




NOTE

Using head, pectoral girdle bones and otoliths to estimate length and weight of Argentine anchovy (*Engraulis anchoita*), a key species in Patagonian marine ecosystem

SANTIAGO J. FERNÁNDEZ^{1, 2, *}, CYNTHIA IBARRA¹, XIMENA NAVOA³ and JAVIER E. CIANCIO¹

¹Centro para el Estudio de Sistemas Marinos (CESIMAR), Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas (CONICET), Centro Nacional Patagónico (CENPAT), Boulevard Almirante Brown 2915, U9120ACD - Puerto Madryn, Argentina. ²Facultad de Ciencias Naturales y Ciencias de la Salud, Universidad Nacional de la Patagonia San Juan Bosco, Boulevard Almirante Brown 3051, U9120ACE - Puerto Madryn, Argentina. ³Instituto de Investigación de Hidrobiología, Facultad de Ciencias Naturales y Ciencias de la Salud, Universidad Nacional de la Patagonia San Juan Bosco, Gales 48, U9100CKA - Trelew, Argentina.

ORCID *Fernández J. Santiago*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2805-0865>, *Cynthia Ibarra*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9561-5531>, *Javier E. Ciancio*  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1674-842X>



ABSTRACT. The Argentine anchovy, *Engraulis anchoita*, plays a vital role as a key prey species for several marine predators in the north Patagonian marine ecosystem of the Atlantic Ocean. Reconstructing the length and weight of each consumed specimen is essential to provide a detailed description of the trophic ecology of top marine predators. Predictive linear regression equations were calculated for the Patagonian stock of Argentine anchovy to estimate parameters of length-weight relationships using measurements of whole individuals and diagnostic elements such as otoliths, head bones and pectoral fin bones. Among the diagnostic elements analyzed, the cleithrum and dentary exhibited the best fit. This study validates the use of head and pectoral girdle bones as reliable indicators for predicting the weight and length of Argentine anchovy across a wide size range, which corresponds to the target range of various predators. These relationships can contribute to the determination of body condition, estimation of consumed biomass, and calculation of energy density, providing valuable insights into the trophic ecology of predators in the southern Atlantic Ocean.



Key words: Head bones, otoliths, regression, Patagonia, measurements, length-weight.

*Correspondence:
sfernandez@conicet-cenpat.gob.ar

Received: 5 June 2023
Accepted: 26 July 2023

ISSN 2683-7595 (print)
ISSN 2683-7951 (online)

<https://ojs.inidep.edu.ar>

Journal of the Instituto Nacional de
Investigación y Desarrollo Pesquero
(INIDEP)



This work is licensed under a Creative
Commons Attribution-
NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0
International License

Utilización de los huesos de la cabeza, cintura pectoral y otolitos para estimar la talla y el peso de la anchoíta (*Engraulis anchoita*), especie clave en el ecosistema marino patagónico

RESUMEN. La anchoíta, *Engraulis anchoita*, juega un papel vital como especie presa clave para varios depredadores marinos en el ecosistema marino patagónico norte del Océano Atlántico. Reconstruir la longitud y el peso de cada espécimen consumido es esencial para proporcionar una descripción detallada de la ecología trófica de los principales depredadores marinos. Se calcularon las ecuaciones de regresión lineal predictiva para el stock patagónico de anchoíta, a fin de estimar los parámetros de las relaciones talla-peso utilizando medidas de individuos completos y elementos de diagnóstico como otolitos, huesos de la cabeza y huesos de la aleta pectoral. Entre los elementos diagnósticos analizados, el cleitro y el dentario exhibieron el mejor ajuste. Este estudio valida el uso de los huesos de la cabeza y la cintura pectoral como indicadores confiables para predecir el peso y la talla de la anchoíta en un amplio rango de tamaños, que corresponden al rango objetivo de varios depredadores. Estas relaciones pueden contribuir a la determinación de la condición corporal, la

estimación de la biomasa consumida y el cálculo de la densidad de energía, proporcionando información valiosa sobre la ecología trófica de los depredadores en el Océano Atlántico sur.

Palabras clave: Huesos de la cabeza, otolitos, regresión, Patagonia, mediciones, talla-peso.

Diet studies are crucial for understanding trophic dynamics, foraging behaviors and life history patterns of most species within ecosystems (Hódar 1997). Descriptions in terms of prey size are essential for determining predator consumption rates, total prey biomass consumed, selectivity of a predator towards a specific prey size, and modeling consumer energy use (Hansel et al. 1988). Additionally, the diet of marine mammals and seabirds can provide early indications of fluctuations in fish populations, making them sentinel species for marine ecosystem variability (Velarde et al. 2013; Ciancio et al. 2021; Pirota et al. 2022; Ramos and Furness 2022).

