

Article Type: Articles

RUNNING HEAD: Lake Trout niche partitioning

TITLE: The role of ecotype-environment interactions in intraspecific trophic niche partitioning subsequent to stocking

O. Morissette<sup>1,2,\*</sup>

P. Sirois<sup>2</sup>

C. C. Wilson<sup>3</sup>

M. Laporte<sup>1</sup>

L. Bernatchez<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Institut de Biologie Intégrative des Systèmes (IBIS), Université Laval, Québec, Québec, Canada G1V0A6

<sup>2</sup> Chaire de recherche sur les espèces aquatiques exploitées, Laboratoire des sciences aquatiques, Département des sciences fondamentales, Université du Québec à Chicoutimi, Chicoutimi, Québec, Canada, G7H2B1

<sup>3</sup> Aquatic Research and Development Section, Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, Peterborough, Ontario, Canada, K9J3C7

\*Corresponding Author. E-mail: [olivier.morissette.1@ulaval.ca](mailto:olivier.morissette.1@ulaval.ca)

Manuscript received 16 October 2018; revised 18 December 2018; accepted 3 January 2019.

Corresponding Editor; Julian D. Olden

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1002/eap.1857

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

## Abstract

Worldwide, stocking of fish represent a valuable tool for conservation and maintenance of species exploited by recreational fishing. Releases of hatchery-reared fish are more and more recognized to have numerous demographic, ecological and genetic impacts on wild populations. However, consequences on intraspecific trophic relationships have rarely been investigated. In this study, we assessed the impacts of supplementation stocking and resulting introgressive hybridization on the trophic niches occupied by stocked, local and hybrid Lake Trout (*Salvelinus namaycush*) within populations of piscivorous and planktivorous ecotypes stocked from a wild piscivorous source population. We compared trophic niches using stable isotope analysis ( $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ ) and trophic position among the three genetic origins. Putative genetic effects were tested with phenotype-genotype association of “life history” ecological traits (body size, growth rate, condition index and trophic niche) and genotypes (RADseq SNP markers) using redundant discriminant analysis (RDA). Results showed that sympatry resulting from the stocking of contrasting ecotypes is a risk factor for niche partitioning. Planktivorous populations are more susceptible to niche partitioning, by competitive exclusion of the local fish from a littoral niche to an alternative pelagic/profundal niche. Observed niche partitioning is probably a manifestation of competitive interactions between ecotypes. Our results emphasize that ecotypic variation should be considered for more efficient management and conservation practices and in order to mitigate negative impact of supplementation stocking.

## Keywords

supplementation stocking, introgressive hybridization, stable isotopes, lake trout, salmonids, life history, RADseq, genotype-by-sequencing, phenotype-genotype association

## Introduction

The goals of human-mediated translocation of fish are manifold, as exemplified by the diverse terminology (i.e. put-and-take, conservation, fishery enhancement) developed to classify stocking activities (Utter and Epifanio 2002, Aprahamian et al. 2003). Population declines or low productivity of species being exploited either by commercial or recreational fisheries (Post et al. 2002) have been commonly compensated by supplementation stocking. Specifically, objectives of supplementation may be defined as aiming to increase or maintain targeted fish stock at sustainable exploitation levels, a situation particularly common in anglers' seek-after salmonid populations (Cowx 1994, Aprahamian et al. 2003, Araki et al. 2008). Hatchery and stocking practices may vary among jurisdictions or be species-specific, but are generally based on an artificial hatchery production of the target species preceding their release into the wild. While supplementation may represent an efficient method for preservation of wild populations, concerns on its potential negative impacts have long been raised (Allendorf et al. 2001, Araki et al. 2009, Vandersteen et al. 2012, Hutchings 2014).

One of the main concerns regarding supplementation stocking consists in the potential genetic and ecological interactions between stocked and local fish. Hatchery-produced fish could exhibit pronounced ecological or genetic differences compared to their wild counterparts, even when they are progeny of wild broodstock (Weber and Fausch 2003, Christie et al. 2016). On the short-term, enhancement of top-predator density could alter trophic networks (Eby et al. 2006). Furthermore, addition of stocked fish may induce deleterious density-dependent phenomenon on local populations (Hunt et al. 2014). On the long-term, introgressive hybridization between stocked and wild fish may affect the integrity of the local populations depending on the extent of reproduction between them (Evans and Willox 1991, Allendorf et al. 2001, Valiquette et al. 2014). Introgression can cause the

Accepted Article

disruption of co-adapted genes and loss of local adaptation (McGinnity et al. 2003, Araki et al. 2009, Muhlfeld et al. 2009, Bourret et al. 2011, Renaut and Bernatchez 2011, Lamaze et al. 2013). Such genetic alteration can have negative consequences on the productivity and the viability of stocked populations (Berejikian et al. 2009, Fraser et al. 2010). However, long-term intraspecific impacts of stocking on trophic niche have seldom been studied. As a consequence, it remains unclear whether divergence between local and stocked fish is sufficient to cause trophic alterations, at the instar of consequences resulting of species introduction (e.g. ecological exclusion or species extirpation). Moreover, the role of introgression in this mechanism is to be defined.

Lake Trout (*Salvelinus namaycush*) is a large and long-lived salmonid from deep and cold lakes of the Canadian Boreal Shield and the northern United States (Martin and Olver 1980, Scott and Crossman 1998). In its natural distribution range, Lake Trout exhibits extensive life history variations in terms of trophic niche, growth, maturation time and body size (Muir et al. 2015). These variations likely reflect the combined influence of environmental conditions, niche availability, and genetics (McDermid et al. 2010, Bernatchez et al. 2016). In small boreal lakes, the two most-common ecotypes are tightly linked with the available prey communities. The piscivorous ecotype is observed in lakes hosting large pelagic preys (forage fish or *Mysid* shrimps). Lake Trout from the piscivorous ecotype are reaching large size (> 600 mm) and are maturing later in life (> 9 years). Whereas trout of the planktivorous ecotype, which are occurring in lakes lacking large pelagic prey (Rasmussen et al. 1990, Shuter et al. 1998), are shown to be smaller fish (~ 400 mm) with a faster maturation time (> 6 years). There is no record of intraspecific trophic consequences subsequent to supplementation of Lake Trout. However, a striking case of Lake Trout trophic niche modification has been reported by Vander Zanden (1999), showing that the introduction of

the invasive Smallmouth Bass (*Micropterus dolomieu*) and Rock Bass (*Ambloplites rupestris*) have profoundly modified the fish community and caused a shift in the trophic niche of this local top predator through competitive interactions (Vander Zanden et al. 2004).

Next-generation sequencing (NGS) now makes possible the rapid sequencing of thousands of single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) genetic markers at a more affordable cost, opening the possibility to assess the potential genetic architecture of any given phenotype (Gagnaire and Gaggiotti 2016). This in turn enables the possibility to investigate the consequences of interactions between polygenic traits and habitat variation for conservation and management purposes, namely in the context of stocking (Bernatchez et al. 2016, Laporte et al. 2016). For instance, in a previous study we showed that body condition of Lake Trout hybrid (*stocked x local*) is negatively correlated to the proportion of their genotype related to stocked fish (Morissette et al. 2018). This suggested that body condition is a complex polygenic trait affected by multiple genes of small effect rather than few genes of large effect, potentially linked to the ecological incompatibilities between stocked populations and the habitat where it is introduced.

The goal of this study was to assess the intraspecific consequences of supplementation stocking on the trophic niche of Lake Trout populations of either piscivorous or planktivorous ecotypes from small Boreal Shield lakes. We combined stable isotope analysis and population genomics to test for potential differences in the observed trophic niche of three genetic groups (stocked, hybrid and local fish) within stocked populations. We tested the hypothesis that the ecotype of the stocking source and recipient populations has an influence on the Lake Trout trophic niche, even years after the last supplementation events. Finally, using genotype information obtained from RADseq genotyping, we tested for a

possible genotype-phenotype association resulting in variations of individual fish ecological traits and occupied trophic niche.

## Methods

*Study design* – Every sampled lake is hosting a single allopatric Lake Trout population of either planktivorous or piscivorous ecotype. We selected populations based on their known stocking history (or absence of stocking). Selected stocked populations have experienced at least one stocking event during the last twelve years, with a stocking history  $\geq 20$  years (Table 1). We also based our selection of populations on hybridization data from a previous study (Valiquette et al. 2014) to avoid highly admixed populations ( $> 75\%$  of stocked genetic background), thus ensuring to collect enough fish to represent the three genetic groups (pure stocked, pure local and hybrids). For comparison, we also sampled unstocked lakes hosting population of both ecotypes.

*Stocking history* – According to the lakes stocking history (Appendix S1), all stocking events have been conducted using first-generation progeny (F1) of wild breeders. Parents were captured on known spawning sites in source lakes (e.g., Blue Sea Lake and Trente-et-un-Miles Lake – both hosting the piscivorous ecotype). Eggs and milt were mixed on site and transferred back in hatcheries to be reared until stocking. No breeders were maintained in hatchery. Age at stocking varied between a few months (fry stage) to a year (1+). Therefore, neither domesticated strains nor adult fish have been involved in the stocking history (MFFP & OMNRF; pers. comm). According to otolith's back-calculated length-at-age (see data from Morissette et al. 2018), there was no significant difference in total length at age 1 (time of stocking) among stocked, hybrids and local fish (one-way ANOVA,  $F_{2,274} = 0.297$ ,  $p = 0.743$ , average TL =  $84.96 \pm 15.31$  mm).

