

1 **A bioenergetics model for estimating prey consumption by an Adélie**  
2 **penguin population in east Antarctica**

3 Darren Southwell<sup>1,2</sup>, Louise Emmerson<sup>1</sup>, Jaume Forcada<sup>3</sup>, Colin Southwell<sup>1</sup>

4 <sup>1</sup>Australian Antarctic Division, Department of the Environment, Channel Highway,  
5 Kingston, TAS, 7050, Australia

6 <sup>2</sup>Current address: School of Botany, University of Melbourne, VIC 3010, Australia

7 <sup>3</sup>British Antarctic Survey, Natural Environment Research Council, High Cross,  
8 Madingley Road, Cambridge, CB3 0ET, UK

9 \*Correspondance email: [darren\\_southwell@hotmail.com](mailto:darren_southwell@hotmail.com)

10 Running header: Prey consumption by Adélie penguins

11 KEY WORDS: Adélie penguin, bioenergetics model, prey consumption, krill, harvesting,  
12 East Antarctica

13

14 ABSTRACT: Quantifying prey consumption by top predators is a crucial component of  
15 ecosystem-based management in the Southern Ocean. In this study, we developed a  
16 bioenergetics model to estimate prey consumption by a top predator, the Adélie penguin  
17 (*Pygoscelis adeliae*). Our model predicts prey consumption throughout the breeding  
18 season and incorporates uncertainty in model parameters using Monte Carlo simulation.  
19 The model was parameterized with data obtained at Béchervaise Island, the site of a long  
20 term monitoring program in east Antarctica. We parameterized the model: 1) using 13  
21 years of penguin population data; 2) for a year in which penguins successfully reared  
22 their chicks (2001/2002), and; 3) for a year with low breeding success (1998/1999). Daily  
23 per capita energy consumption during the breeding season averaged 4269 KJ/d (95% CI  
24 4187 – 4352) and 4684 KJ/d (95% CI 4596 – 4771) for males and females respectively.  
25 Over the entire breeding season male breeders consume 470 (95% CI 461 – 479) MJ  
26 compared to 515 (506 – 525) MJ for females. In 1998/1999 and 2001/2002, total ingested  
27 energy averaged 1,741,840 MJ and 1,853,454 MJ respectively. On average, the  
28 Béchervaise Island population of 1,836 breeding pairs consumes 16,447 MJ per day  
29 which amounts to 1,809,224 MJ during the breeding season. On the basis of variable  
30 breeding success and the proportion of krill and fish in their diet, we estimate that this  
31 population consumes 78 - 406 T of krill and 4 - 46 T of fish each breeding season. Our  
32 results demonstrate clear periods of peak consumption associated with the penguins  
33 breeding cycle.

34

## 35 INTRODUCTION

36 Increased exploitation of fisheries around the world has focused attention on the  
37 management of ecosystems rather than single target species (Pikitch et al. 2004).  
38 Managing fisheries under an ecosystem-based approach aims to ensure the sustainability  
39 of not only target species, but also the higher trophic level predators that are dependent  
40 on harvested prey (Brodziak & Link 2002, Garcia et al. 2003). To achieve ecosystem-  
41 based management, information on both the predator and prey is required; the abundance,  
42 spatial distribution, diet and behavioral interactions between predators and prey  
43 contributes to how prey harvesting might affect predators (Croxall & Lishman 1987). Of  
44 particular importance to ecosystem-based management is quantifying the amount and rate  
45 of prey consumption by predators. Such estimates can be used to develop ecosystem  
46 models, can help set catch limits for harvested species, and can assist the development of  
47 multi-species management approaches (Daan & Sissenwine 1991, Pauly et al. 2003).

48 Southern Ocean ecosystems contain species that are important prey items for many top  
49 predators, but are also the focus of major fisheries. To reduce potential negative effects of  
50 harvesting, fisheries operating in the Southern Ocean are regulated by the Convention for  
51 the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Resources (CCAMLR) (Agnew 1997). CCAMLR  
52 has adopted an ecosystem-based approach to management, whereby catch limits are set to  
53 account for the propagating effects that harvesting might have on dependent predators.  
54 (Edwards & Heap 1981). CCAMLR's approach follows the precautionary principle:  
55 harvesting decisions need to take into account predator-prey interactions and to account  
56 for uncertainty in the system being managed. Integral to this aim is an understanding of  
57 the diet of indicator species in the Southern Ocean, the overlap of their distribution with  
58 prey and the rate of prey consumption across space and time (Duffy & Schneider 1994).

59 Dietary and energetic studies of top predators in the Southern Ocean have been  
60 conducted using techniques such as double-labeled water (Nagy & Obst 1992, Chappell  
61 et al. 1993a, Culik 1994, Ballance et al. 2009), by measuring stomach contents (Wilson et  
62 al. 1992, Ancel et al. 1997), recording foraging behavior (Wilson et al. 1992, Davis et al.  
63 1999, Takahashi et al. 2004, Sala et al. 2012) and measuring changes in stomach  
64 temperature. Each of these techniques determines an aspect of prey consumption which

65 can be synthesized with bioenergetic models. Bioenergetic models are a useful tool for  
66 estimating prey consumption by free-ranging predators where data are available for  
67 parameterization and because direct observations are difficult. They are essentially mass-  
68 balance equations in which ingested energy is partitioned into various compartments such  
69 as growth, metabolism and waste products. Bioenergetic models have been developed for  
70 many top predators in the Southern Ocean including numerous species of penguin  
71 (Brown 1989, Chappell et al. 1993b, Culik 1994, Croll & Tershy 1998, Salihoglu et al.  
72 2001, Green et al. 2007), seals (Boyd 2002, Forcada et al. 2012) and whales (Reilly et al.  
73 2004).

74 While the bioenergetics models that exist in the literature provide useful insight into prey  
75 consumption by top predators in the Southern Ocean, they tend to ignore: 1) the timing  
76 and rate of prey consumption within stages of the breeding program (i.e. day-to-day prey  
77 consumption), and; 2) parameter uncertainty (Boyd 2002, Forcada et al. 2012).  
78 Furthermore, bioenergetic models have tended to focus on individuals or populations in  
79 regions where fisheries are currently concentrated. To our knowledge, few estimates of  
80 prey consumption exist outside of the Antarctic Peninsula or Scotia Sea regions (Woehler  
81 1997) where diet, behavior and phenology of populations, and hence predator-prey  
82 interactions, may be different (Clarke 2001, Ainley 2002). Estimating prey consumption  
83 by top predators at different locations is important because regional differences in  
84 behavior, such as foraging times and trip duration, will likely influence the amount,  
85 timing and rate of prey consumption. In some locations, a lack of rigorous predator-prey  
86 consumption estimation has hampered the development of ecosystem models and limited  
87 the scientific basis for taking account of predators' needs in catch limits (Croxall &  
88 Nicol 2004).

89 Adélie penguins are an important top predator in the Southern Ocean due to their wide  
90 distribution and high abundance (Croxall & Lishman 1987). As central-place foragers,  
91 they are particularly sensitive to prey availability during the breeding season because  
92 breeders must repeatedly return to colonies to feed their offspring, vastly reducing the  
93 area in which they can forage. Adélie penguins consume predominantly fish and krill,  
94 both of which are the focus of major fisheries in the Southern Ocean (Constable et al.

95 2000). The proportion of this prey in the diet of this species is highly variable across  
96 space and time (Ainley 2002). Populations in the Scotia Sea and along the Antarctic  
97 Peninsula feed almost exclusively on krill (Coria et al. 1995, Lynnes et al. 2004), while  
98 those in the Ross Sea and east Antarctica prefer a mixed diet of fish and krill (Watanuki  
99 et al. 1997, Ainley et al. 2003, Tierney et al. 2009, Salliey et al. 2013). Estimating the  
100 amount and timing of prey consumption by Adélie penguins is crucial to ecosystem  
101 management in the Southern Ocean.

102 We developed a bioenergetics model to estimate daily prey consumption by a population  
103 of breeding Adélie penguins in east Antarctica. Our model features three developments  
104 that offer improved estimation of prey consumption by Adélie penguins by: 1) estimating  
105 daily prey consumption, thus allowing the identification of periods of peak demand by  
106 Adélie penguins within a breeding season; 2) incorporating uncertainty in model  
107 parameters to prey consumption estimates, thus providing a scientific basis for  
108 implementing CCAMLR's precautionary principle; and 3) parameterizing the model  
109 where possible with data obtained from a long-term monitoring site in east Antarctica,  
110 thus ensuring estimates that are relevant to east Antarctic ecosystems. We estimate upper  
111 and lower bounds in prey consumption across breeding seasons from long term  
112 monitoring data at Béchervaise Island and fit our model to two specific years of data to  
113 compare prey consumption between successful and unsuccessful breeding seasons.  
114 Quantifying prey consumption by Adélie penguins in east Antarctica will lead to  
115 improved predator-prey and ecosystem models, particularly during the breeding season in  
116 waters adjacent to breeding colonies.

