Accepted refereed manuscript of:

Hauville MR, Rhody N, Resley MJ, Bell JG, Main KL & Migaud H (2015) Comparative study of lipids and fatty acids in the liver, muscle, and eggs of wild and captive common snook broodstock, *Aquaculture*, 446, pp. 227-235.

DOI: 10.1016/j.aquaculture.2015.04.026

Comparative study of lipids and fatty acids in the liver, muscle, and eggs of wild and captive common snook broodstock

Marion R. Hauville [a-b,*], Nicole R. Rhody [b], Matthew J. Resley [b], J. Gordon Bell [a], Kevan L. Main [b], Hervé Migaud [a]

[a] Institute of Aquaculture, University of Stirling, Stirling, FK9 4LA, Scotland, UK

[b] Mote Marine Laboratory, Marine and Freshwater Aquaculture Research Program, 34240 Sarasota, Florida, 34240 USA

[*] Corresponding author: mrhauville@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

In this study, the lipid composition of wild and captive common snook broodstock were investigated to identify potential nutritional deficiencies and formulate suitable diets for captive stocks. Results showed captive snook incorporated significantly more lipid than their wild counterparts. However, cholesterol and arachidonic acid (ARA) levels were significantly lower compared to wild fish, which may impact steroid and prostaglandin production, reproductive behavior and gametogenesis. In eggs obtained from captive broodstock, high docosahexaenoic acid (DHA) and eicosapentaenoic acid (EPA) levels, associated with low ARA contents were found. As a result, ARA/EPA ratio in captive eggs was less than half of that in wild eggs with the potential for negative consequences on embryo and larval development. In conclusion, large differences were noticed between wild and captive broodstock that may contribute to the reproductive dysfunctions observed in captive snook broodstock (e.g. incomplete oocyte maturation, low milt production and highly variable egg and larval quality). The wild snook survey also identified the presence of hydrocarbons in the liver, which should be further studied to identify a potential impact on the reproductive performances of a vulnerable population like common snook.

Keywords: Snook, broodstock, arachidonic acid, egg quality, fatty acid, flesh, liver

INTRODUCTION

Dietary lipids and in particular polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFAs) play a critical role in the successful production of high quality gametes and eggs of marine fish (Izquierdo et al., 2001; Sargent et al., 2002). While a large proportion of dietary lipids is catabolized to fuel reproductive processes, they are also deposited into gametes, especially as yolk reserve in the oocytes (Tocher, 2003). Yolk fatty acid composition directly affects the optimal development of the embryo and yolk-sac larvae by providing docosahexaenoic acid (DHA), essential in neural and visual development, as well as eicosapentaenoic acid (EPA) and arachidonic acid (ARA) which serve as precursors of eicosanoids involved in the modulation of neural, hypothalamic, and immune functions (Bell, 2003; Kamler, 2007; Migaud et al., 2013; Tocher, 2010). ARA is a key PUFA for fish reproduction through the production of prostaglandins that stimulates ovarian and testicular steroidogenesis, final oocyte maturation, ovulation and milt production (Lister & Van Der Kraak, 2008; Norambuena et al., 2013; Sorbera et al., 2001; Wade, 1994). ARA-derived prostaglandins also act as pheromones and influence sexual behavior (Stacey & Sorensen, 2011).

Marine teleosts have lost their ability to synthesize PUFAs, thus, DHA, EPA and ARA are essential fatty acids that must be provided by the diet (Sargent et al., 1997). The low substrate specificity in fatty acid metabolism (several fatty acids are substrates for the same enzyme) explains the greater direct influence of dietary lipids on final concentrations and cellular functions compared to any other class of nutrients. As a result, the fatty acid profile from fish tissues and eggs reflects the fatty acid profile supplied through the diet (Alasalvar et al., 2002; Sargent et al., 1993; Sargent et al., 2002). The comparison of tissues and/or eggs from wild and captive fish allows the identification of potential nutritional deficiencies, which is essential for the

development of suitable broodstock diets (Migaud et al., 2013). This strategy has been successful in many species including striped trumpeter *Latris lineata* (Morehead et al., 2001), sea bass *Dicentrarchus labrax* (Alasalvar et al., 2002), white seabream *Diplodus sargus* (Cejas et al., 2003; Cejas, Almansa, Jérez, Bolaños, Samper, et al., 2004), black seabream *Spondyliosoma cantharus* (Rodriguez et al., 2004), Japanese eel *Anguilla japonica* (Oku et al., 2009), black sea bass *Centropristis striata* (Seaborn et al., 2009), highfin amberjack *Seriola rivoliana* (Saito, 2012), greater amberjack *Seriola dumerili* (Rodriguez-Barreto et al., 2012; Saito, 2012) and Senegalese sole *Solea senegalensis* (Norambuena, Estévez, et al., 2012).

The common snook *Centropomus undecimalis* is an estuarine species found in subtropical and tropical waters, around the Gulf of Mexico and along the western Atlantic coast from Cape Canaveral, Florida, down to Florianopolis, Brazil (Alvarez-Lajonchère & Tsuzuki, 2008). Snook support a valuable recreational fishery in the southeastern United States and are a popular food fish in South America and Mexico. It is a protandric hermaphrodite species with transitional fish observed up to 7 years of age (Muller & Taylor, 2006). On the east coast of Florida, the spawning season extends from April to September, with spawning events typically occurring along sandy beaches, inlets and tidal passes of estuaries (Taylor et al., 1998). Habitat loss, increased recreational fishing pressure, and environmental changes (i.e., cold kills) have contributed to a decline in common snook stocks in the Gulf of Mexico (McRae & McCawley, 2011; Muller & Taylor, 2006). Therefore, additional fishery management tools, such as stock enhancement, are being investigated to supplement local fisheries in Florida (Brennan et al., 2008). Intensive aquaculture production is also of interest to increase market availability in South America (Alvarez-Lajonchère & Tsuzuki, 2008).

Despite recent breakthroughs in the spawning of captive common snook broodstock (Ibarra-Castro et al., 2011; Neidig et al., 2000; Rhody et al., 2013; Rhody et al., 2014; Yanes-Roca et al., 2009) and advances in larval rearing protocols (Barón-Aguilar et al., 2013; Hauville, Main, et al., 2014; Hauville, Bell, et al., 2014; Ibarra-Castro et al., 2011; Rhody et al., 2010; Wittenrich et al., 2009), to date, there is still no established large scale production of this species for food or restocking. Reproductive bottlenecks of captive snook broodstock include the failure of females to ovulate without hormonal manipulation, reduced milt production in males and inconsistent supply of high quality eggs and larvae (Rhody et al., 2013; Rhody et al., 2014).

The aim of this study was to compare the lipid composition of muscle, liver and eggs from wild and common snook broodstock maintained in captivity for 3 years, to gain information on broodstock dietary requirements and improve captive spawn quality.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Captive fish and egg collection

Captive broodstock were collected in Sarasota Bay (27°20'N 82°35'W), Florida, in Fall 2009, and held indoors in a 4.6 m diameter, 25 m^3, fiberglass tank equipped with a filtration unit. Fish were fed a 50 % shrimp, 50 % herring diet (Table 2.1) at 2.5 % body weight every other day, and maintained under simulated natural conditions. In May 2012, female broodstock reproductive development was assessed by ovarian biopsy and individuals with oocytes classified in the later stages of the oogenetic cycle (e.g. Secondary Growth Stage, Full-grown Step) (Neidig et al., 2000; Grier et al., 2009; Rhody et al., 2013) were hormonally induced to spawn with gonadotropin-releasing hormone (GnRHa implants, 50 µg/Kg bodyweight, Institute of Marine and Environmental Technologies, University of Maryland, Baltimore, MD, USA). Fish

then spawned spontaneously by 32 hours post implantation. Eggs were gathered into a collector via skimming of the tank's surface. After collection, eggs were transferred to a conical tank and after 4 hours of incubation (past the blastula stage) the non-viable sinking eggs were removed and discarded (fertilization rate 64.1 ± 4.2 %). Three viable buoyant egg aliquots were then sampled and rinsed with deionized water before storage at -70°C. Eggs hatched after 16 hours of incubation at 28°C (hatching rate 82.6 ± 2.8 %). In addition, 6 males ~~with poor milt production~~ and 6 females presenting non mature oocytes, were sacrificed with an overdose of tricaine methanesulfonate (MS 222), weighed, measured, the otoliths were extracted for age determination, and flesh and liver samples were stored at -70°C. Hepatosomatic index (HSI) and gonadosomatic index (GSI) were calculated as: (liver or gonad weight (g) / body weight (g)) x100 (Table 2).

All fish were collected under a Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission Special Activity License (Contract No.10087, Permit # SAL 09-522-SR). Animals were sacrificed in accordance with United States legislation concerning the protection of animals used for experimentation. All methods were conducted in accordance with Mote Marine Laboratory's Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee approved protocols (IACUC Approval No. 12-03-KM1).

Wild fish tissue and egg collection

Wild fish were collected from two close spawning sites (Emerson Point or Rattlesnake Key) in waters around Sarasota, once each in April, June, July and August 2012. Fish were captured with a seine net and held in floating pens until processed. Fish were measured, weighed and their sex and reproductive status

assessed. At each time point, 6 sexually mature females (visual observation of mature oocytes after stripping or canulation biopsy) and 6 males (visual observation of milt expression after stripping or canulation) were sacrificed with an overdose of MS 222, placed on ice and quickly brought back to the laboratory where they were processed identically to captive fish ~~gonad, liver and total weight were recorded, the otoliths were extracted for age determination, and flesh and liver samples stored at -70°C~~. In June and August, no mature males were captured and therefore only female samples could be analyzed. In July, milt was collected from 6 males ~~using syringes~~ and stored on ice and eggs were stripped from 6 females. Eggs from 2 females were pooled and the 3 batches of eggs were fertilized in sterile seawater using a drop of milt from each male. After fertilization, eggs were rinsed and stored in sterile seawater in a bag under pure oxygen, secured in a cooler and quickly brought back to the laboratory and transferred to conical tanks to separate viable and non-viable eggs before sampling of 3 aliquots and storage as described previously. The average fertilization rate and hatching rate for the 3 batches were 78.3 ± 6.3 % and 83.1 ± 5.1 % respectively.

~~All fish were collected under a Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission Special Activity License (Contract No.10087, Permit # SAL-09-522-SR). Animals were sacrificed in accordance with United States legislation concerning the protection of animals used for experimentation. All methods were conducted in accordance with Mote Marine Laboratory's Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee approved protocols (IACUC Approval No. 12-03-KM1).~~

Proximate, fatty acid and lipid classes analyses

Proximate compositions of flesh and liver samples were determined according to standard procedures (AOAC, 2000). Prior to analysis, samples were minced and

blended to ensure homogeneity. Moisture content was determined by drying the samples to constant weight (105 °C for 24 h). Ash content was determined after 24 h in crucibles at 600 °C. Crude protein content (Nx6.25) was determined using the automated Kjeldahl method (Tecator Kjeltec Auto 1030 analyzer, Foss, Warrington, U.K). Crude lipid content was determined after extraction according to Folch et al. (1957).

Separation of lipid classes was performed by double development high-performance thin- layer chromatography using methyl acetate/ isopropanol/ chloroform/ methanol/ 0.25% aqueous KCl (25:25:25:10:9, by volume) as first development to separate polar lipids and isohexane/diethyl ether/acetic acid (85:15:1, by volume) as a secondary development to separate neutral lipids (Henderson & Tocher, 1992). Lipid classes were visualized by charring at 160°C for 20 min after spraying with 3% (w/v) aqueous cupric acetate in 8% (v/v) phosphoric acid and quantified by densitometry with a tungsten lamp at 370 nm using a CAMAG-3 TLC scanner (CAMAG, Muttenz, Switzerland) with winCATS Planar Chromatography Manager software. Identification of individual classes was confirmed by comparison and reference to retention factors of authentic standards run alongside samples.