*Sampling* - A total of 342 Lake Trout were sampled in 10 selected lakes throughout Québec and Ontario (Canada) (Fig. 1). Fish were captured with gill nets, in collaboration with the Québec *Ministère des Forêts, de la Faune et des Parcs* (MFFP) and the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (OMNRF). Both MFFP and OMNRF followed the same normalized sampling protocol, where putative summer habitat volumes (water temperature 12 °C or less and a dissolved oxygen concentration of 5 mg\*L<sup>-1</sup> or more) were randomly sampled. For two lakes (Cayamant and Cedres), seven voluntary anglers sampled fish in the same period of time to complement our sampling efforts. A provincial angler and hunter federation (*Fédération québécoise des chasseurs et pêcheurs*) selected anglers based on their knowledge of targeted lakes. Anglers kept every captured fish (any size) and followed the same field processing procedure as our scientific team (see below), they kept fish heads frozen before shipping them at the end of the sampling period. Additionally, MFFP provided 30 adipose fins from each of two stocking source populations (Lakes Blue Sea and Trente et Un Milles), for genetic groups assignment.

Pelagic zooplankton samples (potential pelagic preys) were obtained at the deepest point of every lakes. Zooplankton net (mouth opening 20 cm and 200 µm mesh) was horizontally towed for 5 to 10 min at a depth between 0 to 10 meters (oblique tow). Samples were then filtered on a sieve of the same mesh size (200 µm), stored and frozen immediately.

*Fish processing* – For every fish, total length (TL, mm) was measured on the field as well as weight (g), using a portable digital scale. The adipose fin was sectioned and stored in 95% ethanol in individual plastic vials (Eppendorf, Mississauga, CAN). In laboratory, sample of dorsal muscle without skin and bones was cut from the fresh fish and immediately frozen; knife was sterilized with 95% ethanol between each sample. To test for the agreement of

stable isotope ration between dorsal and neck muscles, we also sampled near-head (neck) muscle tissue on 30 individuals from Lake McFee during the standardized sampling. Muscle samples were collected accordingly in the neck region from thawed heads of the angler-collected fish.

*Genomic data and genotyping* – Genomic DNA was obtained with the salt-extraction protocol (Aljanabi and Martinez 1997) from adipose fins. Sequencing was performed on an Illumina HiSeq2000 (100 bp length single reads). Adapters were removed from sequencing raw data with *cutadapt* v1.8.2 (Martin 2011) in the single-end mode. Sequences were demultiplexed and 80 bp-trimmed with *process\_radtags* in STACKS v 1.35 (Catchen et al. 2013). Individual reads were aligned and *de novo* potential polymorphic loci were aligned with *ustacks*. A catalog of single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) loci was assembled with *cstacks* using default parameters. Genotyping was performed with *sstacks* by matching individual reads against our catalog.

*Markers quality and filtering* – The *populations* module of STACKS ( $r = 0.5$ ,  $m = 3$ ) and a subsequent quality filtering process of SNP markers were applied to either pairs of source-target populations or, in one case, trio (Louisa Lake was stocked once by Blue Sea source in 1998 and Trente et Un Milles otherwise, Appendix S1). We filtered loci with too low minimum coverage ( $m < 5$ ) but a maximum coverage of 30 and a maximum proportion of heterozygous individuals of 0.7. We retained loci present in at least 70% of individuals within populations. We also removed individuals with percentage of missing loci  $> 30\%$ , identified with the *missing\_vizualisation* function from *stackr* R package (Gosselin and Bernatchez 2016). Loci with more than two alleles were also identified with the function *summary\_haplotype* in *stackr* and removed from the database to filter for putative paralogs or



sequencing artifacts. After these filtration steps, the *populations* module (STACKS software) and filtering steps were rerun. The filtering procedure is part of the STACKS workflow freely available on Github website ([https://github.com/enormandeu/stacks\\_workflow](https://github.com/enormandeu/stacks_workflow)). All module parameters used are listed in the supporting information (Appendix S2).

*Individual genetic group assignment* – Individual assignment to one of the three genetic groups was based on admixture proportion (Q), estimated for source of stocking population using the Bayesian clustering method implemented in the software ADMIXTURE v 1.3 (Alexander et al. 2009). This value is the individual proportion of genotype related to user-specified number of genetic clusters (K) identified without *a priori*. ADMIXTURE analyses were realized including one stocked population and the source population for stocking (lake Blue Sea, Trente et un Milles, or both). The assumed number of genetic clusters was either  $K = 2$  or  $K = 3$ , according to stocking history data, but an extended range of probable K was tested ( $K = 1$  to 6). The most probable K was inferred with cross-validation error. Standard error was estimated from 2000 bootstrapped replicates. Stocked fish were assigned when  $Q_{\text{stocking source}} + SE \geq 90\%$ , local fish when  $Q_{\text{stocking source}} + SE \leq 10\%$ , whereas others were classified as hybrids (Q values ranging from 10 to 90%).

*Stable isotopes ratios quantifications* – Pelagic zooplankton samples were thawed and sorted under a LEICA MZ12 dissecting microscope. Roughly 200 to 700 individuals of *Daphnia sp.* or *Bosmina sp.* (depending on their sizes) were sorted in triplicate for each lake. Frozen muscle samples were thawed and 1 cm<sup>3</sup> samples were sectioned with clean scissors.

Zooplankton and muscle samples were dried at 60 °C for 48h. Mortar and pestle were used to grind samples into a fine powder. Using a digital scale, powder was encapsulated in pressed tin capsules (3.5 x 5 mm) to a weight of  $1 \pm 0.05$  mg.

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Carbon and nitrogen stable isotope ratios were produced using a varioEL III Isotope Cube (Elementar America). The procedure first implies a flash combustion and the resulting gases are carried by ultra-pure helium to the columns and successive absorption traps to separate the gases (“trap and purge procedure”). A thermoconductivity detector (TCD) measures the gases as they are released. Stable isotope results were expressed in delta ( $\delta$ ) notation (as part per thousand, or permil ‰) as the normalized ratios of the sample in relation to international standards. The standards used for the measurements were Vienna Pee Dee Belemnite (VPDB) limestone for carbon isotopes ( $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ ) and atmospheric nitrogen (air) for nitrogen isotopes ( $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ ).

*Stable isotope analysis* – Isotopic values of dorsal and neck muscle tissue within same individuals of lake McFee were compared by single factor analysis of variance (ANOVA). The comparison between dorsal and neck muscle tissue revealed no difference for  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  (ANOVA,  $F_{1,58} = 0.0004$ ,  $p = 0.99$ ) and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  (ANOVA,  $F_{1,58} = 1,91$ ,  $p = 0.17$ ). Slopes of linear relationships were 0.87 and 0.91 and  $R^2 = 0.77$  and 0.79, respectively. Isotopic values of  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  were *a posteriori* normalized for fat content by the C:N ratio, as suggested by Post *et al.* (2007). Trophic position was calculated based on a fractionation factor of 3.4 and the following equation:  $trophic\ position = ((\delta^{15}N_{fish} - \delta^{15}N_{baseline})/3.4) + 2$  (Vander Zanden *et al.* 1999). Since  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  of pelagic zooplankton prey varied widely among lakes (Table 2), we calculated individual fish distance from lake-specific pelagic baseline as  $\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}_{pelagic} = \delta^{13}\text{C}_{fish} - \delta^{13}\text{C}_{zooplankton}$  to enable between-lakes comparison.

We assessed trophic niche breadth by calculating the standard ellipse area (SEA) from isotopic values ( $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ ) of all genetic groups within every lake (three groups in stocked lake; local, hybrid and stocked and one group in unstocked lakes). SEA is based on

an estimation of the Bayesian multivariate normal distribution of every group within the dataset. SEA is calculated on the posterior distribution of the covariance matrices for each group. The calculations of SEA are integrated in the R package SIBER (Jackson et al. 2011). We modelled the effects of ecotype and genetic origin on SEA (response variables) within populations using mixed effect models. Factors of the model were ecotypes (fixed, two levels: piscivorous and planktivorous) and genetic origins (fixed, four levels: wild, local, hybrid and stocked) nested within ecotypes. Populations (lakes) were treated as a random factor, to account for among-lakes variability. SEAs were log-transformed to meet normality assumption. Linear mixed models was fitted using the function *lme* in the R package *nlme*. Post-hoc contrasts among predictors (genetic groups) were realized using a least-square mean procedure provided by the R function *lsmeans* (lsmeans R package).

We also modelled the effects of ecotypes, genetic origin and total length on trophic position and distance from pelagic baseline ( $\Delta\delta^{13}C_{\text{pelagic}}$ ) again with a linear mixed effects model. The model was the same for both response variables. Models' factors were ecotypes (fixed, two levels: piscivorous and planktivorous), genetic origin (fixed, four levels: wild, local, hybrid and stocked) nested within ecotypes and total length nested within ecotypes, to account for size-difference among ecotypes. Populations (lakes) were treated as a random factor to account for among-lakes variability. Response variables were normally distributed then no transformation was required.