## 117 **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### 118 **Study species**

119 The Adélie penguin breeds along most of the Antarctic coastline on ice-free land and  
120 offshore islands. At Béchervaise Island, males arrive at colonies in late October, establish  
121 territories and build nests (Emmerson et al. 2011). Females arrive shortly after to initiate  
122 courtship and mating before laying a single clutch of usually 1-2 eggs (average 22<sup>nd</sup>  
123 November). After egg lay, males incubate the eggs while females depart nests to forage

124 in waters surrounding the colonies. After several weeks females return to the colony to  
125 switch incubation duties with the males (9<sup>th</sup> December). When chicks hatch in late  
126 December, they require regular feeding and constant parental care by one or other of the  
127 parents while small (guard phase) until they can be left unguarded during the crèche  
128 phase (16<sup>th</sup> January) (Clarke et al. 2006). Towards the end of the breeding season at the  
129 beginning of February, adults stop feeding chicks and forage in preparation for their  
130 annual molt. Not long after this, chicks leave the colonies for their winter migration  
131 (fledging). Thus, the breeding cycle of Adélie penguins can be divided into six phases:  
132 courtship/mating, incubation, chick guard, chick crèche, pre-molt and molt.

133 The breeding cycle of Adélie penguins is divided into periods of fasting and foraging  
134 during which their body mass fluctuates markedly (Emmerson et al. 2003). During  
135 fasting, breeding penguins rely on body reserves to satisfy energetic demands. When  
136 foraging, Adélie penguins not only ingest energy (krill and fish) to satisfy activity energy  
137 requirements, but they also ingest sufficient energy to sustain themselves during the next  
138 fasting period. Adélie penguins lose body mass from the time they arrive at the breeding  
139 colonies, throughout the incubation shift, during their nest attendance, during the guard  
140 period, in molt, and in some years during the crèche period, depending on prey  
141 availability and sea-ice conditions (Clarke et al 2006). Considerable body mass is gained  
142 during the pre-breeding season hyperphagia prior to their arrival at the colonies and  
143 during the pre-molt foraging period so that body reserves can maintain their energy  
144 requirements during the long fasts of incubation and molt respectively. This cycle of  
145 fasting and foraging and the associated changes in body mass forms the basis of our  
146 model.

#### 147 **A bioenergetics model**

148 We developed a bioenergetics model for estimating daily prey consumption for male and  
149 female breeding Adélie penguins. Our model accounts for periods of fasting and foraging  
150 within their breeding cycle and has two sub-models: 1) energy balance of breeding adults,  
151 and; 2) prey consumption by an entire breeding population. We describe each of these  
152 sub-models in detail below.

153 **Sub-model 1: Energy balance for breeding adults**

154 Our model estimates the energy balance of a male and female breeder for each day of the  
155 breeding season by subtracting energetic costs (activity energy requirements and energy  
156 delivered to chicks) from ingested energy. Assuming that all food captured was retained  
157 by adults or fed to chicks, the daily energy balance of a male and female adult  $EB_d$  was  
158 given by:

$$EB_d = IE_d - EA_d - EC_d \quad (1)$$

159 where  $IE_d$  is daily ingested energy,  $EA_d$  is daily activity energy requirements and  $EC_d$  is  
160 daily energy delivered to chicks. The three components of equation 1 are described  
161 below.

162 **Ingested energy  $IE_d$**

163 For any day of the breeding cycle, we assumed that the amount of energy ingested by a  
164 breeder  $IE_d$  was a function of the probability of a breeder being at-sea and the rate at  
165 which energy is consumed at-sea, scaled by the assimilation efficiency. We scaled energy  
166 consumption by assimilation efficiency because not all food that is eaten by penguins is  
167 available for metabolism due to inefficiencies in the digestive process. It was calculated  
168 as:

$$IE_d = F_d \times FS \times AE_{adult} \quad (2)$$

169 where  $F_d$  the probability of a male and female breeder being at-sea for each day of the  
170 breeding cycle, foraging success ( $FS$ ) is the rate of energy consumed when at-sea (KJ/d)  
171 and  $AE_{adult}$  is the assimilation efficiency of an adult breeder. In determining the energy  
172 ingested each day by a breeder, we model the probability of a male and female being at-  
173 sea (see supplementary material) and specify adult assimilation efficiency from the  
174 literature. We do not, however, have any information on foraging success. To overcome  
175 this problem, we convert our predictions of ingested energy to body mass, and estimate a  
176 value for foraging success so that our predictions of body mass match observations for  
177 Adélie penguins. This procedure is described below in further detail.

178 **Activity energy requirements  $EA_d$**

179 Adélie penguins incur energetic costs any day in the breeding cycle particularly when  
180 they are at-sea during activities such as swimming and diving, and walking (Nagy & Obst  
181 1992). We assumed that for any day in the breeding cycle, the energetic cost of carrying  
182 out activities depended on body mass, basal metabolic rate and the energetic cost of  
183 activities. Daily activity energy requirements  $EA_d$  of a male and female breeder was  
184 calculated as:

$$EA_d = BMR \times E_d \times BM_{d-1} \quad (3)$$

185 where  $BMR$  is the basal metabolic rate for an adult,  $E_d$  is the daily energy requirement for  
186 a breeder (expressed as multiples of  $BMR$ ), and  $BM_{d-1}$  is body mass of a breeder on the  
187 previous day. We grouped modes of locomotion during foraging and assumed that a  
188 breeder engages into two activities: on-nests and at-sea. We calculated  $E_d$  as:

$$E_d = F_d \times E_{sea} + (1 - F_d) \times E_{nest} \quad (4)$$

189 where  $F_d$  is the probability of being at-sea,  $E_{sea}$  is the energy required for activities such  
190 as foraging, swimming and resting on ice while at-sea (KJ/d) expressed as a multiple of  
191  $BMR$  and  $E_{nest}$  is the energy required while on a nest (KJ/d) expressed as a multiple of  
192  $BMR$ . When the sea-ice is extensive near the breeding colony, this term also includes the  
193 energetic requirements for traversing the sea-ice to reach the open water for foraging.

194 **Energy delivered to a chick  $EC_d$**

195 Breeding Adélie penguins consume energy to not only satisfy their own energetic costs,  
196 but also to provision chicks. For Adélie penguins, this is relevant from the time the chicks  
197 hatch in late December through to when the adults leave the colonies to prepare for molt  
198 in mid to late February. To estimate prey consumption by an adult, knowledge of the  
199 amount and rate at which energy is delivered to chicks is required. For any day in the  
200 breeding season between hatching and fledging, the amount of energy delivered to a  
201 chick  $EC_d$  by a single parent was equal to:

$$EC_d = \frac{FMR_d + GR_d \times S_d \times P \times NC}{AE_{chick}} \quad (5)$$



202 where  $FMR_d$  is the field metabolic rate of a chick,  $GR_d$  is energy required for a gain in  
203 body mass,  $S_d$  is the daily survival rate of chicks,  $P$  is the share of provisioning duty by  
204 parents,  $NC$  is the number of chicks per breeding pair and  $AE_{chick}$  is the assimilation  
205 efficiency of a chick. We assumed the daily survival rate of a chick  $S_d$  decreased linearly  
206 from one at hatching to 0.37 at fledging. This is based on chick survival data collected at  
207 Béchervaise Island: on average 1.88 chicks hatch per nest and of these 0.71 survive to  
208 fledge (Clarke et al. 2003, Emmerson et al. 2003). This meant that prey consumption by  
209 the chick population was influenced by two factors: 1) the rate at which chicks increased  
210 body mass, and; 2) the rate at which the chick population declined throughout the  
211 breeding season.

212 Field metabolic rate for chicks was scaled linearly with body mass (Culik et al. 1990,  
213 Janes 1997) according to the equation  $FMR_d = 910 \times BM_d$  (Janes 1997). Chick body  
214 mass was modeled with a logistic growth curve, given a mean hatching date ( $H$ ), hatching  
215 weight ( $W$ ), growth rate ( $G$ ) and fledging weight ( $F$ ). We assumed that chicks reached  
216 fledging weight after 52 days, which is the mean number of days between hatching and  
217 fledging at our study site.

218 To estimate energy required for a gain in body mass we assumed chicks had constant  
219 total body water content of 75% from hatching to fledging (Salihoglu et al. 2001),  
220 resulting in a tissue energy density of 5.325 KJ/g. Therefore, the daily energy required for  
221 chick growth  $GR_d$  was calculated from the daily increment in body mass gain multiplied  
222 by the energy density of that mass gain, given by:  $GR_d = (BM_d - BM_{d-1}) \times 5.325$ .

### 223 **Estimating Foraging success ( $FS$ )**

224 To estimate foraging success ( $FS$ ), we followed the procedure outlined by Green (2007)  
225 by adjusting  $FS$  to calibrate model predictions of body mass against body mass data  
226 obtained at Béchervaise Island. Although our model predicted daily change in energy  
227 balance, we could not measure energy balance directly to calibrate our model. We  
228 therefore calculated body mass from our predictions of energy surplus given an initial  
229 body mass at the start of the breeding season. We then repeatedly ran the model by  
230 iteratively varying foraging success  $FS$  (with other parameters held constant at their

231 mean) until we found a value of  $FS$  that minimized the squared difference between our  
 232 predictions and observations (Figure 1 a, b). Foraging success  $FS$  was allowed to vary  
 233 between males and females but was assumed to remain constant throughout the breeding  
 234 season.

