Biogeosciences Discuss., 10, 7075–7102, 2013 www.biogeosciences-discuss.net/10/7075/2013/ doi:10.5194/bgd-10-7075-2013 © Author(s) 2013. CC Attribution 3.0 License.



This discussion paper is/has been under review for the journal Biogeosciences (BG). Please refer to the corresponding final paper in BG if available.

Distributions and assemblages of larval fish in the East China Sea in the northeasterly and southwesterly monsoon seasons 2008

W. Y. Chen^{1,2}, M. A. Lee^{2,3}, K. W. Lan², and G. C. Gong³

¹Coastal and Offshore Resources Research Center, Taiwan Fishery Research Institute, Kaohsiung, Taiwan

²Department of Environmental Biology and Fisheries Science, National Taiwan Ocean University, Keelung, Taiwan

³Center of Marine Bioenvironment and Biotechnology, National Taiwan Ocean University, Keelung, Taiwan

Received: 5 March 2013 - Accepted: 4 April 2013 - Published: 22 April 2013

Correspondence to: M. A. Lee (malee@mail.ntou.edu.tw)

Published by Copernicus Publications on behalf of the European Geosciences Union.





Abstract

A total of 8459 larval fish were collected in the southern East China Sea during the winter northeasterly monsoon season and the summer southwesterly monsoon seasons in 2008. They were composed of 184 species belonging to 105 families and 162

- genera. The abundance in terms of CPUE (number of individuals/1000 m³) of the larvae was about six times higher in the southwesterly monsoon season than that in the northeasterly monsoon season. The primary environmental factors affecting the larval abundance were found to be water temperature in the northeasterly monsoon season but food availability in the southwesterly monsoon season. Three larval fish assem blages were recognized; the inshore assemblage, the offshore assemblage, and the
- summer coastal assemblage. The distribution and species composition of the larvae in the assemblages reflected the hydrographic conditions and water currents resulted from the seasonal monsoons.

1 Introduction

25

- The East China Sea (ECS) is one of the largest marginal seas in the world. It is bordered by China Mainland, Taiwan Island, Japanese Archipelago, and Korean Peninsula. The hydrographic systems in the continental shelf of ECS have been known to be influenced by the southward China Coastal Current and Yellow Sea water in the northeasterly monsoon season, but by the northward Kuroshio Current and Taiwan Strait
- ²⁰ Current in the southwesterly monsoon season (Katoh et al., 2000; Gong et al., 2003; Yang et al., 2011, 2012). Fresh water discharges from the Changjiang River also affect the hydrographic system of ECS in the summer (Gong et al., 1996).

Ichthyoplankton are meroplankton, a planktonic stage that is very sensitive to environmental changes. Their spatial distribution and assemblages are closely related to oceanic hydrographic features (Okazaki et al., 2002; Okazaki and Nakata, 2007; Lo et al., 2010). These features act as the mechanisms of enrichment, concentration and





retention for larval fish, affecting their survival and production (Okazaki et al., 2002; Hsieh et al., 2011). This biological–physical relation has been observed in estuarine system (Queiroga et al., 1997; DiBacco et al., 2001), shelf break front (Hsieh et al., 2007; Chen et al., 2012) and upwelling area (Vargas and Castro, 2001; Yannicelli et al., 5 2006).

Many studies have been conducted on the changes in the structure of larval fish assemblages in relation to the hydrographic conditions, such as current transportation (Sassa et al., 2006), seasonal changes (Hsieh et al., 2011), and food availability and competition (Sassa et al., 2008). For ECS such studies have been made on a shelf break area (Okazaki and Nakata, 2007) and the waters around Taiwan (Hsieh et al., 2010). Recently, more attentions have been made on effects of monsoon systems on marine environments, particularly on the circulation pattern (Lo et al., 2010; Hsieh et al., 2010, 2011, 2012). With these there were the studies on the spatio-temporal difference in larval fish assemblages in relation to local hydrographic features between different monsoon seasons in the northwest Pacific Ocean (Hsieh et al., 2011, 2012).

We have been conducting the Longterm Observation and Research of East China Sea (LORECS) since 1997 to determine the biogeochemical cycle and main plankton loop to assess the impacts of the reduction in Changjiang River discharges on marine environments caused by the construction of Three Gorges Dam in 2003 (Gong et al.,

20 2007). This study was a part of the LORECES to investigate the species composition, assemblages and abundances of larval fish in the ECS and compared them between the two distinct monsoon seasons in 2008 as a part of the evaluation of the food web dynamics in ECS.





2 Materials and methods

2.1 Data collection

Larval fish were collected at 16 stations on board the Ocean Research I in January and July 2008 (Fig. 1), using an Ocean Research Institute (ORI) net with a mouth diameter

- of 1.6 m and stretch mesh size of 0.33 mm. At each of the station, the net was towed obliquely from the depth at 200 m to the surface at deep stations (depths > 200 m) or from 10 m above the bottom to the surface at shallower stations (< 200 m). The volume of water filtered was calculated using a flow meter attached at the center of the net. Biological samples collected were fixed immediately in 5 % formalin-seawater solution.
- ¹⁰ In the laboratory, ichthyoplankton were picked up from the collections and identified to the lowest taxonomic level as possible, according to the atlas of Okiyam (1988), and Leis and Carson-Ewart (2000). Larval fish abundance was calculated and standard-ized as CPUE (number of individuals/1000 m³). Sea water temperature and salinity were recorded by a conductivity temperature depth (CTD) profiler (SBE 9/11, Sea-Bird
- ¹⁵ Electronics Inc. Washington DC, USA). Environmental features including nutrients and chlorophyll *a* were obtained from the LORECS reports (Chen et al., 2009).

Meso-scale oceanographic conditions of ECS were collected from the satellite images and HYCOM model data. The sea surface temperature images were obtained from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration/Advanced Very High Reso-

²⁰ Iution Radiometer (NOAA/AVHRR) sensors (Lee et al., 2005). The HYCOM ocean surface currents with 1/12° spatial resolution were download from the OPeNDAP ocean database (http://opendap.org/ml-toolbox) (Cornillon et al., 2009).

2.2 Data analysis

25

Mann–Whitney U-test was used to determine the significant level in difference of CPUEs between the two monsoon seasons. The CPUEs were normalized by a logarithmic function $[\ln(x + 1)]$ transformation. Cluster analysis with normalized Euclidean





distances was used to measure levels of similarity in species composition among the sampling stations. Ward's method was used to illustrate their relations in a dendrogram. The cluster analysis was processed using the STATISTICA 8 statistical software package.

