

ResearchOnline@JCU

This file is part of the following reference:

St John, Jill (1995) *Feeding ecology of the coral trout, Plectropomus leopardus (Serranidae), on the Great Barrier Reef, Australia.* PhD thesis, James Cook University.

Access to this file is available from:

<http://eprints.jcu.edu.au/24127/>

The author has certified to JCU that they have made a reasonable effort to gain permission and acknowledge the owner of any third party copyright material included in this document. If you believe that this is not the case, please contact ResearchOnline@jcu.edu.au and quote <http://eprints.jcu.edu.au/24127/>

Feeding ecology of the coral trout,
Plectropomus leopardus (Serranidae),
on the Great Barrier Reef, Australia.

by
Jill St John
(BSc. Hons, Sydney)

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Marine Biology
at James Cook University of North Queensland.
August 1995

Third fisherman :

Master I marvel how the fishes
live in the sea

First fisherman :

Why as men do a-land
the great ones eat up the little ones

Shakespeare Pericles Act ii sc 1 l. 29 1608

STATEMENT OF ACCESS

I, the undersigned, the author of this thesis, understand that James Cook University of North Queensland will make it available for use within the University library and, by microfilm or other means, allow access to users in other approved libraries. All users consulting this thesis will have to sign the following statement:

In consulting this thesis I agree not to copy or closely paraphrase it in whole or in part without the written consent of the author; and to make proper public written acknowledgement for any assistance which I have obtained from it.

Beyond this, I do not wish to place any restriction on access to this thesis.

8-8-96

(Jill St. John)

(Date)

STATEMENT ON SOURCES

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis is my own work and has not been submitted in any form for another degree or diploma at any university or other institution of tertiary education. Information derived from the published or unpublished works of others has been acknowledged in the text and a list of references is given.

8-8-96

(Jill St. John)

(Date)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

One of the major conclusions of this study is that PhD's are not accomplished alone. Mine is no exception. I extend my sincere thanks to all of you who helped me along the way.

I'd like to thank the people who made this all possible by providing a stipend. I am gratefully indebted to the members of the Australian Federation of University Women - Queensland, particularly those volunteers who run a business to fund women in academia. This thesis is dedicated to them.

I am very grateful to my supervisor, Garry Russ for his continuous support, guidance and advice throughout this study. Garry read and re-read all of my thesis except this section. I found Garry to be accessible, dependable and humorous, three qualities of a good supervisor. I was fortunate to have two associate supervisors. Hugh Sweatman provided invaluable logistical and statistical assistance. Hugh's answers to endless questions and his provision of important equipment such as access to statistical programs and a coffee machine has greatly improved this thesis. Bruce Mapstone supported me with sensible and logical advice on many matters including statistics and design. Bruce assisted me a lot in the early stages of this study. Thank you.

A special thanks to Lyle Squire who helped me get this thesis up and running. Lyle provided much needed practical assistance and advice as well as connections to the Townsville Spearfishing Club. Lyle gave me his time, his hospitality and a heap of specimens speared privately (by himself and by his sons) or in connection with his work.

Many thanks to the following people (mentioned in no particular order) for their various roles.

In the field, many trout were collected by the spearos from Townsville Skindiving Club, Bill Roberts, Todd Protheroe, Geoff Ramm, John Goebels, Dave Welsh, Angelo Angeli and John Robinson. Chris Robb was particularly helpful as he volunteered his spearing skills on other field trips. Others kept trout guts for me.... a smelly business, Lyle Squire Jnr and Snr, Campbell Davies, Jeff Bibby, Beatrice Ferreira, Phill Laycock, Hugh Sweatman and Melita Samoilys. Phill Light dissected 150 tiny stomachs for me. Data was provided by Peter Doherty (Australian Institute of Marine Science), Ian Brown and Melita Samoilys (Southern and Northern Fisheries Research Institute QDPI), Tony Ayling (Sea Research) and Bruce Mapstone (GBRMPA). At Orpheus Island Research Station helpful staff included Russell Bathard and Snow and Virginia Downton. These people and Jo Goudie fed fish for me. Volunteer assistants included Dave Hocking, Dave Welsh, Debbie Rae and Carole Wallace. Bill Gladstone took some great photographs. Line fishing was done by Michael Osborne, Doug and John Clark and Jim Higgs. Laura Castell-Perez and Hugh Sweatman assisted me in the field. Technical help