Fatty acid composition was determined by gas-liquid chromatography after preparation of fatty acid methyl esters (FAMEs) according to Morrison and Smith (1964) . FAMEs were separated and quantified on a gas chromatograph (Shimadzu GC-2014, Shimadzu Scientific Instruments, Columbia, MD, USA) equipped with a Phenomenex ZB-WAX plus capillary column (30 m long, 0.53 mm internal diameter, 1.0 µm thickness; Phenomenex, Torrance, CA, USA) with on-column injection and flame ionization detection, using helium as carrier gas (4 mL min^{-1}) and injector and detector temperatures of 250 and 260 °C respectively. Temperature was held at 160°C

for 5 min then increased up to 220°C at 3°C per minute and maintained at this temperature for 30 minutes. FAME peaks were identified by comparison with known standards (Supelco, Inc., Bellefonte, Pennsylvania, USA).

Statistics

Statistical analysis was performed using MINITAB® version 16.0. Data were analyzed by two-way ANOVA (sex and origin for table 2 through 6, and origin and tissue in table 7) followed by a Tukey's post hoc test with 95% confidence. Non-homogenous data were arcsine square root transformed before analysis. No statistical analysis was performed on hydrocarbon data as this lipid class was not observed in all samples and more data would be required. All results are presented as means ± SEM. Only fatty acids contributing to at least 1% in one group are represented.

RESULTS

Broodstock morphometrics and proximate composition

Morphometric and lipid class composition data are presented in table 2. There was no statistical difference in age, weight and length among the groups used in this study. No difference in HSI or GSI was found between captive males and captive females. HSI from July males was the lowest (0.3±0.0) of all fish groups, though not statistically different from captive males, captive females, and July females. HSI from August females was the greatest (1.2±0.1) of all fish groups, yet not statistically different from April and June females. GSI was the lowest for captive fish (0.7±0.2), though not statistically different from wild males and females caught in April. Highest

GSI values were observed for July and August females (5.2±1.5 and 5.0±0.8 respectively), though not statistically different from June females.

In flesh samples, lipid content was significantly higher for captive females (2.2±0.5 %) compared to all the other groups (average of 0.7±0.1 %). Liver lipid content was statistically higher for captive males compared to wild males, however captive females liver lipid content was not statistically different from that of wild females. Liver protein content was significantly higher in wild June females and wild July males and females. In contrast, in these same three groups, flesh protein content was lower, though not statistically different from April males and females.

Lipid classes

Lipid class composition of flesh and liver are represented respectively in table 3 and 4. In flesh, captive females presented significantly lower total polar lipid content, and higher total neutral lipid content compared to wild females. Likewise, captive males presented lower total polar lipid content and higher total neutral lipid content compared to wild males. In addition, levels of phosphatidylcholine (PC), phosphatidylethanolamine (PE) and cholesterol (CHOL) were significantly lower, and levels of triacylglycerols (TAG) significantly higher in captive females flesh samples compared to wild females and captive males compared to wild males. Among wild males, significantly lower total polar lipid content and higher total neutral lipid content were observed in April males compared to July males. Among wild females, highest total polar lipid content and lowest total neutral lipid content were observed in July females, though not significantly different than levels in June females.

In liver, captive males presented significantly lower total polar lipid content, and higher total neutral lipid content compared to wild males. However, levels were more

variable among wild females with highest total polar lipid content observed in July females, though not significantly different from that of June and April females. July females also presented the lowest total neutral lipid content, though not significantly different from that of April females. In addition, presence of hydrocarbons was detected in wild liver samples, while no observation was made in captive liver samples and flesh samples from both wild and captive fish.

Fatty acid profiles

Fatty acid profiles and total fatty acid content of flesh and liver samples are presented in tables 5 and 6 respectively. In flesh samples, total of saturated fatty acids (SFA) and mono-unsaturated fatty acid (MUFA) were significantly higher in captive males compared to wild males and in captive females compared to April, June and July females. No significant difference in total SFA was observed among wild fish. ~~Total MUFA were not statistically different between wild males, while it was significantly higher in August females compared to the other wild female groups.~~ Levels of ARA in captive females and males were similar (5.6±0.6 % of Total Fatty Acids (TAF)) and significantly lower than that of wild fish (average of 9.2±0.9 % of TFA). ~~No significant difference was observed in ARA levels among wild males, while in wild females, ARA levels were significantly higher in July females compared to other wild females groups. There was no significant difference in EPA levels between captive and wild fish. In addition, no difference was observed among wild males and among wild females.~~ DHA levels were not different in males of both origins, while among females, a significantly lower level of DHA was observed in August females compared to July and captive females, with April and June presenting intermediate levels. ~~DHA/EPA ratio was not statistically different among males from both origins~~

~~and not significantly different among females with the exception of August females presenting a significantly lower DHA/EPA ratio than that of April and July. Captive females and wild June females presented an intermediate ratio.~~ ARA/EPA ratio was significantly lower in captive males (1.6±0.2), compared to wild males (average of 3.1±0.4). It was significantly also lower for captive females (1.6±0.1), compared to June and July females (average of 2.6±0.4) and not statistically different from April and August females. ~~Total PUFA levels were significantly lower in captive males (40.6±2.2 %), compared to April and July males (46.0±2.9 and 46.3±2.8 respectively). In females, lower total PUFA was observed in August (40.4±3.2 %) and captive females (39.7±1.4 %), compared to July females (47.4±0.7 %) and content was intermediate in April and June females.~~

In liver, no difference in total SFA was observed among males, while captive females showed levels similar to that of all other groups, except August females that showed a significantly higher total SFA. Total MUFA were significantly greater in captive males compared to wild males, while captive females presented a total MUFA level not statistically different from April, June and August females, but significantly higher that that of July females. As in flesh, liver ARA levels in captive males (4.3±1.0 % of TFA) were significantly lower than that of wild males (average of 8.6±0.9 % of TFA). ARA levels in captive females (3.3±0.8 % of TFA) were not different from that of August females, but significantly lower than that of other female groups (average of 6.1±0.9 % of TFA). ~~EPA levels in captive males were not statistically different from that of wild males, while EPA levels in captive females were significantly lower than that in June, July and August females, with April females showing an intermediate level.~~ DHA levels in captive females were not statistically different to that of captive males, however, DHA levels in wild females

(average of 12.4±2.7 % of TFA) were significantly lower than that of wild males (average of 23.3±2.5 % of TFA). DHA/EPA ratio was not statistically different among males from all groups, while it was significantly higher in captive females compared to wild females. As in flesh, ARA/EPA ratio of captive males (2.1±0.5) was significantly lower than that of wild males (3.8±0.7 and 6.4±1.2 respectively). ARA/EPA ratio in captive females was significantly lower than that of July females, but not different from that of other wild female groups. ~~Total PUFA was not significantly different among males, while only August females presented a significantly lower total PUFA compared to other female groups. In addition,~~ Wild males incorporated a significantly higher total level of PUFA (average of 43.7±2.7 % of TFA), compared to that of females from all groups (average of 29.9±3.5 % of TFA).

Overall, in both flesh and liver, between captive females and captive males, there was no significant difference in total SFA, total MUFA, total PUFA, and ARA, EPA or DHA content and resulting ratios. In flesh, among wild females and males, from the same time group (April females-April males, July females-July males), there was no significant difference in total SFA, total MUFA, total PUFA, and ARA, EPA or DHA contents and resulting ratios. However, in liver tissue, total MUFA, total PUFA and DHA contents were significantly higher in April males compared to April females and July males compared to July females, resulting in higher DHA/EPA ratios in April males compared to April females and July males compared to July females, while ARA/EPA ratios were not significantly different among April fish or among July fish.

Fatty acid profile and total fatty acid content of flesh, liver and egg samples from July females and captive females are compared in table 7. No significant differences were

observed in flesh and liver total SFA between wild and captive females, however captive eggs contained significantly lower SFA levels compared to wild eggs (25.4±0.3 and 30.6±0.6 % of TFA respectively). Total MUFA were significantly lower in captive eggs compared to wild eggs (23.3±0.3 and 29.5±0.2 % of TFA respectively), although not different between wild and captive liver tissue and significantly higher in captive flesh tissue compared to wild flesh tissue (22.7±1.2 and 17.2±0.5 % of TFA respectively). ARA contents were significantly higher in wild fish tissues and eggs compared to captive fish tissues and eggs ~~with~~ (11.4±0.7 and 5.6±0.6 % of TFA respectively in flesh, 7.4±1.1 and 3.3±0.8 % of TFA respectively in liver, and 5.4±0.3 and 3.8±0.2 % of TFA respectively in eggs). No significant differences were observed between wild and captive fish flesh and liver EPA contents; however, EPA contents were significantly lower in wild eggs than in captive eggs (2.4±0.4 and 4.2±0.2 % of TFA respectively). A similar pattern was observed in DHA incorporation with no significant difference in flesh and liver DHA content between wild and captive fish, however, DHA contents were significantly lower in wild eggs compared to captive eggs (14.5±0.2 and 27.3±0.4 % of TFA respectively). Consequently, ARA/EPA ratio in wild eggs was significantly higher than that in captive eggs (2.3±0.6 and 0.9±0.1 respectively), while there was no significant difference between DHA/EPA ratios. Total PUFA was not significantly different in wild and captive liver tissue, however, total PUFA in wild flesh tissue was significantly higher than that in captive flesh tissue (47.4±0.7 and 39.7±1.4 % of TFA respectively) and total PUFA in wild eggs was significantly lower than that in captive eggs (33.6±0.5 and 47.0±0.3 % of TFA respectively).

DISCUSSION

Results from this study highlighted numerous differences in lipids between wild and captive snook broodstock with potential consequences on reproductive success and egg quality.

Captive fish presented a significantly higher flesh lipid content compared to their wild counterparts. This is the consequence of feeding a high lipid diet combined with reduced physical activity as already reported in several other marine fish species, including white seabream (Cejas, Almansa, Jérez, Bolaños, Samper, et al., 2004; Cejas et al., 2003), black seabream (Rodriguez et al., 2004), greater amberjack (Rodriguez-Barreto et al., 2012; Saito, 2012) and Senegalese sole (Norambuena, Estévez, et al., 2012). In fish, excess energy is mainly stored as neutral lipid and more particularly as TAG (Sargent et al., 2002), explaining the high TAG content (>40%) in the flesh of captive females. In this study, despite the significantly higher lipid and TAG content of captive females, captive eggs contained a significantly lower total FA content compared to wild eggs (13 % reduction). Rodriguez-Barreto et al. (2012) made a similar observation between wild and cultured greater amberjack with cultured fish presenting higher total lipid content in flesh and liver, but lower content in gonads. The accumulation of lipids in teleost eggs is a complex process that is not yet fully understood (Hiramatsu et al., 2015). Several species-specific phospholipoglycoproteins (vitellogenins) are involved and their synthesis is controlled by a series of regulating hormones. Estrogen is believed to be the most potent steroid, stimulating the synthesis of vitellogenins by the liver. Vitellogenins are then released into the bloodstream and actively incorporated into maturing oocytes through receptor-mediated endocytosis (Hiramatsu et al., 2015; Lubzens et al., 2010; Tocher, 2003). In captive broodstock, a disruption of the endocrine reproductive axis

is commonly observed, requiring the use of hormonal therapies (injection/implant) to induce final gonad maturation and spawning (Mylonas et al., 2010; Zohar & Mylonas, 2001). This disruption has been confirmed in common snook where lower estrogen and androgen levels were measured in captive broodstock compared to wild fish (Rhody et al., 2015). Therefore, while high lipid content is observed in the flesh and liver of captive fish, low estrogen levels likely impact vitellogenesis, affecting egg final total lipid content.

