[Article begins on next page]

1   **Historical trophic ecology of some divergent shark and skate species in the Dutch**

2   **coastal North Sea zone.**

3

4   Suzanne S.H. Poiesz[1,2], Tomas van Elderen[1], Johannes IJ. Witte[1], Henk W. van der Veer[1]

5

6   ORCID record corresponding author: 0000-0003-1396-3618

7

8   [1]NIOZ Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research, Department of Coastal Systems, P.O.

9   Box 59, 1790 AB, Den Burg, Texel, The Netherlands

10   [2]Faculty of Science and Engineering, Groningen Institute of Evolutionary Life Sciences,

11   University of Groningen, P.O. Box 11103, 9700 CC Groningen, the Netherlands

12

13   **Abstract**

14

15   Over the last century the fish community of the Dutch coastal North Sea zone has

16   lost most its shark and skate species. Whether their disappearance has changed the trophic

17   structure of these shallow waters has not been properly investigated. In this study

18   historical dietary data of sharks and skates, being in the past (near)-residents, juvenile

19   marine migrants and marine seasonal visitors of the Dutch coastal North Sea zone were

20   analyzed for the period 1946 - 1954. Near-resident and juvenile marine migrant species

21   were demersal while all marine seasonal visitors species were pelagic. Based on stomach

22   content composition, the trophic position of four of the various shark and skate species

23   could be reconstructed. The (near)-resident species, the lesser spotted dogfish, the marine

24   juvenile migrant, the starry smooth hound, and the benthopelagic marine seasonal visitor,

25   the thornback ray, had a benthic/demersal diet (polychaetes, molluscs and crustaceans),

26   while the pelagic marine seasonal visitor, the tope shark, fed dominantly on cephalopods

27   and fishes. Diet overlap occurred for fish (tope shark and lesser spotted dogfish), for hermit

28   crabs (lesser spotted dogfish and starry smooth hound) and for shrimps (thornback ray

29   and starry smooth hound). Trophic position ranged from 3.2 for thornback ray preying

exclusively on crustaceans to 4.6 for the tope shark consuming higher trophic prey (crustaceans and fish). The analysis indicates that most of the shark and skate species were generalist predators. The calculated trophic positions of shark and skate species indicate that those species were not necessarily at the top of the marine ecosystem food web, but they might have been the top predators of their particular ecological assemblage.

Funding

Not applicable

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Ethics approval

Human and animal rights statement: This article does not contain any studies with animals performed by any of the authors.

Consent to participate

All authors declare that they give consent to participate.

 Consent for publication

All authors declare that they give consent for publication.

Availability of data, material and code.

All data, materials used, and code will be available on request.

Authors' contributions

	SP	TvE	JW	HvdV
Conceptualization	X		X	X
Data collection	X	X	X	
Data analysis	X	X		
Writing	X			X

1. Introduction

1   Worldwide, major structural and functional changes have occurred in coastal

2   ecosystems due to overfishing (Pauly et al 1998; Jackson et al 2001; Lotze 2005). Pauly

3   et al (1998) state that this so-called "fishing down the marine food web" reflects the

4   removal of long-lived, high trophic level, piscivorous fish, including sharks and skates. It

5   is unclear what effect the removal of top predators can have on the stability of a community

6   (Shurin et al 2002), because for instance the relationship between food chain stability and

7   food chain length is unclear (Sterner et al 1997). While it is easy to predict that carnivores

8   have a high trophic position and exert a degree of top-down effects, these effects are still

9   very poorly understood (Cortés 1999). Consequences of the removal of top predators could

10   have a cascading effect down the food web, through to lower trophic positions such as

11   bivalves and polychaetes (Hussey et al 2015). These cascades potentially could extend to

12   the level of the primary producers (Myers et al 2007). Considering these possible

13   consequences, eliminating larger predators carries more risks of broader ecosystem

14   degradation than previously thought. Top down effects must be widely expected whenever

15   entire groups of predators are eliminated or removed.

16   The loss of top predators will cause a reduction of the mean trophic level in fish

17   communities (Estes et al 1998; Worms & Myers 2003; Dulvy et al 2004; Frank et al 2005;

18   Myers et al 2007), but the impact can vary across niches and communities (Borer et al

19   2005; Frank et al 2007). Predator reductions can also cause a shift in niche availability,

20   which can subsequently alter the niche of other predatory species (Frid et al 2007). As top

21   predatory species, sharks and skates might play pivotal roles in the regulation of lower

22   trophic level organisms and, therefore, of marine ecosystems (Myers et al. 2007). For

23   instance, model studies on the impact of shark depletion in different ecosystems showed

24   differences in the response of prey species and a larger increase in the abundance of minor

25   prey species compared to major prey species (Stevens et al 2000).

26   Whereas sharks and skates used to be more common in the North Sea and

27   surrounding coastal areas, nowadays these species are one of the most vulnerable groups

28   of marine fishes (Dulvy et al. 2004; Stevens et al. 2000) and are under pressure and either

29   absent or occurring in low densities (de Vooys et al 1991; Walker & Heessen 1996; Walker

& Hislop 1998; Heessen et al 2015; Bom et al 2020). For instance, the thornback ray *Raya clavata* was a common species in Dutch coastal waters, but has disappeared from the late 1950s onwards (Walker & Heessen 1996). The trophic position of the species that are still present in the North Sea indicate also a relatively high trophic position (Jennings et al 2002).

Sharks and skates were common in Dutch coastal waters and estuaries in the past (Egmond 2005). These waters also have been subject to pervasive human disturbance for centuries (Lotze 2005, 2007). A compilation of available information by Witte & Zijlstra (1983) listed ten shark and skate species that were components of the coastal fish community in the past but were already considered extremely rare by the 1970s. For one of the species, the common smooth-hound *Mustelus mustelus* doubt occurred about the taxonomic identification. Heessen et al (2015) state that species identification between the common smooth-hound and the starry smooth-hound (*Mustulus asterias)* has been quite problematic and that the common smooth-hound is not as common as suggested or may not even occur in the North Sea, implying that all identification in the past of *M. mustulus* would have been *M. asterias.* In an update, Wolff (2005) and Bom et al (2020) concluded that nowadays, additional rare species had become extinct in or near Dutch coastal waters. Conversely, recently commercial catches have recorded the re-occurrence of some shark species in the Dutch coastal zone (source: Sportvisserij (Dutch fishing society); The Netherlands).