235 To follow this calibration procedure, we first converted predicted daily energy balance  
 236 (Equation 1) into body mass. We assumed that Adélie penguin tissue contains 37% water,  
 237 7% protein, 54% lipid and 2% other materials, which equates to an energy equivalent of  
 238 22.7 KJ/g (Green et al. 2007). On days with an energy deficit ( $IE_d$  is less than the sum of  
 239  $EA_d$  and  $EC_d$ ), the amount of body mass lost by individuals to account for 1 KJ in energy  
 240 expended was set to 0.044 g, as was assumed by Green et al. (2007) for macaroni  
 241 penguins. Alternatively, on days when ingested energy exceeded energetic costs (a  
 242 positive energy balance), we assumed breeders increased in body mass by 0.103g for  
 243 each gram of krill consumed (Green et al. 2007).

$$BM_d = \begin{cases} BM_{d-1} + EB_{d-1} \times 0.103 & \text{if } EB_{d-1} > 0 \\ BM_{d-1} - EB_{d-1} \times 0.044 & \text{if } EB_{d-1} < 0 \\ BM_{d-1} & \text{if } EB_{d-1} = 0 \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

244 where  $BM_d$  is the body mass of an individual penguin on any given day,  $BM_{d-1}$  is body  
 245 mass of an individual penguin during the previous day and  $EB_d$  is the energy balance on  
 246 the given day calculated using Equation 1.

## 247 **Sub-model 2: Prey consumption by a breeding population**

248 We combined per capita ingested energy (Equation 2) with abundance estimates to  
 249 calculate ingested energy by an entire breeding population and the amount of prey needed  
 250 to satisfy this energetic requirement. The amount of prey required was converted to the  
 251 amount of krill and fish consumed as these are the most likely prey items to overlap with  
 252 fisheries in the east Antarctic sector and are large components of their diet in the region  
 253 (Tierney 2009). The amount of prey consumed by the population  $PC_d$  depended on  
 254 ingested energy, the proportion of each prey type in the diet and the energy content of  
 255 prey, given by:

$$PC_d = \frac{IE_d \times N \times D_{prey}}{ED_{prey}} \quad (7)$$

256 where  $IE_d$  is daily per capita ingested energy,  $N$  number of breeding pairs,  $D_{prey}$  is the  
257 proportion of a prey type in the diet and  $ED_{prey}$  is the energy density of prey. We assumed  
258 that Adélie penguins consume predominantly two types of prey; krill (*Euphausia superba*  
259 and *Euphausia crystallorophias*) and fish (Tierney et al. 2009). The proportion of fish  
260 and krill in the diet of breeders was estimated using diet composition data published by  
261 (Tierney et al. 2009) (Supplementary information). Tierney et al. (2009) measured the  
262 mean mass of krill and fish in the stomach of male and females during the guard and  
263 crèche stage over an 11 year period (1991/92 – 2002/03). We pooled these data across  
264 years and gender to calculate the mean percentage of krill and fish in the diet of breeders  
265 (Table 1). We ignored any differences in diet between sexes or differences between the  
266 energy content of prey consumed by males and females. Such differences will have a  
267 slight influence on the relative amount of krill and fish consumed by the male and female  
268 population, but not on total overall amount of energy ingested by the population.

### 269 **Model parameterization**

270 We parameterized our model using data on body mass, time spent foraging, breeding  
271 success, proportion of prey in their diet, population size and phenology (i.e. the timing of  
272 the breeding cycle) obtained from the Béchervaise Island (67°35'S; 62°49'E) long-term  
273 monitoring site approximately 2 km from Mawson station in east Antarctica. We defined  
274 breeding success as the proportion of eggs laid that hatch and survive to fledging. Adélie  
275 penguins have been monitored at Béchervaise Island since 1990. We used data collected  
276 primarily from 1990 – 2003. Where data were unavailable from this site, we used  
277 published data from other locations. Data collection methodology is described in the  
278 Supplementary material and parameter estimates and data sources are listed in Table 1.

### 279 **Simulation and sensitivity analysis**

280 We ran the model for each day of a breeding season commencing on the 1<sup>st</sup> November  
281 until the completion of molt (150 days). Simulations were run using R<sup>®</sup> 3.0.2 (R  
282 Development Core Team 2014). Initial body mass of a male and female breeder was set

283 to 5713 g and 5119 g respectively (Figure 1 a, b) which is the mean body mass of birds  
284 arriving to the island. To determine uncertainty in model predictions, our model was  
285 iterated 10,000 times by re-sampling model parameters using Monte Carlo simulation.  
286 Total prey consumption was calculated by summing  $PC_d$  across days for both male and  
287 females respectively.

288 To demonstrate three applications of our model we calibrated predicted body mass of a  
289 male and female breeder to: 1) 13 years of body mass data; 2) body mass data collected  
290 during one of the most successful years during this period in terms of chick survival  
291 (2001/02), and; 3) body mass data collected during one of the most unsuccessful years in  
292 terms of chick survival (1998/99). In the first instance, we sampled model parameters  
293 from their full ranges of inter-annual variation. However, when calibrating our model to  
294 the successful and unsuccessful breeding seasons, we set the survival rate of chicks and  
295 the proportion of krill in the diet of breeders to values observed in those years (Tierney et  
296 al. 2009). In 1998/99 the number of chicks per nest and the proportion of krill in the diet  
297 of adults were set to 0.35 and 49% respectively, while in 2001/02 these values were fixed  
298 at 1.03 and 83% respectively.

299 We tested the sensitivity of model predictions to each of the input variables. This was  
300 done by increasing and decreasing the mean (or upper and lower bounds) of each input  
301 variable by 10% while holding all other variables constant. The sensitivity of the model  
302 to input variables was then measured as the percentage change in the magnitude of total  
303 krill consumption by the Béchervaise Island population. While we chose to measure  
304 model sensitivity by comparing predictions of krill consumption, we could have just as  
305 easily conducted the sensitivity analysis by measuring changes in fish consumption.

## 306 **RESULTS**

### 307 **Energy consumption by a chick**

308 Our model estimated daily per capita prey consumption, total per capita consumption,  
309 daily prey consumption by the Béchervaise Island population and total population prey  
310 consumption by males, females and chicks (Table 2 – 4). Assuming no mortality, daily  
311 per capita ingested energy by a chick was equal to 2774 (2015 – 3533) KJ/d from

312 hatching to fledging (52 days) (Table 2). On average, this energetic demand is satisfied  
313 by 376 (114 – 651) g of krill and 36 (6 – 73) g of fish. In total a single chick ingests 144  
314 (105 – 184) MJ of energy, composed of 20 (6 – 34) kg of krill and 1.9 (0.3 – 3.8) kg of  
315 fish. If all chicks survive to fledge, the Béchervaise Island chick population requires 9581  
316 (6658 – 12699) MJ of energy per day. Assuming the diet of chicks is the same as adults,  
317 this is equivalent to 1.3 (0.4 – 2.3) T of krill and 0.13 (0.02 – 0.26) T of fish. From  
318 hatching to fledging, a population of 1400 chicks requires  $4.9 \times 10^5$  ( $3.4 \times 10^5$  –  $6.6 \times$   
319  $10^5$ ) MJ of energy, which on average is satisfied by 68 (20 – 119) T of krill and 7 (1 – 13)  
320 T of fish.

### 321 **Energy delivered to chicks by a breeding pair**

322 Assuming a constant decrease in the survival rate of chicks, a breeding pair delivers 3627  
323 (2632 – 4636) KJ of energy to a two chick brood. Assuming chicks receive the same diet  
324 as adults, this is equivalent to 492 (151 – 850) g of krill and 47 (8 – 96) g of fish (Table  
325 3). A brood of chicks receive 26 (8 – 44) kg of krill and 2.5 (0.4 – 5) kg of fish from  
326 hatching to fledging (52 days), amounting to 189 (137 – 241) MJ of energy. The chick  
327 population at Béchervaise Island is delivered on average 6665 (4621 – 8862) MJ per day,  
328 comprised of 1.7 (0.5 – 3) T of krill and 0.2 (0.02 – 0.33) T of fish assuming a decrease  
329 in survival over time. During a breeding season 88 (27 – 156) T of krill and 9 (1 – 17) T  
330 of fish is delivered to a brood of chicks by breeders, amounting to a total of  $3.4 \times 10^5$  ( $2.4$   
331  $\times 10^5$  –  $4.6 \times 10^5$ ) MJ of energy.

### 332 **Energy consumption by an adult**

333 Foraging success was estimated to be 9627 KJ/d for a male and 9125 KJ/d for a female  
334 when predicted body mass was calibrated to the average of body mass observations made  
335 at Béchervaise Island (Table 4). Assuming these values, daily per capita ingested energy  
336 was equal to 4249 (4187 - 4352) KJ for a male and 4684 (4596 – 4771) for a female. To  
337 satisfy this energy requirement, approximately 579 (186 – 949) g and 635 (203 – 1039) g  
338 of krill is consumed by a male and female adult daily. A male and female consume  
339 approximately 56 (9 – 109) g and 61 (10 – 120) g of fish per day respectively. When  
340 summed over the breeding season, a male ingests 7842 (6635 – 9056) MJ of energy,

341 while a female ingests 8605 (7280 – 9941) MJ. Krill consumption totaled 1063 (337 –  
342 1762) kg for a male and 1166 (370 – 1933) kg for a female, while fish consumption over  
343 a breeding season was approximately 103 (17 – 201) kg and 113 (18 – 222) kg  
344 respectively.