Among wild fish, no clear trend of TAG utilization during the reproduction period was detected, even though lowest TAG levels in the flesh were observed in July, which is considered the peak of the snook spawning season. Wild snook keep feeding throughout the spawning season and though Almansa et al., (2001) demonstrated the use of lipid reserve during ovarian maturation of captive seabream fed during the spawning period, the wild snook diet seems to cover the nutritional needs of brooders. This would explain the lack of depletion of TAG reserves, the low flesh lipid content and low levels of perivisceral fat. Additional data would be necessary to investigate the mobilization of reserves during the spawning season. Another difference in lipid classes among wild and captive fish was noticed with regards to CHOL levels. CHOL is a simple lipid that does not contain any fatty acid and teleost fish have the ability to synthesize it (Leaver et al., 2008; Tocher, 2003). In humans, the role of ARA in CHOL regulation has been recently studied, demonstrating the regulation of reverse cholesterol transport by ARA metabolites (lipoxins) (Demetz et al., 2014; Spite, 2014). In addition, ARA lipoxygenated or epoxygenated products are involved in the expression of the steroidogenic acute regulatory (StAR) gene (Stocco et al., 2001). StAR proteins are involved in CHOL transfer from the outer to the inner mitochondrial membrane, where the first step of steroid production occurs and a

strong correlation between StAR gene tissue-specific expression and tissue capacity to produce steroids has been reported (Castillo et al., 2015). In Senegalese sole, ARA and CHOL levels in blood were correlated with dietary ARA levels (Norambuena et al., 2013). CHOL has been identified as the main precursor of sex steroid hormones in fish which play major roles in final oocyte maturation, meiosis resumption and sexual behavior (Diotel et al., 2011; Tokarz et al., 2013). Therefore, the lower levels of CHOL observed in captive fish may be a consequence of the lower ARA levels and may contribute to the reproductive dysfunction reported in captive snook (e.g. incomplete ovarian maturation, reduced milt volume as compared to wild males, and low quality eggs). In wild fish, the presence of hydrocarbons in the liver is of concern. Hydrocarbon contaminants have been found to have detrimental effect on vitellogenesis with repercussion on circulating hormones and plasma vitellogenin, estrogenic and antiestrogenic effects as well as delay in oocyte maturation (Nicolas, 1999). In vulnerable populations such as common snook, any reduction in reproductive success can seriously impact wild stock recruitment and further investigation is therefore critical. Previous research has demonstrated the existence of hydrocarbon detoxification mechanisms in fish (Lee et al., 1972) and the lack of hydrocarbons in captive fish samples suggest a successful detoxification after three years in captivity unless the contamination of wild fish occurred after the acquisition of the captive broodstock (e.g. BP Deepwater Horizon oil spill in April 2010) (Weisberg et al., 2014).

Dietary fatty acids and their cyclooxygenase and lipoxygenase metabolites are known to impact on oocyte maturation and spermatogenesis as well (Cerda et al., 1997; Sorbera et al., 2001). Lower ARA contents in captive broodstock, as observed in the present study, have also been reported in captive broodstock of white sea bream

(Cejas, Almansa, Jérez, Bolaños, Samper, et al., 2004), black sea bream (Rodriguez et al., 2004), Senegalese sole (Norambuena, Estévez, et al., 2012) and greater amberjack (Rodriguez-Barreto et al., 2012; Saito, 2012). As mentioned previously, ARA is a precursor of prostaglandins that is thought to stimulate the later stages of gametogenesis (e.g. ovulation) as well as influencing mating behavior (e.g. pheromones). ARA and EPA compete for the same enzymes involved in the production of prostaglandins (Sargent, Bell, et al., 1999). ARA forms 2-series prostaglandins, while EPA forms the less biologically active and antagonistic 3-series prostaglandins (Bell et al., 1994; Tocher et al., 1996). Therefore, in addition to absolute content, the relative proportion of each fatty acid should be taken into consideration (Izquierdo et al., 2000; Izquierdo et al., 2001; Sargent, Bell, et al., 1999). Indeed, in turbot, *Scophthalmus maximus*, changes in the dietary ARA/EPA ratio modified the proportion of prostaglandins produced (J. G. Bell et al., 1995; Bell et al., 1994). In addition, significantly higher levels of 2-series prostaglandins and lower levels of 3-series prostaglandins were measured in wild Senegalese sole compared to captive broodstock that had lower ARA content, lower ARA/EPA ratio and presented reproductive dysfunctions (Norambuena, Mackenzie, et al., 2012). Therefore, the lower ARA content and ARA/EPA ratios in captive snook broodstock may impact on prostaglandin synthesis with potential negative consequences on captive snook reproduction. In addition, in Senegalese sole, increased ARA levels and ARA/EPA ratios were correlated with increased plasma steroid levels in males (11-ketotestosterone and testosterone), but no effect was observed in females (estradiol) (Norambuena et al., 2013). Moreover, in sea bass, it was demonstrated that a diet high in n-3 fatty acids promoted female reproductive performance, while a diet with a higher level of ARA and lower n-3 content improved fertilization rate (Asturiano et

al., 2001). Therefore, dietary ARA levels and ARA/EPA ratios seem to be of particular importance in male gonad maturation and quality, and the lower values observed in the captive males in this study most likely contributed to the poor milt production (quantity and quality) reported in captivity. Among wild fish, no clear seasonal variation in flesh and liver fatty acid profiles was observed during the spawning season even though ARA content was significantly higher in July during the peak of the natural spawning season. Fuiman and Faulk (2013) studied the transfer of dietary ARA to the eggs in red drum *Sciaenops ocellatus* and demonstrated a rapid diet-egg connection, supporting the hypothesis that batch-spawners migrate to their spawning ground to take advantage of a diet promoting gonad maturation and quality. Therefore, it seems as though snook spawning ground diets are able to sustain gamete production throughout the spawning season with potentially a higher supply of ARA during the peak of the spawning season.

In addition to their impact on gonad maturation, spawning behavior and sperm quality, dietary fatty acids also influence egg quality and larval survival. Indeed, many studies demonstrated the importance of egg and yolk-sac lipid reserves for both energy and structural development of embryos and larvae from warm and temperate waters, including red drum (Vetter et al., 1983), red sea bream *Pagrus major* (Koven et al., 1989), gilthead sea bream *Sparus aurata* (Koven et al., 1989; Rønnestad et al., 1994), common dentex *Dentex dentex* (Mourente et al., 1999), white seabream (Cejas, Almansa, Jérez, Bolaños, Felipe, et al., 2004) and Atlantic Bluefin tuna *Thunnus thynnus* (Morais et al., 2011). After hatching, MUFAs are preferentially used for energy while SFAs and PUFAs are incorporated into structural phospholipids (Kamler, 2007; Sargent et al., 2002). DHA is the main fatty acid in neural and visual membranes and a deficiency has been shown to strongly impair larval development

(M. V Bell et al., 1995; Benítez-Santana et al., 2007; Neuringer et al., 1988). DHA and EPA compete in the formation of phospholipid structures with a higher biological value for DHA than EPA (Rodriguez et al., 1998; Sargent, Mcevoy, et al., 1999). Therefore, as for ARA and EPA, the DHA:EPA ratio needs to be considered in addition to absolute content. In this study, DHA and EPA levels were significantly higher in captive eggs, however DHA/EPA ratios were similar in the eggs. It is interesting to note that flesh and liver DHA and EPA levels were not different between wild and captive females. The selective transfer and accumulation of DHA and to a lesser extent EPA into fish eggs has been demonstrated and the DHA and EPA rich captive diet probably leads to this large deposition in captive eggs (Johnson, 2009; Sargent et al., 2002; Wiegand, 1996). The higher level of EPA incorporated into the eggs, combined with the lower ARA content, lead to an ARA/EPA ratio less than half that of wild eggs, leading to possible modification in eicosanoid production and subsequent pathways ~~modulation of neural transmission, hypothalamic and immune functions as well as stress resistance~~ (Bell, 2003).

Overall, the present results highlight lipid imbalances in captive broodstock, especially in ARA levels. Therefore, an ARA dietary supplementation may be of interest, with potential benefits to reproductive success and egg quality. Additional studies are required to determine the optimal level of supplementation and to achieve an adequate ARA/EPA ratio taking into account a probable rapid diet-egg transfer. In addition, lowering the dietary EPA content would most likely benefit egg quality as well. The presence of hydrocarbon in the liver of wild fish should be further investigated to identify the source and potential impact on fish reproduction. The study of spawning grounds diet would also be of interest, allowing for the monitoring

of the resource as a shift in prey availability due to changing environmental conditions could impact snook reproductive success.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Funding for this study was provided by the University of Stirling and Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (Contract No. 10087, Permit # SAL 09-522-SR). The views are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the view of these organizations. The authors would like to thank the research team at the Mote Marine Laboratory Aquaculture Park, as well as Cynthia Faulk from the Fisheries and Mariculture Laboratory at the University of Texas Marine Science Institute for her help with the fatty acid analysis, and James Dick, Matthew Sprague and Graeme McWinnie from the Institute of Aquaculture Nutrition Group at the University of Stirling for their assistance with the proximate and lipid classes analyses.

REFERENCES:

Alasalvar, C., Taylor, K.D.., Zubcov, E., Shahidi, F. & Alexis, M. (2002) Differentiation of cultured and wild sea bass (Dicentrarchus labrax): total lipid content, fatty acid and trace mineral composition. *Food Chemistry*, 79(2), pp.145–150.

Almansa, E., Martian, M. V., Cejas, J.R., Badi, P., Jerez, S. & Lorenzo, A. (2001) Lipid and fatty acid composition of female gilthead seabream during their reproductive cycle: effects of a diet lacking n-3 HUFA. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 59(2), pp.267–286.

Alvarez-Lajonchère, L. & Tsuzuki, M.Y. (2008) A review of methods for Centropomus spp. (snooks) aquaculture and recommendations for the establishment of their culture in Latin America. *Aquaculture Research*, 39(7), pp.684–700.

AOAC (2000) *Official methods of analysis*, Gaithersburg, Maryland, USA: Association of Official Analytical Chemists.

Asturiano, J.F., Sorbera, L.A., Carrillo, M., Zanuy, S., Ramos, J., Navarro, J.C. & Bromage, N. (2001) Reproductive performance in male European sea bass (Dicentrarchus labrax , L .) fed two PUFA-enriched experimental diets : a comparison with males fed a wet diet. *Aquaculture*, 194, pp.173–190.

Barón-Aguilar, C.C., Rhody, N.R., Brennan, N.P., Main, K.L., Peebles, E.B. & Muller-Karger, F.E. (2013) Influence of temperature on yolk resorption in common snook Centropomus undecimalis (Bloch, 1792) larvae. *Aquaculture Research*, p.n/a–n/a.

Bell, G. (2003) Arachidonic acid in aquaculture feeds: current status and future opportunities. *Aquaculture*, 218(1-4), pp.491–499.

Bell, J.G., Castell, J.D., Tocher, D.R., Macdonald, F.M. & Sargent, J.R. (1995) Effects of different dietary arachidonic acid : docosahexaenoic acid ratios on phospholipid fatty acid compositions and prostaglandin production in juvenile turbot (Scophthalmus maximus). *Fish physiology and biochemistry*, 14(2), pp.139–51.

Bell, J.G., Tocher, D.R. & Sargent, J.R. (1994) Effect of supplementation with 20:3(n-6), 20:4(n-6) and 20:5(n-3) on the production of prostaglandins E and F of the 1-, 2- and 3-series in turbot (Scophthalmus maximus) brain astroglial cells in primary culture. *Biochimica et biophysica acta*, 1211(3), pp.335–42.