FishBase (Froese & Pauly 2019) provide average trophic positions of individual sharks and skates, but these might not correspond with local observations as a recent analysis of the Wadden Sea coastal fish food web by Poiesz et al (2020) has shown. Therefore, the past role and trophic position of these lost sharks and skates in the Dutch coastal zone fish food web is unknown. Recent isotope studies showed that the trophic ecology of shark and skate species is potentially very complex (Hussey et al 2015; Bird et al 2018; Flowers et al 2020).

The aim of this study is to reconstruct the trophic position for shark and skate species listed by Witte & Zijlstra (1983) in the past food web of the Dutch coastal North

Sea zone. This information on the trophic position of these lost ecosystem components is important with respect to our perspective regarding past food web structure and functioning. The reconstruction is based on information on stomach content composition of fish species in the Dutch coastal zone and estuarine Wadden Sea, dating back to the 1930's (de Vooys et al 1991). The data were extracted from the archive of the Royal Netherlands Institute for Sea Research (NIOZ). These reconstructions of the trophic position of different shark and skate species was done in line with a recent analysis of the present fish food web structure in the western Wadden Sea by Poiesz et al (2020).

First, the various shark and skate species were listed according to their mode of life (pelagic, benthopelagic or demersal) following FishBase (Froese & Pauly 2019) and their functional group [marine seasonal visitors, (near)-residents or juvenile marine migrants] after Zijlstra (1983) and Elliott & Dewailly (1995). Next, stomach content and ontogenetic shifts in diet were analyzed and described for the various species. Subsequently, the trophic positions of shark and skate species were reconstructed based on the stomach composition. Since the historical data set only contained information on prey species found, trophic position was estimated based on the average trophic position of the various prey species, ignoring differences in mass between the various prey species. The potential bias of ignoring differences in prey mass was investigated with a recent data set of stomach content data of fish community of the Wadden Sea collected between 2010 and 2018 (Poiesz et al 2020). Lastly, the relative degree of specialization in the diet of the various shark and skate species was reconstructed and dietary overlap among species was quantified and the niche type for each species was determined.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. The NIOZ archive

In the period from 1930 until 1969, trained staff of the Royal NIOZ registered landings of rare fish and invertebrate species. Specimens were delivered at the port of Den

5

Helder, mainly by local fishermen from Wieringen, Texel and Den Helder and were paid for with a price slightly above the auction value at the local market. Most of the landings originated from Dutch coastal North Sea waters and the rest from inside the Dutch Wadden Sea.

All elasmobranchs were identified to the species level. All information about species, date of catch, catch location and depth, size of the fish and stomach content was stored. A detailed description of the NIOZ archive can be found in de Vooys et al (1991, 1993).

2.2. Stomach content analysis

Prey items were in most cases identified and registered to species level. When prey items were (partly) digested, identification was made to a higher taxonomic level. Almost all prey items (total of 364) could be identified at least at the class level. In only a few cases unidentified prey items were registered. These were removed from further analysis. For prey species belonging to fishes, shrimps and crabs, total length was also registered. Incomplete specimens, often from species that were eaten in pieces such as *Alitta virens* or *Ensis leei* or when species were in part such as the *Crangon crangon*, were counted only by the number of 'heads'. Nine classes were identified (worms, sea stars, bivalves, gastropods, crabs, shrimps, lobsters, cephalopods and fishes).

For each prey item percentage of occurrence was calculated (= number of stomachs containing a prey species divided by total number of stomachs examined) as measure of diet composition following Baker et al (2014).

2.2.1. Trophic position (TP)

For each prey species, the mean trophic position was taken for their class, order and family as taxonomic group (see Suppl Mat Table A1). FishBase (Froese & Pauly 2019) was used as it provided dietary information of over 800 mostly peer-reviewed references.

1   Trophic position (TP_j) for each individual skate or shark j, was calculated in line with

2   a previous study of the trophic structure of the Wadden Sea fish fauna (Poiesz et al 2020).

3   as 1 + the mean value of the trophic positions of the different prey species found in a

4   stomach:

5    $$TP_j = 1 + \sum(\overline{TP}_{i1} + \overline{TP}_{i2} + \overline{TP}_{i3} \dots) \qquad\qquad [1]$$

6   where

7   TP_j being the calculated trophic position of the individual predator j;

8   TP_{i1} the mean trophic position of the first prey species $i1$.

9    $TP_{i2}, TP_{i3} \dots$ the mean trophic position of the second and third etc. prey species.

10

11   2.2.2. Potential bias in trophic position

12

13   From the data set of stomach content data of fish community of the Wadden Sea

14   collected between 2010 and 2018 (Poiesz et al 2020), all individual fishes with at least two

15   different prey species were selected. For these individuals (n = 5300), trophic position was

16   estimated in two different ways:

17   Estimate 1: Based on mean trophic position of the prey items in line with this study.

18   Trophic position was calculated as 1 + the mean trophic position of the various

19   prey species according to FishBase.

20   Estimate 2: Based on weighted mean trophic position of the different prey masses. First,

21   the contribution of the various prey item to the total diet was determined on

22   the basis of back-calculated consumed fresh biomass, reconstructed by means

23   of length-weight relationships, whereby for small prey items a mean wet mass

24   was taken. Next the trophic position of the predator was estimated as 1 + the

25   weighted average of the trophic positions of the various food items.

26   The potential bias associated with not taking prey mass into account was assessed by

27   constructing a linear regression between both estimates.

28

29   2.3. Niche overlap

1

2   To determine the relative degree of specialization in diet and to compare the diets

3 between the different shark and skate species, the Levins' index of niche breath was used

4 (Levins 1968). For this analysis the contribution of each different prey species within a

5 stomach was used and calculated according to:

6 $$P_{ij} = \frac{N_{ij}}{N_{jtot}}$$ [2]

7 where

8 P_{ij} being the proportion of each prey species i in the diet of each individual predator j;

9 N_{ij} the number of individuals of the species i in the stomach of the predator j;

10 N_{jtot} the total number of preys counted of each individual predator j.

11 Next, the average proportion (P_{ij}) of each prey species was taken for each predatory

12 species.