#### 345 **Prey consumption by the Béchervaise Island population**

346 Daily ingested energy by the Béchervaise Island population under average conditions  
347 equaled 470 (461 – 479) MJ for males and 515 (506 – 525) MJ for females, totaling 985  
348 (971 – 999) MJ (Table 4). Total krill consumption by the population averaged 134 (43 –  
349 219) kg, of which 64 (20 – 104) kg was consumed by males and 70 (22 – 114) kg is  
350 consumed by females. Approximately 6 (1 – 12) kg of fish is consumed each day by the  
351 male population and 7 (1 – 13) kg by the female population, totaling 13 (2 – 25) kg.  
352 During an average breeding season, the Béchervaise Island population ingest a total of  
353 1809224 (1531502 – 2088701) MJ of energy; 862649 (729902 – 996193) MJ is ingested  
354 by males and 946574 (800774 – 1093475) MJ is ingested by females (Figure 3a).  
355 Approximately 117 (37 – 194) T of krill and 11 (2 – 22) T of fish is consumed by males.  
356 Females consume 128 (41 – 213) T of krill and 12 (2 – 24) T of fish. Total krill and fish  
357 consumption by the male and female population is 245 (78 – 406) T and 24 (4 – 46) T  
358 respectively (Figure 3b).

359 Our model predicted the day-to-day demand in prey consumption by the Béchervaise  
360 Island population. Not surprisingly, prey consumption by male and female breeders  
361 mirrored the probability of being on or off nests. Prey consumption by the population  
362 increases shortly after egg laying, when females undertake their first foraging trip (Figure  
363 3a), remaining relatively constant while male and females swap incubation duties. As  
364 chicks become more independent during the crèche stage, adults spend less time on their  
365 nest and more time at-sea. A peak in prey consumption occurs between fledging and molt  
366 as breeders must consume enough prey to gain considerable body mass (Figure 3a).

#### 367 **Prey consumption in 1998/99 and 2001/02**

368 Per capita ingested energy by a male and female in 1998/99 was 4154 (4076 – 4232) KJ  
369 and 4462 (4377 – 4545) KJ respectively. Of this, approximately 472 (413 – 540) g of krill

370 was consumed by a male and 507 (444 – 580) g by a female per day. Fish consumption  
371 was estimated at 67 (62 – 72) g for males and 72 (67 – 77) g for females. In 1998/99  
372 approximately of 1,741,840 (1,476,368 – 2,002,963) MJ of energy was consumed by the  
373 Béchervaise Island population, which is slightly lower than average energy consumption  
374 averaged over 13 years (Figure 3c). During 2001/02, when the diet of adults was 83%  
375 krill and chick survival was high, a male ingested 4369 (4284 – 4451) KJ of energy per  
376 day compared with 4802 (4711 – 4891) KJ by a female. Daily per capita krill  
377 consumption was higher than in 1998/99, with males and females consuming 840 (735 –  
378 965) and 923 (808 – 1061) g respectively, while approximately 23 (22 – 25) T of fish was  
379 consumed by males and 26 (24 – 28) T by females. The Béchervaise Island population  
380 consumed 1,853,454 (1,577,293 – 2,134,531) MJ in 2001/02, which is significantly  
381 greater than the average amount of energy ingested by this population (Figure 3c).

#### 382 **Sensitivity of krill consumption to changes in input variables**

383 Krill consumption by the Béchervaise Island breeding population was most sensitive  
384 abundance estimates, percent krill in diet, energy density of krill and fish, and adult  
385 assimilation efficiency (Table 5). In general, varying the mean of these parameters by  
386 10% changed the final estimate of population krill consumption by 6 – 11%. Not  
387 surprisingly, krill consumption by the Béchervaise Island population was relatively  
388 insensitive to the chick model as well as parameters associated with the energetic  
389 requirements of breeders at an individual level.

#### 390 **DISCUSSION**

391 Quantifying prey consumption by predators is crucial to ecosystem-based management of  
392 the Southern Ocean. We estimated daily prey consumption by Adélie penguins by  
393 calibrating a bioenergetics model to observed changes in body mass at Béchervaise Island  
394 in east Antarctica. While the energetic requirements of Adélie penguins have received  
395 considerable attention to date (Culik & Wilson 1992, Chappell et al. 1993b, Ballance et  
396 al. 2009), the majority of studies have focused on populations located on the Antarctic  
397 Peninsula and have assumed that individuals have a constant body mass throughout the  
398 breeding season, ignoring the timing and rate of prey consumption within activity phases.

399 Here, we quantify prey consumption by a breeding population in east Antarctica, where  
400 differences in phenology, diet and foraging behavior will likely influence the timing, rate  
401 and amount of prey consumed (Ainley 2002). Unlike previous studies, we account for  
402 day-to-day changes in body mass of both chicks and breeders to identify peaks in prey  
403 consumption during the breeding season.

404 Our estimates of energy consumption by breeders at Béchervaise Island are similar to  
405 values reported on the Antarctic Peninsula (Green & Gales 1990, Nagy & Obst 1992,  
406 Chappell et al. 1993b). Estimates of per capita energy consumption for Adélie penguins  
407 on the Antarctic Peninsula are highly variable, ranging from 4120 – 5761 KJ per day  
408 (Green & Gales 1990, Nagy & Obst 1992, Chappell et al. 1993b). By comparison, we  
409 estimate that males and females consume around 4210 KJ and 4520 KJ per day  
410 respectively (Table 4), which is at the lower end of published estimates. Such differences  
411 in daily per capita energy consumption are likely due to our assumptions about body  
412 mass, basal metabolic rate, activity energy requirements and the length of the breeding  
413 season. We also found a difference in the total amount of energy consumed by males and  
414 females. From the time breeders arrive at colonies to the completion of molt, energy  
415 consumption totals 463 (454 – 472) MJ for males and 496 (487 – 506) MJ for females.  
416 Differences in energy requirements between male and female Adélie penguins have been  
417 reported in other studies. Croll (1998) estimated a male and female consumes 431 MJ and  
418 423 MJ respectively during the breeding season. The difference in energy consumption  
419 between sexes is likely due to differences in the amount of time males and females forage  
420 during the breeding season. On average, females spend more time foraging than males,  
421 mainly because they undertake the first foraging trip after courtship and mating, and  
422 therefore consume more energy despite being smaller in size.

423 Although our estimates of daily per capita energy requirements are similar to values  
424 published in the literature, estimates of daily per capita krill consumption were  
425 considerably lower. We estimate that males and females consume approximately 565  
426 (179 – 925) g and 606 (192 – 992) g of krill per day respectively. Estimates of daily per  
427 capita krill consumption by Adélie penguins on the Antarctic Peninsula range from 800 –  
428 1000 g per day (Culik 1994) to 1400 – 1600 kg per day (Chappell et al. 1993b). Our



429 estimates of per capita average daily krill consumption were lower than either of the  
430 Antarctic Peninsula studies because krill Béchervaise made up on average 62% of the  
431 diet of foragers at Béchervaise Island krill, compared with the 95% used by Culik (1994)  
432 and Chappell (1993). If we assume that Adélie penguins feed exclusively on krill, daily  
433 per capita krill consumption increases to 976 (854 – 1117) g for males and 1053 (922 –  
434 1206) g for females, which is closer to the range of values reported in the studies listed  
435 above. Thus, our model suggests that on average, per capita krill consumption at  
436 Béchervaise Island can be lower compared with other locations, but importantly for this  
437 population, due to the variability in the proportion of fish and krill in their diet, can be  
438 highly variable between years.

439 Due to the high variability in the diet of breeders, chicks at Béchervaise Island consume  
440 less krill than for populations at other locations. Assuming survival to fledging, we  
441 estimated that a single chick consumes on average 18 (6 – 32) kg of krill and 1.8 (0.3 –  
442 3.6) kg of fish, amounting to 136 (98 – 174) MJ of energy between hatching and  
443 fledging. Salihoglu et al. (2001) estimate that 24.12 kg of fresh krill is delivered to chicks  
444 over 54 days. Their model was further developed by Chapman et al. (2010) to include a  
445 link between environmental conditions (such as temperature and wind speed) and chicks  
446 growth, increasing krill consumption to 27.8 kg of krill. Trivelpiece et al. (1987) also  
447 estimated a chick consumes 25 kg of krill based on stomach content analysis combined  
448 with feeding rates, while Janes (1997) estimated a chick consumes 33.6 kg. If we assume  
449 the diet of chicks is entirely krill, as was assumed in the studies listed above, our estimate  
450 of total krill consumption by a chick during the breeding season increases to 32 (22 – 41)  
451 kg. Our model suggests that energy consumed by chicks is equal to 72 – 74 % of energy  
452 ingested by an adult. Using double-labeled water to determine activity energy  
453 requirements, Chappell et al. (1993b) estimated that approximately 75 – 80% of captured  
454 prey fuels the metabolism of breeders, with the remainder allocated towards chicks, while  
455 Culik (1994) estimated that 17% of krill consumed by adults is fed to chicks.