*Genotype-phenotype association* – Individual polygenic association with observed life-history traits was assessed using multivariate analyses. We tested for an association between genomic (SNP) individual variations and five individual ecological metrics. Those ecological metrics were trophic niche ( $\delta^{15}N$  and  $\delta^{13}C$ ), growth (asymptotic length  $L_{inf}$  and early life

growth rate  $\omega$ ) and body condition (relative weight condition index  $Wr$ ), and will be referred as life history traits thereafter for simplicity.  $L_{inf}$  and  $\omega$  were regression-estimated for each individual fish using typical Von Bertalanffy growth models (VBGM) fitted with a non-linear regression of back-calculated total length in function of age. Individual length-at-age were back-calculated using otolith measures and age-estimation under the body-proportional hypothesis (Francis 1990). VBGM modelling was performed using the *nls* function implemented within the FSA R package (Ogle 2016). This model  $L_t = L_{inf} [1 - e^{-K(t-t_0)}] + \varepsilon$  describes back-calculated length ( $L_t$ ) as a function of asymptotic length ( $L_{inf}$ ), the Von Bertalanffy growth parameter ( $K$ ), the theoretical length-at-age 0 ( $t_0$ ) and additive process error ( $\varepsilon$ ). Omega ( $\omega$ ) growth rate was calculated for each individual as  $\omega = L_{inf} * K$ , as suggested by Gallucci & Quinn (1979). This parameter is corresponding to the slope of the growth curve at its origin measured in mm/year. It can be biologically interpreted as the growth rate early in life.

The relative weight condition index was estimated as  $Wr = 100 * (W/W_s)$ , where  $W$  is weight of fish at the time of capture and  $W_s$  is a standard weight, calculated from a species-specific equation, as first suggested by Wege and Anderson (1978). These authors suggested that  $Wr$  relates not only to “fish plumpness”, but also fish general health when calculated from a standard equation encompassing the entire geographic range of a given species (Blackwell et al. 2000). Hence, we calculated standard weight based on Lake Trout total length (TL) and using the published equation derived from 58 Lake Trout populations throughout the native range of distribution;  $\log_{10}W_s = -5.681 + 3.2462 \log_{10}TL$  (Piccolo et al. 1993). We observed no significant linear relationship between  $Wr$  and total length (t-statistic<sub>20,153</sub> = -1.45, p = 0.147) or age (t-statistic<sub>20,146</sub> = -0.8, p = 0.425) in wild fish from unstocked populations. This

absence of relationship open the possibility to compare  $W_r$  between size classes as well as within and among populations (Blackwell et al. 2000).

We limited the genotype-phenotype analysis on stocked planktivorous populations, as we observed no significant variation of life history metrics between genetic origins among piscivorous populations (Morissette et al. 2018). Life history and individual SNP genotype variations were expressed as composite variables resulting from two principal component analyses (PCA); PCA for life history metrics (continuous quantitative values) was conducted on a standardized correlation matrix since those variables are based on different scales (see Legendre and Legendre 2012 for further details). PCA for SNP genotypes were realized on a covariance matrix. As PCA does not tolerate missing data, SNP alleles were imputed to avoid missing data using a Random Forest algorithm included within *vcf\_imputation* function of *stackr* package. The procedure imputed respectively 31.2 % and 21 % of the loci from McFee and Louisa lake populations. Life history principal component (PC) axes were retained for subsequent analyses based on the broken stick distribution (Legendre and Legendre 2012). Because genetic variance is usually well distributed among PC axes and differences among them are not sufficient to retain axes according to the broken-stick distribution criteria, we consider for analysis every PC axes explaining  $> 1.5\%$  of genetic variance. This percentage of variance corresponds to half the maximum percentage of variance explained by the first PC axis (3.2%). We chose this criterion to include the most informative genetic variations while remaining parsimonious and to avoid adding unnecessary variance.

Association between life history PCs (response variables) and genotypes PCs (explanatory variables) was assessed using a redundant discriminant analysis (RDA), a variant of canonical correlation analysis (CCA), included in the R package *vegan* (Oksanen et al. 2017).

Selection of the best explanatory variables (genotypes PCs) for the RDA model was conducted using automatic permutation tests of the ordination model (function *ordistep* within *vegan* package). Loci showing association with life history were selected within the significant PCs of the RDA model, based on variable loadings. The loadings of the loci within PCs were transformed to standard deviations from the mean, then loci with values  $> 2.5$  (positive correlation) or  $< -2.5$  (negative correlation) were selected, as in Uva et al. (2009). To avoid the possible confounding effect of population structure, the above analyses were realized on population-specific datasets.

The gene ontology (performed by a BLAST (blastn) query) of loci most associated with life history traits was investigated by alignment of the 80 bp sequences surrounding each relevant SNP to the Rainbow Trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) genome (Berthelot et al. 2014). We kept only alignment hits with an E-value  $< 10^{-20}$ . If multiple hits from the same loci were present, the loci with lowest E-value within the significant hits were retained. The gene ontology of the identified sequences was annotated according to (Berthelot et al. 2014) and principal known function assessed using the Uniprot database.

## Results

*Population genomics and genetic groups assignment* – The total number of raw reads obtained by sequencing was 2 057 139 965, averaging 3 590 122 reads/individual. After filtering, we retained an average of 600 SNP markers (range = 553–700) for pairwise comparisons between the source and stocked populations. Thus, in all cases, the most probable number of clusters was  $K = 2$  when stockings were from only one source population and  $K = 3$  when stockings were from two different source populations. This confirmed the accuracy of the stocking history records (Appendix S1). As expected, all five stocked

populations were constituted of trout from stocked, local and hybrid origins, with a proportion of local individuals accounting between 18% and 55% of the samples.

*Trophic niche size* – The linear mixed effects model showed that genetic origin (i.e, wild, stocked, hybrid and local) was the only factor significantly affecting SEA sizes (Table 3).

Stocked fish occupied a significantly broader isotopic niche than hybrid and local fish.

Trophic niche breaths of wild populations were highly variables, not significantly different from any other groups. Increases of trophic niche size were significant for both ecotypes (Fig. 2). In every stocked population, except Muskoka Lake, stocked fish showed a larger SEA niche size (Table 2). Trophic niche sizes of stocked fish within piscivorous populations were twice larger as local/hybrids, whereas four times larger within planktivorous.

*Group-specific trophic positions* – Average trophic positions by ecotypes ranged from  $4.29 \pm 0.54$  (planktivorous) to  $5.15 \pm 0.43$  (piscivorous). Accordingly, the linear mixed effects model showed a significant effect of ecotypes on trophic position (ANOVA,  $F_{1,3} = 10.99$ ,  $p < 0.04$ ). Among all studied Lake Trout populations (both ecotypes), there was no significant effect of genetic origin on trophic position (Table 4). Total length had only a significant effect on trophic position for piscivorous ecotypes. Larger fish were at a higher trophic position than smaller ones. Within stocked planktivorous populations, however, 20% of stocked Lake Trout showed a higher trophic position than all other fish (one way ANOVA,  $F_{1,98} = 5.67$ ,  $p = 0.01$ ). The mean difference of trophic position was 0.4 higher than other stocked fish and nearly one trophic level higher than local planktivorous trout (Tukey HSD,  $p = 0.01$ ).

*Group-specific distance from pelagic prey* – Linear mixed effect model showed no significant effect of ecotypes on distance from pelagic prey ( $\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{pelagic}}$ ). Genetic origin and total length had a significant effect on distance from pelagic prey, but only within planktivorous populations (Table 4). Thus, fish of local genetic origin had a significantly more negative (pelagic)  $\Delta\delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{pelagic}}$  value (-0.30‰) than wild (2.41‰), hybrid (0.78‰) and stocked fish (0.70‰), showing a higher than expected reliance on pelagic/profundal trophic resources. Total length was positively correlated to distance from pelagic prey only within populations of the planktivorous ecotype. Hence, larger hybrid and stocked fish displayed  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values linked to a diet comprising a larger proportion of littoral preys compared to local fish. There was no significant effect of any factor on distance from pelagic preys within piscivorous populations (Fig. 3).

*Genotype-phenotype association* – After the second filtering, we retained respectively 1248 and 5119 SNP markers for the McFee and Louisa planktivorous populations. A population-specific PCA for life history and genotype metrics was performed prior to RDA analysis. In the McFee population, we kept the first two life history PCs according to the broken-stick distribution, which together explained 66.6% of the life history variation, and the first 31 genotype PCs each explaining >1.5% of variation, and which collectively explained 65.3% of all genetic variation. In the Louisa population, we kept also two life history PC and 31 genotypes PCs, which represented 79.8% and 66.7% of the life history and genetic variance, respectively. Stepwise selection of the RDA model using the *ordistep* R function identified five genotype PCs (PC1, PC14, PC19, PC25 and PC31) for the McFee population. The model was globally significant ( $p = 0.007$ ) and explained 65.5 % of the life history variation ( $\text{Adj.R}^2 = 0.13$ ) (Fig. 4). In the Louisa population, stepwise RDA construction retained three genotype PCs (PC1, PC2 and PC8). The model was globally significant ( $p < 0.001$ ) and explained 46



% of the life history variation ( $\text{Adj.R}^2 = 0.15$ ) (Fig. 4). After selection of loci showing association with life history, based on PC loadings, 135 and 341 loci were respectively retained for the McFee and Louisa populations.