Direct measurement and weighing of prey items is challenging due to fragmentation or digestion (Hódar 1997). Therefore, reconstructing the length or weight fragmented preys in diet samples is often necessary. Despite advanced digestion in predators, certain prey parts exhibit slower digestion and maintain a constant relationship with prey body size, enabling reliable identification and reconstruction of most prey items (Hansel et al. 1988). This is the case of bones, for which several studies use marine fish diagnostic bones to estimate original lengths and weights of prey consumed by predators through regressions (Sinovčić et al. 2004; Tapella and Lovrich 2006; González-Zevallos et al. 2010; Pérez Comesaña et al. 2014; Riestra et al. 2020).

In the marine ecosystem of northern Patagonia, the dominant schooling fish is the Patagonian stock of Argentine anchovy, *Engraulis anchoita* (Hubbs and Marini, 1935). This stock is distributed from 41° S to 48° S, and a large fraction is located in front of Península Valdés during the last quarter of the year in waters ranging from 50 to 80 m deep (Hansen 2004). They play a key role as an important prey item for several fishes, seabirds, and

marine mammals (Crespo et al. 1997; Koen Alonso et al. 2000; Gatto and Yorio 2009; Belleggia et al. 2012; Loizaga de Castro et al. 2016; Ibarra et al. 2018; Fernández et al. 2019). To provide a detailed description of the trophic ecology of top predators, it is essential to reconstruct the length and biomass of each consumed specimen. Therefore, our goals were to estimate parameters of length-weight relationships using measurements of whole individuals, as well as diagnostics elements such as otoliths, head bones and pectoral fin bones from the Patagonian stock of Argentine anchovy.

A total of 125 specimens from the Patagonian stock of Argentine anchovy were studied. Sixteen specimens were captured in April 2013 using a net in Golfo Nuevo, Península Valdés, Chubut Province. Additionally, specimens from commercial fishery vessels in Rawson, Chubut Province during October 2014 (n = 23), December 2019 (n = 28), and June-July 2021 (n = 41) were included. All specimens were frozen for further analysis. Finally, 17 samples preserved in formalin from the same stock were obtained from the Ichthyological Collection of the Centro Nacional Patagónico (CENPAT) (n = 17, CNPICT 1992/75, CNPICT 1992/76 and CNPICT 2000/23).

Furca length (FL) from individuals was measured to the closest millimeter with an ichthyometer and weighted (W) in grams using an analytical balance. For samples obtained since 2019, total length (TL) was also measured (n = 69). Furca length refers to the measurement from the tip of the longest jaw of a fish to the center of the fork in the caudal fin, while total length is measured to the longest caudal lobe.

Dissection techniques were employed to dissect anchovies after they have been soaked in boiling water (100 °C) for at least ten minutes. Selected diagnostic elements (Table 1) were those

that commonly appear in stomach contents based on Gosztonyi and Kuba (1996) and our personal experience. Photographs of elements were taken using a digital camera with a scale. Images were subsequently digitally measured with ImageJ 1.48v software (Schindelin et al. 2015) according to the description in Table 1 and the scheme delineated in Figure 1.

Statistical analyses were conducted using the R software (R Core Team 2021). Relationships were modeled using ‘lm’ function from car package (Fox et al. 2007). Normality and homoscedasticity assumptions were tested using graphical methods. Prior to model fitting, log-transformed data plots were used to detect outliers following the suggestion of Froese (2006). The performance of the regression models was assessed using the root mean squared error (RMSE) during repeated K-fold cross-validation (10 folds with 100 repeats) (Linhart and Zucchini 1986). The RMSE provides a measure of the average difference between the observed and predicted values of the model, allowing for the evaluation of how well the model fits the data. In our study, RMSE values that were a small fraction of the data (less than 10%) were considered as low, indicating a good fit of the model and accurate predictions.

Length-weight relationship was examined using the equation $W = aL^b$ (Froese 2006), where W represents the wet weight, L is the furca length or total length (TL, when data was available), a is the intercept, and b is the scaling exponent. To establish the relationship, the exponential model was linearized by applying logarithmic transformation ($\log[W] = \log[a] + b \log[L]$). The scaling exponent (b) of the length-weight relationship determined the growth pattern, indicating isometric growth ($b = 3$), positive allometric growth ($b > 3$), or negative allometric growth ($b < 3$). The growth status was determined using a t-test according to the $b = 3$ isometric growth hypothesis (Sokal and Rohlf 1987), providing insights into the species’ growth patterns and indicating its status in a given environment (Froese 2006). Total length is more widely used than furca length in fisheries research (Carlander and Smith 1945). Therefore, establishing a more precise relationship between these two measurements was aimed for lengths conversion. The equation $TL = a + b L$, with TL and L in mm, was used.

Simple linear regression equations were calculated to estimate the furca or total length versus the length of diagnostic elements using the equa-

Table 1. Measurement description for the diagnostic elements of the Argentine anchovy.