Pearson's correlation analyses were used to determine the relationship between CPUEs and each of sea surface temperature (SST), primary production and zooplankton wet weight. Non-linear relationships between dominant taxa and environmental variables were analyzed with the canonical correlation analysis (CCA), a statistical visualization method (ter Braak, 1994).

10 3 Results

3.1 Hydrographic conditions

Maps of satellite temperatures and current directions in January and July 2008 showed the meso-scale environmental features in ECS (Figs. 2 and 3). In January the cold China Coastal Current flowed southward (Fig. 2a, blue color) and Kuroshio Branch ¹⁵ Current occurred on the southeastern shelf (Fig. 2a, green color). In July the warm waters (> 25 °C) were widely distributed in the continental shelf (Fig. 2b). The current directions displayed that Kuroshio Current was a strong current flowing along the 200 m isobaths in both seasons (Fig. 3). In northeasterly monsoon season, the southward current at a depth of 10 m intruded along the coast of China into the southern ECS around latitude 26° N (Fig. 3a). In the southwesterly monsoon season, this current move north-

- ²⁰ latitude 26° N (Fig. 3a). In the southwesterly monsoon season, this current move northeasterly from the Taiwan Strait to the shelf of ECS with the flow rate of ca. 0.5 m s⁻¹ (Fig. 3b). The current directions at the depths of 10 m and 50 m changed from northeast direction to east direction around the latitudes of 30° N and 28° N, respectively (Fig. 3b, d).
- ²⁵ The distributions of sea surface temperature and salinity at the depth of 10 m in January and July 2008 are shown in Fig. 4. In general, the temperature and salinity at the





stations adjacent to the coast of China were lower. In the winter northeasterly monsoon season, the sea surface temperatures ranged between 12.1 and 24.3 °C and salinities between 30.8 and 34.6 psu. In the southwesterly monsoon season, the temperatures were between 19.6 and 29.6 °C that were higher than those in the northeasterly monsoon season. The salinities varied between 28.0 and 34.2 psu. The salinities less than 31 psu (Gong et al., 1996) were found only at the Changjiang River estuary in the southwesterly monsoon season.

3.2 Abundance and composition of larval fish in relation to environments

A total of 8459 fish larvae were collected. They were comprised of 184 species belonging to 105 families and 162 genera with a total CPUE of 15534 ind./1000 m³. The spatial distribution of larval abundance expressed as CPUE is showed in Fig. 5. The average CPUE was 143 ind./1000 m³ in the northeasterly monsoon season that was about 6 times less than 828 ind./1000 m³ in the southwesterly monsoon season. The maximum CPUE was 502 ind./1000 m³ at Station E8 in the northeasterly monsoon season (Fig. 5).

The CPUEs showed a significant difference between northeasterly and southwesterly monsoon seasons (Mann–Whitney U-test, p < 0.05) but not between day and night in each of the two seasons (Tables 1 and 2).

Figure 6 shows the relationships between CPUEs and the environmental variables: sea surface temperature, primary production and zooplankton wet weight. In the northeasterly monsoon season, CPUE were significantly, positively correlated (r = 0.61, p < 0.05) with sea surface temperature but not with primary production. A positive correlation was also found between CPUE and zooplankton wet weights, when Station E20 where a shrimp bloom occurred was excluded (r = 0.57, p < 0.05) (Fig. 6c). In the southwesterly monsoon season, a significant, positive correlation was found only between CPUE and primary production (r = 0.59, p < 0.05).

The dominant species of larval fish (> 1 %) are showed in Table 2. In the northeasterly monsoon season, the dominant species were *Valamugil* sp., *Sigmops gracilis*, and



CC D

scorpaenid larvae. When their numbers were combined, the combined average CPUE was 795 ind./1000 m³, occupying 34.48 % of the total larval fish sample. In the south-westerly monsoon season, gobiid type 2, *Saurida* spp. and *Engraulis japonicus* were the dominant taxa accounted for 6084 ind./1000 m³, occupying 45.92 % of the total sample.

The ordination diagrams of canonical correlation analysis (CCA) of CPUEs of dominant larval fish taxa and environment variables are shown in Fig. 7. In the northeasterly monsoon period, CPUE of each of *Sigmops gracilis, Diaphus* A and B, and callionymid larvae was positively related with sea surface temperature, sea surface salinity and primary production, but negatively with DO and opposite to CPUE of scorpaenid larvae (Fig. 7a). In the southwesterly monsoon season, the CPUE of *Engraulis japonicus* was positively related with primary production and zooplankton wet weight, but negatively with sea surface salinity and opposite to CPUE of gobiid type 2 (Fig. 7b). The CPUE of *Bregmaceros* spp. was negatively correlated with DO.

3.3 Assemblages and biodiversity of larval fish

10

The dendrogram and geographic locations of the larval fish communities analyzed with the cluster analysis for the two monsoons are shown in Fig. 8. In the dendrogram, based on the station association and spatial distribution pattern of the species, three assemblages were recognized; they were the inshore assemblage, the offshore assemblage, and the summer coastal assemblage. The latter one occurred only in the southwesterly monsoon season. The dominant species of each of the assemblages with ecological information of species at adult stage in the two monsoon seasons are shown in Table 3.

The inshore assemblage was observed at 11 stations in the northeasterly mon-²⁵ soon season and 3 stations in the southwesterly monsoon season (Fig. 8). It was located in the area with lower sea surface temperature and sea surface salinity (Fig. 4) with average CPUE of 68 ind./1000 m³ in the northeasterly monsoon season and 168 ind./1000 m³ in the southwesterly monsoon season (Table 3). Its abundance was the





lowest for the three assemblages. The most dominant species of the larvae in the inshore assemblage was scorpaenid larvae that accounted for 26.45% in the northeasterly monsoon season and 20.18% in the southwesterly monsoon season (Table 3). The offshore assemblage was observed at 5 stations in the northeasterly monsoon season

- ⁵ and 8 stations in the southwesterly monsoon season in the offshore region (Fig. 8) with higher sea surface temperature and sea surface salinity (Fig. 4). The average CPUE of the assemblage was 286 ind./1000 m³ in the northeasterly monsoon season and 289 ind./1000 m³ in the southwesterly monsoon season. They were, respectively, 2 to 4 times higher than those of the inshore assemblages in both seasons (Table 3). The
- ¹⁰ most dominant species were Valamugil sp. in the northeasterly monsoon season and *Trachinocephalus myops* in the southwesterly monsoon season. The former had CPUE of 323 ind./1000 m³occupying 22.61 % of the total offshore assemblage sample, while the latter had 295 ins./1000 m³accounted for 12.79 %.

