition between co-specifics at different life-history stages, as Ebert (2002) proposed for Notorynchus cepedianus. Ontogenetic change in feeding habits is an almost universal phenomenon in fishes and thus its occurrence in elasmobranchs is not surprising. Although many species of skates increase in size, there are also changes in habitat, movement patterns, swimming speed, size of jaws, teeth and other factors that result in variable exposure to prey or improved ability to capture different prey (Wetherbee and Cortés, 2006).

Some studies on the feeding habits of skates have described them as generalist predators (McEachran *et al.*, 1976; Orlov, 1998), although some species have been regarded as specialist predators (Ebert *et al.*, 1991; Braccini and Perez, 2005; Scenna *et al.*, 2006; San Martín *et al.*, 2007). A gen-

eralist predator has a broad dietary niche, in contrast to the small variety of prey found in the stomach contents of a specialist predator. In our study, the Levins' standardized index indicated that the niche breadth was widest for small skates, whereas the niche breadth of the larger skates was relatively narrow. The analysis of the prey-specific abundance in relation to frequency of occurrence showed that small individuals of *B. brachyurops* have a generalist strategy with isopods as the main prey. However, larger skates, demonstrated a marked specialization in teleosts.

As in this study, Brickle et al. (2003) found that adult specimens of Bathyraja brachyurops were active predators and preyed mainly on fishes and cephalopods. However, the Argentine short fin squid Illex argentinus appeared to be the most important prey among cephalopods in the diet of *B. brachyurops* on the Argentinean continental shelf (the present study) and the loliginid squid Loligo gahi was the most common (in terms of numbers and frequency of occurrence) in the diet around the Malvinas Islands (Brickle et al., 2003). The difference would be attributed to different distribution patterns observed in these two species of cephalopods. Loligo gahi is the coldest water dwelling loliginid species, and reaches its highest abundance in waters associated with the Malvinas Current which derives from the Antarctic Circumpolar Current (Hatfield and Des Clers, 1998). In contrast, I. argentinus presents latitudinal migrations and its concentrations during different times of the year are governed by feeding, sexual maturation and egg-laving (Brunetti et al., 1998). It is a species associated mainly with waters of the Patagonian shelf (Haimovici et al., 1998).

Bathyraja brachyurops occurs sympatrically with *B. macloviana* and *B. albomaculata* along the Argentinean continental shelf (Cousseau *et al.*, 2000), which have been reported to be polychaete consumers (Sánchez and Mabragaña, 2002; Mabragaña *et al.*, 2005; Scenna *et al.*, 2006). Species that share the same habitat may rely on differences in the utilization of food resources to avoid competition (Schoener, 1974). In our study we found that polychaetes made a low contribution to the diet of *B. brachyurops* (%IRI =0.44). The differences in feeding habits between these two polychaete consumers and *B. brachyurops* would indicate low feeding competition among these species.

Prior to this diet study, no published information was available on the food habits of *B. brachyurops*

on the Argentinea continental shelf. To date our understanding of the Argentinean benthic ecosystem is scant. Although the results of this research will contribute to increasing our knowledge about benthic communities, further studies are warranted to fully understand the food webs of benthic and demersal communities on the Argentinean continental shelf.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo Pesquero (INIDEP) for the specimens collected from different research cruises. We are also grateful to Dr. M. A. Scelzo (UNMdP), Dra. G. Alonso (Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales "Bernardino Rivadavia") and Dra. N. Brunetti (INIDEP) for their help in identifying crabs, amphipods and squids respectively. Special thanks to Guillermina Cosulich, Gaby Silvoni and Nancy Lenzo, librarians of the INIDEP, who provided most helpful documentation. Two anonymous reviewers provided helpful comments that greatly improved the manuscript. This research was supported by the ECORAYA program financed by the Volkswagen Stiftung (proyect number 03F0383A) and PIP 5009 of CONICET. Belleggia M., Barbini S., and Scenna L. were supported by scholarships from UNMdP, CIC and CONICET respectively.