Measurement	Abbreviation	Description
Parasphenoid	LPar	Length from the tip of the anterior process to the posterior incisure
Dentary	LDen(1)	Length from the rostral tip to the external incisure
	LDen(2)	Maximal length measured from the rostral tip to the caudal tip of the ventral process
Maxilla	LMax	Maximal length, from the rostral tip of the external process to the tip of the caudal process
Anterior ceratohyal	LCer	Maximal length of the anterior ceratohyal
Cleithrum	LCle	Length from the dorsal to the ventral tip
Otolith	LOto(1)	Maximal length (rostro-cauda axis)
	LOto(2)	Maximal width (dorso-ventral axis)




Figure 1. Scheme of measurements performed on cranial bones, pectoral girdle bones, and otoliths of the Argentine anchovy. A) Fish body measurements. B) Parasphenoid and the left paired bones (from left to right): dentary, maxilla, anterior ceratohyal, and cleithrum. C) Left otolith indicating the two measurements used. 1) LPar: length of the parasphenoid. 2) LDen(1): length of dentary. 3) LDen(2): maximal length of dentary. 4) LMax: maximal length of the maxilla. 5) LCer: maximal length of the anterior ceratohyal. 6) LCl: length of cleithrum. 7) LOto(1): maximal length of otolith. 8) LOto(2): maximal width of otolith. Measurements of right bones and otoliths were taken in the same manner as shown in the diagram.

tion $L = a + b DL$, where DL is the length (mm) of the diagnostic element. Additionally, linear regression on log-transformed data was used to determine relationships between wet weight and the length of diagnostic elements. An ANCOVA was performed to test for significant differences between left and right measurements of pair bones and otoliths, as they may not always provide the same estimation of fish length (e.g. Martínez-Polanco et al. 2022).

Population studies comprised Argentine anchovies with furca lengths ranging from 40 to 170 mm (mean \pm SD: 120.50 ± 30.89 mm, $n = 125$), total lengths between 87 and 195 mm (mean

\pm SD: 159.92 ± 24.75 mm, $n = 69$), and wet weight that ranged from 0.23 to 47.54 g (mean \pm SD: 20.57 ± 13.62 g, $n = 125$) (Table 2).

Length-weight relationships for furca and total length were statistically significant ($R^2 = 0.989$ and 0.922 , respectively). Estimated values of b ($b \pm$ SE: $b_L = 3.69 \pm 0.03$ and $b_{TL} = 3.41 \pm 0.12$) differed significantly from 3 (t-test, p-values < 0.05), indicating positive allometric growth in our samples. The linear relationship between total length and furca length was also significant ($R^2 > 0.914$, p-value < 0.05) (Table 2).

Fifteen linear regressions were conducted to estimate furca and total length using the length of

Table 2. Parameters of morphometric equations calculated for the Argentine anchovy. Mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum size of the fish (lengths in mm, weight in g), R^2 , and the root mean squared error (RMSE) value are presented. The level of significance is not shown since all equations had a p-value < 0.05. For length equations, use the formula $L = a + b * DL$, and for weight equation, use $W = aDL^b$, where L can be total length (TL) or furca length (FL), and DL is the length of the diagnostic element. To estimate the relationship between total length and fork length, use the equation $TL = a + b * FL$.

Diagnostic element	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	N	Relationship	Parameters [CI 95%inf, CI 95%sup]		R^2	RMSE
							a	b		
Furca length (FL)	120.50	30.89	40	170	125	TL versus FL	13.787	1.074	0.914	6.966
Total length (TL)	159.93	24.76	87	195	69	FL	[2.726, 24.858]	[0.994, 1.154]	0.989	0.113
Wet weight (W)	20.57	13.62	0.23	47.57	125	W versus FL	$[2.41 \times 10^{-7}, 4.55 \times 10^{-7}]$	[3.625, 3.759]	0.922	0.168
						W versus W	7.54×10^{-7}	3.415	0.934	6.461
Parasphenoid	13.06	3.69	5.65	20.87	68	LPar versus TL	$[-24.639, -1.772]$	[3.173, 3.656]	0.947	0.241
						FL	-13.206	10.087	0.887	8.192
Dentary left (1)	15.41	3.5	6.46	20.44	69	LPar versus W	$[-18.590, -7.093]$	[8.287, 9.012]	0.971	5.275
						W	2.51×10^{-4}	4.038	0.978	0.167
Dentary left (2)	19.26	4.51	7.71	26.65	69	LDenL(1) versus TL	$[1.50 \times 10^{-4}, 4.00 \times 10^{-4}]$	[3.865, 4.211]	0.888	8.211
						LDenL(2) vs. TL	-13.137	10.106	0.977	4.852
Dentary right (1)	15.27	3.68	4.4	20.65	69	versus FL	$[-7.287, -11.355, -3.219]$	[8.114, 8.633]	0.978	0.167
						versus W	5.34×10^{-4}	3.778	0.889	8.192
Dentary right (1)	15.27	3.68	4.4	20.65	69	LDenL(1) versus FL	$[4.00 \times 10^{-4}, 7.00 \times 10^{-4}]$	[3.676, 3.879]	0.978	0.167
						LDenL(2) versus FL	-3.998	7.635	0.888	8.211
Dentary right (1)	15.27	3.68	4.4	20.65	69	vs. TL	$[-18.342, 10.345]$	[6.973, 8.296]	0.977	4.852
						LDenL(2) versus W	-4.524	6.553	0.978	0.167
Dentary right (1)	15.27	3.68	4.4	20.65	69	LDenL(1) versus TL	$[-8.101, -0.947]$	[6.372, 6.735]	0.978	0.167
						LDenL(2) versus W	2.77×10^{-4}	3.714	0.889	8.192
Dentary right (1)	15.27	3.68	4.4	20.65	69	LDenR(1) versus TL	$[-26.551, 3.253]$	[9.119, 10.837]	0.973	5.094
						LDenR(1) versus FL	-6.017	8.286	0.978	0.166
Dentary right (1)	15.27	3.68	4.4	20.65	69	LDenR(1) versus W	$[-9.871, -2.164]$	[8.041, 8.532]	0.978	0.166
						LDenR(1) versus W	5.98×10^{-4}	3.736	0.978	0.166
Dentary right (1)	15.27	3.68	4.4	20.65	69	LDenR(1) versus W	$[4.60 \times 10^{-4}, 7.80 \times 10^{-4}]$	[3.637, 3.836]	0.978	0.166