*Gene ontology* – The BLAST alignment analysis on the 135 (McFee Lake) and 341 (Louisa Lake) loci identified as putatively associated with life history metrics returned five and 14 significant ( $E\text{-value} < 1 \text{e-}20$ ) and unique alignments that were located within genes. Those genes were mainly associated with biological functions related to growth, immunity, metabolism and oogenesis (Table 5).

## Discussion

Risk assessment and prediction of the consequences resulting from supplementation represent a major challenge in the management of exploited fish stocks (Ham and Pearsons 2001, Aprahamian et al. 2003). In particular, introductions of predators from the same trophic guild, deliberated or not, have been shown to modify food webs (Sharma and Borgström 2008, Schulze et al. 2012, Bašić and Britton 2016). Accordingly, our data showed an increased niche breadth in stocked populations of both ecotypes, but individual segregation in resource utilization only for populations of planktivorous ecotype. To our knowledge, our results are the first to show the underlying potential to induce intraspecific niche partitioning as a consequence of supplementation stockings. In contrast, a study of supplementation stockings using a domesticated hatchery strain of Brook Trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*) showed no impact on utilized trophic niche of stocked, hybrid and local resident fish (Lachance and Magnan 1990). The wider trophic capacity of Lake Trout (a large apex-predator) compared to Brook Trout, along with the striking variations in life-history traits observed in Lake Trout (Muir et al. 2015), could explain the more pronounced food web modifications observed in this study.

We are suggesting that community complexity, niche availability and the resulting competitive interactions between divergent groups of individuals as probable explanations for the observed niche partitioning within planktivorous populations.

*Community as niche partitioning susceptibility factor*

In this study, trophic niche sizes of stocked fish were significantly larger in population of both ecotypes. Trophic niche widening could be caused either by a generalist feeding strategy as well as individual specialization in response of intraspecific competition (Bolnick et al. 2003, Svanback and Persson 2004). Both of these strategies may cause the same manifestation of an apparent niche widening at the population level. Assessing individual utilization rather than population averages was thus critical to understand the underlying processes of those niche expansions. Hence, analyses of individual trophic position and distance from pelagic prey had a unique contribution to address this question.

Whereas our results indicate that niche diversification/expansion of stocked fish was a consistent consequence of supplementation stocking, the difference in effect size and the values of trophic metrics are suggesting that underlying mechanisms for this diversification were not the same among ecotypes. Within populations of piscivorous ecotype, individual trophic metrics only showed a simultaneous increase of trophic position alongside total length. This observation was consistent with the ontogenetic diet shift observed in natural populations (Trippel and Beamish 1989, France and Steedman 1996). Younger and smaller lake trout feeding on zooplankton and macrobenthic invertebrates are gradually becoming more piscivorous or moving toward larger pelagic invertebrate preys (i.e. *mysids*) as they grow. This phenomenon is common in species with gape limit and is generally operating at age 1 – 4 and/or TL > 200 mm in wild populations of large-bodied piscivorous lake trout

(Martin 1951, Zimmerman et al. 2009). The uniformity of other diet metrics among genetic groups suggested that only some atypical individuals were involved in the observed trophic niche expansion. Hence, broader niche size may be a consequence of a diet diversification fueled by plasticity of the newly stocked individuals exposed to a novel, potentially stressful habitat (Ghalambor et al. 2007, Amundsen et al. 2012). Hatchery rearing, even after one generation, could promote atypical behavioral characteristics (i.e., bolder and more aggressive fish), favoring establishment of new life history strategies (Tymchuk et al. 2006, Pearsons et al. 2007). However, the diversity of available trophic resources in lakes hosting large-bodied piscivorous ecotypes is probably sufficient to sustain those individuals, precluding population-wide deleterious trophic consequences.

The significant difference among genetic groups in planktivorous lakes suggests a much more complex mechanism. Stocked fish exhibited a broader, but also contrasting individual niche use compared to the local and hybrid fish. Resident local fish appeared restricted to a limited trophic niche mostly based on pelagic/profundal prey. In comparison, stocked fish showed higher reliance on littoral resources of higher trophic position. The local pelagic/profundal trophic niche metrics showed practically no similarity with conspecifics from unstocked planktivorous populations, suggesting alteration of typical trophic niche subsequent to supplementation. This finding is in accordance with theoretical expectation of communities' susceptibility; consequences of exogenous introduction/invasion are higher in simpler food webs (Emmerson and Yearsley 2004). The presence of pelagic prey are expected to buffer against the impacts of introduction (Vander Zanden et al. 2004), by sustaining diet diversification and/or atypical ontogenetic shifts. This supports the hypothesis that lake community structure mediates the impacts of supplementation (Downing and Leibold 2010). Stocking-induced niche displacements are probably resulting from competitive exclusion

between stocked and local lake trout, as well as genetic divergence from the local populations (McDermid et al. 2007).

#### *Generalist/specialist competitive interactions*

Intraspecific competitive interactions seem important between Lake Trout ecotypes newly found in sympatry following supplementation stocking. Indeed, our results show that local fish were displaced by stocked trout, a situation analogous to food web consequences observed following introduction of Smallmouth Bass (Vander Zanden et al. 1999). Similar results were also obtained in a study on sympatric Brown Trout (*Salmo trutta*) and Arctic Char (*Salvelinus alpinus*) in Norway where species coexist. The most aggressive territorial trout relegate the less competitive char to the inferior pelagic or profundal trophic niche (Langeland et al. 1991). This represents a clear case of niche differentiation caused by interspecific competitive asymmetry. Niche segregation observed between Arctic Char and Brown Trout has also been hypothesized to be a symptom of prey preference and foraging efficiency of both species (Jansen et al. 2002). Hence, stocked Lake Trout from source population of the piscivorous ecotype could be a more competitive generalist predator than the specialized local planktivorous trout.

Previous studies have shown that top consumers in high-latitude lakes feed preferentially on littoral rather than pelagic energy sources (Vadeboncoeur et al. 2002, Eloranta et al. 2010).

Littoral habitat tends to provide more opportunities, but is also a habitat of higher competitive interactions (e.g., more pronounced light intensity, restricted vertical space) compared to the open pelagic habitat which offers scarce and small prey (Schindler and Scheuerell 2002).

Large-bodied piscivorous Lake Trout is an opportunistic generalist feeder, with energy acquisition coming from a trophic niche more or less distributed between littoral and pelagic

habitat (Vander Zanden et al. 2000). However, the simpler food webs of lakes hosting the planktivorous ecotype is limited in terms of possible energy sources and have driven evolution of trophic specialization, or ecotypes (Morbey et al. 2006, Zimmerman et al. 2007, McDermid et al. 2010). Thus, phylogeographic studies suggest that the planktivorous ecotype most likely result from local adaptation that evolved following postglacial colonization (i.e. ~ 8000 B.P. Wilson and Hebert 1996, 1998) and represent a specialized (and less competitive) form of the ancestral piscivorous ecotype (McDermid et al. 2010, Bernatchez et al. 2016). Trophic flexibility and larger size of stocked fish are probably favoring competitive exclusion of local trout, forcing them to decrease foraging on macro-benthic littoral preys. Interestingly, hybrid fish displayed intermediate trophic status between pure genetic groups, suggesting that the genetic basis of ecotypic determination (Baillie et al. 2016, Bernatchez et al. 2016), may at least partially contribute to ecological outcomes of competitive interactions.

*Contrasting ecotypic variation; a genetic predisposition to competitive interactions?*

The high numbers of significant loci identified by RDA analyses corroborates the potential polygenic basis of life history traits, with a large set of small effect genes leading to important intra-population differences. This is in accordance with other salmonid alternative life history strategies shown to be under some genetic control (Rogers et al. 2002, Aubin-Horth et al. 2004, Gagnaire et al. 2013). According to our previous observations and hypotheses (Morissette et al. 2018), contrasting trophic niches could be related to intraspecific divergence in early life growth rate ( $\omega$ ) and asymptotic length ( $L_{inf}$ ).

Results of gene ontology showed that SNPs significantly associated with life history trait variations are mainly located within genes linked to growth functions and differentiation in various cell types (*Growth differentiation factor 11*, *transforming growth factor beta 2 & 3*, *inhibin beta A2*, and *follistatin B1*), including regulation of muscle growth and development

(Berthelot et al. 2014, de Mello et al. 2014). All of these genes have been described as part of the transforming growth factor beta (TGF $\beta$ ) superfamily and represent a coherent complex of genes implied in growth as well as sexual maturation (notably *inhibin beta A4*) and immunity (de Mello et al. 2014).