REFERENCES

- Alonso, M.K., E.A. Crespo, N.A. García, S.N. Pedraza and M.A. Coscarella. – 1998. Diet of dusky dolphins, *Lagenorhynchus* obscurus, in waters off Patagonia, Argentina. *Fish. Bull.*, 96: 366-374.
- Amundsen, P.A., H.M. Gabler and F.J. Staldvik. 1996. A new approach to graphical analysis of feeding strategy from stomach contents data-modification of the Costello (1990) method. *J. Fish Biol.*, 48: 607-614.
- Bastida, R.O. and M.R. Torti. 1973. Los Isópodos Serolidae en la Argentina. Clave para su reconocimiento. *Physis, A*, 84: 19-46.
 Belleggia, M. – 2007. *Ecología trófica de la raya de cola corta,*
- Belleggia, M. 2007. Ecología trófica de la raya de cola corta, Bathyraja brachyurops (Fowler, 1910), en el Atlántico Sudoccidental. Tesis de Licenciatura, Univ. Nacional de Mar del Plata.
- Bezzi, I.S., M. Renzi, G. Irusta, B. Santos, L.S. Tringali, M.D. Ehrlich, F. Sánchez, S. B. García de la Rosa, M. Simonazzi and R. Castrucci. – 2004. Caracterización biológica y pesquera de la Merluza (*Merluccius hubbsi*). In: E. Boschi (ed.), *El Mar Argentino y sus recursos pesqueros, Tomo 4*, pp. 157-205. IN-IDEP, Mar del Plata, Publicaciones Especiales.
- Boltovskoy, E. 1981. Masas de agua en el Atlántico Sudoccidental. In: D. Boltovskoy (ed.), Atlas del zooplancton del Atlántico Sudoccidental y métodos de trabajo con el zooplancton marino, pp. 227-237. Publicación Especial del Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo Pesquero (INIDEP), Mar del Plata, Argentina.
- Boschi, E.E., C.E. Fischbach and M.I. Iorio. 1992. Catálogo ilustrado de los crustáceos estomatópodos y decápodos marinos

de Argentina. Frente Marítimo., 10: 7-94.

- Braccini, J.M. and J.E. Perez. –2005. Feeding habits of the sandskate *Psammobatis extenta* (Garman, 1913): sources of variation in dietary composition. *Mar. Freshw. Res.*, 56: 395-403.
- Brickle, P., V. Laptikhovsky, J. Pompert and A. Bishop. 2003. Ontogenic changes in the feeding habits and dietary overlap between three abundant rajid species on the Falkland Islands' shelf. J. Mar. Biol. Ass. U. K., 83: 1119-1125.
- Brunetti, N.E., M.L. Ivanovic and B. Elena. 1998. Calamares omastréfidos (Cephalopoda, Ommastrephidae). In: E. Boschi (ed.), *El Mar Argentino y sus recursos pesqueros, Tomo 2*, pp. 37-68. INIDEP, Mar del Plata, Publicaciones Especiales.
- Clarke, K.R. and R.M. Warwick. 2001. Changes in marine communities: an approach to statistical analysis and interpretation, 2nd. edition. PRIMER-E: Plymouth.
- Cortés, E. 1997. A critical review of methods of studying fish feeding based on analysis of stomach contents: application to elasmobranch fishes. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.*, 54: 726-738.
- Cortés, E. 1999. Standardized diet compositions and trophic levels of sharks. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.*, 56: 707-717.
- Cousseau, M.B., D.E. Figueroa and J.M. Díaz De Astarloa. 2000. Clave para la identificación de las rayas del litoral marítimo de Argentina y Uruguay (Chondricthyes, Familia Rajidae). IN-IDEP, Mar del Plata, Publicaciones especiales, 35 pp. Cousseau, M.B. and R.G. Perrota. – 2000. Peces Marinos de Argen-