The summer coastal assemblage occurred only at 5 stations at the 50 m iso-¹⁵ pleths along the China coast south and out the mouth of the Changjiang River in the southwesterly monsoon season (Fig. 8b). Its abundance was 10 304 ind./1000 m³ that was comparatively higher than those of the other two assemblages (Table 3). Three dominant species were gobiid type 2 (2344 ind./1000 m³), *Saurida* larvae (2234 ind./1000 m³) and *Engraulis japonicas* (1,378 ind./1000 m³) (Table 3). *E. japonicas* larvae were highly aggregated at Stations E19 (446 ind./1000 m³) and E27 (897

4 Discussion

4.1 Seasonal difference in oceanic currents

ind./1000 m³) located at or near the Changiang River estuary.

The hydrography in ECS was strongly influenced by the seasonal changes in China ²⁵ Coastal Current, Taiwan Strait Current and Kuroshio Branch Current, even the boundary of the Kuroshio Current with high temperature and salinity was along the shelf



break of ECS in the two monsoon seasons (Figs. 2 and 3). In the northeasterly monsoon season, water temperature is low with an obvious intensive thermal front, when the monsoon wind turns northeasterly direction and brings the China Coastal Current flows southwardly. It has been revealed that the cold China Coastal Current expands southward over the mid-shelf of ECS and interacts with the Kuroshio Branch Current

to form thermal fronts along the 50 m isopleths (Fig. 2a) (Chang et al., 2008). The extension of southward China Coastal Current along the China coast disappeared in the southwesterly monsoon season (Fig. 2b).

The Kuroshio Branch Current and Taiwan Strait Current concurrently intrude to the
 East China Sea carrying with warm water from the south in the southwesterly monsoon (Isobe, 2008). They may block the southward flow of the China Coastal Current with cold water from the north at the south of Changjiang River (Figs. 3b and 4). Intrusion of the lower salinity water into the East China Sea has been described by Chang and Isobe (2003) and Gong et al. (2011) suspecting that the discharges of the Changjiang
 River in the seas extends farther northeastward but constrained by the Taiwan Strait

Current in the southwesterly monsoon season.

4.2 Abundance of larval fish in relation to environmental variables

In this study the abundance of larval fish in the northeasterly monsoon season was found to be much lower than that in the southwesterly monsoon season in the ECS

(Table 2), a fairly similar result obtained by Hernandez et al. (2010). It has been known that larval fish are significantly abundant in the warm season (Meekan et al., 2003) and the low temperature (< 20 °C) in general is not suitable for larval fish to live. Batty and Blaxter (1992) and Stoll and Beeck (2012) indicate that growth and swimming ability of larval fish was impeded by the low temperature. Okazaki and Nakata (2007) suggest
 that the abundance of larval fish and species number are less so at lower temperature

and increased with the warm temperature.

It was found that sea surface temperature was significantly positively correlated with zooplankton wet weight (Chen et al., 2012) and abundance of larval fish was





positively related to zooplankton wet weight and presumed to related to availability of food sources in summer (Hsieh et al., 2010). Zooplankton are also known to be the primary prey for larval fish and their mouth widths must match with the prey sizes in predation (Cunha and Planas, 1999). Fifty percent of the larvae are able to capture prey when the size of the prey was equal to 85% of the width of the mouth. When the prey size is less than 57% of the width of the mouth, more than 95% larvae were able to capture them (Hunter and Kimbrell, 1980).

Development stages of the larval fish collected with the ORI net with a mesh size of 330 um mesh was dominated by the pre-flexion and flexion stages. The mouth devel-

- opment at these stages was not completely established to enable the larvae to capture most of mature zooplankton. Therefore, it was difficult for this study to examine whether zooplankton wet weight was a causal factor for the fish larval abundance, even they were significantly, positively correlated in the northeasterly monsoon season (Fig. 6). The suitable warm temperature is considered to an important factor affecting the sur vival and production of larval fish in the northeasterly monsoon season (Zenitani et al.,
- 2009).

It is interesting that the larval increased with primary production but not SST and zooplankton wet weight in the southwesterly monsoon season (Fig. 6). This suggested that the influence of SST on survival and production of larval fish decreased as the environment became warmer (> 25 °C). The primary production is the biomass index of food availability for fish (Chen et al., 2004), suggesting that the production and survival of larval fish were influenced by food availability in the southwesterly monsoon season.

4.3 Larval fish assemblages in relation to oceanic currents

5

20

There were three larval fish assemblages, inshore assemblage, offshore assemblage and summer coastal assemblage in ECS. Many biological features, such as trophic level, life style and migration, are not obviously different among larval stages and species. Fish larvae are pelagic plankton in the early life stages of fishes whose ecological features differ from their adults (Leis, 2006). Therefore, ecological features were





not the main reason for group structures. Even then, our result still showed that the abundance of the larvae differed significantly at each of the assemblages between the two monsoon seasons. The summer coastal assemblage had the highest average CPUE, about 2061 ind./1000 m³, that was about 12 times higher that of the inshore assemblage and 7 times higher than that of offshore assemblage. Moreover, spatial distribution and species composition among the three assemblages were also differed significantly. As paragraph of the previously discussion, we suggest that it depends on food supply.

In the northeasterly monsoon season, the offshore assemblage occupied a few shelf areas at the latitudes from 26° N to 28° N, while the inshore assemblage occupied the southern area of ECS. This inshore assemblage receded toward the Changjiang River estuary and bank in the southwesterly monsoon season. Scorpaenid larvae were dominant in both monsoon seasons. Wu (2000) indicating their optimal temperature ranged between 10 ~ 14 °C that fairly well corresponded to the temperature < 19 °C, salinity < 33 psu) of the southward China Coastal Current (Jan et al., 1998; Chen and Wang, 2006). In addition, Adult scorpaenid preferred to live the shallow near-shore waters with rocky bottom and belong to settled habitat type (Okiyama, 1988), so the place of

 adult scorpaenid life was its spawning ground.
 The spatial distributions of the offshore assemblage stations were found to be fairly
 stable in the shelf waters. However, the two most dominant species were Valamugil
 spp. and Sigmops gracilis in the northeasterly monsoon season but changed to Trachinocephalus myops and Auxis larvae in the southwesterly monsoon season. Among
 them Valamugil larvae was widely distributed in the ECS and Taiwan Strait, but their
 taxonomy and ecology are still not clear (Durand et al., 2012). T. myops and Auxis lar-

vae were abundant taxa important to the warm Taiwan Strait Current (Hsieh et al., 2012); while Sigmops gracilis have been recorded as the dominant species in the Kuroshio water (Hsieh et al., 2011). As shown in Fig. 7a, Sigmops gracilis was well related to the warm and saline water. Nakabo (2002) indicates that this adult species mainly inhabit the deeper oceanic waters and its larvae are pelagic life and abundant in





the Kuroshio Current and offshore waters. In general, the larvae are pelagic plankton, sensitive to environmental changes (Ohshimo et al., 2012), and their survival depends on availability of food supply and suitable temperature. Moreover, Parmesan and Yohe (2003) also point out the current context of marked environmental changes may affect species distributions, natural resources and biodiversity. The above suggested that the

species distributions, natural resources and biodiversity. The above suggested that the change in the dominant species in the ECS between the two monsoon seasons might be due to the northward intrusion of Taiwan Strait Current and Kuroshio Current in the southwesterly monsoon season.