was provided by Leigh Winsor, Don Booth, Leigh Owens, Phill Osmond, Colleen, Anita, Ann Sharp, Savita and Jan Woodley, who also sent my mail on. Brett Molony, Hugh Sweatman, Garry Russ sent me references when I was in Japan. Kyoko Tamate and Keiichi Matsuura provided me with access to references in Japan. H. Hirakawa provided me the use of a microscope at the Onahama Fisheries Research Institute. Prey fish were identified by Jeff Leis, Doug Hoese, Dirk Zeller, Alison Green, Garry Russ, Hugh Sweatman, Ann Cabanban and Bill Gladstone. Cephalopods were identified by Natalie Moltschaniwskyj. John Collins and Danielle Johnston identified crustaceans.

Chapters were read by my supervisors, as well as Leigh Winsor, Melita Samoilys, Bill Gladstone, Bryce Stewart, Lin Schwarzkopf, Kathy Kavanaugh, Jean Deklerk, Brett Molony, Jo Beukers, Barry Goldman, Julian Caley, Ilona Stobbard and Ivana Noell. Maps and diagrams were drawn by Steve Clarke.

References were typed by Lishu Chen with the help of Suzy Dormer. The thesis was greatly improved by discussions with Geoff Jones, Beatrice Ferreira, Melita Samoilys, Campbell Davies, Julian Caley, Bryce Stewart, Jo Beukers and my supervisors.

Warm friendships and fun times were enjoyed with many kind people. People who have been particularly supportive include Jo Beukers, Suzy Dormer, Bea Ferreira, Jane Fromont, Bill Gladstone, Gina Mercer, Libby Moodie, Brett Molony, Debbie Rae, Mary Robertson, Carole Wallace and Jan Woodley. Thanks to Mary Robertson, Cheryl Hercus and Grant Whiteman, Carole Wallace and Chris Hill, Jane Fromont and Dave Sutton and Ivana Noell for providing a place to live. Baby sitters include Mary Robertson, Mary Stafford-Smith, Jane Fromont and Dave Sutton, Julia Shand and Rob MacCauley, Gina Mercer, Suzy Dormer, Hugh Sweatman, Laura Castell and Lishu Chen.

Finally, I thank my family. Both my parents, _____ and _____ played a vital role in all of this. Little _____ was born to this thesis and has had to share me with a computer for her first year of life. Her joy of life and thrill of learning has kept my work in perspective. _____ lived this thesis with me from field work to editing. His endless support, encouragement and patience helped me the most.

ABSTRACT

The Great Barrier Reef (GBR) is the largest coral reef system in the world and the coral trout, *Plectropomus leopardus* (Pisces: Serranidae, Lacepede 1802) is one of its most widespread and abundant piscivores (Ayling and Ayling 1986). Despite the importance of the coral trout fishery, very little is known about the feeding ecology of *P. leopardus* on the GBR.

The principal objective of this study was to describe the diet and feeding of *P. leopardus* on this large reef system. Variation in the diet of this piscivore over a range of latitudes along the GBR and on reefs open and closed to fishing was examined. Seasonality of feeding by *P. leopardus* was addressed by comparing rates of digestion, consumption of food and diet in the austral summer and winter. Within populations of *P. leopardus*, the ontogenetic shifts in diet and individual feeding behaviour were examined.

Plectropomus leopardus is one of the major predators of adult coral reef fishes on the GBR. After their first year of life, *P. leopardus* are almost entirely piscivorous on adult fishes (99% of fish diet). The dominance of fish in the diet does not vary temporally or spatially.

Feeding studies have shown that *P. leopardus* are intermittent feeders, consuming an average of one prey item daily. After 24 hours, approximately 90% of prey items were digested. Thus, contents of stomachs represented daily feeding in *P. leopardus*. Seasonal rates of food consumption were not related to rates of digestion in *P. leopardus*.