13   In order to compare the different diets, the average proportion of the different prey

14 items (p_{ij}) were classified up to the highest taxonomic level (order) level. Next, Levins'

15 standardized measure of niche breadth (B_j) was calculated according to:

16 $$B_j = \frac{1}{\sum Pij^2}$$ [3]

17 Levins' measure of niche breadth can range from 1 (indicating a highly specific diet with

18 only one prey species) to <1 (indicating a less specific diet with more prey species).

19

20   To quantify dietary overlap, the MacArthur-Levins' method was used (MacArthur

21 & Levins 1967; Feinsinger et al 1981). It estimates the extent to which the prey of

22 consumer species K overlaps with that of species J. For instance, if species J specializes on

23 a certain type of food source which is also eaten by a more generalist species K, then from

24 species J's viewpoint its niche overlaps completely with the other species, but from species

25 $K's$ viewpoint the niche only partially overlaps with the niche of species $J.$ Therefore, the

26 calculated values can differ between J and K and vice versa. The MacArthur-Levins' method

27 is calculated using the following equation:

1    $M_{jk} = s \; \dfrac{\sum p_{ij*}p_{ik}}{\sum p_{ij}^2} \quad$ and $\quad M_{kj} = s \; \dfrac{\sum p_{ij*}p_{ik}}{\sum p_{ik}^2}$ [4]

2   where M_{jk} and M_{kj} are the degree of overlap on species j by species k and vice versa, and

3   p_{ij} and p_{ik} are the proportions that food resource i contributes to the diets of species j and

4   k, respectively (Ellis 1996; Sa-Oliveira et al 2014).

5

6   2.4. Data exploration and visualization

7

8   The data was explored using the protocol described in Zuur et al (2010).

9   Ontogenetic shifts in diet and trophic position were explored with length as categorical

10   variable. Local Polynomial Regression (LPR) were used by means of LOESS (span = 0.75)

11   with the ggplot package (Wickham 2016).

12   Visualizations of the network data was made by the bipartite package in Dormann

13   et al (2009) and Levins' index of niche breath calculation was made using the MicroNiche

14   package (Finn 2020). All further data analysis and data manipulations were done in R (R

15   Core Team 2019).

16

17   **3. Results**

18

19   3.1. Species composition

20

21   The NIOZ-archive contained information from nine shark and skate species (Table

22   1). No records were found from the common smooth-hound. Therefore, all records have

23   been considered to have been starry smooth-hound *Mustelus asterias*. One species, the

24   lesser spotted dogfish, belonged to the (near)-resident species and three species were

25   juvenile marine migrants: the thornback ray, the starry smooth-hound and the angelshark.

26   All other species were marine seasonal visitors. (Near)-resident and juvenile marine

27   migrants were demersal species, and all marine seasonal visitors were pelagic species.

Capture locations of individual sharks and skates could be grouped into wider geographical areas (e.g., banks, grounds and holes) in the North Sea and Wadden Sea (Fig 1). The lesser spotted dogfish, starry smooth-hound, tope shark and thornback ray were captured at almost all locations. All other species were caught throughout the North Sea and Wadden Sea (Fig 1). The only species that did not occur in the Terschelling Bank was the common thresher shark, while only the starry smooth-hound and tope shark occurred in the eastern Wadden Sea.

Most stomach content data were collected between 1946 and 1954, therefore the analysis was restricted to this period. For five species (common thresher shark, basking shark, common sting ray, porbeagle and angelshark), the NIOZ archive contained very few data, i.e., information from less than ten stomachs (see Suppl Mat Table B1). Therefore these species were not included in subsequent analysis.

3.2. Stomach content and trophic position

3.2.1. Lesser spotted dogfish (*Scyliorhinus canicula*)

The size of the lesser spotted dogfish ranged from 10 to 83 cm total length and they were caught in depths between 2 and 77 meters. Suppl Mat Fig B2 shows the records at the various locations. Stomach data from 180 individuals were available: of these 19 stomachs were empty (10.6%) and for 12 stomachs the information about total fish length was lacking. In total 29 different prey items were found (Suppl Mat Table B2), with only a few groups occurring frequently in the stomachs: Pisces and Malacostraca and to a lesser extent Caenogastropoda and Polychaeta. Pisces consisted mainly of Pleuronectiformes (flatfishes, flounder, sole), Ammoditidae (greater sandeel), and Trigiidae (gurnard). Malacostraca included mainly Crangonidae (shrimps), Anomura (hermit crabs) and Brachyura (crabs). Caenogastropoda comprised Buccinidae (whelks) and Polychaeta Annelidae (Nereididae) (Fig 2). About half (48.4%) of the prey items in the stomachs were crustaceans. With increasing fish size, the occurrence of Brachyura decreased. The

occurrence of Annelids (Nereididae) also decreased with size and they were absent above 60 cm in size. Larger lesser spotted dogfish did also consume flatfishes (Fig 2). There was variability in the estimates of trophic position, but there was no significant relationship with fish size [ANOVA; $F_{(3, 149)}$ = 1.492, p = 0.22] (Fig 6). Mean trophic position was 4.01 (±0.43 SE).

3.2.2. Thornback ray (*Raja clavata*)

All thornback rays were caught from water depths ranging from 3 to 49 meters and measured from 10 to 85 cm in total length. Suppl Mat Fig B3 shows the number of individuals caught at the various locations. From all thornback rays captured, 174 individuals contained information about stomach content. Ten individuals (5.5%) had empty stomachs, and for 9 individuals no fish size was documented (Suppl Mat Table B3). The diet of thornback rays mainly consisted of Malacostraca and low percentages of Pisces and some Bivalvia and Polychaeta (Fig 3). The Malacostraca included mainly Crangonidae (shrimp species) and Brachyura (crab species) and the Pisces were Ammoditidae (greater) sandeel). Nereididae were the dominant Polychaeta family. No trends between trophic position and size was found [ANOVA; $F_{(3, 152)}$ = 0.892, p = 0.447], which might partly be due to the low number of observations of small (<30 cm) and large (>70 cm) fishes (Fig 6). Mean trophic position was 3.59 (±0.14 SE).