- Cousseau, M.B. and R.G. Perrota. 2000. Peces Marinos de Argentina: Biología, Distribución y Pesca. INIDEP, Mar del Plata, 167 pp.
- Díaz de Astarloa, J.M. and E. Mabragaña. 2004. Bathyraja cousseauae sp. n., a new softnose skate from the southwestern Atlantic (Rajiformes, Rajidae). Copeia, 2004: 326-335.
- Du Buit, M.H. 1978. Remarques sur la denture des rajes et sur leur alimentation. *Vie Milieu.*, 28-29: 165-174.
 Ebert, D.A. 2002. Ontogenetic changes in the diet of the sev-
- Ebert, D.A. 2002. Ontogenetic changes in the diet of the sevengill shark (Notorynchus cepedianus). *Mar. Freshw. Res.*, 53: 517-523.
- Ebert, D.A., P.D. Cowley and L.J.V. Compagno. 1991. A preliminary investigation of the feeding ecology of skates (Batoidea: Rajidae) off the west coast of southern Africa. S. Afr. J. Mar. Sci., 10: 71-81.
- Ebert, D.A. and J.J. Bizarro. 2007. Standardized diet compositions and trophic levels of skates (Chondrichthyes: Rajiformes: Rajoidei). *Environ. Biol. Fish.*, 80: 221-237.
- Ebert, D.A. and J.V. Compagno. 2007. Biodiversity and systematics of skates (Chondrichthyes: Rajiformes: Rajoidei). *Environ. Biol. Fish.*, 80: 111-124.
 Ellis, J.R., M.G. Pawson and S.E. Shackley. 1996. The compara-
- Ellis, J.R., M.G. Pawson and S.E. Shackley. 1996. The comparative feeding ecology of six species of shark and four species of ray (Elasmobranchii) in the north-east Atlantic. J. Mar. Biol. Ass. U. K., 76: 89-106.
- Ferry, L.A. and G.M. Caillet. 1996. Sample size and data analysis: are we characterizing and comparing diet properly? In: D. MacKinlay and K. Shearer (eds.), *Feeding Ecology and Nutrition in Fish*, pp. 71-80. Symposium Proceedings, American Fisheries Society, San Francisco.
- García de la Rosa, S.B. and F. Sánchez. 1997. Alimentación de *Squalus acanthias* y predación sobre *Merluccius hubbsi* en el Mar Argentino entre 34°47'-47°S. *Rev. Invest. Desarr. Pesq.*, 11: 119-199.
- Haimovici, M., N. Brunetti, P.G. Rodhouse, J. Csirke and R.H. Leta. – 1998. Illex argentinus. In: P.G. Rodhouse, E.G. Dawe and R.K. O'Dor (eds.), Squid recruitment dynamics. The genus Illex as a model. The commercial Illex species. Influences on variability, pp. 27-58, FAO Fisheries Technical Paper 376, Rome.
- *ability*, pp. 27-58. FAO Fisheries Technical Paper 376, Rome. Hatfield, E.M.C. and S. des Clers. – 1998. Fisheries management and research for *Loligo gahi* in the Falkland Islands. *CalCOFI Rep.*, 39: 81-91.
- Kajiura, S.M., A.P. Sebastian and T.C. Tricas. 2000. Dermal bite wounds as indicators of reproductive seasonality and behaviour in the Atlantic stingray, *Dasyatis sabina. Environ. Biol. Fish.*, 58: 23-34.
- Koen Alonso, M., E.A. Crespo, N.A. García, S.N. Pedraza, P.A. Mariotti, B. Beron Vera and N.J. Mora. – 2001. Food habits of *Dipturus chilensis* (Pisces: Rajidae) off Patagonia, Argentina. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.*, 58: 288-297.
- Krebs, C.J. 1989. Ecological Methodology. Harper Collins, Nueva York.
- Lucifora, L.O., J.L. Valero, C.S. Bremec and M.L. Lasta. 2000.