The summer coastal assemblage was biggest among the three assemblages. It was found in the coastal waters and the Changjiang River estuary and along its bank. *E. japonicus* was the 3rd dominant species in this assemblage. It was distributed mainly at the Changjiang River estuary and south side of the river bank, similar to that reported by Iseki and Kiyomoto (1997), who also states that the estuary is its major spawning ground. Gobiid type 2 and *Saurida* larvae were the two most dominant species of the assemblage. Although the gobiid type 2 occur widely in the coastal waters of ECS, the

- assemblage. Although the gobild type 2 occur widely in the coastal waters of ECS, the larvae taxonomy and phylogeny of gobildae are not well established and morphological characters useful for species diagnosis of the larvae are insufficient, resulting in the constraint in the species identification. It is not easy to identify larval fish to species level (Thacker and Roje, 2011; Ko et al., 2013). In order to solve the above problems,
 it has been suggested to employ bio-technique methodology (Spies et al., 2006; Ko
- et al., 2013).

5 Conclusions

Our results provide evidence that the distribution of the larval fish assemblage in the continental shelf of ECS linked to the hydrographic conditions. It may be concluded that

the abundance and spatial-temporal distribution of the larval fish assemblage were related to SST in the northeasterly monsoon season but food availability in the southwesterly monsoon season. There were three larval fish assemblages, the inshore, offshore





and summer coastal assemblages. The species composition and distribution of the assemblages differed between the two monsoon seasons, resulted from changes in oceanic currents and hydrographic conditions of the two seasons.

Acknowledgements. This research was supported in part by the National Research Council of
 Taiwan (100-2611-M-019-005) and the Center of Marine Bioenvironment and Biotechnology,
 National Taiwan Ocean University. Our special gratitude goes to the LORECS Research Team
 who provided assistance in the field work and hydrographic data for the study.

References

10

Aizawa, M.: Stomiiformes, in: Fishes of Japan with Pictorial Keys to the Species, edited by: Nakabo, T., Tokai University Press, Tokyo, 306–310, 2002.

- Batty, R. S. and Blaxter, J. H. S.: The effect of temperature on the burst swimming performance of fish larvae, J. Exp. Biol., 170, 187–201, 1992.
- Chang, P. H. and Isobe, A.: A numerical study on the Changjiang diluted water in the Yellow and East China Seas, J. Geophys. Res.-Oceans, 108, 1–17, doi:10.1029/2002jc001749, 2003.
- ¹⁵ Chang, Y., Lee, M. A., Shimada, T., Sakaida, F., Kawamura, H., Chan, J. W., and Lu, H. J.: Wintertime high-resolution features of sea surface temperature and chlorophyll *a* fields associated with oceanic fronts in the southern East China Sea, Int. J. Remote Sens., 29, 6249– 6261, doi:10.1080/01431160802175462, 2008.

Chen, C. C., Shiah, F. K., Chiang, K. P., Gong, G. C., and Kemp, W. M.: Effects of the Changjiang

- 20 (Yangtze) River discharge on planktonic community respiration in the East China Sea, J. Geophys. Res.-Oceans, 114, C03005, doi:10.1029/2008jc004891, 2009.
 - Chen, T. A. and Wang, S. L.: A salinity front in the southern East China Sea separating the Chinese coastal and Taiwan Strait waters from Kuroshio waters, Cont. Shelf Res., 26, 1636–1653, doi:10.1016/j.csr.2006.05.003, 2006.
- ²⁵ Chen, W. Y., Wang, Y. C., and Lee, M. A.: Early-summer ichthyoplankton biodiversity associated with oceanic factors on the continental shelf of the southern East China Sea, J. Mar. Sci. Tech., 20, 698–706, 2012.

Chen, Y. L. L., Chen, H. Y., Gong, G. C., Lin, Y. H., Jan, S., and Takahashi, M.: Phytoplankton production during a summer coastal upwelling in the East China Sea, Cont. Shelf Res., 24, 1321–1338. doi:10.1016/j.csr.2004.04.002.2004

³⁰ 1321–1338, doi:10.1016/j.csr.2004.04.002, 2004.





Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

- Hernandez, F. J., Powers, S. P., and Graham, W. M.: Seasonal variability in ichthyoplankton abundance and assemblage composition in the northern Gulf of Mexico off Alabama, Fish. 30 B. NOAA, 108, 193-207, 2010.
- Three Gorges Dam?", Geophys. Res. Lett., 34, L14610, doi:10.1029/2007gl029633, 2007. Gong, G. C., Liu, K. K., Chiang, K. P., Hsiung, T. M., Chang, J., Chen, C. C., Hung, C. C., Chou, W. C., Chung, C. C., Chen, H. Y., Shiah, F. K., Tsai, A. Y., Hsieh, C. H., Shiao, J. C., 25 Tseng, C. M., Hsu, S. C., Lee, H. J., Lee, M. A., Lin, I. I., and Tsai, F. J.: Yangtze River floods enhance coastal ocean phytoplankton biomass and potential fish production, Geophys. Res. Lett., 38, L13603, doi:10.1029/2011gl047519, 2011.
- Sea, Deep-Sea Res. Pt. II, 50, 1219–1236, doi:10.1016/s0967-0645(03)00019-5, 2003. 20 Gong, G. C., Hung, C. C., and Chang, J.: Reply to comment by Jinchun Yuan et al. on "Reduction of primary production and changing of nutrient ratio in the East China Sea: effect of the
- Gong, G. C., Wen, Y. H., Wang, B. W., and Liu, G. J.: Seasonal variation of chlorophyll a concentration, primary production and environmental conditions in the subtropical East China
- Gong, G. C., Chen, Y. L. L., and Liu, K. K.; Chemical hydrography and chlorophyll a distribution 15 in the East China Sea in summer: Implications in nutrient dynamics, Cont. Shelf Res., 16, 1561-1590, 1996.
- Durand, J. D., Shen, K. N., Chen, W. J., Jamandre, B. W., Blel, H., Diop, K., Nirchio, M., 10 de Leon, F. J. G., Whitfield, A. K., Chang, C. W., and Borsa, P.: Systematics of the grey mullets (Teleostei: Mugiliformes: Mugilidae): molecular phylogenetic evidence challenges two centuries of morphology-based taxonomy, Mol. Phylogenet. Evol., 64, 73-92, doi:10.1016/j.ympev.2012.03.006, 2012.
- 8486(99)00040-x, 1999. DiBacco, C., Sutton, D., and McConnico, L.: Vertical migration behavior and horizontal distribution of brachyuran larvae in a low-inflow estuary: implications for bay-ocean exchange, Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser., 217, 191-206, doi:10.3354/meps217191, 2001.