3.2.3. Starry smooth-hound (*Mustelus asterias*)

Stomach content data of 276 starry smooth-hounds were available. Of these, five individuals (1.8%) had empty stomachs. The total length of the starry smooth-hounds ranged between 27 and 117 centimeters and they were caught at depths ranging between 5 and 56 meters. Suppl Mat Figure B4 shows the number of individuals caught at each location. Almost all prey species were Malacostraca with in addition some Pisces, Polychaeta and Molluscs (Fig 4) (See Suppl Mat Table B4 for more detailed information).

The Malacostraca were Crangonidae (various shrimp species), Anomura (hermit crabs) and Brachyura (crabs). The few Pisces belonged to the Callionimidae (dragonets) and the Polychaeta were Nereididae. The prey species remained the same with increasing fish size, however frequency of occurrence did show some variability over the different size classes. Estimated trophic position showed some variability but was not related to the different size classes [ANOVA; $F_{(3, 276)} = 0.428$, $p = 0.73$] (Fig 6). Mean trophic position was 3.88 (±0.27 SE).

3.2.4. Tope sharks (*Galeorhinus galeus*)

The NIOZ archive contained stomach data of 508 tope sharks, but 29 individuals (5.7%) had an empty stomach and for 2 individuals, total length data was not recorded from prey (See Suppl Mat Table B5 for more detailed information). All tope sharks were caught at depths between 3 and 67 meters and the total length ranged from 25 to 166 cm. Suppl Mat Fig B5 shows the number of individuals caught at each location. Pisces were the most important prey item for all size classes (Fig 5). Smaller individuals (<40 cm) also had Malacostraca in their stomachs. Other groups were found infrequently: Polychaeta only occurred in the stomachs below 40 cm total length whereas Asteroidea and Ophiuridae were only present in fish with a total length above 120 cm. Cephalopods occurred in almost all size classes. Several families of Pisces were eaten: both demersal (Pleuronectidae, Solidae, Gobiidae) and pelagic (Clupeidae, Ammodytidae, Scrombidae, Trigiidae, Tadidae, Carangidae) species. Malacostraca were preyed on mainly by the smallest size groups, especially Anomura (hermit crabs) and Brachyura (crabs) and to a lesser extent Crangonidae (shrimp species). Trophic position showed a significant positive relationship with size [ANOVA; $F_{(6, 470)} = 15.36$, $p < 0.05$], however with some variability (Fig 6). Overall, mean trophic position was 4.37 (± 0.39 SE).

3.2.5. Other species

Five species (common thresher shark, basking shark, common stingray, porbeagle and angelshark) contained very few data (see Suppl Mat Table C1). The diet of the thresher shark consisted mostly of Pisces, while the diet of the basking shark only contained Crustacea. The porbeagle preyed upon Pisces and to a small extend on Cephalopoda. The diet of the common stingray was more variable and consisted of a mixture of Annelida and Crustacea and some Pisces. The angelshark preyed mainly on Pisces, and in addition on Crustacea and Cephalopoda (Suppl Mat Table C2). Suppl Mat Fig C1-C5 shows the number of individuals caught at the various locations for these five species.

3.2. Potential bias in TP estimate

The data set of stomach content data of fish community of the Wadden Sea collected between 2010 and 2018 contained 2876 stomach content records about 54 prey fish species and 72 different prey taxa. For all individual stomachs, the relationship between the two methods (Estimate 1: based on mean trophic position of the prey items; Estimate 2: based on the weighted mean trophic position of the different prey masses) was highly significant (R^2 = 0.98, p < 0.05) over a range in trophic positions from 2.0 to 4.7 (Fig 7). A selection of stomachs containing only fish and crustaceans, corresponding with the main prey items of the sharks and skates in this study, resulted in a similar significant relationship (R^2 = 0.91, p < 0.05; Fig 7), with an estimated intercept of 0 and slope 95 confidence limits that overlapped with 1. As such, we concluded that no mass-based correction of TP estimates used in this study was required.

3.3. Niche overlap

The four shark and skate species appeared to be generalists, feeding on a variety of different prey items (Fig 8) with differences between the species. The lesser spotted dogfish, the starry smooth hound and thornback ray showed a benthic/demersal diet (polychaetes, molluscs and crustaceans), while the tope shark fed dominantly on

1 cephalopods and fishes. Most diet overlap occurred for three groups of prey: Pisces,

2 Crustacea and Cephalopoda (Fig 8).

3   Niche overlap occurred for fish (tope shark and lesser spotted dogfish), for hermit

4 crabs (lesser spotted dogfish and starry smooth hound) and for shrimps (thornback ray

5 and starry smooth hound). A niche overlap analysis (Table 2) showed that the lesser

6 spotted dogfish had a significant diet overlap with the other species. The tope shark showed

7 no significant diet overlap with other predatory species (Table 2).

8

9 **4. Discussion**

10

11   We used historical dietary data to examine the trophic ecology of four species of

12 sharks and skates which have disappeared from Dutch coastal and North Sea waters. Our

13 results show that the four species were generalist feeders and had trophic positions

14 between 3.2 and 4.6. Three species, the (near)-resident lesser spotted dogfish, the marine

15 juvenile migrant starry smooth hound, and the benthopelagic marine seasonal visitor

16 thornback ray had a benthic/demersal diet feeding especially on polychaetes, molluscs and

17 crustaceans. The pelagic marine seasonal visitor tope shark fed dominantly on cephalopods

18 and fishes. The diet of the different species overlapped: for fish (tope shark and lesser

19 spotted dogfish), for hermit crabs (lesser spotted dogfish and starry smooth hound) and

20 for shrimps (thornback ray and starry smooth hound).

21   The catch data of the various species illustrate that the records of most sharks and

22 skates from the NIOZ archive originated from Dutch coastal waters. These shark and skate

23 species can be considered part of the wider Dutch coastal and Wadden Sea food web as

24 they have also been registered inside the Wadden Sea (Witte & Zijlstra, 1983). Tagging

25 experiments also indicate that the data may be representative for the Dutch Wadden Sea.