456 The timing and amount of prey consumption by Adélie penguins can be compared with  
457 similar or related species that undertake extended periods of fasting and foraging. For  
458 example, bioenergetic models have been developed for macaroni, gentoo and chinstrap

459 penguins at various locations in the Southern Ocean. Croll & Tershy (1998) estimated  
460 that out of these species, Adélie penguins have the highest estimated individual energy  
461 requirement during the breeding season. They found that male and female Adélie  
462 penguins require 431 MJ and 423 MJ respectively, compared with 422 MJ and 423 for  
463 male and female gentoo penguins. This compares with 360 MJ and 329 MJ for male and  
464 female chinstrap penguins, which is considerably less than our estimate for Adélie  
465 penguins. Other studies suggest that macaroni penguins consume similar amounts of prey  
466 to Adélie penguins. Boyd (2002) estimated macaroni penguins consume 1.2 kg of krill  
467 per day, while Green et al. (2007) found that 111.7 kg of prey is consumed during the  
468 chick rearing period, of which 15.3% is fed to chicks. The amount of energy delivered to  
469 chicks is considerably less than what was found in this study (26 – 28%). Differences in  
470 prey consumption between species is due to differences in the length of chick rearing  
471 period, the number of chicks per breeding pair, foraging trip duration, and the metabolic  
472 requirements of adult breeders.

### 473 **Model assumptions**

474 Many sources of uncertainty may have contributed to biases in our model. Firstly, we did  
475 not include the effects of temperature and wind in our model (Chappell 1989), nor did we  
476 include the effect of thermoregulation on chick growth, which can account for about 10 -  
477 11% of assimilated energy (Chappell 1990). Secondly, most parameters were held  
478 constant over time. In some cases, model parameters will likely change throughout the  
479 breeding season. For example, foraging success *FS* may vary between phases of the  
480 foraging cycle as sea-ice conditions change. Incorporating methods that allows *FS* to vary  
481 over time would be an interesting area of further work. Thirdly, we grouped activities  
482 into two categories; on-nests and at-sea. In reality, penguins will participate in a range of  
483 other activities when off their nests, such as swimming, walking, resting and diving  
484 (Culik & Wilson 1991a, b). Including the energetic costs of these activities separately  
485 would require GPS and heart rate data to obtain detailed information on foraging  
486 activities and energetic requirements (Green 2006). While we could have developed a  
487 more detailed model to incorporate these factors, we believe our model strikes a balance  
488 between complexity and generality relevant to prey consumption estimates at a

489 population rather than individual level. Finally, our sensitivity analysis revealed that  
490 energy consumption estimates were most sensitive to abundance estimates. This finding  
491 is in agreement with other bioenergetic models (Boyd 2002). When gathering data to  
492 estimate prey consumption at the population level, it is wise to invest resources to reduce  
493 uncertainty in this parameter.

#### 494 **Model limitations**

495 Our estimates of prey consumption do not account for the energy requirements of non-  
496 breeders, other Adélie penguin colonies in the region, or other species that feed on krill in  
497 the same area. Prey consumption by fledglings after they depart the colony is not  
498 included in our model, nor is prey consumption by non-breeders or intermittent breeders.  
499 Hence, our model underestimates prey consumption by the entire Adélie penguin  
500 population at Béchervaise Island. Few prey consumption models include both breeding  
501 and non-breeding individuals because it is difficult to know the abundance and energetic  
502 requirements of individuals not constrained to forage close to colonies. Prey consumption  
503 by other species of seabirds, seals and whales that forage in the vicinity of Béchervaise  
504 Island and the offshore waters, is likely to be large (Woehler 1997). Developing multi-  
505 species bioenergetics models for all components of these predator populations in addition  
506 to breeding Adélie penguins warrants further research.

#### 507 **Management implications**

508 Although fisheries are currently concentrated in waters surrounding the Antarctic  
509 Peninsula, recent development of efficient fishing methods and a rising catch limits,  
510 increases the likelihood that fishing will resume in east Antarctica (Nicol et al. 2012). By  
511 estimating day-to-day changes in prey consumption rather than just providing total  
512 estimates over the breeding season, we can identify critical periods when prey  
513 requirements are high. Figure 3c,d shows a peak in krill and fish consumption by the  
514 Béchervaise Island breeding population towards the end of the breeding season prior to  
515 molt when breeders forage to rapidly improve body condition without the burden of  
516 feeding chicks. Similar peaks in estimated prey consumption have been reported for  
517 macaroni penguins (Boyd 2002), chinstrap penguins and gentoo penguins (Croll &

518 Tershy 1998). Our model contributes to precautionary management by quantifying the  
519 uncertainty around prey consumption estimates. A precautionary approach could be  
520 achieved by considering the upper limit of estimated prey consumption when setting  
521 catch limits as well as the timing of peaks in prey consumption.

522 Our model could be used to predict the potential impact of changes in food resource  
523 levels on Adélie penguins due to climate change or prey harvesting. We could vary key  
524 parameters such as foraging success (*FS*) to assess the potential impacts of reducing the  
525 rate of prey consumption on energy balance or body mass. However, modeling the effect  
526 of changes in food resource levels may not be simple: there will likely be complex  
527 compounding relationships between prey availability and adult behavior. For example, it  
528 is thought that adult Adélie penguins preserve their own condition at the cost of their  
529 chicks when environmental stress occurs (Tveraa 1998; Watanuki 2002; Takahashi  
530 2003). Accounting for such dependencies between prey capture rates and model  
531 parameters such as foraging trip duration, activity energy requirements and chick growth  
532 would be complex, but is an important area of further research.

533 We could also modify the model to estimate prey consumption by other Adélie penguin  
534 colonies, or by other species that experience extended periods of foraging and fasting. To  
535 run the model for other Adélie populations, the most critical data requirement is diet,  
536 abundance and nest attendance. Nest attendance data are particularly important for  
537 modeling the daily probability of individuals being at-sea. We used daily nest attendance  
538 data to model activity schedules; however we could have easily used observations  
539 collected less regularly. Ideally, data loggers would be attached to individuals to obtain  
540 detailed information on attendance and energetic expenditure (Green et al. 2007). To  
541 apply the model to other species, information would also be needed on basal metabolic  
542 rate, the energetic cost of activities, assimilation efficiency and chick growth. If  
543 information about these parameters is scarce, our method allows for plausible upper and  
544 lower bounds to be specified. If no empirical data are available, our model can be  
545 parameterized using information from similar or related species or with expert opinion.  
546 The most important data requirement, however, is observations of body mass during the  
547 breeding season to facilitate the calibration process.

548 **CONCLUSION**

549 We estimated prey consumption by Adélie penguins during the breeding season by  
550 calibrating a bioenergetics model to body mass data obtained from a long term  
551 monitoring site in East Antarctica. Day-to-day estimates of prey consumption by  
552 populations of Adélie penguins can help CCAMLR set catch limits for harvested species,  
553 which is an important component of ecosystem-based management. The greatest benefit  
554 of our model is that it estimates uncertainty in prey consumption, allowing decision-  
555 makers to adopt a precautionary approach to management. An understanding of the  
556 relationship between prey availability and predator performance is essential when using  
557 predators as indicators of marine systems.

558 *Acknowledgements.* We thank Knowles Kerry for establishing the Béchervaise Island  
559 penguin monitoring program, the Béchervaise Island field teams; Megan Tierney and  
560 Judy Clarke, who collected nest attendance and dietary data; and Luke Einoder, who  
561 provided useful ideas for the manuscript. All procedures were with approval of the  
562 Australian Antarctic Division's Animal Ethics Committee. This work was conducted  
563 under AAS projects 4086, 4087 and 4088.