We are aware that our BLAST alignment analysis does not cover the entire genome and should be taken with caution. However, parallel identification of genes from the same functional roles in two independent populations suggests a congruent mechanism of ecological differentiation observed in response of supplementation stocking of planktivorous populations. Hence, genetically-based differences underlying ecotypic variation (piscivorous vs. planktivorous ecotypes) could be a factor of predisposition to contrasting life strategies by favoring fast early life growth rate and larger maximum length of the stocked piscivorous trout. In turn, this may increase intraspecific competition and promote niche partitioning. Hence, the small proportion of larger stocked fish feeding in high trophic position and hybrid individuals are probably the main drivers of the observed competitive exclusion (Fig. 4).

### *Conclusion*

Considerations of the food web structure generally focus on a somewhat oversimplification of the species role and function within a given environment. Indeed, there is a tendency to consider each species as a homogenous set of individuals, especially when planning supplementation stocking. Yet, most if not all species are characterized by intra-specific variations, including generalist top predators. It is thus increasingly important to consider the individual variability of a species' trophic niche to assess potential inter- and intraspecific interactions. Our results showed that the intraspecific competitive interactions between contrasting ecotypes could be an important cause of trophic niche perturbation. Lake Trout

communities lacking pelagic fish prey seem more susceptible to such perturbations, and should be managed taking this information into consideration. Finally, natural variation among populations that evolved different life histories (e.g. planktivorous vs. piscivorous) as well as the community characteristics of their habitats should be considered in order to mitigate risk factors associated with competitive exclusion and food web alterations resulting from supplementation stocking.

### **Acknowledgments**

We are grateful to Anne-Laure Ferchaud and Amanda Xuereb for their insightful comments.

We also want to thank Patrick Plourde-Lavoie, Tommy Larouche, Stéphane Gagnon-Harvey, Guillaume Côté and Cecilia Hernandez for their help with field sampling and/or laboratory.

We are also grateful to three anonymous reviewers for their constructive comments and suggestions on a previous version of this manuscript. This research was financially supported by a strategic partnership grant for projects from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council (NSERC) of Canada to LB and PS, the Canadian Research Chair in Genomics and Conservation of Aquatic Resources to LB and the Chaire de recherche sur les espèces aquatiques exploitées to PS. OM was supported by a Fonds de Recherche du Québec – Nature et Technologies FRQNT scholarship (2014) and an Alexander Graham Bell scholarship (NSERC, 2015-2017). We also acknowledge the invaluable contribution of the Ministère des Forêts, de la Faune et des Parcs (MFFP), the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (OMNRF) and the Fédération québécoise des Chasseurs et Pêcheurs (FédéCP) for their support. This study is a contribution to the research program of Ressources Aquatiques Québec (RAQ).

## References

- Alexander, D. H., J. Novembre, and K. Lange. 2009. Fast model-based estimation of ancestry in unrelated individuals. *Genome Research* **19**:1655-1664.
- Aljanabi, S. M., and I. Martinez. 1997. Universal and rapid salt-extraction of high quality genomic DNA for PCR-based techniques. *Nucleic Acids Research* **25**:4692-4693.
- Allendorf, F. W., R. F. Leary, P. Spruell, and J. K. Wenburg. 2001. The problems with hybrids: setting conservation guidelines. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **16**:613-622.
- Amundsen, P. A., E. Salonen, T. Niva, K. O. Gjelland, K. Praebel, O. T. Sandlund, R. Knudsen, and T. Bohn. 2012. Invader population speeds up life history during colonization. *Biological Invasions* **14**:1501-1513.
- Aprahamian, M. W., K. Martin Smith, P. McGinnity, S. McKelvey, and J. Taylor. 2003. Restocking of salmonids—opportunities and limitations. *Fisheries Research* **62**:211-227.
- Araki, H., B. A. Berejikian, M. J. Ford, and M. S. Blouin. 2008. Fitness of hatchery-reared salmonids in the wild. *Evolutionary Applications* **1**:342-355.
- Araki, H., B. Cooper, and M. S. Blouin. 2009. Carry-over effect of captive breeding reduces reproductive fitness of wild-born descendants in the wild. *Biology Letters* **5**:621-624.
- Aubin-Horth, N., J. J. Dodson, and B. Sinervo. 2004. Influence of individual body size and variable thresholds on the incidence of a sneaker male reproductive tactic in Atlantic Salmon. *Evolution* **58**:136-144.
- Baillie, S. M., A. M. Muir, M. J. Hansen, C. C. Krueger, and P. Bentzen. 2016. Genetic and phenotypic variation along an ecological gradient in lake trout *Salvelinus namaycush*. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* **16**:219.



- Bašić, T., and J. R. Britton. 2016. Characterizing the trophic niches of stocked and resident cyprinid fishes: consistency in partitioning over time, space and body sizes. *Ecology and Evolution* **6**:5093-5104.
- Berejikian, B. A., D. M. Van Doornik, J. A. Scheurer, and R. Bush. 2009. Reproductive behavior and relative reproductive success of natural- and hatchery-origin Hood Canal summer chum salmon (*Oncorhynchus keta*). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **66**:781-789.
- Bernatchez, S., M. Laporte, C. Perrier, P. Sirois, and L. Bernatchez. 2016. Investigating genomic and phenotypic parallelism between piscivorous and planktivorous Lake Trout (*Salvelinus namaycush*) ecotypes by means of RADseq and morphometrics analyses. *Molecular Ecology* **25**:4773-4792.
- Berthelot, C., F. Brunet, and D. Chalopin. 2014. The rainbow trout genome provides novel insights into evolution after whole-genome duplication in vertebrates. *Nature Communications* **5**:3657.
- Betancor, M. B., E. McStay, M. Minghetti, H. Migaud, D. R. Tocher, and A. Davie. 2014. Daily rhythms in expression of genes of hepatic lipid metabolism in Atlantic Salmon (*Salmo salar* L.). *PLoS ONE* **9**:e106739.
- Blackwell, B. G., M. L. Brown, and D. W. Willis. 2000. Relative weight ( $W_r$ ) status and current use in fisheries assessment and management. *Reviews in Fisheries Science* **8**:1-44.
- Bolnick, D. I., R. Svanback, J. A. Fordyce, L. H. Yang, J. M. Davis, C. D. Hulsey, and M. L. Forister. 2003. The ecology of individuals: Incidence and implications of individual specialization. *American Naturalist* **161**:1-28.
- Bourret, V., P. T. O'Reilly, J. W. Carr, P. R. Berg, and L. Bernatchez. 2011. Temporal change in genetic integrity suggests loss of local adaptation in a wild Atlantic salmon (*Salmo*

*salar*) population following introgression by farmed escapees. *Heredity* (Edinb) **106**:500-510.

Catchen, J., P. A. Hohenlohe, S. Bassham, A. Amores, and W. A. Cresko. 2013. Stacks: an analysis tool set for population genomics. *Molecular Ecology* **22**:3124-3140.

Christie, M. R., M. L. Marine, S. E. Fox, R. A. French, and M. S. Blouin. 2016. A single generation of domestication heritably alters the expression of hundreds of genes. *Nature Communications* **7**:10676.

Cowx, I. G. 1994. Stocking strategies. *Fisheries Management and Ecology* **1**:15-30.

Davail, B., F. Pakdel, H. Bujo, L. Perazzolo, M. Waclawek, W. Schneider, and F. Le Menn. 1998. Evolution of oogenesis: the receptor for vitellogenin from the rainbow trout. *Journal of lipid research* **3**:1929-1937.

de Mello, F., D. P. Streit, N. Sabin, and J.-C. Gabillard. 2014. Identification of TGF- $\beta$ , inhibin  $\beta$ A and follistatin paralogs in the rainbow trout genome. *Comparative biochemistry and physiology. Part B, Biochemistry & molecular biology* **177-178**:46-55.

Downing, A. L., and M. A. Leibold. 2010. Species richness facilitates ecosystem resilience in aquatic food webs. *Freshwater Biology* **55**:2123-2137.

Eby, L. A., W. J. Roach, L. B. Crowder, and J. A. Stanford. 2006. Effects of stocking-up freshwater food webs. *TRENDS in Ecology and Evolution* **21**:576-584.

Eloranta, A. P., K. K. Kahilainen, and R. I. Jones. 2010. Seasonal and ontogenetic shifts in the diet of Arctic charr *Salvelinus alpinus* in a subarctic lake. *Journal of Fish Biology* **77**:80-97.

Emmerson, M., and J. M. Yearsley. 2004. Weak interactions, omnivory and emergent food-web properties. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences* **271**:397.

- Evans, D. O., and C. C. Willox. 1991. Loss of exploited, indigenous populations of lake trout, *Salvelinus namaycush*, by stocking of nonnative stocks. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **48**:134-147.
- France, R., and R. Steedman. 1996. Energy provenance for juvenile lake trout in small Canadian Shield lakes as shown by stable isotopes. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* **125**:512-518.
- Francis, R. I. C. C. 1990. Back-calculation of fish length: a critical review. *Journal of Fish Biology* **36**:883-902.
- Fraser, D. J., A. L. S. Houde, P. V. Debes, P. O'Reilly, J. D. Eddington, and J. A. Hutchings. 2010. Consequences of farmed–wild hybridization across divergent wild populations and multiple traits in salmon. *Ecological Applications* **20**:935-953.
- Gagnaire, P., and O. Gaggiotti. 2016. Detecting polygenic selection in marine populations by combining population genomics and quantitative genetics approaches. *Current Zoology* **62**:603-616.
- Gagnaire, P.-A., E. Normandeau, S. A. Pavey, and L. Bernatchez. 2013. Mapping phenotypic, expression and transmission ratio distortion QTL using RAD markers in the Lake Whitefish (*Coregonus clupeaformis*). *Molecular Ecology* **22**:3036-3048.
- Gallucci, V. F., and T. J. Quinn. 1979. Reparameterizing, fitting, and testing a simple growth model. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* **108**:14-25.
- Ghalambor, C. K., J. K. McKay, S. P. Carroll, and D. N. Reznick. 2007. Adaptive versus non-adaptive phenotypic plasticity and the potential for contemporary adaptation in new environments. *Functional Ecology* **21**:394-407.
- Gosselin, T., and L. Bernatchez. 2016. stackr: GBS/RAD Data exploration, manipulation and visualization using R. R package version 0.3.1.