26 Tagging of the tope shark and the starry smooth-hound has shown migration of these

27 species from the south coast of England and the north coast of Wales to the Bay of Biscay

28 in Portugal (Holden & Horrod 1979; Farrell et al 2010). Also, thornback rays move over

29 several hundred kilometers (Walker et al 1997) and the lesser spotted dogfish have shown

movement up to 30 kilometres (Rodríguez-Cabello et al 1998, 2004; Sims et al 2001). The movement of the common stingray has not yet been studied, but the dispersion of this species as shown in de Vooys et al (1991), indicates a population that lived close to or in the Dutch Wadden Sea.

4.1. Diet composition

The taxonomic identification of the stomach contents in this study was not always made to species level but to higher taxonomic groups (class and order). More detailed information may have resulted in more detailed information about segregation and overlap in prey items between species. Also, elasmobranchs quickly digest and break down their prey (Córtes et al 2008; Wieczorek et al 2018), which might have meant that soft-bodied prey were under-represented.

Due to the limited data available for five species (the common thresher shark, porbeagle, basking shark, the angelshark and the common stingray), it is questionable whether these species are really generalist or specialist feeders. At least for the angelshark, the focus on crustaceans and (flat)fishes in the Irish Sea (Ellis et al 1996) suggest that this species is a specialist feeder. The other four shark and skate species in the Dutch coastal zone appeared to be generalist predators consuming a variety of polychaetes, mollusks, crustaceans and teleosts, as also found for the North-eastern Atlantic by Ellis et al (1996). In generalist predators, spatial differences in diet composition might be expected reflecting local variability in prey availability.

In the Dutch coastal zone, the diet of the lesser spotted dogfish contained a wide variety of other taxonomic groups but about half of the prey items were crustaceans, similar to reports from other parts of the North Sea (Pinnegar 2014) and elsewhere (Lyle 1983; Ellis et al 1996; Wieczorek et al 2018). The diet of thornback rays in the Dutch coastal zone mainly consisted of crustaceans and low percentages of Pisces and some Bivalvia and Polychaeta. The diet composition of the starry smooth-hound contained Pisces

and Crustacea and to a lesser extent Caenogastropoda and Polychaeta. The focus of both species on mainly crustacean species is comparable with feeding patterns in other parts of the North Sea (Daan 1993; Pinnegar 2014). Other studies reported similar diet composition for the common stingray, but also included additional benthic invertebrate species (Yeldan et al 2009; Saglam et al 2010; Šantić et al 2011). The diet composition of the starry smooth-hound also corresponded with the findings of Ellis et al (1996) for the Irish Sea, but the NIOZ archive data showed an additional consumption of shrimps in the early life stage. The results for the tope shark found in this study are in line with the those described for sharks by Cortés (1999).

In this study, ontogenetic shifts in diet were only found the lesser spotted dogfish and the tope shark whereby the prey size and diet composition differed with total length and life stage, in line with other studies (Lyle 1983; Ellis et al 1996; Henderson & Dunne 2002; Lucifora et al 2006; Martinho et al 2012). In the lesser spotted dogfish, the occurrence of crab and polychaeta worms decreased with size while in the tope shark smaller individuals (< 40 cm) had crustaceans in their stomachs and larger individuals had a wider variety of fish species (Pleuronectiformes, Gadidea). Ontogenetic shifts in diet have also been described for the thornback ray in contrast to this study. In other areas, young individuals prey on small crustaceans such as shrimps, while larger individuals consume larger crustaceans, such as swimming crabs (Holden & Tucker 1974; Ellis et al 1996; Farias et al 2006). In this study, only large thornback rays > 70 cm showed a higher preference for Pisces.

4.2. Trophic position

Estimates of trophic position might to some extend depend on the methodology used. In a previous analysis of stomach contents of the lesser spotted dogfish from the west coast of Ireland, Wieczorek et al (2018) found mainly hard-bodied prey or vertebrates, such as decapods or fish with a relatively higher trophic level. However, a simultaneous stable isotope analysis resulted in a lower estimate of the trophic position of

the lesser spotted dogfish (Wieczorek et al 2018). Apparently, elasmobranchs digest soft-bodied prey items very quickly and therefore their contribution is underestimated by stomach content analysis. Conversely, comparable trophic positions estimated from isotope composition were found by Jennings and van der Molen (2015) for the two species in this study (the thornback ray and the starry smooth-hound). This suggests that estimates of trophic position based on historical stomach content data may be biased due to missing digested soft prey items. In this study stomachs with a record of only a single prey item resulted in some cases in an estimate of a very low or high trophic position of the predator. Most likely other less important prey items were not registered or identified in these stomachs and as such, estimates of trophic position based on these data are invalid. However, stomach content analyses remains a simple and valuable tool to reconstruct the historic trophic position of predators, including predator-prey relationships and niche overlap. For future studies, it is highly desirable that stomach content analysis and stable isotope analysis should be combined to unravel the complex trophic ecology of these elusive predators (Cortés 1999; Flowers et al 2020).

The shark and skate species from the Dutch coastal zone also occurred in large parts of the North Sea (Heessen et al 2015) and included species from different functional groups (Zijlstra 1983; Elliott & Dewailly 1995). One species, the lesser spotted dogfish, belonged to the (near)-resident species and three species were juvenile marine migrants: the thornback ray, the starry smooth-hound and the angelshark. All other species were marine seasonal visitors. (Near)-resident and juvenile marine migrants were demersal species, and all marine seasonal visitors were pelagic species. Most niche overlap occurred among the benthic/demersal species for hermit crabs (lesser spotted dogfish and starry smooth hound) and for shrimps (thornback ray and starry smooth hound). There was no evidence for overlap between the lesser spotted dogfish, starry smooth-hound and thornback ray. The pelagic tope shark had some overlap for fish with the benthic/demersal lesser spotted dogfish.

Estimates of trophic position ranged from 3.2 for thornback ray preying exclusively on crustaceans to 4.6 for the tope shark consuming higher trophic prey (crustaceans and

fish) over the period 1946 - 1954. The calculated trophic position for the shark and skate species in the Dutch coastal zone in this study corresponds closely with that found in other parts of the North Sea by Jiming (1982). The calculated trophic positions of shark and skate species indicate that some species fed at the top of the marine food web, but others fed at a lower trophic level, but may be top predators of their ecological assemblage.