SCI. MAR., 72(4), December 2008, 701-710. ISSN 0214-8358 doi: 10.3989/scimar.2008.72n4701

Feeding habits and prey selection by the skate Dipturus chilensis (Elasmobranchii: Rajidae) from the south-western Atlantic. J. Mar. Biol. Ass. U.K., 80: 953-954.

- Mabragaña, E., D.A. Giberto and C.S. Bremec. 2005. Feeding ecology of Bathyraja macloviana (Rajiformes, Arhynchobatidae): a polychaete-feeding skates from the South-west Atlantic. Sci. Mar., 69: 405-413.
- Mabragaña, E., and D.A. Giberto. 2007. Feeding ecology and abundance of two sympatric skates, the shortfin sand skate Psammobatis normani McEachran, and the smallthorn sand skate P. rudis Günther (Chondrichthyes, Rajidae), in the southwest Atlantic. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.*, 64: 1017-1027. Massa, A.M. and N. Hozbor. 2003. – Peces cartilaginosos de la
- Plataforma Argentina: explotacion, situación y necesidades para un manejo pesquero adecuado. Frente Marit. Sección B, 19: 199-206.
- McEachran, J.D. 1977. Reply to "sexual dimorphism in skates (Rajidae)". Evolution, 31: 218-220.
- McEachran, J.D., D.F. Boesch and J.A. Musick. 1976. Food division within two sympatric species-pairs of skates (Pisces: Rajidae). Mar. Biol., 35: 301-317.
- McEachran, J.D. and T. Miyake. 1990. Zoogeography and bathymetry of skates (Chondrichthyes: Rajidae). In: H.L. Pratt, S.H. Grub and T. Taniuchi (eds.), Easmobranchs and Living Resources: Advances in the Biology, Ecology, Systematics and the Status of the Fisheries, pp. 305-326. NOAA Tec. Rep., **NMFS 90.**
- Menni, R.C. and M.F.W. Stehmann. 2000. Distribution, environment and biology of batoid fishes of Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil. A review. Rev. Mus. Arg. Cienc. Nat., 2: 69-109.
- Menni, R.C. and H.L. López. 1984. Distributional patterns of Ar-gentine marine fishes. *Physis, A.*, 42: 71-85.
- Menni, R.C., R.A. Ringuelet and R.H. Aramburu. 1984. Peces marinos de la Argentina y Uruguay. Hemisferio Sur, Buenos Aires.
- Nelson, J.S. 2006. Fishes of the world. 3erd. ed. by J. Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Olson, D.B., G.P. Podestá, R.H. Evans and O.B. Brown. 1988. Temporal variations in the separation of Brazil and Malvinas Currents. *Deep-Sea Res.*, 15: 1971-1990.
- Orlov, A.M. 1998. The diets and feeding habits of some deep-water benthic skates (Rajidae) in the Pacific waters Off the Northern Kuril Islands and Southeastern Kamchatka. Alsk. Fish. Res. Bull., 5: 1-17.
- Orlov, A.M. 2001. Feeding habits of some deep-benthic skates (Rajidae) in the western Bering Sea. Oceans, 2: 842-855
- Pedersen, S.A. 1995. Feeding habits of R. radiate (Raja radiate) in West Greenland waters. ICES J. Mar. Sci., 52: 43-53.

- Pinkas, L.M., S. Oliphant and I.L.K. Iverson. 1971. Food habits of albacore, bluefin tuna and bonito in Californian waters. Calif. Fish Game, 152: 1-105.
- Price, K.S. 1967. Copulatory behavior in the clear nose skate, Raja eglanteria, in Lower Chesapeake Bay. Copeia, 1967: 854-855.
- Robinson, H.J., G.M. Caillet and D.A. Ebert. 2007. Food habits of the longnose skate, Raja rhina (Jordan and Gilbert, 1880), in central California waters. Environ. Biol. Fish., 80: 165-179.
- San Martín, M.J., J.M. Braccini, L.L. Tamini, G.E. Chiaramonte and J.E. Perez. - 2007. Temporal and sexual effects in the feeding ecology of the marbled sand skate Psammobatis bergi Marini, 1932. Mar. Biol., 151: 505-513.
- Sánchez, F. and E. Mabragaña. 2002. Características biológicas de algunas rayas de la región sudpatagónica. INIDEP Inf. Téc., 48: 1-15.
- Santos, R.A. and M. Haimovici. 1997. Food and feeding of the short-fined squid *Illex argentinus* (Cephalopoda: Ommast-rephidae) off Southern Brazil. *Fish. Res.*, 33: 139-147.
- Scenna, L.B., S.B. García de la Rosa and J.M. Díaz de Astarloa. 2006. Trophic ecology of the Patagonian skate, Bathyraja macloviana, on the Argentine continental shelf. ICES J. Mar. Sci., 63: 867-874.
- Schoener, T.W. 1974. Resource partitioning in ecological communities. Science, 185: 27-39.
- Skjaeraasen, J.E. and O.A. Bergstad. 2000. Distribution and feeding ecology of Raja radiate in the northeastern North Sea and Skagerrak (Norwegian Deep). ICES J. Mar. Sci., 57: 1249-1260.
- Smale, M.J. and P.D. Cowley. 1992. The feeding ecology of skates (Batoidea: Rajidae) off the Cape south coast, South Africa. S. *Afr. J. Mar. Sci.*, 12: 823-834. Stehmann, M. – 2002. Proposal of a maturity stages scale for ovipa-
- rous and viviparous cartilaginous fishes (Pisces, Chondrichthyes). Arch. Fish. Mar. Res., 50: 23-48.
- Stevens, J.D., R. Bonfil, N.K. Dulvy and P.A. Walker. 2000. The effects of fishing on sharks, rays, and chimaeras (condrichthyans), and the implications for marine ecosystems. ICES J. Mar. Sci., 57: 476-494.
- Wetherbee, B.M. and E. Cortés. 2006. Food Consumption and Feeding Habits. In: J. C. Carrier, J. A. Musick, and M. R. Heithaus (Eds.), Biology of the sharks and their relatives, pp. 225-246. Crc Press, Boca Raton.

- Scient. ed.: W. Norbis. Received October 17, 2007. Accepted May 30, 2008.
- Published online October 21, 2008.