Ham, K. D., and T. N. Pearsons. 2001. A practical approach for containing ecological risks associated with fish stocking programs. *Fisheries* **26**:15-23.

Hansen, J. D., and J. M. Dijkstra. 2010. The rainbow trout UGA locus.

EMBL/GenBank/DDBJ databases.

Hunt, T. L., G. Khageswor, P. Brown, B. L. Ingram, P. L. Jones, L. J. B. Laurenson, and A. M. Wallis. 2014. Consequences of fish stocking density in a recreational fishery.

*Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **71**:1554-1560.

Hutchings, J. A. 2014. Unintentional selection, unanticipated insights: introductions, stocking and the evolutionary ecology of fishes. *Journal of Fish Biology* **85**:1907-1926.

Jackson, A. L., R. Inger, A. C. Parnell, and S. Bearhop. 2011. Comparing isotopic niche widths among and within communities: SIBER – Stable Isotope Bayesian Ellipses in R. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **80**:595-602.

Lachance, S., and P. Magnan. 1990. Comparative ecology and behavior of domestic, hybrid, and wild strains of Brook Trout, *Salvelinus fontinalis*, after stocking. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **47**:2285-2292.

Lamaze, F. C., D. Garant, and L. Bernatchez. 2013. Stocking impacts the expression of candidate genes and physiological condition in introgressed brook charr (*Salvelinus fontinalis*) populations. *Evolutionary Applications* **6**:393-407.

Langeland, A., J. H. L'Abée-Lund, B. Jonsson, and N. Jonsson. 1991. Resource partitioning and niche shift in Arctic Charr *Salvelinus alpinus* and Brown Trout *Salmo trutta*. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **60**:895-912.

Laporte, M., S. A. Pavey, C. Rougeux, F. Pierron, M. Lauzent, H. Budzinski, P. Labadie, E. Geneste, P. Couture, M. Baudrimont, and L. Bernatchez. 2016. RAD sequencing reveals within-generation polygenic selection in response to anthropogenic organic and metal contamination in North Atlantic Eels. *Molecular Ecology* **25**:219-237.

- Legendre, P., and L. Legendre. 2012. Numerical ecology, 3rd edition. Elsevier.
- Martin, M. 2011. Cutadapt removes adapter sequences from high-throughput sequencing reads. *EMBnet. journal* **17**:10-12.
- Martin, N. V. 1951. A study of the lake trout, *Salvelinus namaycush*, in two Algonquin Park, Ontario, lakes. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*:111-137.
- Martin, N. V., and C. H. Olver. 1980. The lake charr, *Salvelinus namaycush*. in E. K. Balon, editor. *Charrs, salmonids fishes of the genus Salvelinus*. Dr. W. Junk Publishers, Hague, Netherlands.
- McDermid, J. L., P. E. Ihssen, W. N. Sloan, and B. J. Shuter. 2007. Genetic and environmental influences on life history traits in lake trout. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* **136**:1018-1029.
- McDermid, J. L., B. J. Shuter, and N. P. Lester. 2010. Life history differences parallel environmental differences among North American lake trout (*Salvelinus namaycush*) populations. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **67**:314-325.
- McGinnity, P., P. Prodohl, K. Ferguson, R. Hynes, N. O'Maoileidigh, N. Baker, D. Cotter, B. O'Hea, D. Cooke, G. Rogan, J. Taggart, and T. Cross. 2003. Fitness reduction and potential extinction of wild populations of Atlantic salmon, *Salmo salar*, as a result of interactions with escaped farm salmon. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B-Biological Sciences* **270**:2443-2450.
- Morbey, Y. E., P. Addison, B. J. Shuter, and K. Vascotto. 2006. Within-population heterogeneity of habitat use by lake trout *Salvelinus namaycush*. *Journal of Fish Biology* **69**:1675-1696.
- Morissette, O., P. Sirois, N. P. Lester, C. C. Wilson, and L. Bernatchez. 2018. Supplementation stocking of Lake Trout (*Salvelinus namaycush*) in small boreal lakes: ecotypes influence on growth and condition. *PLoS ONE* **13**.

- Muhlfeld, C. C., S. T. Kalinowski, T. E. McMahon, M. L. Taper, S. Painter, R. F. Leary, and F. W. Allendorf. 2009. Hybridization rapidly reduces fitness of a native trout in the wild. *Biology Letters* **5**:328-331.
- Muir, A. M., M. J. Hansen, C. R. Bronte, and C. C. Krueger. 2015. If Arctic charr *Salvelinus alpinus* is 'the most diverse vertebrate', what is the lake charr *Salvelinus namaycush*? *Fish and Fisheries* **17**:1194-1207.
- Ogle, D. H. 2016. FSA: Fisheries Stock Analysis. R package version 0.8.11.
- Oksanen, J., G. Blanchet, M. Friendly, R. Kindt, P. Legendre, D. McGlinn, P. R. Minchin, R. B. O'Hara, G. L. Simpson, P. Solymos, H. H. Stevens, E. Szoecs, and H. Wagner. 2017. vegan: Community Ecology Package.
- Pearsons, T. N., A. L. Fritts, and J. L. Scott. 2007. The effects of hatchery domestication on competitive dominance of juvenile spring Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*). *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **64**:803-812.
- Piccolo, J. J., W. A. Hubert, and R. A. Whaley. 1993. Standard weight equation for Lake trout. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management* **13**:401-404.
- Post, D. M., C. A. Layman, D. A. Arrington, G. Takimoto, J. Quattrochi, and C. G. Montana. 2007. Getting to the fat of the matter: models, methods and assumptions for dealing with lipids in stable isotope analyses. *Oecologia* **152**:179-189.
- Post, J. R., M. Sullivan, S. Cox, N. P. Lester, C. J. Walters, E. A. Parkinson, A. J. Paul, L. Jackson, and B. J. Shuter. 2002. Canada's recreational fisheries: The invisible collapse? *Fisheries* **27**:6-17.
- Rasmussen, J. B., D. J. Rowan, D. R. S. Lean, and J. H. Carey. 1990. Food chain structure in Ontario lakes determines PCB levels in Lake trout (*Salvelinus namaycush*) and other pelagic fish. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **47**:2030-2038.

Renaut, S., and L. Bernatchez. 2011. Transcriptome-wide signature of hybrid breakdown associated with intrinsic reproductive isolation in lake whitefish species pairs (*Coregonus* spp. Salmonidae). *Heredity (Edinb)* **106**:1003-1011.

Rogers, S. M., V. Gagnon, and L. Bernatchez. 2002. Genetically based phenotype-environment association for swimming behavior in Lake Whitefish ecotypes (*Coregonus clupeadormis* Mitchill). *Evolution* **56**:2322-2329.

Schindler, D. E., and M. D. Scheuerell. 2002. Habitat coupling in lake ecosystems. *Oikos* **98**:177-189.

Schulze, T., H. Dörner, U. Baade, and F. Hölker. 2012. Dietary niche partitioning in a piscivorous fish guild in response to stocking of an additional competitor – The role of diet specialisation. *Limnologica - Ecology and Management of Inland Waters* **42**:56-64.

Scott, W. B., and E. J. Crossman. 1998. *Freshwater fishes of Canada*. Galt House Publications Ltd. edition. Galt House Publications Ltd.

Sharma, C. M., and R. Borgström. 2008. Shift in density, habitat use, and diet of perch and roach: An effect of changed predation pressure after manipulation of pike. *Fisheries Research* **91**:98-106.

Shuter, B. J., M. L. Jones, R. M. Korver, and N. P. Lester. 1998. A general, life history based model for regional management of fish stocks: the inland lake trout (*Salvelinus namaycush*) fisheries of Ontario. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **55**:2161-2177.

Svanback, R., and L. Persson. 2004. Individual diet specialization, niche width and population dynamics: implications for trophic polymorphisms. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **73**:973-982.