Bell, M. V, Batty, R.S., Dick, J.R., Fretwell, K., Navarro, J.C. & Sargent, J.R. (1995) Dietary deficiency of docosahexaenoic acid impairs vision at low light intensities in juvenile herring (Clupea harengus L.). *Lipids*, 30(5), pp.443–449.

Benítez-Santana, T., Masuda, R., Juárez Carrillo, E., Ganuza, E., Valencia, Hernández-Cruz, C.M. & Izquierdo, M.S. (2007) Dietary n-3 HUFA deficiency induces a reduced visual response in gilthead seabream Sparus aurata larvae. *Aquaculture*, 264(1-4), pp.408–417.

Brennan, N.P., Walters, C.J. & Leber, K.M. (2008) Manipulations of Stocking Magnitude: Addressing Density-Dependence in a Juvenile Cohort of Common Snook (Centropomus undecimalis). *Reviews in Fisheries Science*, 16(1-3), pp.215–227.

Castillo, A.F., Orlando, U., Helfenberger, K.E., Poderoso, C. & Podesta, E.J. (2015) The role of mitochondrial fusion and StAR phosphorylation in the regulation of StAR activity and steroidogenesis. *Molecular and Cellular Endocrinology*, In press.

Cejas, J.R., Almansa, E., Jérez, S., Bolaños, A., Felipe, B. & Lorenzo, A. (2004) Changes in lipid class and fatty acid composition during development in white seabream (Diplodus sargus) eggs and larvae. *Comparative biochemistry and physiology. Part B, Biochemistry & molecular biology*, 139(2), pp.209–16.

Cejas, J.R., Almansa, E., Jérez, S., Bolaños, A., Samper, M. & Lorenzo, A. (2004) Lipid and fatty acid composition of muscle and liver from wild and captive mature female broodstocks of white seabream, Diplodus sargus. *Comparative biochemistry and physiology. Part B, Biochemistry & molecular biology*, 138(1), pp.91–102.

Cejas, J.R., Almansa, E., Villamandos, J.E., Badia, P., Bolanos, A. & Lorenzo, A. (2003) Lipid and fatty acid composition of ovaries from wild fish and ovaries and eggs from captive fish of white sea bream (Diplodus sargus). *Aquaculture*, 216(1), pp.299–313.

Cerda, J., Zanuy, S. & Carrillo, M. (1997) Evidence for dietary effects on plasma levels of sexual steroids during spermatogenesis in the sea bass. *Aquaculture International*, 5, pp.473–477.

Demetz, E. et al. (2014) Article The Arachidonic Acid Metabolome Serves as a Conserved Regulator of Cholesterol Metabolism. *Cell Metabolism*, 20(5), pp.787–798.

Diotel, N., Do Rego, J.-L., Anglade, I., Vaillant, C., Pellegrini, E., Vaudry, H. & Kah, O. (2011) The brain of teleost fish, a source, and a target of sexual steroids. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 5, pp.1–15.

Fuiman, L.A. & Faulk, C.K. (2013) Batch spawning facilitates transfer of an essential nutrient from diet to eggs in a marine fish. *Biology letters*, 9(5), p.20130593.

Grier, H.J., Uribe, M.C. & Patiño, R. (2009) The ovary, folliculogenesis, and oogenesis in teleosts. In B. Jamieson, ed. *Biology and Phylogeny of Fish (Agnatha and Osteichthyes)*. Enfield, NH: Science Publishers, pp. 25–84.

Hauville, M.R., Bell, J.G., Migaud, H. & Main, K.L. (2014) Effects of a mix of Bacillus sp . as a potential probiotic for Florida pompano , common snook and red drum larvae performances and digestive enzyme activities. *Aquaculture Nutrition*, In press(Early view available online).

Hauville, M.R., Main, K.L., Migaud, H. & Gordon Bell, J. (2014) Fatty acid utilization during the early larval stages of Florida pompano (Trachinotus carolinus) and Common snook (Centropomus undecimalis). *Aquaculture Research*, In press(Early view available online).

Henderson, R.J. & Tocher, D.R. (1992) Thin-layer chromatography. In R. J. Hamilton & S. Hamilton, eds. *Lipid Analysis: A Practical Approach*. Oxford, UK: IRL Press, pp. 65–111.

Hiramatsu, N., Todo, T., Sullivan, C. V., Schilling, J., Reading, B.J., Matsubara, T., Ryu, Y.-W., Mizuta, H., Luo, W., Nishimiya, O., Wu, M., Mushirobira, Y., Yilmaz, O. & Hara, A. (2015) Ovarian yolk formation in fishes: Molecular mechanisms underlying formation of lipid droplets and vitellogenin-derived yolk proteins. *General and Comparative Endocrinology*, pp.1–7.

Ibarra-Castro, L., Alvarez-Lajonchère, L., Rosas, C., Palomino-Albarrán, I.G., Holt, G.J. & Sanchez-Zamora, A. (2011) GnRHa-induced spawning with natural fertilization and pilot-scale juvenile mass production of common snook, Centropomus undecimalis (Bloch, 1792). *Aquaculture*, 319(3-4), pp.479–483.

Izquierdo, M.., Fernández-Palacios, H. & Tacon, a. G.. (2001) Effect of broodstock nutrition on reproductive performance of fish. *Aquaculture*, 197(1-4), pp.25–42.

Izquierdo, M.S., Socorro, J., Arantzamendi, L. & Hernández-Cruz, C.M. (2000) Recent advances in lipid nutrition in fish larvae. *Fish Physiology and Biochemistry*, 22(2), pp.97–107.

Johnson, R.B. (2009) Lipid Deposition in Oocytes of Teleost Fish During Secondary Oocyte Growth. *Reviews in Fisheries Science*, 17(1), pp.78–89.

Kamler, E. (2007) Resource allocation in yolk-feeding fish. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*, 18(2), pp.143–200.

Koven, W.M., Kissil, G.W. & Tandler, A. (1989) Lipid and n-3 requirement of Sparus aurata larvae during starvation and feeding. *Aquaculture*, 79, pp.185–191.

Leaver, M.J., Villeneuve, L.A., Obach, A., Jensen, L., Bron, J.E., Tocher, D.R. & Taggart, J.B. (2008) Functional genomics reveals increases in cholesterol biosynthetic genes and highly unsaturated fatty acid biosynthesis after dietary substitution of fish oil with vegetable oils in Atlantic salmon (Salmo salar). *BMC genomics*, 9, p.299.

Lee, R.F., Sauerheber, R. & Dobbs, G.H. (1972) Uptake, metabolism and discharge of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons by marine fish. *Marine Biology*, 17(3), pp.201–208.

Lister, A.L. & Van Der Kraak, G. (2008) An investigation into the role of prostaglandins in zebrafish oocyte maturation and ovulation. *General and comparative endocrinology*, 159(1), pp.46–57.

Lubzens, E., Young, G., Bobe, J. & Cerdà, J. (2010) Oogenesis in teleosts: how eggs are formed. *General and comparative endocrinology*, 165(3), pp.367–89.

McRae, G. & McCawley, J. (2011) *Snook cold kill report*, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission.

Migaud, H., Bell, G., Cabrita, E., McAndrew, B., Davie, A., Bobe, J., Herráez, M.P. & Carrillo, M. (2013) Gamete quality and broodstock management in temperate fish. *Reviews in Aquaculture*, 5, pp.S194–S223.

Morais, S., Mourente, G., Ortega, A., Tocher, J.A. & Tocher, D.R. (2011) Expression of fatty acyl desaturase and elongase genes, and evolution of DHA:EPA ratio during development of unfed larvae of Atlantic bluefin tuna (Thunnus thynnus L.). *Aquaculture*, 313(1), pp.129–139.

Morehead, D.. T., Hart, P.. R., Dunstan, G.. A., Brown, M. & Pankhurst, N.. W. (2001) Differences in egg quality between wild striped trumpeter (Latris lineata) and captive striped trumpeter that were fed different diets. *Aquaculture*, 192(192), pp.39–53.

Morrison, W.R. & Smith, L.M. (1964) Preparation of fatty acid methyl esters and dimethylacetals from lipids with boron fluoride--methanol. *Journal of Lipid Research*, 5(4), pp.600–608.

Mourente, G., Rodriguez, A., Grau, A. & Pastor, E. (1999) Utilization of lipids by Dentex dentex L . (Osteichthyes , Sparidae) larvae during lecitotrophia and subsequent starvation. *Fish Physiology and Biochemistry*, 21, pp.45–58.

Muller, R.G. & Taylor, R.G. (2006) *The 2005 stock assessment update of common snook, Centropomus undecimalis. Report: IHR 2006-003*, St. Petersburg, Florida.

Mylonas, C.C., Fostier, A. & Zanuy, S. (2010) Broodstock management and hormonal manipulations of fish reproduction. *General and comparative endocrinology*, 165(3), pp.516–34.

Neidig, C., Skapura, D., Grier, H.J. & Dennis, C. (2000) Techniques for Spawning Common Snook: Broodstock Handling, Oocyte Staging, and Egg Quality. *North American Journal Of Aquaculture*, 62(2), pp.103–113.

Neuringer, M., Anderson, G.J. & Connor, W.E. (1988) The essentiality of n-3 fatty acids for the development and function of the retina and brain. *Annual review of nutrition*, 8, pp.517–41.

Nicolas, J.-M. (1999) Vitellogenesis in fish and the effects of polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon contaminants. *Aquatic Toxicology*, 45(2-3), pp.77–90.

Norambuena, F., Estévez, A., Bell, G., Carazo, I., Duncan, N. & Estevez, A. (2012) Proximate and fatty acid compositions in muscle, liver and gonads of wild versus cultured broodstock of Senegalese sole (Solea senegalensis). *Aquaculture*, 356-357(null), pp.176–185.

Norambuena, F., Estévez, A., Mañanós, E., Bell, J.G., Carazo, I. & Duncan, N. (2013) Effects of graded levels of arachidonic acid on the reproductive physiology of Senegalese sole (Solea senegalensis): Fatty acid composition, prostaglandins and steroid levels in the blood of broodstock bred in captivity. *General and comparative endocrinology*, 191, pp.92–101.

Norambuena, F., Mackenzie, S., Bell, J.G., Callol, A., Estévez, A. & Duncan, N. (2012) Prostaglandin (F and E, 2- and 3-series) production and cyclooxygenase (COX-2) gene expression of wild and cultured broodstock of Senegalese sole (Solea senegalensis). *General and comparative endocrinology*, 177(2), pp.256–62.

Oku, T., Sugawara, A., Choudhury, M., Komatsu, M., Yamada, S. & Ando, S. (2009) Lipid and fatty acid compositions differentiate between wild and cultured Japanese eel (Anguilla japonica). *Food Chemistry*, 115(2), pp.436–440.

Rhody, N.R., Nassif, N.A. & Main, K.L. (2010) Effects of salinity on growth and survival of common snook Centropomus undecimalis (Bloch, 1792) larvae. *Aquaculture Research*, 41(9), pp.e357–e360.

Rhody, N.R., Neidig, C.L., Grier, H.J., Main, K.L. & Migaud, H. (2013) Assessing Reproductive Condition in Captive and Wild Common Snook Stocks: A Comparison between the Wet Mount Technique and Histological Preparations. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*, 142(4), pp.979–988.

Rhody, N.R., Puchulutegui, C., Taggart, J.B., Main, K.L. & Migaud, H. (2014) Parental contribution and spawning performance in captive common snook Centropomus undecimalis broodstock. *Aquaculture*, 432, pp.144–153.