5

Cornillon, P., Adams, J., Blumenthal, M. B., Chassignet, E., Davis, E., Hankin, S., Kinter, J., Mendelssohn, R., Potemra, J. T., Srinivasan, A., and Sirott, J.: Nvods and the development of OPeNDAP, Oceanography, 22, 116–127, doi:10.5670/oceanog.2009.43, 2009.

Cunha, I. and Planas, M.: Optimal prey size for early turbot larvae (Scophthalmus maximus L.)

based on mouth and ingested prey size, Aquaculture, 175, 103-110, doi:10.1016/s0044-



Discussion Paper

Discussion Paper

Discussion Paper

Discussion Paper

10, 7075–7102, 2013

Distributions and assemblages of larval fish in the East **China Sea**

W. Y. Chen et al.

Title Page

Abstract

Conclusions

Tables

14

Back

Introduction

References

Figures

Close

Hsieh, F. J., Lee, M. A., Pan, J. Y., Wang, Y. T., Lan, K. W., and Lan, Y. C.: Winter distribution and composition of ichthyoplankton associated with thermal front on the continental shelf of the southern East China Sea, J. Fish. Soc. Taiwan, 34, 69–85, 2007.

Hsieh, H. Y., Lo, W. T., Liu, D. C., and Su, W. C.: Influence of hydrographic features on larval fish distribution during the south-westerly monsoon in the waters of Taiwan, western North

Pacific Ocean, J. Fish Biol., 76, 2521–2539, doi:10.1111/j.1095-8649.2010.02643.x, 2010.

Hsieh, H. Y., Lo, W. T., Wu, L. J., Liu, D. C., and Su, W. C.: Monsoon-driven succession of the larval fish assemblage in the East China Sea shelf waters off northern Taiwan, J. Oceanogr., 67, 159–172, doi:10.1007/s10872-011-0015-6, 2011.

¹⁰ Hsieh, H. Y., Lo, W. T., Wu, L. J., and Liu, D. C.: Larval fish assemblages in the Taiwan Strait, western North Pacific: linking with monsoon-driven mesoscale current system, Fish Oceanogr., 21, 125–147, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2419.2011.00612.x, 2012.

Hunter, J. R. and Kimbrell, C. A.: Early life history of Pacific mackerel, *Scomber japonicus*, Fish. B. NOAA, 78, 89–101, 1980.

- Iseki, K. and Kiyomoto, Y.: Distribution and settling of Japanese anchovy (*Engraulis japonicus*) eggs at the spawning ground off Changjiang River in the East China Sea, Fish Oceanogr., 6, 205–210, 1997.
 - Isobe, A.: Recent advances in ocean-circulation research on the Yellow Sea and East China Sea shelves, J. Oceanogr., 64, 569–584, 2008.
- ²⁰ Jan, S., Chern, C. S., and Wang, J.: A numerical study of currents in the Taiwan strait during winter, Terr. Atmos. Ocean. Sci., 9, 615–632, 1998.
 - Katoh, O., Morinaga, K., and Nakagawa, N.: Current distributions in the southern East China Sea in summer, J. Geophys. Res.-Oceans, 105, 8565–8573, doi:10.1029/1999jc900309, 2000.
- Ko, H. L., Wang, Y. T., Chiu, T. S., Lee, M. A., Leu, M. Y., Chang, K. Z., Chen, W. Y., and Shao, K. T.: Evaluating the accuracy of morphological identification of larval fishes by applying DNA barcoding, PLOS ONE, 8, e53451, 2013.

Lee, M. A., Chang, Y., Sakaida, F., Kawamura, H., Cheng, C. H., Chan, J. W., and Huang, I.: Validation of satellite-derived sea surface temperatures for waters around Taiwan, Terr. Atmos.

³⁰ Ocean. Sci., 16, 1189–1204, 2005.

5

Leis, J. M.: Are larvae of demersal fishes plankton or nekton?, in: Advances in Marine Biology, edited by: Southward, A. J., and Sims, D. W., Vol. 51, Advances in Marine Biology, Academic Press Ltd-Elsevier Science Ltd, London, 57–141, 2006.



- lanternfish Diaphus garmani and D. chrysorhynchus with environmental changes in the East 10 China Sea, Fish, Sci., 78, 33–39, doi:10.1007/s12562-011-0424-x, 2012.
 - Okazaki, Y. and Nakata, H.: Effect of the mesoscale hydrographic features on larval fish distribution across the shelf break of East China Sea, Cont. Shelf Res., 27, 1616-1628, doi:10.1016/i.csr.2007.01.024.2007.
- ¹⁵ Okazaki, Y., Nakata, H., and Kimura, S.: Effects of frontal eddies on the distribution and food availability of anchovy larvae in the Kuroshio Extension, Mar. Freshwater Res., 53, 403-410, doi:10.1071/mf01115, 2002.
 - Okiyama, M.: An atlas of the early stage fishes in Japan, Tokai University Press, Tokyo, 1154 pp., 1988.
- Omori, M. and Ikeda, T.: Methods in marine zooplankton ecology, John Wiley, New York, 332 20 pp., 1984.
 - Parmesan, C. and Yohe, G.: A globally coherent fingerprint of climate change impacts across natural systems, Nature, 421, 37-42, 2003.
 - Queiroga, H., Costlow, J. D., and Moreira, M. H.: Vertical migration of the crab Carcinus maenas
- first zoea in an estuary: Implications for tidal stream transport, Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser., 149, 25 121-132, doi:10.3354/meps149121, 1997.
 - Sassa, C., Konishi, Y., and Mori, K.: Distribution of jack mackerel (Trachurus japonicus) larvae and juveniles in the East China Sea, with special reference to the larval transport by the Kuroshio Current, Fish Oceanogr., 15, 508–518, doi:10.1111/j.1365-2419.2006.00417.x, 2006.
 - Sassa, C., Tsukamoto, Y., and Konishi, Y.: Diet composition and feeding habits of Trachurus iaponicus and Scomber spp. larvae in the shelf break region of the East China Sea, Bull. Mar. Sci., 82, 137–153, 2008.