Table 2. Continued.

Diagnostic element	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	N	Relationship	Parameters [CI 95%inf, CI 95%sup]	R ²	RMSE
Dentary right (2)	19.10	4.66	6.25	26.23	69	LDenR(2)	-6.313	0.892	8.135
						versus TL	[-20.570, 7.944]	7.727	[7.071, 8.384]
						LDenR(2)	-5.034	0.979	4.610
						versus FL	[-8.468, -1.601]	6.577	[6.402, 6.752]
Maxilla left	20.86	5.2	6.37	28.86	69	LDenR(2)	2.43×10^{-4}	0.982	0.149
						versus W	$[1.80 \times 10^{-4}, 3.20 \times 10^{-4}]$	3.760	[3.669, 3.851]
						LMaxL	-4.137	0.892	8.073
						versus TL	[-18.195, 9.921]	7.010	[6.415, 7.605]
Maxilla right	20.82	5.11	6.44	28.72	69	LMaxL	-2.096	0.977	4.722
						versus FL	[-5.604, 1.411]	5.911	[5.747, 6.075]
						LMaxR	2.62×10^{-4}	0.983	0.147
						versus W	$[2.00 \times 10^{-4}, 3.40 \times 10^{-4}]$	3.632	[3.546, 3.718]
Anterior ceratohyal left	11.62	2.86	3.39	16.03	66	LMaxR	-2.965	0.866	8.859
						versus TL	[-18.712, 12.782]	6.957	[6.291, 7.623]
						LMaxR	-0.922	0.969	5.410
						versus FL	[-4.918, 3.074]	5.864	[5.677, 6.051]
Anterior ceratohyal right	11.66	2.84	3.45	16.02	68	LMaxR	2.91×10^{-4}	0.980	0.161
						versus W	$[2.20 \times 10^{-4}, 3.80 \times 10^{-4}]$	3.601	[3.509, 3.693]
						LCerL	-0.172	0.880	8.544
						versus TL	[-15.169, 14.824]	12.350	[11.213, 13.488]
Cleithrum left	14.07	3.76	5.38	20.47	68	LCerL	-4.349	0.969	5.599
						versus FL	[-8.526, -0.172]	10.779	[10.429, 11.129]
						LCerR	1.79×10^{-3}	0.972	0.188
						versus W	$[1.36 \times 10^{-3}, 2.35 \times 10^{-3}]$	3.710	[3.597, 3.823]
Cleithrum right	14.07	3.76	5.38	20.47	68	LCerR	-5.87×10^{-3}	0.882	8.526
						versus TL	[-14.521, 14.509]	12.285	[11.181, 13.388]
						LCerR	-2.398	0.970	5.382
						versus FL	[-6.398, 1.602]	10.613	[10.277, 10.948]
Cleithrum left	14.07	3.76	5.38	20.47	68	LCerR	2.17×10^{-3}	0.974	0.182
						versus W	$[1.67 \times 10^{-3}, 2.82 \times 10^{-3}]$	3.632	[3.525, 3.739]
						LCleil	22.841	0.897	7.971
						versus TL	[-11.251, 34.431]	8.550	[7.837, 9.262]
Cleithrum right	14.07	3.76	5.38	20.47	123	LCleil	6.031	0.983	3.985
						versus FL	[-3.218, 8.844]	8.163	[7.969, 8.357]
						LCleil	1.25×10^{-3}	0.983	0.144
						versus W	$[1.00 \times 10^{-3}, 1.57 \times 10^{-3}]$	3.581	[3.496, 3.666]

Table 2. Continued.