Rhody, N.R., Resley, M.J., Brennan, N., Hauville, M.R., Main, K.L. & Migaud, H. (2015) Spawning performance and endocrine profiles of captive common snook Centropomus undecimalis broodstock treated with different sustained release GnRHa-delivery systems. *Aquaculture*, In press.

Rodriguez, C., Acosta, C., Badía, P., Cejas, J.R., Santamaría, F.J. & Lorenzo Hernandez, A. (2004) Assessment of lipid and essential fatty acids requirements of black seabream (Spondyliosoma cantharus) by comparison of lipid composition in muscle and liver of wild and captive adult fish. *Comparative biochemistry and physiology. Part B, Biochemistry & molecular biology*, 139, pp.619–29.

Rodriguez, C., Pérez, J.A., Badía, P., Izquierdo, M.S., Fernández-Palacios, H. & Lorenzo Hernandez, A. (1998) The n-3 highly unsaturated fatty acids requirements of gilthead seabream (Sparus aurata L .) larvae when using an appropriate DHA EPA ratio in the diet. *Aquaculture*, 169, pp.9–23.

Rodriguez-Barreto, D., Jerez, S., Cejas, J.R., Martin, M.V., Acosta, N.G., Bolaños, A. & Lorenzo, A. (2012) Comparative study of lipid and fatty acid composition in different tissues of wild and cultured female broodstock of greater amberjack (Seriola dumerili). *Aquaculture*, 360-361, pp.1–9.

Rønnestad, I., Koven, W.M., Tandler, A., Harel, M. & Fyhn, H.J. (1994) Energy metabolism during development of eggs and larvae of gilthead sea bream (Sparus aurata). *Marine Biology*, 120(2), pp.187–196.

Saito, H. (2012) Lipid characteristics of two subtropical Seriola fishes, Seriola dumerili and Seriola rivoliana, with differences between cultured and wild varieties. *Food chemistry*, 135(3), pp.1718–29.

Sargent, J.R., Bell, G., McEvoy, L.A., Tocher, D.R. & Estévez, A. (1999) Recent developments in the essential fatty acid nutrition of fish. *Aquaculture*, 177, pp.191–199.

Sargent, J.R., Mcevoy, L., Estévez, A., Bell, G., Bell, M. V, Henderson, R.J. & Tocher, D.R. (1999) Lipid nutrition of marine fish during early development: current status and future directions. *Aquaculture*, 179, pp.217–229.

Sargent, J.R., McEvoy, L.A. & Bell, G. (1997) Requirements, presentation and sources of polyunsaturated fatty acids in marine fish larval feeds. *Aquaculture*, 155(1-4), pp.117–127.

Sargent, J.R., Tocher, D.R. & Bell, G. (2002) The Lipids. In J. Halver & R. Hardy, eds. *Fish Nutrition*. San Diego: Elsevier, pp. 181–257.

Sargent, J.R.R., Bell, J.G.G., Bell, M.V. V, Henderson, R.J.J. & Tocher, D.R. (1993) The Metabolism of Phospholipids and Polyunsaturated Fatty Acids in Fish B. Lahlou & P. Vitiello, eds. *Aquaculture: Fundamental and Applied Research*, 43, p.p103.

Seaborn, G.T., Smith, T.I.J., Denson, M.R., Walker, A.B. & Berlinsky, D.L. (2009) Comparative fatty acid composition of eggs from wild and captive black sea bass, Centropristis striata L. *Aquaculture Research*, 40(6), pp.656–668.

Sorbera, L. a, Asturiano, J.F., Carrillo, M. & Zanuy, S. (2001) Effects of polyunsaturated fatty acids and prostaglandins on oocyte maturation in a marine teleost, the European sea bass (Dicentrarchus labrax). *Biology of reproduction*, 64(1), pp.382–9.

Spite, M. (2014) Resolving Lipids: Lipoxins Regulate Reverse Cholesterol Transport. *Cell Metabolism*, 20(6), pp.935–937.

Stacey, N. & Sorensen, P.W. (2011) *Encyclopedia of Fish Physiology*, Elsevier.

Stocco, D.M., Clark, B.J., Reinhart, A.J., Williams, S.C., Dyson, M., Dassi, B., Walsh, L.P., Manna, P.R., Wang, X., Zeleznik, A.J. & Orly, J. (2001) Elements involved in the regulation of the StAR gene. *Molecular and Cellular Endocrinology*, 177(1-2), pp.55–59.

Taylor, R.G., Grier, H.J., Whittington, J.A., Biology, F. & Protection, E. (1998) Spawning rhythms of common snook in Florida. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 53, pp.502–520.

Tocher, D.R. (2010) Fatty acid requirements in ontogeny of marine and freshwater fish. *Aquaculture Research*, 41(5), pp.717–732.

Tocher, D.R. (2003) Metabolism and Functions of Lipids and Fatty Acids in Teleost Fish. *Reviews in Fisheries Science*, 11(2), pp.107–184.

Tocher, D.R., Bell, J.G. & Sargent, J.R. (1996) Production of eicosanoids derived from 20:4n-6 and 20:5n-3 in primary cultures of turbot (Scophthalmus maximus) brain astrocytes in response to platelet activating factor, substance P and interleukin-1 beta. *Comparative biochemistry and physiology. Part B, Biochemistry & molecular biology*, 115(2), pp.215–22.

Tokarz, J., Möller, G., de Angelis, M.H. & Adamski, J. (2013) Zebrafish and steroids: what do we know and what do we need to know? *The Journal of steroid biochemistry and molecular biology*, 137, pp.165–73.

Vetter, R.D., Hodson, R.E. & Arnold, C. (1983) Energy metabolism in a rapidly developing marine fish egg, the red drum (Sciaenops ocellata). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 40(5), pp.627–634.

Wade, M.G. (1994) Release and steroidogenic actions of polyunsaturated fatty acids in the goldfish testis. *Biology of Reproduction*, 51(1), pp.131–139.

Weisberg, R.H., Zheng, L., Liu, Y., Murawski, S., Hu, C. & Paul, J. (2014) Did Deepwater Horizon Hydrocarbons Transit to the West Florida Continental Shelf? *Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*, (In press).

Wiegand, M.D. (1996) Composition, accumulation and utilization of yolk lipids in teleost fish. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*, 6(3), pp.259–286.

Wittenrich, M.L., Rhody, N.R., Turingan, R.G. & Main, K.L. (2009) Coupling osteological development of the feeding apparatus with feeding performance in common snook, Centropomus undecimalis, larvae: Identifying morphological constraints to feeding. *Aquaculture*, 294(3-4), pp.221–227.

Yanes-Roca, C., Rhody, N., Nystrom, M. & Main, K.L. (2009) Effects of fatty acid composition and spawning season patterns on egg quality and larval survival in common snook (Centropomus undecimalis). *Aquaculture*, 287(3-4), pp.335–340.

Zohar, Y. & Mylonas, C.C. (2001) Endocrine manipulations of spawning in cultured fish: From hormones to genes. *Aquaculture*, 197, pp.99–136.

Highlights:

- Captive snook incorporated significantly more lipid than their wild counterparts, however, cholesterol and arachidonic acid levels were significantly lower in captive fish compared to wild fish.
- Eggs obtained from captive broodstock presented high DHA and EPA levels, associated with low ARA contents and as a result, ARA/EPA ratio in captive eggs was less than half of that in wild eggs.
- Wild snook survey identified the presence of hydrocarbons in the liver

Table 1:
Fatty acid profile (% of total FA) and total fatty acid content (mg/g of dry weight) of the diet fed to the captive broodstock (n=3).

	Captive broodstock diet		
	Herring	**Shrimp**	**50/50**
14:0	4.7 ± 0.1	1.5 ± 0.1	3.9 ± 0.4
15:0	1.2 ± 0.1	1.0 ± 0.0	1.0 ± 0.1
16:0	20.5 ± 0.2	11.6 ± 0.4	18.8 ± 0.9
17:0	1.5 ± 0.0	1.6 ± 0.1	1.5 ± 0.0
18:0	6.0 ± 0.2	6.9 ± 0.3	6.9 ± 0.0
Σ SFA[1]	**34.0 ± 0.3**	**22.8 ± 0.9**	**32.3 ± 1.4**
16:1n-7	5.9 ± 0.1	5.2 ± 0.4	5.5 ± 0.1
18:1n-9	6.4 ± 0.1	7.0 ± 0.2	6.1 ± 0.4
18:1n-7	4.3 ± 0.2	6.0 ± 0.3	5.1 ± 0.4
20:1n-9	0.4 ± 0.1	1.0 ± 0.2	0.8 ± 0.1
Σ MUFA[2]	**17.0 ± 0.2**	**19.4 ± 0.4**	**17.6 ± 0.1**
16:3n-4	0.5 ± 0.0	1.1 ± 0.0	0.5 ± 0.0
18:2n-6	1.4 ± 0.0	1.5 ± 0.1	1.5 ± 0.0
20:4n-6	**3.1 ± 0.2**	**9.2 ± 0.4**	**4.3 ± 0.2**
22:5n-6	1.5 ± 0.1	1.0 ± 0.2	1.6 ± 0.1
20:5n-3	**8.6 ± 0.4**	**15.3 ± 0.3**	**9.5 ± 0.3**
22:5n-3	1.6 ± 0.1	2.1 ± 0.1	1.8 ± 0.1
22:6n-3	**22.2 ± 0.6**	**8.7 ± 0.7**	**19.9 ± 0.9**
Σ n-6[3]	7.5 ± 0.3	13.3 ± 0.4	8.6 ± 0.3
Σ n-3[4]	34.8 ± 1.0	27.1 ± 1.0	33.0 ± 1.1
Σ PUFA[5]	**43.7 ± 0.9**	**42.1 ± 1.0**	**42.9 ± 1.3**
DHA/EPA	**2.6 ± 0.1**	**0.6 ± 0.0**	**2.1 ± 0.0**
ARA/EPA	**0.4 ± 0.0**	**0.6 ± 0.0**	**0.5 ± 0.0**
n-3/n-6	4.7 ± 0.3	2.0 ± 0.1	3.8 ± 0.0
Total FA	**117.3 ± 6.9**	**26.0 ± 1.3**	**71.8 ± 11.2**

[1] Includes 12:0.
[2] Includes 15:1.
[3] Includes 18:3n-6, 20:2n-6, 20:3n-6.
[4] Includes 18:3n-3, 18:4n-3, 20:3n-3, 20:4n-3.
[5] Includes 16:2n-4, 18:3n-4.
SFA: saturated fatty acids, MUFA: mono-unsaturated fatty acids; PUFA: poly-unsaturated fatty acids; DHA: docosahexaenoic acid (22:6n-3); EPA: eicosapentaenoic acid (20:4n-3); ARA: arachidonic acid (20:4n-6).

Table 2. Proximate composition (% of wet weight) of flesh and liver, weight (kg), fork length (cm), hepatosomatic index (HSI), gonadosomatic index (GSI) and age (years) from wild and captive common snook broodstock (n=6). Superscript letters indicate significant differences within a row.