Leis, J. M. and Carson-Ewart, B. M.: The Larvae of Indo-Pacific Coastal Fishes: An Identification Guide to Marine Fish Larvae, Leiden press, Boston, 850 pp., 2000.

Lo, W. T., Hsieh, H. Y., Wu, L. J., Jian, H. B., Liu, D. C., and Su, W. C.: Comparison of larval fish assemblages between during and after northeasterly monsoon in the waters around Taiwan,

5

30

Discussion Pape western North Pacific, J. Plankton Res., 32, 1079–1095, doi:10.1093/plankt/fbg034, 2010. Meekan, M. G., Carleton, J. H., McKinnon, A. D., Flynn, K., and Furnas, M.: What determines the growth of tropical reef fish larvae in the plankton: food or temperature?, Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser., 256, 193–204, doi:10.3354/meps256193, 2003. Ohshimo, S., Yasuda, T., Tanaka, H., and Sassa, C.: Biomass fluctuation of two dominant Discussion Paper Abstract Discussion Paper



BGD



Discussion Pape

- Shannon, C. E. and Weaver, W.: The mathematical theory of communication, University of Illinois Press, Urbana, IL, 125, 1963.
- Spies, I. B., Gaichas, S., Stevenson, D. E., Orr, J. W., and Canino, M. F.: DNA-based identification of Alaska skates (Amblyraja, Bathyraja and Raja: Rajidae) using cytochrome C oxidase
- subunit I (col) variation, J. Fish Biol., 69, 283–292, doi:10.1111/j.1095-8649.2006.01286.x, 2006.
 - Stoll, S. and Beeck, P.: Larval fish in troubled waters is the behavioural response of larval fish to hydrodynamic impacts active or passive?, Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci., 69, 1576–1584, doi:10.1139/f2012-086, 2012.
- ¹⁰ ter Braak, C. J. F.: Canonical community ordination, Part I: Basic theory and linear methods, Ecoscience, 1, 127–140, 1994.
 - Thacker, C. E. and Roje, D. M.: Phylogeny of Gobiidae and identification of gobiid lineages, Syst. Biodivers., 9, 329–347, doi:10.1080/14772000.2011.629011, 2011.
 - Vargas, C. A. and Castro, L. R.: Spawning of the chilean hake (*Merluccius gayi*) in the upwelling system off Talcahuano in relation to oceanographic features. Sci. Mar., 65, 101–110, 2001.
 - Wu, C. W.: The Effect of Several Environmental Factors on the Survival Rate of Sebasticus marmoratus Larvae, J. Zhejiang Ocean Univ., 19, 12–16, 2000.

15

25

- Yang, D. Z., Yin, B. S., Liu, Z. L., and Feng, X. R.: Numerical study of the ocean circulation on the East China Sea shelf and a Kuroshio bottom branch northeast of Taiwan in summer, J. Geophys. Res.-Oceans, 116, C05015, doi:10.1029/2010jc006777, 2011.
- 20 Geophys. Res.-Oceans, 116, C05015, doi:10.1029/2010jc006777, 2011. Yang, D. Z., Yin, B. S., Liu, Z. L., Bai, T., Qi, J. F., and Chen, H. Y.: Numerical study on the pattern and origins of Kuroshio branches in the bottom water of southern East China Sea in summer, J. Geophys. Res.-Oceans, 117, C02014, doi:10.1029/2011jc007528, 2012.
 - Yannicelli, B., Castro, L. R., Valle-Levinson, A., Atkinson, L., and Figueroa, D.: Vertical dis-
 - tribution of decapod larvae in the entrance of an equatorward facing bay of central Chile: implications for transport, J. Plankton Res., 28, 19–37, doi:10.1093/plankt/fbi098, 2006.
 - Zenitani, H., Kono, N., Tsukamoto, Y., and Masuda, R.: Effects of temperature, food availability, and body size on daily growth rate of Japanese anchovy *Engraulis japonicus* larvae in Hiuchi-nada, Fish. Sci., 75, 1177–1188, doi:10.1007/s12562-009-0147-4, 2009.



Discussion Paper

Discussion Pape

Discussion Paper

Discussion Paper

Discussion Paper **BGD** 10, 7075–7102, 2013 **Distributions and** assemblages of larval fish in the East **Discussion** Paper **China Sea** W. Y. Chen et al. Title Page Abstract Introduction **Discussion** Paper Conclusions References Figures **Tables** 14 Back Close **Discussion** Paper



Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Table 1. Results of Mann-Whitney U-test for seasonal and diurnal differences in larval fish abundance (CPUE) in ECS, 2008.

Periods		Number of station	<i>p</i> value
northeasterly monsoon southwesterly monsoon		16 16	0.0008
northeasterly	day night	8 8	0.9164
southwesterly	day night	7 9	0.1248

Northeasterly	monsoon	Southwesterly monsoon			
Species	CPUE (ind./1000 m ³)	%	Species	CPUE (ind./1000 m ³)	%
Valamugil sp.	326	14.23	Gobiidae type 2	2344	17.69
Sigmops gracilis	239	10.46	<i>Saurida</i> spp.	2274	17.16
Scorpaenidae	230	10.06	Engraulis japonicus	1466	11.07
<i>Diaphus</i> A group	145	6.33	Gobiidae type 1	1064	8.03
<i>Diaphus</i> B group	113	4.95	Bregmaceros spp.	902	6.81
Callionymidae	111	4.85	Sciaenidae	763	5.76
Gobiidae type 2	71	3.09	<i>Cynoglossus</i> spp.	714	5.39
Trachurus japonicus	67	2.93	other Gobiidae species	359	2.71
other Gobiidae species	62	2.71	Apogontidae	352	2.66
Bregmaceros spp.	60	2.61	Benthosema pterotum	304	2.29
Myctophum asperum	40	1.77	Trachinocephalus myops	295	2.23
Triglidae	39	1.72	Callionymidae	235	1.77
Champsodon sp.	35	1.51	Leiognathidae	170	1.29
Ceratoscopelus warmingi	34	1.47	Scorpaenidae	146	1.1
Trichiurus lepturus	33	1.43	<i>Auxis</i> sp.	136	1.03
Vinciguerria nimbaria	29	1.25	others (< 1 %, 170 species)	1722	13
Scomber japonicus	29	1.25	Total	13246	100
Teraponidae	25	1.09	Average	828	
Scomber australasicus	23	1.02			
others (< 1 %, 165 species)	578	25.27			
Total	2288	100			
Average	143				

Table 2. Abundance (CPUE, number of individuals/1000 m^3) of dominant species of larval fish in the northeasterly and southwesterly monsoon seasons in ECS, 2008.