Diagnostic element	Mean	SD	Min.	Max.	N	Relationship	Parameters [CI 95%inf, CI 95%sup]		R ²	RMSE
							a	b		
Cleithrum right	14.13	3.67	5.95	20.36	67	LCleIR versus TL	20.772	8.694	0.910	7.423
							[9.764, 31.781]	[8.016, 9.372]		
							7.147	8.076		
							[4.278, 10.016]	[7.878, 8.273]		
Otolith left (1)	3.9	0.55	2.35	4.96	68	LCleIR versus W	1.59 × 10 ⁻³	3.491	0.986	0.124
							[1.30 × 10 ⁻³ , 1.93 × 10 ⁻³]	[3.416, 3.567]		
							-9.957	41.914		
							[-27.033, 7.118]	[37.738, 46.089]		
Otolith left (2)	2.02	0.27	1.39	2.59	68	LOtoL(1) versus FL	-22.267	38.916	0.907	6.865
							[-31.911, -12.624]	[36.469, 41.364]		
							0.070	4.179		
							[0.048, 0.101]	[3.910, 4.449]		
Otolith right (1)	3.9	0.57	2.38	5.08	68	LOtoL(2) versus W	-4.477	78.052	0.842	10.021
							[-30.045, 21.092]	[66.009, 90.095]		
							-26.236	76.866		
							[-39.495, -12.977]	[70.359, 83.374]		
Otolith right (2)	2.02	0.27	1.43	2.74	68	LOtoR(1) versus FL	0.948	4.361	0.671	14.159
							[0.717, 1.253]	[3.967, 4.755]		
							-4.449	40.468		
							[-22.143, 13.244]	[36.154, 44.782]		
Otolith right (2)	2.02	0.27	1.43	2.74	68	LOtoR(2) versus W	-19.839	38.183	0.809	10.101
							[-29.523, -10.157]	[35.727, 40.638]		
							0.077	4.106		
							[0.053, 0.111]	[3.836, 4.376]		
Otolith right (2)	2.02	0.27	1.43	2.74	68	LOtoR(2) versus TL	-0.024	76.251	0.793	0.305
							[-27.748, 27.700]	[63.143, 89.359]		
							-23.083	75.464		
							[-37.588, -8.578]	[68.337, 82.589]		
Otolith right (2)	2.02	0.27	1.43	2.74	68	LOtoR(2) versus W	0.992	4.307	0.793	0.305
							[0.733, 1.342]	[3.879, 4.736]		

diagnostic elements, as well as to estimate the wet weight of anchovies using bones and otoliths (Table 2). All relationships were significant (p -value < 0.05). Generally, a strong correlation was observed between diagnostic elements and lengths, with R^2 values exceeding 0.81 for furca length and 0.67 for total length. The R^2 values greater than 0.793 for the regressions with the wet weight as the response variable were obtained. The slope b did not significantly differ between measurements of the right and left diagnostic elements (ANCOVA, p -value > 0.05). Overall, the prediction error (RMSE) was low, ranging from 0.11 to 14.159, indicating the reliability of the proposed regressions for predicting anchovy size and weight.

This study contributes to the use of different diagnostic elements such as otoliths, pectoral and head bones to estimate the length and weight of Argentine anchovy, a highly relevant species in the southwestern Atlantic Ocean and a significant prey item for numerous top predators (Velasco and Castello 2005). The analyzed length range encompasses the maximum size recorded for the Patagonian stock (198 mm, Hansen 2004) and the prey size range observed in the diet of various important marine predators in the region, including fish (Koen Alonso et al. 2001; Sánchez 2009), seabirds (Gatto and Yorio 2009; Castillo et al. 2019), and marine mammals (Koen Alonso et al. 1998; Koen Alonso et al. 2000).

Traditionally, otoliths have been commonly used in diet studies to estimate length and/or weight of consumed prey. However, regressions conducted in this study exhibited lower coefficients of determination (R^2) and higher RMSE for otoliths compared to other elements. This discrepancy may be attributed to differences in the otolith length and fish growth relationship (Laidig and Ralston 1995). Typically, otoliths exhibit a linear relationship until fish reaches its maximum size, after which it begins to increase in thickness (Blacker 1974). In contrast, cranial

bone lengths exhibited stronger relationships, with R^2 values ranging from 0.866 to 0.989. This is because fish length and the length of some growth bones are constant (Prenda and Granado-Lorencio 1992; Carss and Elston 1996). Moreover, cranial and pectoral bones are easily recognizable and identifiable at the species level (Prenda and Granado-Lorencio 1992) and more resistant to erosion compared to otoliths (Carss and Elston 1996), which can introduce lower biases in size calculation (Scharf et al. 1998). For this reason, durable bones like cleithrum and dentary are preferred. In our study, the best regression estimates were obtained using these two bones.