In *P. leopardus*, the major dietary shift in the type, species composition, length and shape of prey occurred at approximately 20 cm SL and corresponded to the onset of sexual maturity. Juvenile *P. leopardus* consumed a higher proportion of benthic crustaceans, mostly penaeid prawns. Though families of prey fish in the diet varied ontogenetically, the breadth of the diet (in terms

of family richness) did not increase with the size of predator . This shift in diet must be due to a change in feeding behaviour because juvenile *P. leopardus* live in similar habitats to adults.

Overall, Pomacentridae were the dominant family in the diet of *P. leopardus*. The main families in the diet of *P. leopardus* were divided into two groups. Common families (Pomacentridae, Labridae, Caesionidae and Scaridae) constituted a consistent and substantial portion of the diet. Small schooling fishes (e.g. Clupeidae), were a highly variable component of the diet both temporally and spatially. Sporadic appearances of small schooling prey in the diet of *P. leopardus* were the main cause of the reduction in dietary overlap between reefs and times.

The abundance of prey in three common families varied latitudinally in the diet of *P. leopardus* . Pomacentridae and Caesionidae were consumed more in the northern GBR whereas Scaridae were eaten more in the south. There were no detectable effects of fishing on the diet of *P. leopardus*. Dietary overlap among reefs zoned for different levels of fishing were within natural spatial and temporal variations for the GBR. Most of the major changes in the diet of *P. leopardus* occurred before the piscivores entered the fishery (current legal minimum size is 38 cm FL). Adult *P. leopardus* prey on juvenile *Plectropomus* spp. and thus high densities of adults may reduce abundances of juveniles.

The major seasonal difference in feeding was a higher consumption of food in winter that coincided with increased production of mesenteric fat that is stored in preparation for reproduction (Ferreira 1993). Family richness in the diet increased during winter months because rare prey were consumed to meet a higher requirement for food. Otherwise, composition of the diet did not vary seasonally. *Plectropomus leopardus* did not appear to respond to the seasonal influx of recruits to the reef during summer; newly recruited prey individuals were consumed rarely.

Plectropomus leopardus appear to be selective feeders in terms of both families and species of prey. At a family level, 37 families were identified in the stomachs of *P. leopardus*. Many abundant families of fishes on the GBR (e.g. Chaetodontidae, Holocentridae, Pomacanthidae and Siganidae) were rarely eaten while others (e.g. Haemulidae) were not identified in the diet at all. The choice of species among the Pomacentridae was examined. Approximately 25% of the 120 possible species of Pomacentridae were identified in the stomachs of *P. leopardus*. Some of these prey species were eaten in much higher proportions than expected when compared to their general abundance on reefs (e.g. *Acanthochromis polyacanthus*) whereas other species were eaten in much lower proportions (e.g. *Pomacentrus amboinensis*, *Pomacentrus moluccensis* and *Neopomacentrus azysron*).

The abundance of families (measured by digested weight) in the diet of *P. leopardus* was compared to the biomass of prey fishes on another midshelf reef on the Central GBR (Williams and Hatcher 1983). The top five ranked families in the diet of *P. leopardus* (Pomacentridae, Caesionidae, Scaridae, Labridae and Serranidae) were also the top five families in terms of biomass on reefs. Furthermore, these five families represented approximately 80% of both fishes on reefs and the total biomass of the prey in the diet. Prey in families were not eaten in exactly the same ranking as biomass on reefs. There was a large difference between the proportions of the two major prey species, Pomacentridae and Caesionidae, on midshelf reefs. *Plectropomus leopardus* consumed more Pomacentridae than Caesionidae even though the biomass of Caesionidae on the reef was more than double that of Pomacentridae. The modes of life of schooling, mobile Caesionidae and demersal, site attached Pomacentridae differ on coral reefs and this may explain the reversal of ranks of these two families in the diet of *P. leopardus*.

In general, the size of prey and composition of the diet *P. leopardus* was related to the size of the predator. As the gape of *P. leopardus* limits the size of prey ingested, the critical dimension of the prey is depth rather than length.