		Female					**Male**		
		Wild April	**Wild June**	**Wild July**	**Wild August**	**Captive**	**Wild April**	**Wild July**	**Captive**
Lipid	Flesh	1.0 ± 0.1^{b}	0.7 ± 0.1^{ab}	0.5 ± 0.0^{a}	0.7 ± 0.1^{ab}	2.2 ± 0.5^{c}	0.7 ± 0.1^{ab}	0.5 ± 0.0^{a}	1.0 ± 0.1^{b}
	Liver	6.0 ± 1.0^{b}	9.4 ± 3.2^{bc}	6.3 ± 1.8^{b}	15.8 ± 4.6^{c}	9.8 ± 2.0^{bc}	3.4 ± 0.3^{a}	4.5 ± 0.9^{a}	6.6 ± 1.0^{b}
Protein	Flesh	20.1 ± 0.3^{ab}	19.4 ± 0.2^{a}	19.2 ± 0.5^{a}	21.1 ± 0.5^{b}	22.0 ± 0.2^{b}	20.1 ± 0.4^{ab}	18.9 ± 0.2^{a}	21.9 ± 0.2^{b}
	Liver	14.8 ± 0.8^{ab}	17.3 ± 1.3^{b}	18.0 ± 1.6^{b}	13.0 ± 0.9^{a}	13.3 ± 0.9^{a}	13.2 ± 0.4^{a}	18.4 ± 2.1^{b}	12.9 ± 0.7^{a}
Moisture	Flesh	78.2 ± 0.4^{b}	79.3 ± 0.2^{b}	79.5 ± 0.3^{b}	76.2 ± 0.3^{a}	75.0 ± 0.4^{a}	78.6 ± 0.3^{b}	79.8 ± 0.2^{b}	76.4 ± 0.4^{a}
	Liver	73.6 ± 0.9^{b}	69.8 ± 3.1^{ab}	75.0 ± 1.8^{b}	65.9 ± 4.1^{a}	66.6 ± 1.5^{a}	74.2 ± 0.6^{b}	74.4 ± 0.7^{b}	69.6 ± 1.1^{ab}
Ash	Flesh	1.2 ± 0.1	1.2 ± 0.0	1.2 ± 0.1	1.2 ± 0.0	1.4 ± 0.1	1.3 ± 0.0	1.2 ± 0.1	1.3 ± 0.0
	Liver	1.4 ± 0.1	1.5 ± 0.1	1.4 ± 0.1	1.3 ± 0.1	1.2 ± 0.1	1.3 ± 0.0	1.3 ± 0.1	1.1 ± 0.1
Weight		3.04 ± 0.55	4.32 ± 0.84	3.32 ± 0.77	3.79 ± 0.48	2.05 ± 0.17	2.22 ± 0.24	3.22 ± 0.91	2.19 ± 0.19
Fork Length		668 ± 39	722 ± 64	604 ± 64	726 ± 27	593 ± 18	617 ± 20	556 ± 44	583 ± 25
HSI		0.9 ± 0.1^{bc}	0.9 ± 0.1^{bc}	0.7 ± 0.1^{ab}	1.2 ± 0.1^{c}	0.7 ± 0.1^{ab}	0.8 ± 0.1^{b}	0.3 ± 0.0^{a}	0.6 ± 0.1^{ab}
GSI		1.6 ± 0.6^{ab}	4.1 ± 0.7^{bc}	5.2 ± 1.5^{c}	5.0 ± 0.8^{c}	0.7 ± 0.2^{a}	0.9 ± 0.4^{ab}	1.2 ± 0.3^{ab}	0.7 ± 0.2^{a}
Age (mean)		6.3 ± 0.9	5.7 ± 0.8	6.0 ± 1.0	6.0 ± 0.7	6.7 ± 0.5	6.3 ± 0.4	7.5 ± 1.2	8.8 ± 1.3
Age (range)		4 - 10	3 - 8	3 - 9	5 - 9	5 - 8	5 - 8	4 - 12	6 - 14

Table 3: Lipid class composition (%) of flesh from wild and captive common snook broodstock (n=6). Superscript letters indicate significant differences within a row.

	Female					**Male**		
	Wild April	**Wild June**	**Wild July**	**Wild August**	**Captive**	**Wild April**	**Wild July**	**Captive**
PC	25.3 ± 1.6^{bc}	27.3 ± 1.8^{bc}	29.7 ± 0.5^{c}	19.9 ± 1.2^{b}	15.4 ± 1.1^{a}	29.3 ± 1.6^{c}	31.5 ± 0.2^{c}	20.7 ± 1.3^{b}
PS	3.2 ± 0.3^{ab}	3.6 ± 0.2^{b}	5.0 ± 0.2^{c}	4.5 ± 0.3^{c}	2.3 ± 0.6^{a}	3.8 ± 0.2^{b}	5.3 ± 0.2^{c}	3.1 ± 0.3^{ab}
PI	4.8 ± 0.4^{ab}	5.9 ± 0.4^{b}	6.1 ± 0.2^{b}	5.8 ± 0.3^{b}	3.5 ± 0.5^{a}	6.4 ± 0.5^{b}	8.2 ± 0.3^{c}	5.1 ± 0.3^{ab}
PE	11.7 ± 0.7^{bc}	12.7 ± 0.8^{c}	13.4 ± 0.5^{c}	9.5 ± 0.7^{b}	7.3 ± 0.3^{a}	14.1 ± 1.0^{c}	14.3 ± 0.3^{c}	9.3 ± 0.6^{b}
Total polar*	**51.1 ± 3.4^{b}**	**55.8 ± 2.7^{bc}**	**64.3 ± 1.3^{cd}**	**51.9 ± 2.5^{b}**	**33.9 ± 3.2^{a}**	**59.7 ± 3.1^{c}**	**69.1 ± 0.2^{d}**	**45.3 ± 2.4^{ab}**
DAG	2.2 ± 0.3^{b}	1.6 ± 0.4^{ab}	0.4 ± 0.2^{a}	2.0 ± 0.1^{b}	2.7 ± 0.2^{b}	2.0 ± 0.2^{b}	0.8 ± 0.3^{a}	2.4 ± 0.3^{b}
CHOL	12.1 ± 0.7^{b}	14.4 ± 1.2^{bc}	17.7 ± 0.7^{c}	12.3 ± 0.4^{b}	8.6 ± 0.5^{a}	13.8 ± 0.6^{b}	16.6 ± 0.5^{c}	10.1 ± 0.8^{a}
FFA	4.9 ± 0.4^{a}	4.5 ± 0.4^{a}	5.3 ± 0.5^{a}	14.9 ± 0.7^{b}	4.8 ± 0.5^{a}	5.0 ± 0.6^{a}	5.6 ± 0.1^{a}	4.7 ± 0.7^{a}
TAG	24.1 ± 4.1^{bc}	19.8 ± 4.3^{b}	8.5 ± 1.3^{a}	15.7 ± 3.0^{b}	43.9 ± 3.7^{d}	14.6 ± 3.4^{b}	4.9 ± 0.6^{a}	28.8 ± 2.1^{c}
W+SE	5.6 ± 0.6^{b}	3.9 ± 0.7^{a}	3.9 ± 0.6^{a}	3.2 ± 0.2^{a}	6.3 ± 1.9^{b}	5.0 ± 0.6^{ab}	3.0 ± 0.2^{a}	8.8 ± 1.8^{bc}
HC	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd	nd
Total neutral	**48.9 ± 3.4^{c}**	**44.2 ± 2.7^{bc}**	**35.8 ± 1.3^{ab}**	**48.1 ± 2.5^{c}**	**66.1 ± 3.2^{e}**	**40.4 ± 3.1^{b}**	**30.9 ± 0.2^{a}**	**54.7 ± 2.4^{cd}**

PC: phosphatidylcholine; PS: phosphatidylserine; PI: phosphatidylinositol; PE: phosphatidylethanolamine; DAG: diacylglycerols; CHOL: cholesterol; FFA: free fatty acids; TAG: triacylglycerols; W+SE: wax and sterol ester; HC: hydrocarbons; nd: not detected.

*: includes lysophosphatidylcholine, spingomyelin, phosphatidylglycerol and pigmented material.

Table 4: Lipid class composition (%) of liver from wild and captive common snook broodstock (n=6). Superscript letters indicate significant differences within a row.

	Female					**Male**		
	Wild April	**Wild June**	**Wild July**	**Wild August**	**Captive**	**Wild April**	**Wild July**	**Captive**
PC	16.0 ± 1.4^{bc}	13.3 ± 2.2^{b}	21.7 ± 2.6^{c}	5.8 ± 0.9^{a}	9.1 ± 1.5^{ab}	17.6 ± 0.7^{bc}	14.3 ± 1.5^{b}	10.0 ± 1.7^{ab}
PS	1.9 ± 0.3^{ab}	1.3 ± 0.5^{a}	3.0 ± 0.7^{b}	1.1 ± 0.2^{a}	1.2 ± 0.5^{a}	2.8 ± 0.3^{b}	3.9 ± 0.6^{b}	1.6 ± 0.5^{a}
PI	2.8 ± 0.5^{b}	2.5 ± 0.6^{b}	5.2 ± 0.9^{c}	0.7 ± 0.1^{a}	1.7 ± 0.6^{ab}	3.2 ± 0.3^{b}	3.6 ± 0.6^{bc}	1.6 ± 0.5^{ab}
PE	9.4 ± 0.9^{b}	8.8 ± 1.4^{ab}	11.9 ± 1.4^{b}	3.6 ± 0.9^{a}	5.7 ± 1.0^{a}	10.3 ± 0.7^{b}	10.0 ± 1.2^{b}	6.3 ± 1.2^{ab}
Total polar*	**43.0 ± 3.2^{bc}**	**37.6 ± 6.6^{bc}**	**51.0 ± 6.2^{c}**	**22.2 ± 2.6^{a}**	**28.8 ± 5.0^{ab}**	**48.7 ± 1.9^{c}**	**45.6 ± 4.8^{c}**	**31.7 ± 5.0^{ab}**
DAG	2.7 ± 1.0^{ab}	3.7 ± 1.0^{bc}	1.7 ± 0.8^{a}	4.9 ± 0.6^{c}	5.3 ± 0.8^{c}	2.1 ± 0.2^{ab}	0.9 ± 0.9^{a}	4.6 ± 1.0^{c}
CHOL	12.4 ± 1.7^{b}	8.7 ± 1.6^{ab}	13.4 ± 1.9^{b}	5.5 ± 0.5^{a}	8.1 ± 1.1^{ab}	13.3 ± 0.7^{b}	13.8 ± 1.7^{b}	8.9 ± 1.3^{ab}
FFA	20.6 ± 1.8^{b}	20.6 ± 0.7^{b}	15.7 ± 1.4^{ab}	28.4 ± 0.8^{c}	20.1 ± 1.5^{b}	18.1 ± 0.8^{ab}	18.4 ± 1.5^{ab}	20.6 ± 1.2^{b}
TAG	9.8 ± 2.8^{b}	18.9 ± 6.9^{c}	10.2 ± 5.1^{b}	29.3 ± 4.1^{d}	27.1 ± 5.9^{cd}	7.0 ± 4.1^{ab}	4.9 ± 4.9^{a}	23.0 ± 4.4^{c}
W+SE	11.0 ± 2.1^{b}	7.4 ± 0.4^{a}	6.8 ± 1.1^{a}	7.6 ± 1.8^{ab}	10.7 ± 1.7^{b}	10.3 ± 1.7^{b}	10.9 ± 1.8^{b}	11.2 ± 1.5^{b}
HC	0.5 ± 0.9	3.1 ± 0.5	1.3 ± 0.3	2.1 ± 0.7	nd	0.3 ± 0.1	3.2 ± 0.4	nd
Total neutral	**57.0 ± 5.5^{ab}**	**62.4 ± 6.6^{b}**	**49.0 ± 6.2^{a}**	**77.8 ± 2.6^{c}**	**71.2 ± 5.0^{bc}**	**51.2 ± 4.1^{a}**	**52.1 ± 5.4^{a}**	**68.3 ± 5.0^{bc}**

Abbreviations as in table 3.

*: includes lysophosphatidylcholine, spingomyelin, phosphatidylglycerol and pigmented material.

Table 5. Fatty acid profile (% of total FA) and fatty acid content (mg/g of dry weight) of flesh from wild and captive common snook broodstock (n=6). Superscript letters indicate significant differences within a row.