- Trippel, E. A., and W. H. Beamish. 1989. Lake Trout (*Salvelinus namaycush*) growth potential predicted from Cisco (*Coregonus artedii*) population structure and conductivity. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **46**:1531-1538.
- Tymchuk, W. E., C. Biagi, R. Withler, and R. H. Devlin. 2006. Growth and behavioral consequences of introgression of a domesticated aquaculture genotype into a native strain of Coho Salmon. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* **135**:442-455.
- Utter, F., and J. Epifanio. 2002. Marine aquaculture: Genetic potentialities and pitfalls. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries* **12**:59-77.
- Uva, P., L. Aurisicchio, J. Watters, A. Loboda, A. Kulkarni, J. Castle, F. Palombo, V. Viti, G. Mesiti, V. Zappulli, L. Marconato, F. Abramo, G. Ciliberto, A. Lahm, N. La Monica, and E. de Rinaldis. 2009. Comparative expression pathway analysis of human and canine mammary tumors. *BMC Genomics* **10**:135.
- Vadeboncoeur, Y., M. J. Vander Zanden, and D. M. Lodge. 2002. Putting the lake back together: Reintegrating benthic pathways into lake food web models. *Bioscience* **52**:44-54.
- Valiquette, E., C. Perrier, I. Thibault, and L. Bernatchez. 2014. Loss of genetic integrity in wild lake trout populations following stocking: insights from an exhaustive study of 72 lakes from Québec, Canada. *Evolutionary Applications* **7**:625-644.
- Vander Zanden, M. J., J. M. Casselman, and J. B. Rasmussen. 1999. Stable isotope evidence for the food web consequences of species invasions in lakes. *Nature* **401**:464-467.
- Vander Zanden, M. J., J. D. Olden, J. H. Thorne, and N. E. Mandrak. 2004. Predicting occurrences and impacts of Smallmouth Bass introductions in North temperate lakes. *Ecological Applications* **14**:132-148.
- Vander Zanden, M. J., B. J. Shuter, N. P. Lester, and J. B. Rasmussen. 2000. Within- and among-population variation in the trophic position of a pelagic predator, lake trout



(*Salvelinus namaycush*). Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences **57**:725-731.

Vandersteen, W., P. Biro, L. Harris, and R. Devlin. 2012. Introgression of domesticated alleles into a wild trout genotype and the impact on seasonal survival in natural lakes. *Evolutionary Applications* **5**:76-88.

Verleih, M., A. Rebl, T. Korytar, K. Wimmers, and T. Goldammer. 2010. Apoptosis-related genes in rainbow trout. EMBL/GenBank/DDBJ databases.

Wang, T., N. Bols, and C. J. Secombes. 2000. Two promoters of inducible nitric oxide synthase gene exist in Rainbow Trout evidenced by studies with RTS-11 and RTG-2 cell lines. EMBL/GenBank/DDBJ databases.

Weber, E. D., and K. D. Fausch. 2003. Interactions between hatchery and wild salmonids in streams: differences in biology and evidence for competition. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences **60**:1018-1036.

Wege, G. J., and R. O. Anderson. 1978. Relative weight ( $W_r$ ): A new index of condition for Largemouth bass. Pages 79-91 in G. Novinger and J. Dillard, editors. *New approaches to the management of small impoundments*. American Fisheries Society, Bethesda, MD.

Wilson, C. C., and P. D. N. Hebert. 1996. Phylogeographic origins of lake trout (*Salvelinus namaycush*) in eastern North America. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences **53**:2764-2775.

Wilson, C. C., and P. D. N. Hebert. 1998. Phylogeography and postglacial dispersal of Lake trout (*Salvelinus namaycush*) in North America. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences **55**:1010-1024.

Zimmerman, M. S., C. C. Krueger, and R. L. Eshenroder. 2007. Morphological and ecological differences between shallow- and deep-water lake trout in Lake Mistassini, Quebec. *Journal of Great Lakes Research* **33**:156-169.

Zimmerman, M. S., S. N. Schmidt, C. C. Krueger, M. J. Vander Zanden, and R. L. Eshenroder. 2009. Ontogenetic niche shifts and resource partitioning of lake trout morphotypes. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **66**:1007-1018.

Zou, J., B. Gorgoglione, N. G. H. Taylor, T. Summathed, P.-T. Lee, A. Panigrahi, C. Genet, Y.-M. Chen, T.-Y. Chen, M. Ul Hassan, S. M. Mughal, P. Boudinot, and C. J. Secombes. 2014. Salmonids have an extraordinary complex type I IFN system: Characterization of the IFN locus in Rainbow Trout *Oncorhynchus mykiss* reveals two novel IFN subgroups. *The Journal of Immunology* **193**:2273.

#### **Data Availability**

All raw data file and R codes from this work are available from the Dryad Digital Repository:

<https://doi.org/10.5061/dryad.nt511dp>

## Tables

Table 1. Study design and key information for each lake, including the year that each lake was stocked for the last time, lake area, and average annual air temperature and design groups.

| Lake       | Lat.   | Long.   | Last year stocked | Lake area (ha) | Mean air temp (°C) | Mean length (mm) | Mean age | Design group            |
|------------|--------|---------|-------------------|----------------|--------------------|------------------|----------|-------------------------|
| Desert     | 46.573 | -76.322 | -                 | 329            | 3.08               | 483.3            | 11.5     | Wild - Piscivorous      |
| Marguerite | 47.029 | -75.804 | -                 | 662            | 2.34               | 491.5            | 11.8     | Wild - Piscivorous      |
| Opeongo    | 45.688 | -78.363 | -                 | 5154           | NA                 | 485.3            | 10.5     | Wild - Piscivorous      |
| Antoine    | 46.370 | -76.986 | -                 | 435            | 3.33               | 417.4            | 11.4     | Wild - Planktivorous    |
| Bondy      | 47.083 | -75.851 | -                 | 531            | 2.18               | 372.4            | 12.9     | Wild - Planktivorous    |
| Cayamant   | 46.106 | -76.277 | 2011              | 725            | 3.93               | 484.8            | 10.4     | Stocked - Piscivorous   |
| Muskoka    | 45.054 | -79.491 | 2014              | 12205          | NA                 | 502.0            | 12.2     | Stocked - Piscivorous   |
| Cedres     | 46.305 | -76.111 | 2011              | 282            | 3.84               | 539.9            | 10.6     | Stocked - Piscivorous   |
| Louisa     | 45.772 | -74.417 | 2006              | 440            | 3.98               | 418.4            | 11.9     | Stocked - Planktivorous |
| McFee      | 45.715 | -75.623 | 2001              | 93             | 4.03               | 408.0            | 13.6     | Stocked - Planktivorous |

Table 2. Mean and standard deviation (SD) of stable isotope ratios of each genetic group (local, hybrid, stocked and wild) within lakes, number of fish by groups, convex hull total area (TA) and 95% standard ellipse area (SEA) of the group niches

| <b>Ecotypes</b>      | <b>Lake</b> | <b>Genetic group</b> | <b>n</b> | <b>Mean <math>\delta^{13}\text{C}</math></b> | <b>SD</b> | <b>Mean <math>\delta^{15}\text{N}</math></b> | <b>SD</b> | <b>TA</b>       | <b>SEA</b>      |
|----------------------|-------------|----------------------|----------|--|-----------|--|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| <i>Piscivorous</i>   | Desert      | Wild                 | 15       | -28.18                                       | 0.27      | 12.18  | 0.36      | 0.85            | 0.29            |
|                      | Marguerite  | Wild                 | 15       | -26.66                                       | 0.62      | 10.44  | 0.85      | 3.51            | 1.57            |
|                      | Opeongo     | Wild                 | 25       | -25.99                                       | 0.87      | 10.60  | 1.94      | 20.0            | 4.93            |
|                      | Cayamant    | Local                | 8        | -29.59                                       | 1.30      | 12.25  | 0.52      | 3.49            | 1.97            |
|                      |             | Hybrid               | 5        | -29.85                                       | 2.24      | 12.62  | 0.58      | 1.50            | 1.44            |
|                      |             | Stocked              | 10       | -29.60                                       | 2.42      | 12.53  | 0.68      | 7.20            | 3.37            |
|                      | Cèdres      | Local                | 21       | -28.54                                       | 0.33      | 11.69  | 0.48      | 1.47            | 0.49            |
|                      |             | Hybrid               | 13       | -28.56                                       | 0.27      | 11.84  | 0.18      | 0.31            | 0.15            |
|                      |             | Stocked              | 9        | -28.28                                       | 0.83      | 11.76  | 0.62      | 1.31            | 0.83            |
|                      | Muskoka     | Local                | 24       | -26.87                                       | 0.49      | 16.04  | 1.40      | 6.86            | 2.02            |
|                      |             | Hybrid               | 25       | -26.91                                       | 0.60      | 16.18  | 1.04      | 5.55            | 1.52            |
|                      |             | Stocked              | 25       | -26.92                                       | 0.53      | 15.88  | 1.65      | 9.60            | 2.29            |
| <i>Planktivorous</i> | Antoine     | Wild                 | 15       | -27.13                                       | 0.88      | 10.90  | 1.03      | 5.67            | 2.86            |
|                      | Bondy       | Wild                 | 10       | -25.91                                       | 0.37      | 8.60   | 0.71      | 1.81            | 0.82            |
|                      | Louisa      | Local                | 2        | -28.35                                       | 0.17      | 11.68  | 0.11      | ND <sup>1</sup> | ND <sup>1</sup> |
|                      |             | Hybrid               | 6        | -28.65                                       | 0.67      | 12.11  | 0.48      | 1.05            | 0.86            |
|                      |             | Stocked              | 9        | -28.20                                       | 2.98      | 11.85  | 0.41      | 8.16            | 4.32            |
|                      | McFee       | Local                | 13       | -34.23                                       | 1.48      | 11.06  | 0.66      | 13.9            | 2.66            |
|                      |             | Hybrid               | 18       | -33.65                                       | 2.18      | 11.05  | 0.75      | 8.25            | 2.37            |
| Stocked              |             | 36                   | -32.80   | 2.08   | 11.16     | 0.89   | 13.4      | 5.39            |                 |