564 **LITERATURE CITED**

- 565 Adams NJ, Brown CR (1990) Energetics of molt in penguins. In: Davis LS, Darby JT  
566 (eds) Penguin biology. Academic Press, San Diego
- 567 Agnew DJ (1997) The CCAMLR ecosystem monitoring programme. *Antarctic Science*  
568 9:235-242
- 569 Ainley DG (2002) *The Adelle Penguin: bellwether of climate change*, Vol. Columbia  
570 University Press, New York
- 571 Ainley DG, Ballard G, Barton KJ, Karl BJ, Rau GH, Ribic CA, Wilson PR (2003) Spatial  
572 and temporal variation of diet within a presumed metapopulation of Adelle  
573 Penguins. *Condor* 105:95-106
- 574 Ancel A, Horning M, Kooyman GL (1997) Prey ingestion revealed by oesophagus and  
575 stomach temperature recordings in cormorants. *Journal of Experimental Biology*  
576 200:149-154
- 577 Ballance LT, Ainley DG, Ballard G, Barton K (2009) An energetic correlate between  
578 colony size and foraging effort in seabirds, an example of the Adelle penguin  
579 *Pygoscelis adeliae*. *Journal of Avian Biology* 40:279-288
- 580 Boyd IL (2002) Estimating food consumption of marine predators: Antarctic fur seals and  
581 macaroni penguins. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 39:103-119

582 Brodziak J, Link J (2002) Ecosystem-based fishery management: What is it and how can  
583 we do it? *Bulletin of Marine Science* 70:589-611

584 Brown CR (1989) Energy requirements and food consumption of *Eudyptes* penguins at  
585 the Prince Edward Islands. *Antarctic Science* 1:15-21

586 Chapman EW, Hofmann EE, Patterson DL, Fraser WR (2010) The effects of variability  
587 in Antarctic krill (*Euphausia superba*) spawning behavior and sex/maturity stage  
588 distribution on Adelie penguin (*Pygoscelis adeliae*) chick growth: A modeling  
589 study. *Deep-Sea Research Part II-Topical Studies in Oceanography* 57:543-558

590 Chappell MA, Janes DN, Shoemaker VH, Bucher TL, Maloney SK (1993a) Reproductive  
591 effort in Adelie penguins. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 33:173-182

592 Chappell MA, Shoemaker VH, Janes DN, Maloney SK, Bucher TL (1993b) Energetics of  
593 foraging in breeding Adelie penguins. *Ecology* 74:2450-2461

594 Chappell MA, Souza SL (1988) Thermoregulation, gas exchange and ventilation in  
595 Adelie penguins (*Pygoscelis adeliae*). *Journal of Comparative Physiology B-*  
596 *Biochemical Systemic and Environmental Physiology* 157:783-790

597 Clarke J, Emmerson LM, Otahal P (2006) Environmental conditions and life history  
598 constraints determine foraging range in breeding Adelie penguins. *Marine*  
599 *Ecology Progress Series* 310:247-261

600 Clarke J, Emmerson LM, Townsend A, Kerry KR (2003) Demographic characteristics of  
601 the Adelie penguin population on Bechervaise Island after 12 years of study.  
602 *Ccamlr Science* 10:53-74

603 Clarke J, Manly B, Kerry K, Gardner H, Franchi E, Corsolini S, Focardi S (1998) Sex  
604 differences in Adelie penguin foraging strategies. *Polar Biology* 20:248-258

605 Clarke JR (2001) Partitioning of foraging effort in Adelie penguins provisioning chicks at  
606 Bechervaise Island, Antarctica. *Polar Biology* 24:16-20

607 Constable AJ, de la Mare WK, Agnew DJ, Everson I, Miller D (2000) Managing fisheries  
608 to conserve the Antarctic marine ecosystem: practical implementation of the  
609 Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources  
610 (CCAMLR). *Ices Journal of Marine Science* 57:778-791

611 Coria NR, Spairani H, Vivequin S, Fontana R (1995) Diet of Adelie penguins *Pygoscelis-*  
612 *adeliae* during the post hatching period at Esperanza Bay, Antarctica, 1987/88.  
613 *Polar Biology* 15:415-418

614 Croll DA, Tershy BR (1998) Penguins, fur seals, and fishing: prey requirements and  
615 potential competition in the South Shetland Islands, Antarctica. *Polar Biology*  
616 19:365-374

617 Croxall JP (1982) Energy costs of incubation and molt in petrels and penguins. *Journal of*  
618 *Animal Ecology* 51:177-194

619 Croxall JP, Lishman GS (1987) The food and feeding ecology of penguins. In: Croxall JP  
620 (ed) *Seabirds: feeding ecology and role in marine ecosystems*. Cambridge  
621 University Press, Cambridge, England

622 Croxall JP, Nicol S (2004) Management of Southern Ocean fisheries: global forces and  
623 future sustainability. *Antarctic Science* 16:569-584

624 Culik B (1994) Energetic costs of raising *Pygoscelid* penguin chicks. *Polar Biology*  
625 14:205-210

- 626 Culik B, Wilson RP (1991a) Energetics of underwater swimming in Adelie penguins  
627 (*Pygoscelis adeliae*). Journal of Comparative Physiology B-Biochemical  
628 Systemic and Environmental Physiology 161:285-291
- 629 Culik B, Wilson RP (1991b) Swimming energetics and performance of instrumented  
630 Adelie penguins (*Pygoscelis adeliae*). Journal of Experimental Biology 158:355-  
631 368
- 632 Culik B, Woakes AJ, Adelung D, Wilson RP, Coria NR, Spairani HJ (1990) Energy  
633 requirements of Adelie penguin (*Pygoscelis adeliae*) chicks. Journal of  
634 Comparative Physiology B-Biochemical Systemic and Environmental Physiology  
635 160:61-70
- 636 Culik BM, Wilson RP (1992) Field metabolic rates of instrumented Adelie penguins  
637 using double-labelled water. Journal of Comparative Physiology B-Biochemical  
638 Systemic and Environmental Physiology 162:567-573
- 639 Daan N, Sissenwine MP Multispecies models relevant to management of living  
640 resources. In: Proc ICES Marine Science Symposia
- 641 Davis RW, Croxall JP, Oconnell MJ (1989) The reproductive energetics of gentoo  
642 (*Pygoscelis papua*) and macaroni (*Eudyptes chrysolophus*) penguins at South  
643 Georgia. Journal of Animal Ecology 58:59-74
- 644 Davis RW, Fuiman LA, Williams TM, Collier SO, Hagey WP, Kanatous SB, Kohin S,  
645 Horning M (1999) Hunting behavior of a marine mammal beneath the Antarctic  
646 fast ice. Science 283:993-996
- 647 Duffy DC, Schneider DC (1994) Seabird-fishery interactions: a manager's guide. In:  
648 Nettleship DN, Buger J, Gochfeld M (eds) Seabirds on islands. Birdlife  
649 Conservation , Birdlife International, Cambridge
- 650 Edwards DM, Heap JA (1981) Convention on the conservation of Antarctic marine living  
651 resources: a commentary. Polar Record 20:353-362
- 652 Emmerson L, Pike R, Southwell C (2011) Reproductive consequences of environment-  
653 driven variation in Adelie penguin breeding phenology. Marine Ecology Progress  
654 Series 440:203-216
- 655 Emmerson L, Southwell C (2011) Adelie penguin survival: age structure, temporal  
656 variability and environmental influences. Oecologia 167:951-965
- 657 Emmerson LM, Clarke J, Kerry KR, Southwell C (2003) Temporal variability and the  
658 interrelationships between CEMP parameters collected on Adelie penguins at  
659 Bechervaise Island. Ccamlr Science 10:75-90
- 660 Forcada J, Trathan PN, Boveng PL, Boyd IL, Burns JM, Costa DP, Fedak M, Rogers TL,  
661 Southwell CJ (2012) Responses of Antarctic pack-ice seals to environmental  
662 change and increasing krill fishing. Biological Conservation 149:40-50
- 663 Garcia SM, Zerbi A, Aliaume C, Do Chi T, Lasserre G (2003) The ecosystem approach  
664 to fisheries. Issues, terminology, principles, institutional foundations,  
665 implementation and outlook. In: FAO Fisheries Technical Paper 443, FAO, Rome
- 666 Green B, Gales RP (1990) Water, sodium and energy turnover in free-living penguins. In:  
667 Davis LS, Darby JT (eds) Penguin biology. Academic Press, San Diego,  
668 California
- 669 Green JA, Boyd IL, Woakes AJ, Green CJ, Butler PJ (2007) Feeding, fasting and  
670 foraging success during chick rearing in macaroni penguins. Marine Ecology  
671 Progress Series 346:299-312

672 Hastie T, Tibshirani R (1990) Generalized additive models, Vol. Chapman and Hall,  
673 London

674 Irvine LG, Clarke JR, Kerry KR (2000) Low breeding success of the Adelie penguin at  
675 Bechervaise Island in the 1998/99 season. *Ccamlr Science* 7:151-167

676 Janes DN (1997) Energetics, growth, and body composition of Adelie penguin chicks,  
677 *Pygoscelis adeliae*. *Physiological Zoology* 70:237-243

678 Kerry KR, Clarke JR, Else GD (1993) The use of an automated weighing and recording  
679 system for the study of the biology of Adelie penguins (*Pygoscelis adeliae*)  
680 Proceedings of the NIRP Symposium on Polar Biology 6

681 Kooyman GL, Gentry RL, Bergman WP, Hammel HT (1976) Heat loss in penguins  
682 during immersion and compression. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology*  
683 54A:75-80

684 Lea MA, Nichols PD, Wilson G (2002) Fatty acid composition of lipid-rich myctophids  
685 and mackerel icefish (*Champsocephalus gunnari*) - Southern ocean food-web  
686 implications. *Polar Biology* 25:843-854

687 Leresche RE, Boyd JC (1969) Response to acute hypothermia in Adelie penguin chicks.  
688 *Communications in behavioral biology* 4:85-89

689 Lynnes AS, Reid K, Croxall JP (2004) Diet and reproductive success of Adelie and  
690 chinstrap penguins: linking response of predators to prey population dynamics.  
691 *Polar Biology* 27:544-554

692 Nagy KA, Obst BS (1992) Food and energy requirements of Adelie penguins (*Pygoscelis*  
693 *adeliae*) on the Antarctic Peninsula. *Physiological Zoology* 65:1271-1284