	Female					**Male**		
	Wild April	**Wild June**	**Wild July**	**Wild August**	**Captive**	**Wild April**	**Wild July**	**Captive**
14:0	1.8 ± 0.3^{ab}	1.6 ± 0.2^{a}	1.4 ± 0.1^{a}	2.0 ± 0.2^{ab}	2.6 ± 0.2^{b}	1.4 ± 0.2^{a}	1.3 ± 0.3^{a}	2.8 ± 0.2^{b}
15:0	1.3 ± 0.3	1.0 ± 0.1	0.6 ± 0.1	1.1 ± 0.1	0.6 ± 0.0	0.7 ± 0.1	0.7 ± 0.1	0.6 ± 0.0
16:0	21.6 ± 0.9^{ab}	20.9 ± 0.4^{a}	20.5 ± 0.5^{a}	21.9 ± 0.9^{ab}	23.8 ± 0.2^{b}	21.9 ± 0.4^{ab}	20.9 ± 0.8^{a}	23.1 ± 0.8^{b}
18:0	5.2 ± 0.2^{a}	5.7 ± 0.2^{ab}	5.6 ± 0.3^{ab}	5.3 ± 0.3^{a}	5.4 ± 0.2^{a}	5.9 ± 0.4^{b}	6.2 ± 0.3^{b}	5.5^{a} ± 0.2
Σ SFA[1]	**30.9 ± 1.3^{a}**	**30.0 ± 0.7^{a}**	**28.8 ± 0.5^{a}**	**31.2 ± 1.2^{ab}**	**33.1 ± 0.2^{b}**	**30.7 ± 0.8^{a}**	**29.8 ± 1.2^{a}**	**32.7 ± 0.9^{b}**
16:1n-7	5.8 ± 0.7^{b}	4.8 ± 0.5^{ab}	4.2 ± 0.4^{a}	6.2 ± 0.8^{b}	5.5 ± 0.5^{b}	3.9 ± 0.5^{a}	3.3 ± 0.6^{a}	5.4 ± 0.5^{b}
18:1n-9	10.9 ± 1.0^{a}	10.8 ± 0.9^{a}	10.1 ± 0.3^{a}	12.0 ± 0.8^{ab}	13.5 ± 0.6^{b}	11.0 ± 1.3^{a}	10.6 ± 1.2^{a}	12.9 ± 0.8^{b}
18:1n-7	3.3 ± 0.3^{b}	2.8 ± 0.3^{ab}	2.5 ± 0.1^{a}	3.4 ± 0.4^{b}	2.8 ± 0.2^{ab}	2.5 ± 0.3^{a}	2.3 ± 0.2^{a}	2.7 ± 0.2^{ab}
Σ MUFA[2]	**20.7 ± 1.8^{ab}**	**18.9 ± 1.6^{a}**	**17.2 ± 0.5^{a}**	**22.3 ± 2.1^{b}**	**22.7 ± 1.2^{b}**	**18.0 ± 1.9^{a}**	**16.8 ± 2.1^{a}**	**22.1 ± 1.6^{b}**
16:3n-4	1.6 ± 0.3^{b}	1.4 ± 0.1^{ab}	1.6 ± 0.1^{b}	1.6 ± 0.1^{b}	1.1 ± 0.1^{a}	1.2 ± 0.1^{a}	1.4 ± 0.2^{ab}	1.0 ± 0.1^{a}
18:2n-6	1.4 ± 0.1^{b}	1.1 ± 0.1^{a}	1.5 ± 0.2^{b}	1.2 ± 0.1^{a}	1.2 ± 0.0^{a}	1.3 ± 0.1^{ab}	1.2 ± 0.1^{a}	1.3 ± 0.1^{ab}
20:4n-6	**7.4 ± 0.7^{b}**	**8.9 ± 1.0^{bc}**	**11.4 ± 0.7^{c}**	**7.7 ± 1.1^{b}**	**5.6 ± 0.6^{a}**	**8.8 ± 1.0^{bc}**	**10.8 ± 1.0^{c}**	**5.6 ± 0.6^{a}**
22:5n-6	2.6 ± 0.4^{a}	3.0 ± 0.3^{ab}	3.9 ± 0.3^{b}	2.5 ± 0.4^{a}	2.5 ± 0.2^{a}	3.5 ± 0.4^{b}	4.2 ± 0.4^{b}	2.6 ± 0.3^{a}
20:5n-3	**3.7 ± 0.3^{ab}**	**4.4 ± 0.1^{b}**	**3.8 ± 0.3^{ab}**	**4.9 ± 0.4^{b}**	**3.6 ± 0.1^{ab}**	**3.5 ± 0.2^{ab}**	**3.1 ± 0.2^{a}**	**3.5 ± 0.1^{ab}**
22:5n-3	3.7 ± 0.4^{b}	3.7 ± 0.3^{b}	3.0 ± 0.2^{a}	3.5 ± 0.4^{b}	2.8 ± 0.2^{a}	3.6 ± 0.2^{b}	2.9 ± 0.2^{a}	3.2 ± 0.2^{ab}
22:6n-3	**18.5 ± 2.7^{ab}**	**18.7 ± 1.6^{ab}**	**19.5 ± 1.4^{b}**	**15.5 ± 2.0^{a}**	**20.0 ± 0.8^{b}**	**21.2 ± 2.0^{b}**	**20.3 ± 1.7^{b}**	**20.5 ± 1.3^{b}**
Σ n-6[3]	12.3 ± 1.0^{bc}	14.1 ± 1.2^{c}	17.8 ± 1.0^{d}	12.5 ± 1.3^{bc}	10.2 ± 0.8^{a}	14.6 ± 1.3^{cd}	17.0 ± 1.4^{d}	10.4 ± 0.9^{a}
Σ n-3[4]	27.3 ± 2.4^{ab}	27.7 ± 1.4^{ab}	27.2 ± 1.2^{ab}	25.1 ± 2.0^{a}	27.4 ± 0.7^{ab}	29.5 ± 1.8^{b}	27.1 ± 1.7^{ab}	28.2 ± 1.4^{b}
Σ PUFA[5]	**42.2 ± 3.1^{ab}**	**44.1 ± 2.2^{ab}**	**47.4 ± 0.7^{b}**	**40.4 ± 3.1^{a}**	**39.7 ± 1.4^{a}**	**46.0 ± 2.9^{b}**	**46.3 ± 2.8^{b}**	**40.6 ± 2.2^{a}**
DHA/EPA	**5.2 ± 0.9^{bc}**	**4.3 ± 0.3^{ab}**	**5.4 ± 0.8^{bc}**	**3.2 ± 0.3^{a}**	**5.6 ± 0.2^{bc}**	**6.1 ± 0.8^{c}**	**6.9 ± 1.0^{c}**	**5.9 ± 0.3^{c}**
ARA/EPA	**2.0 ± 0.3^{ab}**	**2.1 ± 0.3^{b}**	**3.1 ± 0.4^{c}**	**1.6 ± 0.2^{a}**	**1.6 ± 0.1^{a}**	**2.6 ± 0.4^{bc}**	**3.6 ± 0.4^{c}**	**1.6 ± 0.2^{a}**
n-3/n-6	2.2 ± 0.1^{ab}	2.0 ± 0.2^{ab}	1.6 ± 0.2^{a}	2.1 ± 0.2^{ab}	2.7 ± 0.1^{b}	2.1 ± 0.1^{ab}	1.6 ± 0.1^{a}	2.8 ± 0.2^{b}

Total FA	37.4 ± 4.1^{bc}	27.2 ± 2.1^{ab}	23.3 ± 1.5^{a}	40.1 ± 9.2^{bc}	56.7 ± 13.7^{cd}	31.0 ± 3.6^{b}	22.3 ± 3.8^{a}	70.7 ± 35.7^{cd}

Abbreviations as in table 1. [1] Includes 12:0. [2] Includes 15:1, 20:1n-9. [3] Includes 18:3n-6, 20:2n-6, 20:3n-6. [4] Includes 18:3n-3, 18:4n-3, 20:3n-3, 20:4n-3. [5] Includes 16:2n-4, 18:3n-4.

Table 6. Fatty acid profile (% of total FA) and fatty acid content (mg/g of dry weight) of liver from wild and captive common snook broodstock (n=6). Superscript letters indicate significant differences within a row.

	Female					**Male**		
	Wild April	**Wild June**	**Wild July**	**Wild August**	**Captive**	**Wild April**	**Wild July**	**Captive**
14:0	1.7 ± 0.3^{ab}	1.8 ± 0.3^{ab}	1.4 ± 0.3^{a}	2.4 ± 0.3^{ab}	3.8 ± 0.6^{b}	1.3 ± 0.2^{a}	1.2 ± 0.2^{a}	3.3 ± 0.4^{b}
15:0	1.3 ± 0.5^{ab}	2.1 ± 0.6^{b}	0.8 ± 0.2^{a}	1.7 ± 0.1^{b}	0.9 ± 0.1^{a}	0.7 ± 0.1^{a}	1.0 ± 0.2^{a}	0.8 ± 0.0^{a}
16:0	23.7 ± 1.5^{bc}	24.6 ± 1.7^{bc}	22.5 ± 2.0^{b}	29.6 ± 0.4^{c}	23.1 ± 1.1^{b}	22.0 ± 1.1^{ab}	22.8 ± 1.1^{b}	20.8 ± 0.7^{a}
17:0	1.0 ± 0.2^{a}	1.8 ± 0.2^{b}	1.4 ± 0.2^{ab}	1.7 ± 0.1^{b}	1.0 ± 0.0^{a}	0.9 ± 0.1^{a}	1.2 ± 0.1^{ab}	1.0 ± 0.0^{a}
18:0	5.8 ± 0.5^{a}	8.3 ± 1.6^{b}	10.6 ± 1.2^{bc}	6.2 ± 0.6^{ab}	5.5 ± 0.2^{a}	6.1 ± 0.4^{ab}	7.7 ± 0.6^{b}	6.0 ± 0.1^{ab}
Σ SFA[1]	**33.6 ± 1.7^{ab}**	**38.5 ± 1.4^{bc}**	**36.9 ± 1.3^{b}**	**41.5 ± 0.6^{c}**	**34.4 ± 1.4^{ab}**	**31.0 ± 1.5^{a}**	**33.9 ± 1.3^{ab}**	**31.8 ± 1.0^{a}**
16:1n-7	7.5 ± 1.2^{bc}	6.5 ± 1.3^{b}	4.4 ± 1.1^{a}	9.9 ± 0.6^{c}	7.3 ± 0.7^{b}	4.3 ± 0.6^{a}	3.4 ± 0.6^{a}	6.1 ± 0.6^{b}
18:1n-9	12.7 ± 1.4^{b}	12.5 ± 1.5^{b}	13.1 ± 0.9^{b}	16.0 ± 0.5^{c}	13.5 ± 1.4^{b}	9.7 ± 1.4^{a}	8.2 ± 1.2^{a}	13.4 ± 1.9^{b}
18:1n-7	5.0 ± 1.1^{bc}	3.9 ± 0.5^{b}	3.7 ± 0.6^{ab}	5.5 ± 0.3^{c}	4.2 ± 0.2^{b}	3.2 ± 0.3^{a}	2.9 ± 0.3^{a}	3.9 ± 0.4^{b}
Σ MUFA[2]	**26.0 ± 1.9^{c}**	**23.5 ± 2.6^{bc}**	**21.7 ± 2.6^{b}**	**32.1 ± 0.9^{cd}**	**26.2 ± 2.1^{c}**	**17.9 ± 2.3^{a}**	**15.0 ± 2.0^{a}**	**24.7 ± 3.0^{bc}**
16:3n-4	1.4 ± 0.4^{b}	1.9 ± 0.4^{b}	0.9 ± 0.2^{a}	1.7 ± 0.1^{b}	0.9 ± 0.1^{a}	0.8 ± 0.1^{a}	0.9 ± 0.2^{a}	0.8 ± 0.1a
18:2n-6	1.2 ± 0.2^{a}	1.0 ± 0.1^{a}	1.3 ± 0.2^{ab}	1.1 ± 0.1^{a}	1.5 ± 0.1^{b}	1.0 ± 0.1^{a}	1.1 ± 0.1^{a}	1.4 ± 0.1^{b}
20:4n-6	**5.4 ± 0.8^{b}**	**5.6 ± 0.8^{b}**	**7.4 ± 1.1^{bc}**	**2.9 ± 0.2^{a}**	**3.3 ± 0.8^{a}**	**8.0 ± 0.9^{c}**	**9.1 ± 0.9^{c}**	**4.3 ± 1.0^{ab}**
22:5n-6	1.4 ± 0.2^{bc}	1.1 ± 0.2^{b}	2.1 ± 0.5^{cd}	0.5 ± 0.0^{a}	1.4 ± 0.1^{bc}	2.4 ± 0.3^{d}	2.6 ± 0.2^{d}	1.6 ± 0.2^{c}
20:5n-3	**2.0 ± 0.2^{ab}**	**2.7 ± 0.3^{bc}**	**2.3 ± 0.3^{b}**	**2.6 ± 0.4^{bc}**	**1.8 ± 0.3^{a}**	**2.3 ± 0.2^{b}**	**1.7 ± 0.3^{a}**	**2.1 ± 0.2^{ab}**
22:5n-3	3.0 ± 0.4^{bc}	1.8 ± 0.1^{ab}	1.8 ± 0.2^{ab}	1.3 ± 0.1^{a}	3.0 ± 0.2^{bc}	3.5 ± 0.3^{c}	2.2 ± 0.3^{b}	3.1 ± 0.2^{c}
22:6n-3	**15.3 ± 2.5^{b}**	**13.4 ± 3.3^{b}**	**15.1 ± 2.7^{b}**	**5.9 ± 0.9^{a}**	**16.6 ± 2.0^{bc}**	**23.4 ± 2.6^{d}**	**23.2 ± 2.3^{d}**	**20.2 ± 3.1^{cd}**
Σ n-6[3]	9.0 ± 0.8^{b}	8.7 ± 0.8^{b}	11.9 ± 1.6^{bc}	5.5 ± 0.3^{a}	7.2 ± 0.9^{ab}	12.3 ± 1.1^{c}	13.7 ± 1.0^{c}	8.2 ± 1.0^{b}
Σ n-3[4]	21.7 ± 2.7^{b}	19.1 ± 3.0^{b}	20.1 ± 2.6^{b}	10.8 ± 0.7^{a}	23.4 ± 2.0^{bc}	30.2 ± 2.0^{c}	28.0 ± 1.9^{c}	27.2 ± 2.8^{c}
Σ	**33.1 ±**	**30.7 ±**	**33.7 ±**	**19.3 ±**	**32.9 ±**	**44.1 ±**	**43.3 ±**	**37.4 ±**