When feeding on larger prey items, small to medium-sized *P. leopardus* (< 35 cm SL) appear to feed optimally as defined by Werner (1974) with respect to body-depth of prey. This size-related feeding did not occur under all circumstances. Size of prey was decoupled from size of predators for all *P. leopardus* larger than 35 cm (SL) and when the prey were small schooling fishes. It appears that *P. leopardus* switch to feeding on small schooling fishes when they are available.

Predatory behaviour of *P. leopardus* in tanks was highly variable among individuals. Both the success of capture of *Acanthochromis polyacanthus* (F. Pomacentridae) and the consistency of predatory abilities varied among individuals. Individual variation in feeding may help explain the high variability in growth and fecundity of individuals observed within populations of *P. leopardus* (Ferreira 1993; Davies 1995).

The abundance and species richness of the families common in the diet of *P. leopardus* suggests that food for the coral trout fishery is sufficient on the GBR. Furthermore, feeding by *P. leopardus* appears to be unaffected by this human activity at present levels of fishing. Other aspects of this study, however, suggest that fishery managers cannot be complacent. The effects of cannibalism within the fishery need to be understood. Fishing may reduce predation on prey on reefs directly by removing predators and, in the case of line fishing, indirectly by feeding predators. Data from the fishery should be treated with caution for two reasons. Firstly, Catch Per Unit Effort (fish per fisher per hour) was considered a poor method to estimate or compare the population density of *P. leopardus* as more of the catch was taken by line when a high proportion of the population was hungry. Secondly, line fished samples of *P. leopardus* should not be used for dietary studies as the abundance and composition of prey was biased by regurgitation and the presence of bait. Line caught fish had fewer natural prey in their stomachs and the composition of the natural diet differed from the sample caught by spear.

In conclusion, the major sources of variability in the diet and feeding behaviour of *P. leopardus* were the following:

1. ontogenetic shift from juveniles to adults,
2. high individual variation in successful capture of prey, and
3. regional variation in the diet.

In contrast, seasonality and varying levels of fishing had little effect on the diet of *P. leopardus*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF ACCESS	iii
STATEMENT ON SOURCES	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
ABSTRACT	vii
1.0 GENERAL INTRODUCTION	1
2.0 GENERAL METHODS	8
2.1. THE STUDY SPECIES, CORAL TROUT	8
2.2 ANALYSIS OF STOMACH CONTENTS	10
2.3 PILOT STUDIES TO DETERMINE SOME GENERAL METHODS	14
2.3.1. Comparison of fishing methods	14
2.3.2. The effect of delays in processing specimens	18
2.3.3. Weight changes in stomach contents due to preservation	21
2.3.4. Quantifying the digestion scale	25
2.4. TANK EXPERIMENTS	29
2.4.1 Study sites	29
2.4.2 Collection of live predators and prey	29
2.4.3 Problems associated with life in captivity	30
2.5. GENERAL ANALYSES	31
2.5.1 Analysis of frequency data	31
2.5.2 Analysis of parametric data	32
2.5.3 Probability data	33
2.5.4 Indices of relative importance and dietary-overlap ...	33
2.5.5 Habitats of prey fishes	35