694 Nicol S, Foster J, Kawaguchi S (2012) The fishery for Antarctic krill - recent  
695 developments. *Fish and Fisheries* 13:30-40

696 Pauly D, Alder J, Bennett E, Christensen V, Tyedmers P, Watson R (2003) The future for  
697 fisheries. *Science* 302:1359-1361

698 Penney RL (1967) Molt in the Adelie penguin. *The Auk* 84:61-71

699 Pikitch EK, Santora C, Babcock EA, Bakun A, Bonfil R, Conover DO, Dayton P,  
700 Doukakis P, Fluharty D, Heneman B, Houde ED, Link J, Livingston PA, Mangel  
701 M, McAllister MK, Pope J, Sainsbury KJ (2004) Ecosystem-based fishery  
702 management. *Science* 305:346-347

703 Pinshow B, Fedak MA, Schmidt Nielsen K (1977) Terrestrial locomotion - it costs more to  
704 waddle. *Science* 195:592-594

705 R Development Core Team (2014) R: A Language and Environment For Statistical  
706 Computing. In. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria

707 Reilly S, Hedley S, Borberg J, Hewitt R, Thiele D, Watkins J, Naganobu M (2004)  
708 Biomass and energy transfer to baleen whales in the South Atlantic sector of the  
709 Southern Ocean. *Deep-Sea Research Part II-Topical Studies in Oceanography*  
710 51:1397-1409

711 Ricklefs RE, Matthew KK (1983) Rates of oxygen consumption in 4 species of seabird at  
712 Palmer station, Antarctic Peninsula. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology a-*  
713 *Physiology* 74:885-888

714 Sailley SF, Ducklow HW, Moeller HV, Fraser WR, Schofield OM, Steinberg DK, Garzio  
715 LM, Doney SC (2013) Carbon fluxes and pelagic ecosystem dynamics near two  
716 western Antarctic Peninsula Adelie penguin colonies: an inverse model approach.  
717 *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 492:253-272



718 Sala JE, Wilson RP, Quintana F (2012) How Much Is Too Much? Assessment of Prey  
719 Consumption by Magellanic Penguins in Patagonian Colonies. Plos One 7  
720 Salihoglu B, Fraser WR, Hofmann EE (2001) Factors affecting fledging weight of Adelie  
721 penguin (*Pygoscelis adeliae*) chicks: a modeling study. Polar Biology 24:328-337  
722 Takahashi A, Sato K, Naito Y, Dunn MJ, Trathan PN, Croxall JP (2004) Penguin-  
723 mounted cameras glimpse underwater group behaviour. Proceedings of the Royal  
724 Society B-Biological Sciences 271:S281-S282  
725 Tierney M, Emmerson L, Hindell M (2009) Temporal variation in Adelie penguin diet at  
726 Bechervaise Island, east Antarctica and its relationship to reproductive  
727 performance. Marine Biology 156:1633-1645  
728 Tierney M, Hindell MA, Goldsworthy S (2002) Energy content of mesopelagic fish from  
729 Macquarie Island. Antarctic Science 14:225-230  
730 Trivelpiece WZ, Trivelpiece SG, Volkman NJ (1987) Ecological segregation of Adelie,  
731 Gentoo and Chinstrap penguins at King George Island, Antarctica. Ecology  
732 68:351-361  
733 Van de Putte A, Flores H, Volckaert F, van Franeker JA (2006) Energy content of  
734 Antarctic mesopelagic fishes: Implications for the marine food web. Polar  
735 Biology 29:1045-1051  
736 Watanuki Y, Kato A, Naito Y, Robertson G, Robinson S (1997) Diving and foraging  
737 behaviour of Adelie penguins in areas with and without fast sea ice. Polar Biology  
738 17:296-304  
739 Wilson RP, Cooper J, Plotz J (1992) Can we determine when marine endotherms feed - a  
740 case study with seabirds. Journal of Experimental Biology 167:267-275  
741 Woehler EJ (1997) Seabird abundance, biomass and prey consumption within Prydz Bay,  
742 Antarctica, 1980/1981-1992/1993. Polar Biology 17:371-383  
743  
744

Table 1: Parameters of the bioenergetics model used to estimate prey consumption by breeding Adélie penguins at Béchervaise Island

Parameter	Description	Value	References
$FS$	Foraging success	Males 10187; Females 9542	This study
$AE_{Adult}$	Assimilation efficiency	Norm(0.729, 0.067)	(Green et al. 2007)
$F_d$	Daily probability off-nest	Supplementary material	Unpublished data
$BMR$	Basal metabolic rate	Norm(275, 29)	(Leresche & Boyd 1969, Kooyman et al. 1976, Pinshow et al. 1977, Ricklefs & Matthew 1983, Chappell & Souza 1988, Nagy & Obst 1992, Chappell et al. 1993a)
$BM_d$	Daily body mass	See Figure 2	Supplementary material; this study
$E_{Nest}$	On-nest energy requirements	Uni(1.3 – 2) x BMR	(Chappell et al. 1993a) (Nagy & Obst 1992) (Green & Gales 1990) (Nagy & Obst 1992) (Croxall 1982, Adams & Brown 1990)
$E_{Sea}$	At-sea energy requirements	Uni(4.7 – 5) x BMR	(Chappell et al. 1993a) (Nagy & Obst 1992) (Green & Gales 1990) (Nagy & Obst 1992) (Croxall 1982, Adams & Brown 1990)
$FMR_d$	Chick activity energy requirements	910 (KJ/d/kg) * BM (kg)	(Culik et al. 1990, Janes 1997, Chapman et al. 2010)
$W$	Chick hatch weight	90 g	(Salihoglu et al. 2001)
$F$	Chick fledging weight	Norm(3432, 574)	(Irvine et al. 2000)
$G$	Chick growth rate	Uni(0.146 – 0.148)	(Trivelpiece et al. 1987, Janes 1997)
$EG_{Chick}$	Chick energy density equivalent	5.325 KJ/g	(Salihoglu et al. 2001)
$AE_{Chick}$	Chicks assimilation efficiency	Uni(0.75-0.8)	(Davis et al. 1989, Salihoglu et al. 2001)
$S_d$	Daily chick survival rate	Norm(0.71, 0.05) per breeding pair	(Clarke et al. 2003, Emmerson et al. 2003)
$P$	Parental provisioning duties	Norm (0.5, 0.05)	(Clarke et al. 2003, Emmerson et al. 2003)
$H$	Hatch date	25 <sup>th</sup> Dec	(Emmerson et al. 2011)
$NC$	Number of chicks per breeding pair	Norm (1.88, 0.05)	(Culik 1994)
$ED_{Krill}$	Energy density of krill (dry)	Uni(3.699 – 4.987 KJ/g)	(Davis et al. 1989, Nagy & Obst 1992, Salihoglu et al. 2001)
$ED_{Fish}$	Energy density of fish (dry)	Uni(29.4 – 34.3 KJ/g)	(Lea et al. 2002, Tierney et al. 2002, Van de Putte et al. 2006)
$D_{Krill}$	Proportion of krill in diet	Norm(0.62, 27)	(Tierney et al. 2009)
$N$	Number of breeding pairs	Norm(1836, 130)	(Clarke et al. 2003, Emmerson et al. 2003)

Table 2: Results from the chick bioenergetics model assuming no mortality. Values in brackets represent 95% confidence intervals

<b>Daily per capita</b>	
Ingested energy (KJ)	2774 (2015 – 3533)
Krill consumption (g)	376 (114 – 651)
Fish consumption (g)	36 (6 – 73)
<b>Total per capita</b>	
Ingested energy (MJ)	144 (105 – 184)
Krill consumption (kg)	20 (6 – 34)
Fish consumption (g)	1.9 (0.3 – 3.8)
<b>Daily population</b>	
Ingested energy (MJ)	9581 (6658 – 12699)
Krill consumption (T)	1.3 (0.4 – 2.3)
Fish consumption (T)	0.13 (0.02 – 0.26)
<b>Total population</b>	
Ingested energy (MJ)	498227 (346205 – 660390)
Krill consumption (T)	68 (20 – 119)
Fish consumption (T)	7 (1 – 13)

Table 3: Energy delivered to chicks by breeding pairs assuming average chick survival (0.71 chicks per nest) from hatching to fledging. Values in brackets represent 95% confidence intervals.