Our study indicated positive allometric growth in Patagonian anchovy stock samples, suggesting that its weight increases more than its predicted total length. The b parameter estimated in previous studies for the Patagonian anchovy stock ranged from 3.21 to 3.35 (Hansen 2004), while it was estimated from 2.97 to 3.40 for the Bonaerensis stock (Hansen 1997; Haimovici and Velasco 2000; Garcarena et al. 2002; Hansen 2004). Differences in these values may be attributed to various sampling-related factors, such as sample size, length range, conservation method, temporal resolution of sampling, sex, and stage of specimens, as well as variations between stocks or those from different geographical regions (Weatherley and Gill 1987; Froese et al. 2011; Kuriakose 2017).

Although this study provides valuable insights, it should be noted that collection methods used did not allow for the acquisition of smallest sizes of Argentine anchovy (< 40 mm furca length), which are particularly challenging to obtain. However, fortuitous stranding events of this species in Golfo Nuevo, Chubut, in 1997 and 2000, did allow for the collection of some of the smallest sizes (2023 pers. comm. A Gosztonyi). Additionally, it should be noted that these samples (17 of the 125 individuals) were preserved in formalin, so caution should be exercised when estimating wet weight based on our

relationship within this size range, as it may underestimate individual weight.

These relationships can be valuable in comparative studies of growth, determination of body condition and calculation of total biomass consumed in diet studies, such as those of Fernández et al. (2019) and Ibarra et al. (2022), and estimation of energy density in this Patagonian population (Ciancio et al. 2020), contributing to the understanding of the trophic ecology of predators in one of the world's most productive oceans.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We express our gratitude to Dr Julio Lancelotti, Dr Atila Gosztonyi, Dr Pablo Yorío, Dr Cristian Marinao, Nestor Ortíz, and the crew of the ship 'El Padrino' in Puerto de Rawson for their valuable assistance in sample collection. Special thanks go to Dr Gabriela Escati Peñaloza from the Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo Pesquero (INIDEP) for her contributions. Lastly, we extend our appreciation to Dr Cristian 'Kily' Durante for his expertise in image editing, and the anonymous reviewers to their valuable comments.

Author contributions

Fernández J. Santiago: conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, roles/writing-original draft, writing-review and editing. Cynthia Ibarra: conceptualization, data curation, formal analysis, investigation, methodology, roles/writing-original draft, writing-review and editing. Ximena Navoa: formal analysis, methodology, supervision, roles/writing-original draft, writing-review and editing. Javier E. Ciancio: project administration, supervision, validation, visualization, writing-review and editing.

REFERENCES

- BELLEGGIA M, FIGUEROA DE, SÁNCHEZ F, BREMEC C. 2012. Long-term changes in the spiny dogfish (*Squalus acanthias*) trophic role in the southwestern Atlantic. *Hydrobiologia*. 684: 57-67. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-011-0967-y>
- BLACKER R. 1974. Recent advances in otolith studies. In: JONES F, editor. *Sea Fisheries Research*. New York: Wiley.
- CARLANDER KD, SMITH LL. 1945. Some factors to consider in the choice between standard, fork, or total lengths in fishery investigations. *Copeia*. 1945: 7-12.
- CARSS DN, ELSTON DA. 1996. Errors associated with otter *Lutra lutra* faecal analysis. II. Estimating prey size distribution from bones recovered in spraints. *J Zool*. 238 (2): 319-332. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7998.1996.tb05397.x>
- CASTILLO J, YORIO P, GATTO A. 2019. Shared dietary niche between sexes in Magellanic Penguins. *Austral Ecol*. 44: 635-647. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/aec.12706>
- CIANCIO JE, BARTES S, FERNÁNDEZ S, HARILLO C, LANCELOTTI J. 2020. Energy density predictors for Argentine anchovy *Engraulis anchoita*, a key species of the southwestern Atlantic Ocean. *Trans Am Fish Soc*. 149: 204-212. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/tafs.10223>
- CIANCIO JE, YORIO P, BURATTI C, COLOMBO GÁ, FRERE E. 2021. Isotopic niche plasticity in a marine top predator as indicator of a large marine ecosystem food web status. *Ecol Indic*. 126: 107687. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2021.107687>
- CRESPO EA, PEDRAZA SN, DANS SL, KOEN ALONSO M, REYES LM, GARCÍA NA, COSCARELLA M, SCHIAVINI ACM. 1997. Direct and indirect effects of the highseas fisheries on the marine mammal populations in the northern and cen-