PUFA[5]	**3.2**^{b}	**3.3**^{b}	**3.7**^{b}	**0.9**^{a}	**2.7**^{b}	**2.8**^{c}	**2.5**^{c}	**3.7**^{bc}
DHA/ EPA	**7.3 ± 0.8**^{b}	**5.8 ± 1.8**^{ab}	**8.3 ± 2.6**^{bc}	**2.7 ± 0.9**^{a}	**11.0 ± 2.1**^{cd}	**11.2 ± 1.9**^{cd}	**16.0 ± 2.5**^{d}	**10.2 ± 1.8**^{c}
ARA/ EPA	**2.6 ± 0.2**^{ab}	**2.3 ± 0.5**^{ab}	**4.1 ± 1.4**^{bc}	**1.3 ± 0.3**^{a}	**2.1 ± 0.5**^{a}	**3.8 ± 0.7**^{b}	**6.4 ± 1.2**^{c}	**2.1 ± 0.5**^{a}
n-3/n-6	2.4 ± 0.1^{b}	2.2 ± 0.2^{ab}	1.7 ± 0.1^{a}	2.0 ± 0.1^{ab}	3.3 ± 0.2^{c}	2.5 ± 0.1^{b}	2.1 ± 0.1^{ab}	3.4 ± 0.1^{c}
Total FA	165.5 ± 36.0^{b}	240.6 ± 63.7^{bc}	169.9 ± 39.8^{b}	352.7 ± 68.7^{c}	277.7 ± 67.4^{bc}	94.5 ± 16.2^{a}	106.2 ± 23.4^{a}	187.7 ± 34.6^{b}

Abbreviations as in table 1. [1] Includes 12:0. [2] Includes 15:1, 20:1n-9. [3] Includes 18:3n-6, 20:2n-6, 20:3n-6. [4] Includes 18:3n-3, 18:4n-3, 20:3n-3, 20:4n-3. [5] Includes 16:2n-4, 18:3n-4.

Table 7. Fatty acid profile (% of total FA) and fatty acid content (mg/g of dry weight) of flesh, liver and eggs from wild and captive common snook female broodstock (n=6 for flesh and liver, n=3 for eggs). Superscript letters indicate significant differences within a row.

	Wild July			Captive		
	Flesh	Liver	Eggs	Flesh	Liver	Eggs
14:0	1.4 ± 0.1^{a}	1.4 ± 0.3^{a}	1.9 ± 0.1^{ab}	2.6 ± 0.2^{b}	3.8 ± 0.6^{c}	2.4 ± 0.1^{b}
16:0	20.5 ± 0.5^{ab}	22.5 ± 2.0^{b}	21.7 ± 0.7^{b}	23.8 ± 0.2^{c}	23.1 ± 1.1^{bc}	17.6 ± 0.3^{a}
17:0	0.7 ± 0.1^{a}	1.4 ± 0.2^{c}	1.0 ± 0.0^{b}	0.7 ± 0.0^{a}	1.0 ± 0.0^{b}	0.8 ± 0.0^{a}
18:0	5.6 ± 0.3^{b}	10.6 ± 1.2^{c}	5.2 ± 0.1^{b}	5.4 ± 0.2^{b}	5.5 ± 0.2^{b}	4.0 ± 0.1^{a}
Σ SFA[1]	**28.8 ± 0.5^{ab}**	**36.9 ± 1.3^{c}**	**30.6 ± 0.6^{b}**	**33.1 ± 0.2^{bc}**	**34.4 ± 1.4^{bc}**	**25.4 ± 0.3^{a}**
16:1n-7	4.2 ± 0.4^{a}	4.4 ± 1.1^{a}	7.6 ± 0.3^{c}	5.5 ± 0.5^{ab}	7.3 ± 0.7^{bc}	6.2 ± 0.1^{b}
18:1n-9	10.1 ± 0.3^{a}	13.1 ± 0.9^{b}	16.9 ± 0.3^{c}	13.5 ± 0.6^{b}	13.5 ± 1.4^{b}	12.9 ± 0.2^{b}
18:1n-7	2.5 ± 0.1^{a}	3.7 ± 0.6^{ab}	4.6 ± 0.2^{bc}	2.8 ± 0.2^{a}	4.2 ± 0.2^{b}	3.8 ± 0.1^{b}
Σ MUFA[2]	**17.2 ± 0.5^{a}**	**21.7 ± 2.6^{b}**	**29.5 ± 0.2^{c}**	**22.7 ± 1.2^{b}**	**26.2 ± 2.1^{bc}**	**23.3 ± 0.3^{b}**
16:2n-4	0.6 ± 0.0^{a}	0.5 ± 0.0^{a}	0.5 ± 0.0^{a}	0.8 ± 0.0^{ab}	1.1 ± 0.1^{b}	0.9 ± 0.0^{b}
16:3n-4	1.6 ± 0.1^{b}	0.9 ± 0.2^{a}	1.4 ± 0.0^{b}	1.1 ± 0.1^{ab}	0.9 ± 0.1^{a}	0.9 ± 0.0^{a}
18:2n-6	1.5 ± 0.2^{ab}	1.3 ± 0.2^{a}	2.2 ± 0.5^{b}	1.2 ± 0.0^{a}	1.5 ± 0.1^{ab}	1.9 ± 0.0^{b}
20:4n-6	**11.4 ± 0.7^{c}**	**7.4 ± 1.1^{bc}**	**5.4 ± 0.3^{b}**	**5.6 ± 0.6^{b}**	**3.3 ± 0.8^{a}**	**3.8 ± 0.2^{a}**
22:5n-6	3.9 ± 0.3^{c}	2.1 ± 0.5^{ab}	2.1 ± 0.2^{ab}	2.5 ± 0.2^{b}	1.4 ± 0.1^{a}	1.9 ± 0.0^{a}
20:5n-3	**3.8 ± 0.3^{c}**	**2.3 ± 0.3^{ab}**	**2.4 ± 0.4^{ab}**	**3.6 ± 0.1^{c}**	**1.8 ± 0.3^{a}**	**4.2 ± 0.2^{cd}**
22:5n-3	3.0 ± 0.2^{b}	1.8 ± 0.2^{a}	2.7 ± 0.1^{b}	2.8 ± 0.2^{b}	3.0 ± 0.2^{b}	3.2 ± 0.1^{b}
22:6n-3	**19.5 ± 1.4^{b}**	**15.1 ± 2.7^{a}**	**14.5 ± 0.2^{a}**	**20.0 ± 0.8^{b}**	**16.6 ± 2.0^{ab}**	**27.3 ± 0.4^{c}**
Σ n-6[3]	17.8 ± 1.0^{c}	11.9 ± 1.6^{b}	10.6 ± 1.0b	10.2 ± 0.8^{b}	7.2 ± 0.9^{a}	8.7 ± 0.1^{ab}
Σ n-3[4]	27.2 ± 1.2^{b}	20.1 ± 2.6^{a}	20.8 ± 0.6^{a}	27.4 ± 0.7^{b}	23.4 ± 2.0^{ab}	36.3 ± 0.3^{c}
Σ PUFA[5]	**47.4 ± 0.7^{c}**	**33.7 ± 3.7^{a}**	**33.6 ± 0.5^{a}**	**39.7 ± 1.4^{b}**	**32.9 ± 2.7^{a}**	**47.0 ± 0.3^{c}**
DHA/EPA	**5.4 ± 0.8^{a}**	**8.3 ± 2.6^{b}**	**6.5 ± .7^{b}**	**5.6 ± 0.2^{a}**	**11.0 ± 2.1^{bc}**	**6.6 ± 0.3^{b}**
ARA/EPA	**3.1 ± 0.4^{c}**	**4.1 ± 1.4^{cd}**	**2.3 ± 0.6^{bc}**	**1.6 ± 0.1^{b}**	**2.1 ± 0.5^{bc}**	**0.9 ± 0.1^{a}**
n-3/n-6	1.6 ± 0.2^{a}	1.7 ± 0.1^{a}	2.1 ± 0.3^{ab}	2.7 ± 0.1^{b}	3.3 ± 0.2^{bc}	4.2 ± 0.1^{c}
Total FA	23.3 ± 1.5^{a}	169.9 ± 39.8^{cd}	193.4 ± 17.2^{d}	56.7 ± 13.7^{b}	277.7 ± 67.4^{de}	169.0 ± 13.9^{c}

Abbreviations as in table 1. [1] Includes 12:0, 15:0. [2] Includes 15:1, 20:1n-9. [3] Includes 18:3n-6, 20:2n-6, 20:3n-6. [4] Includes 18:3n-3, 18:4n-3, 20:3n-3, 20:4n-3. [5] Includes 18:3n-4.