Discussion Paper

Discussion Paper

Discussion Paper

Discussion Paper

Table 3. The abundance (CPUE, ind./1000 m^3) and percentage contribution of dominant larval fish (> 80 %) of three larval fish assemblages in ECS, 2008 (NE, the northeasterly monsoon season; SW, the southwesterly monsoon season).

$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Inshore assemblage		Offshore assemblage		Summer coastal assemblage			
Abu. (%)	Species	NE (11)	SW (3)	Species	NE (5)	SW (8) Species		SW (5)
Scorpaeridae ^{hb} 223 (26.4) 112 (20.18) Valamugit sp. ^{hb} 323 (22.61) Gobidae type 2 ^{hb} 2244 (22.75) Gobidae ^{hb} 58 (6.89) 54 (8.64) 157 (75.9) 205 (12.79) Sainda sp. ^{hb} 223 (21.61) Gobidae type 1 ^{hb} 223 (21.61) Gobidae type 1 ^{hb} 223 (21.61) Gobidae type 1 ^{hb} 224 (22.75) 216 (0.83) Gobidae type 1 ^{hb} 223 (21.61) Gobidae type 1 ^{hb} 226 (12.74) Gobidae type 1 ^{hb} 226 (12.74) Gobidae type 1 ^{hb} 236 (22.51) 121 (52.42) Gobidae type 1 ^{hb} 256 (74.51) Gobidae type 2 ^{hb} 64 (7.65) Gobidae type 1 ^{hb} 32 (22.51) 121 (5.24) Gynaphicab ^{hb} 64 (7.63) Gobidae type 1 ^{hb} 64 (7.63) Gobidae type 1 ^{hb} 102 (7.15) 39 (1.60) Total 10304 (100) Scomber spn. ^{hb} 52 (6.16) Sciaenidae ^{hb} 78 (5.50) 56 (1.57) Sciaenidae ^{hb} 61 (10.77) Werage 28 (3.8) Bothdae ^{hb} 13 (0.89) 75 (3.26) Callionymidae ^{hb} 31 (3.74) Callionymidae ^{hb} 78 (5.50) 56 (1.57) Sciaenida ^{hb} 30 (2.		Abu. (%)	Abu. (%)		Abu. (%)	Abu. (%)		Abu. (%)
Gobildae ^{1,b} 56 (6.8) 54 (9.64) Trachinocephalus myope ^{1,b} 289 (12.79) Saurida sp. ^{1,b} 224 (21.8) Benthosema pterotum ^{1,b,c,p} 18 (2.99) 67 (12.09) Auxis sp. ⁵⁰ 220 (16.13) Forgunuis gaponicus ⁴⁰ 178 (13.8) Benthosema pterotum ^{1,b,c,p} 18 (2.99) 67 (12.09) Auxis sp. ⁵⁰ 220 (16.13) Forgunuis gaponicus ⁴⁰ 66 (7.80) Gobildae type 2 ¹⁰ 64 (7.66) Champsodn sp. ^{1,b} 32 (2.25) 121 (6.24) Other species 61 (9.61) Apogontidae ¹⁰ 60 (10.72) Diaphus A group ^{6,0} 14 (2.7) 39 (16.8) Total 10304 (100) Scomber sp. ^{1,b} 33 (3.87) Calionymidae ^{6,b} 78 (5.50) 56 (1.57) Sciaenidae ^{1,b} 99 (6.21) Tripiolae ^{1,b} 31 (3.74) Ophichtalae ^{6,b} 13 (0.89) 76 (2.7) Paraponi ganoa ² 26 (1.1) Average 2061 Calionymidae ^{6,b} 23 (2.7) Gobidae type 1 ⁶ 13 (0.89) 76 (2.7) Paraponi ganoa ² 26 (1.1) Average 2061 Gobidae ¹⁰ 22 (2.60) <t< td=""><td>Scorpaenidae^{n,b}</td><td>223 (26.45)</td><td>112 (20.18)</td><td>Valamugil sp.^{n,b}</td><td>323 (22.61)</td><td></td><td>Gobiidae type 2^{n,b}</td><td>2344 (22.75)</td></t<>	Scorpaenidae ^{n,b}	223 (26.45)	112 (20.18)	Valamugil sp. ^{n,b}	323 (22.61)		Gobiidae type 2 ^{n,b}	2344 (22.75)
Gobilda type 1 ^{1/b} B8 (15.76) Sigmops gracilla ⁶ 230 (16.13) Engraulis japonicus ^{4/b} B172 (13.8) Barthosema pterotum ^{1/b.op} 66 (7.8) Gobildae type 1 ^{1/b} 172 (7.45) Gobildae type 1 ^{1/b} 804 (7.60) Gobildae type 2 ^{1/b} 64 (7.8) Champsodon spp. ^{1/b} 32 (2.25) 121 (5.24) Cyncajlossus sp. ^{1/b} 645 (7.65) Gobildae type 1 ^{1/b} 102 (7.15) 39 (1.60) Champsodon spp. ^{1/b} 64 (16.7) General centrol and the species 1513 (14.68) Scomber sp. ^{1/b} 52 (6.16) Sciaenida ^{1/b} 139 (16.03) Total 10304 (100) Saurida sp. ^{1/b} 31 (3.74) Callonymidae ^{1/b} 78 (15.50) 56 (1.57) Regrave sp. ^{2/b} 64 (2.2) Trichiurus laptrus ⁶ 22 (2.82) Vincigueria nimbar ^{1/b} 13 (0.89) 75 (3.26) Bergmaliae ^{1/b} 31 (3.74) Ophichthidae ^{1/b} 13 (0.89) 75 (3.26) 86 (1.57) Teraponida ^{1/b} 23 (2.50) Correstocsecolisus sp. ^{1/b} 63 (3.58) 63 (3.58) 63 (3.58) Teraponida ^{1/b} 22 (2.62) Vincogravita sp. ¹	Gobiidae ^{n,b}	58 (6.89)	54 (9.64)	Trachinocephalus myops ^{n,b}		295 (12.79)	Saurida spp. ^{n,b}	2234 (21.68)
$ \begin{array}{l c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Gobiidae type 1 ^{n,b}		88 (15.76)	Sigmops gracilisº	230 (16.13)		Engraulis japonicus ^{n,p}	1378 (13.38)