4.3. Past role in the food web

Common thresher, porbeagles, basking and angel sharks have been extremely rare for a long period in the Dutch Wadden Sea and coastal area (Witte & Zijlstra 1983; Heessen et al 2015). As such, predation pressure and potential food competition from these species will have been low for decades. Commercial landings of skates and rays in the past (Heessen et al 2015; Bom et al 2020) indicate substantial densities in the Dutch coastal zone at that time and imply that they were an important component of the past food web and that their disappearance might have caused changes in the community through competitive release as stated by Stevens et al (2000).

The effects of removing large numbers of these top predators on the marine ecosystem is still largely unknown (Stevens et al 2000), but might be substantial for Dutch coastal waters. For instance, Lynam et al (2017) suggest that top-down exploitation of predators has an important effect on the dynamics of other fish populations and can initiate complex cascading effects. In the North Sea especially planktivorous (top) predators should play such a central role (Lynam et al 2017).

A recent analysis of contemporary food web structure of the Dutch coastal fish community based on stomach content analysis resulted in trophic positions between 2.0 and 4.7, with most trophic positions above 3.0. Until a few decades ago, (near)-resident species were the most abundant functional group in spring and juvenile marine migrants in autumn (Poiesz et al 2020). Part of the shark and skate species analyzed in the study also belonged to (near)-residents and marine juvenile migrants. Therefore, coastal zone

habitats were likely more important for (near)-residents and marine juvenile migrants in the past than nowadays.

The various shark and skate species differ with respect to their prey location, prey depth, prey size and feeding times (Young et al 2010). Mouth dimensions of skates correlate with their diet and prey specialization (Walker 1998; Scharf et al 2000). This trophic or behavioral separation also causes niche segregation. Our work has shown that these now rare species likely played important trophic roles in Dutch coastal waters. However, to what extend these species can be considered as top predators within their own ecological assemblage (Pusineri et al 2008; Young et al 2010), is still unknown. For instance, some reportedly "top-predator" species such as skates (thornback ray), feed at a relatively low trophic position and prey to other species with a higher trophic position (Flowers et al 2020).

5. References

Baker R, Buckland A, Sheaves M (2014) Fish gut content analysis: robust measures of diet composition. Fish Fish 15:170-177

Bird CS, Veríssimo A, Magozzi S, Abrantes KG, Aguilar A, Al-Reasi H, Trueman CN (2018) A global perspective on the trophic geography of sharks. Nat Ecol Evol 2:299-305

1   Bom RA, van de Water M, Camphuysen CJ, van der Veer HW, van Leeuwen A (2020)

2   Historical ecology and demise of the iconic angelshark *Squatina squatina* in the

3   southern North Sea. Mar Biol 167:91

4   Borer ET, Seabloom EW, Shurin JB, Anderson KE, Blanchette, CA, Broitman BR, Cooper S,

5   Halpern B (2005) What determines the strength of a trophic cascade? Ecology

6   86:528-537

7   Cortés E (1999) Standardized diet compositions and trophic levels of sharks. ICES J Mar

8   Sci 56:707-717

9   Cortés E, Papastamatiou YP, Carlson JK, Ferry-Graham L, Wetherbee BM, Cyrino JE, Kapoor

10   BG (2008) An overview of the feeding ecology and physiology of elasmobranch

11   fishes. In: Cyrino JEP, Bureau DP, Kapoor BG (eds) Feeding and digestive functions

12   of fishes CRC Press:393-443

13   Couce E, Schratzberger M, Engelhard GH (2020) Reconstructing three decades of total

14   international trawling effort in the North Sea. Earth Syst Sci Data 12:373-386

15   de Vooys CGN, Witte JIJ, Dapper R, van der Meer J, van der Veer HW (1991) Lange termijn

16   veranderingen in zeldzame vissoorten op het Nederlands continentaal plat van de

17   Noordzee. NIOZ-Report 1991-6

18   de Vooys CGN, Witte JIJ, Dapper R, van der Meer J, van der Veer HW (1993) Lange termijn

19   veranderingen op het Nederlands continentaal plat van de Noordzee: trends in

20   invertebraten van 1931–1990. NIOZ-Report 1993-17

21   Daan N, Johnson B, Larsen JR, Sparholt H (1993) Analysis of the ray (*Raja* spec.*)* samples

22   collected during the 1991 International Stomach Sampling Project. ICES CM

23   1993/G:15

24   Dulvy NK, Freckleton RP, Polunin NVC (2004) Coral reef cascades and the indirect effects

25   of predator removal by exploitation. Ecol Lett 7:410-416

26   Dormann CF, Fruend J, Bluethgen N, Gruber B (2009) Indices, graphs and null models:

27   analyzing bipartite ecological networks. Open Ecol J 2:7-24

28   Egmond F (2005) Het Visboek. De wereld volgens Adriaen Coenen 1514-1587. Walburg

29   Pers, Zutphen, The Netherlands

1   Elliott M, Dewailly F (1995) The structure and components of European estuarine fish
2   assemblages. Neth J Aquat Ecol 29:397–417

3   Ellis JR, Pawson MG, Shackely SE (1996) The comparative feeding ecology of six species
4   of shark and four species of ray (*Elasmobranchii*) in the North-East Atlantic. J Mar
5   Biol Ass UK 76:89-106

6   Estes JA, Tinker MT, Williams TM, Doak DF (1998) Killer whale predation on sea otters
7   linking oceanic and nearshore ecosystems. Science 282:473-476

8   Farias I, Figueiredo I, Moura T, Gordo LT, Neves A, Serra-Pereira B (2006) Diet comparison
9   of four ray species *(Raja clavata*, *Raja brachyura*, *Raja montagui* and *Leucoraja*
10   *naevus*) caught along the Portuguese continental shelf. Aquat Liv Res 19:105-114

11 Farrell ED, Mariani S, Clarke MW (2010) Reproductive biology of the starry smooth-hound
12   shark *Mustelus asterias*: geographic variation and implications for sustainable
13   exploitation. J Fish Biol 77:1505-1525

14 Feinsinger P, Spears EE, Poole RW (1981) A simple measure of niche breadth. Ecology
15   62:27-32

16 Finn D (2020) MicroNiche: Microbial Niche Measurements. R package version 1.0.0.
17   https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MicroNiche

18 Flowers KI, Heithaus MR, Papastamatiou YP (2021) Buried in the sand: Uncovering the
19   ecological roles and importance of rays. Fish Fish 22:105-127