3.0 SEASONAL RATES OF DIGESTION, DAILY CONSUMPTION OF FOOD AND GROWTH IN CAPTIVE <i>P. leopardus</i>	44
3.1 INTRODUCTION	44
3.2 METHODS	46
3.2.1 Daily consumption of food	46
3.2.2 Rates of Digestion	47
3.2.3 Growth rates of captive <i>P. leopardus</i>	50
3.3 RESULTS	50
3.3.1 Daily consumption of food	50
3.3.2 Rates of digestion	51
3.3.3 Growth rates of captive <i>P. leopardus</i>	52
3.4 DISCUSSION	52
4.0 ONTOGENETIC PATTERNS IN THE DIET OF <i>P. leopardus</i>	67
4.1 INTRODUCTION	67
4.2 METHODS AND RESULTS	69
4.2.1 Collection of <i>P. leopardus</i>	69
4.2.2 Measurement of specimens	70
4.2.3 Ontogenetic changes in the diet of <i>P. leopardus</i>	71
4.2.4 Ontogenetic changes in the size of prey fishes in the diet of <i>P. leopardus</i>	72
4.2.5 The prey fishes of <i>P. leopardus</i>	75
4.2.6 Species composition of the diet of <i>P. leopardus</i>	78
4.3 DISCUSSION	79
5.0 TEMPORAL VARIATION IN THE DIET OF <i>P. leopardus</i> ON THE CENTRAL GBR WITH A COMPARISON TO THE ABUNDANCE OF POTENTIAL PREY FAMILIES	111
5.1 INTRODUCTION	111
5.2 STUDY SITES, SAMPLING DESIGN AND DATA USED IN THE ANALYSES	114

5.3 RESULTS	115
5.3.1 Temporal variation in the diet of <i>P. leopardus</i>	115
5.3.2 Comparison of dietary composition with abundance of potential prey families on the Central GBR	120
5.4 DISCUSSION	121
5.4.1 Temporal variation in the diet of <i>P. leopardus</i>	121
5.4.2 Comparison of diet to abundance of potential families of prey fish on the Central GBR	126
6.0 REGIONAL VARIATION IN DIET OF <i>P. leopardus</i>	140
6.1 INTRODUCTION	140
6.2 STUDY SITES, SAMPLING DESIGN AND METHODS	141
6.2.1 Study Sites	141
6.2.2 Sampling Design	142
6.2.3 Intra- and inter-region comparison using other studies	143
6.3 RESULTS	143
6.3.1 Differences among regions and between reefs in the catch of <i>P. leopardus</i>	143
6.3.2 Regional diet of <i>P. leopardus</i>	144
6.3.3 Diet of <i>P. leopardus</i> in the southern region	152
6.3.4 Diet of <i>P. leopardus</i> in the southern and central regions	153
6.4 DISCUSSION	154
7.0 THE EFFECT OF PROTECTION FROM FISHING ON THE DIET OF <i>P. leopardus</i>	176
7.1 INTRODUCTION	176
7.2 STUDY SITES, SAMPLING DESIGN AND METHODS	181
7.2.1 Background to this study	181
7.2.2 Source of specimens	181
7.2.3 Collection of samples from different fishing zones ...	182

7.3 RESULTS	185
7.3.1 The catch of coral trout from reefs within the two zones	185
7.3.2 Differences between samples of <i>P. leopardus</i> caught by line and spear	186
7.3.3 Effects of line fishing on the diet of <i>P. leopardus</i>	187
7.3.4 Variation in the diet of <i>P. leopardus</i> between reefs within different fishing zones	187
7.3.5 Comparison of the diet of <i>P. leopardus</i> among three fishing zones	190
7.3.6 Pomacentridae as prey of <i>P. leopardus</i>	190
7.3.7 Juvenile <i>Plectropomus</i> in the diet of <i>P. leopardus</i> ..	191
7.4 DISCUSSION	193

8.0 PREDATORY SUCCESS AND BEHAVIOUR OF INDIVIDUAL *P.*

<i>leopardus</i> IN CAPTIVITY	218
8.1 INTRODUCTION	218
8.2 METHODS	223
8.2.1 Experimental preparations	223
8.2.2 Experimental design and protocol	224
8.2.3 Justification of methods used	228
8.3 RESULTS	229
8.3.1 Predatory experiment	229
8.3.2 Behaviour of <i>P. leopardus</i> in the experiment	230
8.3.3 Rates of predation by piscivores on coral reefs	233
8.4 DISCUSSION	233

9.0 GENERAL DISCUSSION	254
9.1 <i>P. leopardus</i> are predators on a wide variety of fish prey on the GBR	256
9.2 Potential impact of <i>P. leopardus</i> on coral reef fish communities	257
9.3 Relevance to management of fisheries	259
9.4 Future directions for research	263
9.5 Conclusions	264
10.0 BIBLIOGRAPHY	265