- tral Patagonian coast. *J Northw Atl Fish Sci.* 22: 189-207. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2960/J.v22.a15>
- FERNÁNDEZ SJ, YORIO P, CIANCIO JE. 2019. Diet composition of expanding breeding populations of the Magellanic Penguin. *Mar Biol Res.* 15: 84-96. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17451000.2019.1596286>
- FOX J, FRIENDLY GG, GRAVES S, HEIBERGER R, MONETTE G, NILSSON H, RIPLEY B, WEISBERG S, FOX MJ, SUGGESTS M. 2007. The car package. *R Foundation for Statistical Computing.* 1109: 1431.
- FROESE R. 2006. Cube law, condition factor and weight-length relationships: history, meta-analysis and recommendations. *J Appl Ichthyol.* 22: 241-253. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0426.2006.00805.x>
- FROESE R, TSIKLIRAS AC, STERGIU KI. 2011. Editorial note on weight-length relations of fishes. *Acta Ichthyol Piscat.* 41: 261-263. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3750/aip2011.41.4.01>
- GARCIARENA AD, PERROTTA RG, LÓPEZ F. 2002. Informe sobre el muestreo de desembarque de anchoíta (*Engraulis anchoita*) y caballa (*Scomber japonicus*) en el puerto de Mar del Plata: período septiembre 1999-enero 2000, con algunos comentarios sobre el manejo de estos recursos. *INIDEP Inf Téc.* 45: 17 p.
- GATTO AJ, YORIO P. 2009. Provisioning of mates and chicks by Cayenne and Royal Terns: resource partitioning in northern Patagonia, Argentina. *Emu.* 109: 49-55. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1071/MU08025>
- GONZÁLEZ-ZEVALLOS D, KUBA L, GOSZTONYI AE. 2010. Estimación de la longitud utilizando relaciones morfométricas de huesos del cráneo, cintura escapular, otolitos y medidas específicas del cuerpo en *Merluccius hubbsi* en aguas patagónicas. *Rev Biol Mar Oceanogr.* 45 (2): 341-345. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4067/S0718-19572010000200017>
- GOSZTONYI AE, KUBA L. 1996. Atlas de los huesos craneales y de la cintura escapular de peces costeros patagónicos. *Inf Téc Fund Patagon Nat.* 4: 29 p.
- HAIMOVICI M, VELASCO G. 2000. Relações comprimento peso de peixes teleósteos marinhos do sul do Brasil com uma avaliação de diferentes métodos de ajuste. *Atlantica.* 22: 131-140.
- HANSEL HC, DUKE SD, LOFY PT, GRAY GA. 1988. Use of diagnostic bones to identify and estimate original lengths of ingested prey fishes. *Trans Am Fish Soc.* 117: 55-62. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1577/1548-8659\(1988\)117<0055:UODBTI>2.3.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1577/1548-8659(1988)117<0055:UODBTI>2.3.CO;2)
- HANSEN JE. 1997. Muestreo bioestadístico de pescado en el Puerto de Mar del Plata. Anchoíta (*Engraulis anchoita*). Período 1986-1990. *Inf Téc INIDEP.* 15: 1-24.
- HANSEN JE. 2004. Anchoíta (*Engraulis anchoita*). In: SÁNCHEZ RP, BEZZI SI, editors. *El Mar Argentino y sus recursos pesqueros.* Tomo 4. Los peces marinos de interés pesquero caracterización biológica y evaluación del estado de explotación. Mar del Plata: Instituto Nacional de Investigación y Desarrollo Pesquero (INIDEP). p. 101-115.
- HÓDAR J. 1997. The use of regression equations for the estimation of prey length and biomass in diet studies of insectivore vertebrates. *Arx Misc Zool.* 20: 1-10.
- IBARRA C, MARINAO C, SUÁREZ N, KASINSKY T, YORIO P. 2022. Patterns of sexual segregation in the use of trophic resources in breeding Imperial Cormorants. *Mar Biol.* 169: 154. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-022-04143-7>
- IBARRA C, MARINAO C, SUÁREZ N, YORIO P. 2018. Differences between colonies and chick-rearing stages in Imperial Cormorant (*Phalacrocorax atriceps*) diet composition: implications for trophic studies and monitoring. *Wilson J Ornithol.* 130: 224-234. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1676/16-184.1>
- KOEN ALONSO M, CRESPO E, GARCÍA N, PEDRAZA S, MARIOTTI P, VERA BB, MORA N. 2001. Food habits of *Dipturus chilensis* (Pisces: Rajidae)