20 Frank KT, Petrie B, Choi JS, Leggett WC (2005) Trophic cascades in a formerly cod-
21   dominated ecosystem. Science 308:1621-1623

22 Frank KT, Petrie B, Shackell NL (2007) The ups and downs of trophic control in continental
23   shelf ecosystems. TREE 22:236-242

24 Frid A, Dill LM, Thorne RE, Blundell GM (2007) Inferring prey perception of relative danger
25   in large-scale marine systems. Evol Ecol Res 9:635-649

26 Froese R, Pauly D (2019) FishBase. World Wide Web electronic publication.
27   www.fishbase.org, version (02/2019)

28 Heessen HJL, Daan N, Ellis JR (2015) Fish atlas of the Celtic Sea, North Sea and Baltic Sea.
29   Wageningen Academic Publishers, Wageningen, 572p

Henderson AC, Dunne J, Flannery K (2002) Stomach contents of spiny dogfish *Squalus acanthias* L. off the west coast of Ireland. Ir Nat J 27:101-105

Holden MJ, Horrod RG (1979) The migrations of tope, *Galeorhinus galeus* (L), in the eastern North Atlantic as determined by tagging. ICES J Mar Sci 38:314-317

Holden MJ, Tucker RN (1974) The food of *Raja clavata* (Linnaeus, 1758), *Raja montagui* (Fowler, 1910), *Raja naevus* (Müller and Henle, 1841) and *Raja brachyura* (Lafont, 1873) in British waters. ICES J Mar Sci 35:189-193

Hussey NE, MacNeil MA, Siple MC, Popp BN, Dudley SF, Fisk AT (2015) Expanded trophic complexity among large sharks. Food Webs 4:1-7

Hyslop EJ (1980) Stomach contents analysis – a review of methods and their application. J Fish Biol 17:411-429

Jackson JBC, Kirby MX, Berger WH, Bjorndal, KA, Botsford LW, Bourque BJ, Bradbury RH, Cooke R, Erlandson J, Estes JA, Hughes TP, Kidwell S, Lange CB, Lenihan HS, Pandolfi JM, Peterson CH, Steneck RS, Tegner MJ, Warner RR (2001) Historical overfishing and the recent collapse of coastal ecosystems. Science 293:629-637

Jennings S, Greenstreet SPR, Hill L, Piet GJ, Pinnegar JK, Warr KJ (2002) Long-term trends in the trophic structure of the North Sea fish community: evidence from stable-isotope analysis, size-spectra and community metrics. Mar Biol 141:1985-1097

Jennings S, van der Molen J (2015) Trophic levels of marine consumers from nitrogen stable isotope analysis: estimation and uncertainty. ICES J Mar Sci 72:2289-2300

Jiming Y (1982) A tentative analysis of the trophic levels of North Sea fish. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 7:247-252

Johnson FH (1977) Response of walleye (*Stizostedion vitreum vitreum*) and yellow perch (*Perca flavescens*) populations to removal of white sucker (*Catostomus commersoni*) from a Minnesota lake, 1966. J Fish Res Bd Can 34:1633-1642

Leopold MF (2018) Stomach content analysis. https://www.wur.nl/en/show/Stomach-content-analysis.htm, Retrieved: 27-1-2018

Levins R (1968) Evolution in changing environments: some theoretical explorations (No. 2). Princeton University Press

1 Lotze HK (2005) Radical changes in the Wadden Sea fauna and flora over the last 2000

2 years. Helgol Mar Res 59:71-83

3 Lotze HK (2007) Rise and fall of fishing and marine resource use in the Wadden Sea,

4 southern North Sea. Fish Res 87:208-218

5 Lotze HK, Lenihan HS, Bourque BJ, Bradbury RH, Cooke RG, Kay MC, Jackson JB (2006)

6 Depletion, degradation, and recovery potential of estuaries and coastal seas.

7 Science 312:1806-1809

8 Lucifora LO, García VB, Menni RC, Escalante AH (2006) Food habits, selectivity, and

9 foraging modes of the school shark *Galeorhinus galeus*. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 315:259-

10 270

11 Lyle JM (1983) Food and feeding habits of the lesser spotted dogfish, *Scyliorhinus canicula*

12 (L.), in Isle of Man waters. J Fish Biol 23:725-737

13 Lynam CP, Llope M, Möllmann C, Helaouëte P, Bayliss-Brown GA, Stenseth NC (2017)

14 Interaction between top-down and bottom-up control in marine food webs. PNAS

15 114:1952-1957

16 MacArthur R, Levins R (1967) The limiting similarity, convergence, and divergence of

17 coexisting species. Am Nat 101:377-385

18 Martinho F, Sá C, Falcão J, Cabral HN, Pardal MA (2012) Comparative feeding ecology of

19 two elasmobranch species, *Squalus blainville* and *Scyliorhinus canicula*, off the coast

20 of Portugal. Fish Bull 110:71-84

21 Myers RA, Baum JK, Shepherd TD, Powers SP, Peterson CH (2007) Cascading effects of

22 the loss of apex predatory sharks from a coastal ocean. Science 315:1846-1850

23 Olson RJ, Galván-Magaña F (2002) Food habits and consumption rates of common

24 dolphinfish (*Coryphaena hippurus*) in the eastern Pacific Ocean. Fish Bull 100:279-

25 298

26 Pauly D, Christensen V, Dalsgaard J, Froese R, Torres F (1998) Fishing down marine food

27 webs. Science 279:860-863

28 Pinnegar JK (2014) DAPSTOM - An integrated database & portal for fish stomach records.

29 Version 4.7. CEFAS, Lowestoft, UK. February 2014, 39pp

Poiesz SSH, Witte JIJ, van der Veer HW (2020) Only a few key prey species fuel a temperate coastal fish food web. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 653:153-166

Pusineri C, Chancollon O, Ringelstein J, Ridoux V (2008) Feeding niche segregation among the Northeast Atlantic community of oceanic top predators. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 361:21-34

R Core Team 2019 R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. https://www.R-project.org/

Rodríguez-Cabello C, De la Gándara F, Sánchez F (1998) Preliminary results on growth and movements of dogfish *Scyliorhinus canicula* (Linnaeus, 1758) in the Cantabrian Sea. Oceano Acta 21:363-370