<b>Daily per capita</b>	
Energy delivered by parents to a brood (KJ)	3627 (2632 – 4636)
Krill delivered by parents to a brood (g)	492 (151 – 850)
Fish delivered by parents to a brood (g)	47 (8 – 96)
<b>Total per capita</b>	
Energy delivered by parents to a brood (MJ)	189 (137 – 241)
Krill delivered by parents to a brood (kg)	26 (8 – 44)
Fish delivered by parents to a brood (kg)	2.5 (0.4 – 5.0)
<b>Daily population</b>	
Energy delivered by parents to a brood (MJ)	6665 (4621 – 8862)
Krill delivered by parents to a brood (T)	1.7 (0.5 – 3)
Fish delivered by parents to a brood (T)	0.2 (0.02 – 0.33)
<b>Total population</b>	
Energy delivered by parents to a brood (MJ)	346590 (240335 – 460806)
Krill delivered by parents to a brood (T)	88 (27 – 156)
Fish delivered by parents to a brood (T)	9 (1 – 17)

Table 4: Results of the bioenergetics model for male breeders, female breeders and chicks at Béchervaise Island during the breeding season (150 days). Values in brackets represent 95% confidence intervals.

	male	female	Total (male + female)
<b>Daily per capita</b>			
FS (KJ/d)	9627	9125	18752
Energy consumption (KJ)	4269 (4187 – 4352)	4684 (4596 – 4771)	8953 (8825 – 9080)
Krill consumption (g)	579 (186 – 949)	635 (203 – 1039)	1214 (388 – 1988)
Fish consumption (g)	56 (9 – 109)	61 (10 – 120)	117 (19 – 228)
<b>Daily population</b>			
Ingested energy (MJ)	7842 (6635 – 9056)	8605 (7280 – 9941)	16447 (13922 – 18988)
Krill consumption (Kg)	1063 (337 – 1762)	1166 (370 – 1933)	2229 (706 – 3695)
Fish consumption (Kg)	103 (17 – 201)	113 (18 – 222)	215 (35 – 423)
<b>Annual per capita</b>			
Ingested energy (MJ)	470 (461 – 479)	515 (506 – 525)	985 (971 – 999)
Krill consumption (kg)	64 (20 – 104)	70 (22 – 114)	134 (43 – 219)
Fish consumption (kg)	6 (1 – 12)	7 (1 – 13)	13 (2 – 25)
<b>Annual population</b>			
Ingested energy (MJ)	862649 (729902 – 996193)	946574 (800774 – 1093475)	1809224 (1531502 - 2088701)
Krill consumption (T)	117 (37 – 194)	128 ( 41 – 213)	245 (78 – 406)
Fish consumption (T)	11 (2 – 22)	12 (2 – 24)	24 (4 – 46)

Table 5: Results of a sensitivity analysis for the bioenergetics model

Parameter	Description	% change in output after 10% increase in input	% change in output after 10% decrease in input
$F$	Chick fledging weight	-0.04	0.19
$G$	Chick growth rate	-1.59	1.40
$NC$	Number of chicks per nest	-1.65	0.04
$AE_{Chick}$	Chick assimilation efficiency	-0.69	1.33
$FMR_d$	Chick activity energy requirements	-1.30	1.70
$AE_{Adult}$	Adult assimilation efficiency	9.19	-11.49
$BMR$	Basal metabolic rate	1.26	-0.18
$ED_{Krill}$	Energy density of krill	-9.62	11.76
$ED_{Fish}$	Energy density of fish	0.50	-0.41
$D_{Krill}$	Percent diet krill	5.68	-6.23
$BM_d$	Initial male body mass	1.26	0.25
$BM_d$	Initial female body mass	-2.06	2.11
$E_{Nest}$	Energy requirements on nest	-2.21	2.73
$E_{Sea}$	Energy requirements at sea	1.32	-1.05
$N$	Number of breeding pairs	11.01	-10.90

Figure 1: Predicted body mass of a male (a), female (b) and chick (c) during the breeding season. Solid black lines represent the mean of simulations, with grey shading representing 95% confidence intervals. Solid black vertical lines in (a) and (b) are observations of body mass made at Béchervaise Island during key periods of phenology, including arrival to the colony, egg laying, egg hatching, crèche and departure from the colony. Grey dotted vertical lines indicate major phases of the breeding cycle. Body mass during molt was taken from the literature. We calibrated our model to minimize the squared difference between predictions of body mass and the mean of the observations.

Figure 2: Predicted energy balance for a male (a), female (b) and ingested energy by a chick (c) during the breeding season. Solid black lines represent the mean of 1000 simulations, grey shading is 95% confidence intervals representing inter-annual variation. The horizontal lines in (a) and (b) is zero energy balance, which occurs when ingested energy equals to energetic costs. Grey dotted vertical lines indicate major phases of the breeding cycle. Adults gain body mass when the energy balance is positive and lose body mass when it is negative.

Figure 3: a) Total daily ingested energy by the Béchervaise Island breeding colony during the breeding season. The solid black line represents total daily ingested energy by males and females combined, with grey-shaded areas area 95% confidence intervals representing inter-annual variation. The dotted line is consumption by males, the dashed line consumption by females. b) Total daily ingested energy by the Adélie penguin population at Béchervaise Island, partitioned into the average amount of krill consumed (light grey) and the average amount of fish consumed (dark grey). c) Total daily krill consumption by the Béchervaise Island population. d) Total fish daily fish consumption by the Béchervaise Island population. The solid black line represents total daily ingested energy consumption by males and females combined and averaged across years, and grey-shaded areas represent 95% confidence intervals related to inter-annual variation. The black dashed line represents krill consumption in 2001/2002. The black dotted line represents krill consumption in 1998/1999. Grey dotted vertical lines indicate major phases of the breeding cycle.

## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

**Field data collection:** Data in the energetics model from Béchervaise Island include mass changes, foraging probability, breeding success, proportion of prey types in their diet, population size and phenology. Each of these are described briefly below with reference to detailed studies if they were used for parameter estimates.

**Body mass:** Body mass of male and female breeders at key phenological dates (i.e. arrival, hatching, crèche, fledging) were extracted from an Automated Penguin Monitoring System (APMS), installed at Béchervaise Island. Values were used from across breeding seasons presented in Emmerson et al. (2003) and specifically extracted for 1998/99 and 2000/01 for this study. The APMS consists of a weighbridge, a tag detector, direction sensors and computer microprocessor and records the direction of travel, sex and body mass of tagged breeders that arrive to and from the colony (Kerry et al. 1993, Clarke et al. 1998). Data on body mass at the start and of molt was not recorded by the APMS and was taken from the literature (Penney 1967). Body mass changes are shown in Figure 2a, b.

**Foraging probability and phenology:** The probability of male and female breeders being on and off nests and the phenology of different breeding events were attained from daily nest census data. Nest censuses on up to 300 nests began from 13<sup>th</sup> November when females departed their nests after egg lay until 5<sup>th</sup> February when chicks had crèched and were no longer present on the nest and adults departed in preparation for moult. Daily records of the presence of males, females, eggs and chicks at each study nest were recorded.

To determine the probability that a male or female breeder was at-sea for each day of the breeding cycle  $F_d$  (equation 4), we fitted generalized additive models (GAMS) (Hastie & Tibshirani 1990) to nest attendance data collected at Béchervaise Island during two breeding seasons. In this dataset, the attendance of males and females was recorded at 268 nests in 1998/99 and 318 nests in 2001/02.

To determine the probability that a male or female breeder was at-sea for each day of the breeding cycle  $F_d$  within the dates of the survey, we fitted generalized additive models (GAMS) (Hastie & Tibshirani 1990) to the nest attendance data (Figure 1). Figure 1 shows the results of model fitting. The solid line represents the probability of



a female being at-sea, while the dotted line represents the probability of a male foraging at-sea. The vertical dotted lines represent the start and end of the nest attendance surveys. To extend our model to the start of November, before the start of the attendance surveys, we assumed that the probability of adults being at-sea was 0. This assumption is reasonable since breeders participate in courtship and mating activities during this period. To extend our model past the last day of nest attendance data (5<sup>th</sup> February), we assumed that males and females forage at-sea with a probability of 1 until the start of molt, which occurs on 20<sup>th</sup> February (SD = 5). Adults are then assumed to remain on land with a probability of 1.

Breeding phenology events were taken from Emmerson & Southwell (2011), except for the data for 1998/99 and 2000/01 which were calculated separately for this model.




Figure 1: The probability of a male (dashed line) and female (solid line) at-sea for each day of the breeding season. The models were developed by fitting two seasons of nest attendance data with generalized additive models (GAMS). The two vertical dashed lines represent the start and end of the survey period.

**Breeding success and population size:** Breeding success was measured as the number of chicks surviving to the time when two-thirds of the chicks have crèched (around mid-January) in relation to the number of nests occupied by breeding adults at the commencement of incubation (in early December). Population size related to the the number of occupied nests at the commencement of incubation.

**Proportion of prey type in diet:** Approximately forty stomach content samples were collected during the guard and crèche stages of the chick rearing period in each year (except 1994/95) using the water-offloading technique described in Tierney et al. (Tierney et al. 2009). Stomach samples were stored in 70% ethanol for later analysis. Each sample was drained and excess liquid gently squeezed out before being weighed. Samples were sorted and prey species identified to the lowest taxonomic level possible (Tierney et al. 2009). Generally, krill (*E. superba* and *E. crystallorophias*) were identifiable to species level (unless highly digested). The wet mass of each component of the diet including krill was weighed separately. Total proportion of krill and fish in the diet were determined across years and in the 1998/99 and 2000/01 breeding seasons separately. Penguin diet at Béchervaise Island is summarized in Tierney et al. (2009).

**Estimates of error associated with parameters:** We specified probability distributions wherever possible to account for uncertainty in model parameters using normal distributions where means and standard deviation of measurements were available, or from a uniform distribution representing the maximum and minimum of published estimates. We were able to specify probability distributions for all of the parameters in our model, with the exception of foraging success  $FS$  (equation 2).