- off Patagonia, Argentina. ICES J Mar Sci. 58: 288-297. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1006/jmsc.2000.1010>
- KOEN ALONSO M, CRESPO EA, GARCÍA NA, PEDRAZA SN, COSCARELLA MA. 1998. Diet of dusky dolphins, *Lagenorhynchus obscurus*, in waters off Patagonia, Argentina. Fish Bull. 96: 366-374.
- KOEN ALONSO M, CRESPO EA, PEDRAZA SN, GARCIA NA, COSCARELLA MA. 2000. Food habits of the South American sea lion, *Otaria flavescens*, off Patagonia, Argentina. Fish Bull. 98: 250-263.
- KURIAKOSE S. 2017. Estimation of length weight relationship in fishes. Course Manual Summer School on advanced methods for fish stock assessment and fisheries management lecture note series no. 2/2017. CMFRI, Kochi, p. 215-220.
- LADIG TE, RALSTON S. 1995. The potential use of otolith characters in identifying larval rockfish (*Sebastes* spp.). Fish Bull. 93: 166-171.
- LINHART H, ZUCCHINI W. 1986. Model selection. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- LOIZAGA DE CASTRO R, SAPORITI F, VALES DG, GARCÍA NA, CARDONA L, CRESPO EA. 2016. Feeding ecology of dusky dolphins *Lagenorhynchus obscurus*: evidence from stable isotopes. J Mammal. 97 (1): 310-320. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jmammal/gyv180>
- MARTÍNEZ-POLANCO MF, BÉAREZ P, JIMÉNEZ-ACOSTA M, COOKE RG. 2022. Allometry of Mexican hogfish (*Bodianus diplotaenia*) for predicting the body length of individuals from two pre-Columbian sites in the Pearl Island archipelago (Panama). Int J Osteoarchaeol. 32: 669-681. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/oa.3094>
- PÉREZ COMESAÑA J, CLAVIN P, ARIAS K, RIESTRA C. 2014. Total length estimation of the Brazilian flathead *Percophis brasiliensis*, using morphometric relationships of skull, pectoral girdle bones, otoliths and specific body measures, in Argentine waters. J Appl Ichthyol. 30: 377-380. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/jai.12244>
- PIROTTA V, MCINTOSH R, GRAY R, MARSH H, LYNCH M. 2022. Marine mammals. In: SMITH BP, WAUDBY CA, HAMPTON JO, editors. Wildlife Research in Australia: practical and applied methods. Clayton South: CSIRO Publishing. p. 465-477.
- PRENDA J, GRANADO-LORENCIO C. 1992. Biometric analysis of some cyprinid bones of prey fishes to estimate the original lengths and weights. Folia Zool. 41: 175-185.
- R CORE TEAM. 2021. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- RAMOS JA, FURNESS RW. 2022. Seabirds as indicators of forage fish stocks. In: RAMOS J, PEREIRA L, editors. Seabird biodiversity and human activities. Boca Raton: CRC Press.
- RIESTRA CM, PÉREZ COMESAÑA JE, ARIAS KA, TAMINI LL, CHIARAMONTE GE. 2020. Back-calculation of total length of Argentine seabass *Acanthistius patachonicus* using morphometric relationships of bones and measurements of the body. Mar Fish. 33: 69-75. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47193/mafis.3312020061804>
- SÁNCHEZ F. 2009. Alimentación de la merluza (*Merluccius hubbsi*) en el Golfo San Jorge y aguas adyacentes. INIDEP Inf Téc. 75. 21 p.
- SCHARF F, YETTER R, SUNNINNER A, JUANES F. 1998. Enhancing diet analyses of piscivorous fishes in the Northwest Atlantic through identification and reconstruction of original prey sizes from ingested remains. Fish Bull. 96: 575-588.
- SCHINDELIN J, RUEDEN CT, HINER MC, ELICEIRI KW. 2015. The ImageJ ecosystem: an open platform for biomedical image analysis. Mol Reprod Dev. 82: 518-529. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/mrd.22489>
- SINOVIĆ G, FRANIČEVIĆ M, ZORICA B, ČIKEŠKEČ V. 2004. Length-weight and length-length relationships for 10 pelagic fish species from the Adriatic Sea (Croatia). J Appl Ichthyol. 20:

- 156-158. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1439-0426.2003.00519.x>
- SOKAL R, ROHLF F. 1987. Biostatistics. 2nd ed. New York: Freeman. 301 p.
- TAPPELLA F, LOVRICH GA. 2006. Morphological differences between ‘*subrugosa*’ and ‘*gregaria*’ morphs of adult *Munida* (Decapoda: Anomura: Galatheidae) from the Beagle Channel, southern South America. J Mar Biol Assoc UK. 86: 1149-1155. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025315406014123>
- VELARDE E, EZCURRA E, ANDERSON DW. 2013. Seabird diets provide early warning of sardine fishery declines in the Gulf of California. Sci Rep. 3: 1-6. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep01332>
- VELASCO G, CASTELLO JP. 2005. An ecotrophic model of southern Brazil continental shelf and fisheries scenarios for *Engraulis anchoita* (Pisces, Engraulididae). Atlantica. 27: 59-68.
- WEATHERLEY A, GILL H. 1987. The biology of fish growth. Orlando: Academic Press.