Rodríguez-Cabello C, Sánchez F, Fernández A, Olaso I (2004) Is the lesser spotted dogfish (*Scyliorhinus canicula*) population from the Cantabrian Sea a unique stock? Fish Res 69:57-71

Saglam H, Ak O, Kutlu S, Aydin I (2010) Diet and feeding strategy of the common stingray *Dasyatis pastinaca* (Linnaeus, 1758) on the Turkish coast of south-eastern Black Sea. Cah Biol Mar 51:37-44

Šantić M, Paladin A, Agovic A (20110 Diet of common stingray, *Dasyatis pastinaca* (*Chondrichthyes: Dasyatidae*) in the eastern Adriatic Sea. Cah Biol Mar 52:349-356

Sa-Oliveira JC, Angelini R, Isaac-Nahum VJ (2014) Diet and niche breadth and overlap in fish communities within the area affected by an Amazonian reservoir (Amapá, Brazil). Ann Acad Bras Cienc 86:383-406

Scharf FS, Juanes F, Rountree RA (2000) Predator size - prey size relationships of marine fish predators: interspecific variation and effects of ontogeny and body size on trophic-niche breadth. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 208:229-248

Shurin JB, Borer ET, Seabloom EW, Anderson K, Blanchette CA, Broitman B, Cooper SD, Halpern BS (2002) A cross-ecosystem comparison of the strength of trophic cascades. Ecol Lett 5:785-791

1   Sims D, Nash J, Morritt D (2001) Movements and activity of male and female dogfish in a
2   tidal sea lough: alternative behavioural strategies and apparent sexual segregation.
3   Mar Biol 139:1165-1175

4   Sterner RW, Bajpai A, Adams T (1997) The enigma of food chain length: absence of
5   theoretical evidence for dynamic constraints. Ecology 78:2258-2262

6   Stevens JD, Bonfil R, Dulvy NK, Walker PA (2000) The effects of fishing on sharks, rays,
7   and chimaeras (*Chondrichthyans*), and the implications for marine ecosystems.
8   ICES J Mar Sci 57:476–494

9   Strong DR (1992) Are trophic cascades all wet? Differentiation and donor-control in
10   speciose ecosystems. Ecology 73:747-754

11 Tulp I, Bolle LJ, Rijnsdorp AD (2008) Signals from the shallows: In search of common
12   patterns in long-term trends in Dutch estuarine and coastal fish. J Sea Res 60:54-
13   73

14 Tulp I, van der Veer HW, Walker P, van Walraven L, Bolle LJ (2017) Can guild- or site-
15   specific contrasts in trends or phenology explain the changed role of the Dutch
16   Wadden Sea for fish? J Sea Res 127:150-163

17 van der Veer HW, Dapper R, Henderson PA, Jung AS, Philippart CJM, Witte JIJ, Zuur AF
18   (2015) Changes over 50 years in fish fauna of a temperate coastal sea: Degradation
19   of trophic structure and nursery function. Estua Coast Shelf Sci 155:156-166

20 van Walraven L, Dapper R, Nauw JJ, Tulp I, Witte JIJ, van der Veer HW (2017) Long-term
21   patterns in fish phenology in the western Dutch Wadden Sea in relation to climate
22   change. J Sea Res 127:173-181

23 Yeldan H, Avsar D, Manaşirli M (2009) Age, growth and feeding of the common stingray
24   (*Dasyatis pastinaca* L., 1758) in the Cilician coastal basin, northeastern
25   Mediterranean Sea. J Appl Ichthy 25:98-102

26 Young JW, Lansdell MJ, Campbell RA, Cooper SP, Juanes F, Guest MA (2010) Feeding
27   ecology and niche segregation in oceanic top predators off eastern Australia. Mar
28   Biol 157:2347-2368

1 Walker PA (1998) Fleeting Images: Dynamics of North Sea ray populations. PhD Thesis,

2   University of Amsterdam

3 Walker PA, Heessen HJL (1996) Long-term changes in rays populations in the North Sea.

4   ICES J Mar Sci 53:1085-1093

5 Walker PA, Howlett G, Millner R (1997) Distribution, movement and stock structure of three

6   ray species in the North Sea and eastern English Channel. ICES J Mar Sci 54:797-

7   808

8 Walker PA, Hislop JRG (1998) Sensitive skates or resilient rays? Spatial and temporal shifts

9   in ray species composition in the central and north-western North Sea between

10   1930 and present day. ICES J Mar Sci 55:392-402

11 Wieczorek AM, Power AM, Browne P, Graham CT (2018) Stable-isotope analysis reveals the

12   importance of soft-bodied prey in the diet of lesser spotted dogfish *Scyliorhinus*

13   *canicula*. J Fish Biol 93:685-693

14 Wickham H (2016) ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis. Springer-Verlag New York

15 Witte JIJ, Zijlstra JJ (1983) The species of fish occurring in the Wadden Sea. In: Wolff WJ

16   (Ed) Ecology of the Wadden Sea. Balkema Press, Rotterdam, The Netherlands:

17   5/10-5/19

18 Wolff WJ (1983) Ecology of the Wadden Sea. Balkema Press, Rotterdam, The Netherlands.

19 Wolff WJ (2000) Causes of extirpations in the Wadden Sea, an estuarine area in The

20   Netherlands. Conserv Biol 14:876-885

21 Wolff WJ (2005) Nonindigenous marine and estuarine species in The Netherlands. Zool

22   Meded Leiden 79:1–116

23 Worm B, Myers RA (2003) Meta-analysis of cod-shrimp interactions reveals top-down

24   control in oceanic food webs. Ecology 84:162-173

25 Zijlstra JJ (1972) On the importance of the Wadden Sea as a nursery area in relation to

26   the conservation of the southern North Sea fishery resources. Symp Zool Soc Lond

27   29:233–258

1   Zijlstra JJ (1983) The function of the Wadden Sea for the members of its fish-fauna. In:

2   Wolff WJ (Ed) Ecology of the Wadden Sea. Balkema, Rotterdam, The Netherlands.

3   5/20-5/26

4   Zuur AF, Ieno EN, Elphick CS (2010) A protocol for data exploration to avoid common

5   statistical problems. Meth Ecol Evol 1:3-14