<sup>1</sup> Data number not sufficient to estimate

Table 3. Linear mixed effect model for standard ellipse area (SEA), where columns present the estimates of differences (positive or negative) of group response variables with the intercept (piscivorous ecotype), standard error and  $p$ -values of the factor.

| Coefficient                       | Response SEA |                |                  |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|----------------|------------------|
|                                   | Estimate     | Standard Error | $p$ -value       |
| <b>Fixed parts</b>                |              |                |                  |
| Intercept                         | 0.94         | 0.24           | <b>&lt;0.001</b> |
| Ecotype (planktivorous)           | 0.29         | 0.38           | 0.60             |
| Ecotype (piscivorous) - Local     | 0.23         | 0.10           | 0.07             |
| Ecotype (planktivorous) - Local   | 0.19         | 0.17           | 0.29             |
| Ecotype (piscivorous) - Stocked   | 0.48         | 0.10           | <b>0.005</b>     |
| Ecotype (planktivorous) - Stocked | 0.97         | 0.13           | <b>&lt;0.001</b> |
| Ecotype (piscivorous) - Wild      | 0.40         | 0.48           | 0.44             |
| Ecotype (planktivorous) - Wild    | 0.25         | 0.53           | 0.66             |

Notes: Significant  $p$ -values are in bold. The two-terms coefficients (separated by hyphens) represent the nested factors. Number of tested groups:  $N_{\text{grp}} = 11$ . Number of observations: 20.

Table 4. Linear mixed effect models for the response variables trophic position and distance of pelagic prey where Columns present the estimates of differences (positive or negative) of group response variables with the intercept (piscivorous ecotype), standard error and  $p$ -values of the factor.

| Coefficient                      | Response         |                |                  |                       |                |              |
|----------------------------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------------|
|                                  | Trophic position |                |                  | Distance pelagic prey |                |              |
|                                  | Estimate         | Standard error | $p$ -value       | Estimate              | Standard error | $p$ -value   |
| <b>Fixed parts</b>               |                  |                |                  |                       |                |              |
| Intercept                        | 4.91             | 0.28           | <b>&lt;0.001</b> | 0.699                 | 0.90           | 0.45         |
| Ecotype (planktivorous)          | -0.78            | 0.46           | 0.14             | -0.25                 | 1.58           | 0.88         |
| Ecotype (piscivorous) -Hybrid    | 0.05             | 0.06           | 0.45             | -0.08                 | 0.26           | 0.75         |
| Ecotype (planktivorous) - Hybrid | -0.03            | 0.10           | 0.76             | 0.08                  | 0.40           | 0.83         |
| Ecotype (piscivorous) - Local    | 0.02             | 0.06           | 0.73             | -0.08                 | 0.25           | 0.73         |
| Ecotype (planktivorous) - Local  | -0.01            | 0.09           | 0.88             | -1.00                 | 0.38           | <b>0.008</b> |
| Ecotype (piscivorous) - Wild     | -0.08            | 0.35           | 0.82             | 2.14                  | 1.14           | 0.11         |
| Ecotype (planktivorous) - Wild   | 0.05             | 0.44           | 0.92             | 1.71                  | 1.41           | 0.27         |
| Total length - Piscivorous       | 0.0004           | 0.0002         | <b>0.04</b>      | -0.001                | 0.001          | 0.26         |
| Total length - Planktivorous     | -0.0002          | 0.0004         | 0.66             | 0.004                 | 0.002          | <b>0.004</b> |

Notes: Significant  $p$ -values are in bold. The two-terms coefficients (separated by hyphens) represent the nested factors.

Number of tested groups:  $N_{\text{grp}} = 10$ ; number of observations: 301.

Table 5. BLAST hit sequences of genes putatively associated with life history metrics in the RDA. Statistical significance of the alignment is represented by the E-value. Gene names and principal known functions are listed according to UniProt database and cited literature.

| <b>Locus ID</b> | <b>Transcript name</b> | <b>E-value</b> | <b>Gene name</b>                              | <b>Main known functions</b>  |
|-----------------|------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| <b>McFee</b>    |                        |                |   |  |
| 42417           | AB258536.1             | 4.61E-25       | Onmy-LDA gene for MHC class I antigen         | Immune response (Berthelot et al. 2014)                              |
| 63511           | KF870466.1             | 9.98E-22       | Growth differentiation factor 11 (GDF11)      | Growth factor activity (Berthelot et al. 2014, de Mello et al. 2014) |
| 83824           | KF870468.1             | 2.78E-22       | Inhibin beta A subunit 2                      | Growth factor activity (Berthelot et al. 2014, de Mello et al. 2014) |
| 107567          | NM_001124375.1         | 3.59E-21       | Vitellogenin receptor                         | Oocyte development (Davail et al. 1998)                              |
| 139470          | AY883999.1             | 1.65E-29       | Toll-like receptor 3 gene                     | Innate immunity (Berthelot et al. 2014)                              |
| <b>Louisa</b>   |                        |                |   |  |
| 25303           | KF870466.1             | 4.90E-24       | Growth differentiation factor 11 (GDF11)      | Growth factor activity (Berthelot et al. 2014, de Mello et al. 2014) |
| 44709           | KF870470.1             | 1.36E-24       | Inhibin beta A subunit 4 (InhbetaA4)          | Growth factor activity (Berthelot et al. 2014, de Mello et al. 2014) |
| 45875           | HM208332.1             | 8.15E-27       | Zinc transporter (SLC39A7.B)                  | Trans membrane transporter (Hansen and Dijkstra 2010)                |
| 53166           | HF931026.1             | 8.20E-22       | IFNc1 gene for type I interferon c1           | Defenses response to viruses (Zou et al. 2014)                       |
| 58537           | HE608241.2             | 3.76E-30       | TPT1 gene for tumor protein                   | Cellular function (i.e. apoptosis) (Verleih et al. 2010)             |
| 61853           | GU228520.1             | 1.06E-20       | Clock 1a protein (Clock1a) gene               | Lipid metabolism (Betancor et al. 2014)                              |
| 64924           | KF870474.1             | 2.28E-22       | Transforming growth factor beta 2             | Growth factor activity (Berthelot et al. 2014, de Mello et al. 2014) |
| 69865           | DQ789362.1             | 1.05E-25       | Nonclassical MHC class I antigen (Onmy-LAA)   | Cell growth (Berthelot et al. 2014)                                  |
| 85094           | AB162342.1             | 1.75E-28       | MHC class I a region                          | Immune response (Berthelot et al. 2014)                              |
| 108678          | KF870475.1             | 1.36E-24       | Transforming growth factor beta 3 (TGF-beta3) | Growth factor activity (Berthelot et al. 2014, de Mello et al. 2014) |
| 123037          | AJ295231.1             | 2.93E-26       | iNOS/NOS2 gene for inducible nitric oxide     | Nitric-oxide activity/defense responses (Wang et al. 2000)           |
| 126351          | AB162343.1             | 2.95E-21       | MHC class I b region, complete cds            | Immune response (Berthelot et al. 2014)                              |
| 144100          | FN545577.1             | 3.79E-25       | Db-3 gene for defensin beta 3, exons 1-3      | Defenses response to bacteria (Berthelot et al. 2014)                |
| 224111          | KF870464.1             | 1.75E-28       | Follistatin b1 (Fstb1) gene                   | Growth factor activity (Berthelot et al. 2014, de Mello et al. 2014) |

## Figure legends

Figure 1. Map of studied lakes, symbols are representing either piscivorous (triangle) and planktivorous (circle) ecotypes of stocked (open symbols) and wild (filled symbols) populations.

Figure 2. Distribution of the square root of standardized ellipse area (SEA) among the three genetic origins (local, hybrid, stocked) within stocked populations and wild populations. Letters are representing significant differences from post-hoc least-square mean contrast.

Figure 3. Distribution of trophic position and distance from pelagic preys of wild populations and three genetic groups (pure stocked, pure local, hybrid) within stocked populations of piscivorous (A, B) and planktivorous (C, D) ecotypes, note that axis scales differ among graphics.

Figure 4. Redundancy analysis (RDA) of the McFee (top) and Louisa (bottom) lakes showing position of Lake Trout from stocked populations of planktivorous ecotypes according to a PCA of life history metrics (asymptotic length ( $L_{inf}$ ), early life growth rate ( $\omega$ ), relative weight condition index ( $W_r$ ) and carbon ( $\delta^{13}C$ ) and nitrogen ( $\delta^{15}N$ ) stable isotope ratios) related to the selected axis of a PCA of SNP genotypes illustrated by blue arrows. Individual Lake Trout genetic groups are illustrated by colored dots as following: local (green), hybrid (red) and stocked (black) fish.