Trachurus (aponicus ⁿ) 66 (7.83) Gobidae type 1 ^{hb} T72 (7.45) Bregmaceros spn. ⁰ 788 (7.45) Gobidae type 2 ^{hb} 64 (7.66) Champsodon spp. ^{nb} 32 (2.25) 121 (5.24) Cynoglosus sp. ^{hb} 645 (5.26) Apogentidae ¹ 60 (10.72) Diaphus B group ²⁰ 102 (7.15) 39 (1.80) Other species 1513 (14.69) Scomber spp. ^{nb} 52 (6.16) Sciaenidae ^{nb} 139 (9.63) Total 10304 (100) Saurida sp. ^{nb} 33 (3.87) Callionymidae ^{nb} 78 (5.50) 36 (1.57) Average 2061 Callionymidae ^{nb} 31 (3.74) Ophichtidae ^{nb} 13 (0.89) 75 (3.26) Average 2061 Trapano jarbua ⁿ 24 (2.84) Cynoglosus sp. ^{nb} 63 (2.72) Trapano jarbua ⁿ 22 (2.62) Vinciguerria nimbaria ^{nb} 29 (2.01) 23 (1.01) Average 66 (18.89) 26 (13.97) Gotidae ^{nb} 33 (2.30) Eotidae ^{nb} 43 (1.84) Trapanol jarbua ⁿ 22 (2.62) Vinciguerria nimbaria ^{nb} 33 (2.30) Eotidae ^{nb} 33 (2.30)	Benthosema pterotum ^{n,b,o,p}	18 (2.09)	67 (12.09)	Auxis spp. ^{o,p}		204 (8.83)	Gobiidae type 1 ^{n,b}	804 (7.80)
	Trachurus japonicus ⁿ	66 (7.83)		Gobiidae type 1 ^{n,b}		172 (7.45)	Bregmaceros spp.º	768 (7.45)
	Gobiidae type 2 ^{n,b}	64 (7.66)		Champsodon spp. ^{n,b}	32 (2.25)	121 (5.24)	Cynoglossus sp. ^{n,b}	645 (6.26)
Apogontidae ⁿ 60 (10.72) Diaphus B group ^{0,0} 102 (7.15) 39 (1.68) Other species 1513 (14.68) Scomber spp. ^{n.0} 52 (6.16) Sciaenidae ^{n,0} 131 (9.18) Average 2061 Callionymidae ^{n,0} 33 (3.87) Callionymidae ^{n,0} 78 (5.50) 36 (1.57) 98 (4.22) Trichiurus lepturus ⁰ 28 (3.38) Bothidae ^{n,0} 13 (0.80) 98 (4.22) Teraponidae ⁿ 22 (2.62) Vincigueria nimbaria ^{0,0} 23 (3.58) 63 (2.72) Teraponidae ⁿ 22 (2.62) Vincigueria nimbaria ^{0,0} 29 (2.01) 23 (1.01) Gadidae ⁰ 22 (2.62) Vincigueria nimbaria ^{0,0} 29 (2.01) 23 (1.71) Average 68 168 Myctophum asprun ^{0,0} 33 (2.30) 26 (1.3) Average 68 168 Myctophum asprun ^{0,0} 33 (2.30) 26 (1.02) Average 68 168 Myctophum asprun ^{0,0} 33 (2.30) 21 (1.2) Percophidae ^h 31 (1.36) 22 (0.94) 22 (0.94) 22 (0.94) Mullidae ^h	Engraulis japonicus ^{n,p}		64 (11.57)	Bregmaceros spp.º	34 (2.38)	118 (5.13)	Sciaenidae ^{n,b}	619 (6.01)
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c } \hline Scaenidae^{n.b} & Scaenidae^{n.b} & 139 (6.0) & \hline total & 10304 (100) \\ \hline Saurida sp.^{n.b} & 17 (1.98) & 34 (6.07) & Diaphus A group^{0.p} & 131 (9.18) & \hline Average & 2061 \\ \hline Callionymidae^{n.b} & 33 (3.37) & Callionymidae^{n.b} & 78 (5.50) & 36 (1.57) \\ \hline Triglidae^{n.b} & 13 (0.89) & 75 (3.26) \\ \hline Bregmaceros sp.^{0} & 28 (3.38) & Bothidae^{n.b} & 13 (0.89) & 75 (3.26) \\ \hline Bregmaceros sp.^{0} & 26 (3.04) & Apogonidae^{n} & 83 (3.58) \\ \hline Teraponidae^{n} & 22 (2.62) & Vinciguerria nimbaria^{0.b} & 29 (2.01) & 23 (1.01) \\ \hline Gadidae^{0} & 22 (2.62) & Ostracildae^{n} & 43 (1.84) \\ \hline Total & 750 (100) & 505 (100) \\ \hline Average & 68 & 168 & Myctophum asperum^{0.p} & 37 (2.61) \\ \hline Total & 750 (100) & 505 (100) \\ \hline Percophidae^{0} & 31 (1.36) \\ \hline Ceratoscope luc warmingr^{h.b.op} & 31 (1.36) \\ \hline Decapterus maruadsr^{0} & 22 (0.94) \\ \hline Lophidae^{0} & 31 (1.36) \\ \hline Percophidae^{0} & 21 (0.92) \\ \hline Hertspecies & 66 (18.85) & 56 (100) \\ \hline Average & 58 & 168 & Myctophum asperum^{0.p} & 31 (1.36) \\ \hline Percophidae^{0} & 31 (1.36) \\ \hline Decapterus maruadsr^{0} & 22 (0.94) \\ \hline Lophidae^{0} & 21 (0.92) \\ \hline Multidae^{0} & 20 (0.87) \\ \hline Decapterus maruadsr^{0} & 22 (0.94) \\ \hline Multidae^{0} & 20 (0.87) \\ \hline Decapterus sp.^{0} & 17 (1.19) \\ \hline Synagrops sp.^{0.p} & 17 (1.19) \\ \hline Synagrops sp.p.^{0.p} & 15 (1.02) \\ \hline Detex tumifrons^{0} & 14 (0.59) \\ \hline Detex tumifrons^{0} & 14 (0.59) \\ \hline Detex tumifrons^{0} & 14 (0.59) \\ \hline Total & 1428 (100) & 2310 (100) \\ \hline Average & 280 (9.56) & 451 (19.53) \\ \hline Total & 1428 (100) & 2310 (100) \\ \hline Average & 286 & 289 \\ \hline \end{array}$	Apogontidae ⁿ		60 (10.72)	Diaphus B group ^{o,p}	102 (7.15)	39 (1.68)	Other species	1513 (14.68)
Saurida sp. ^{n.b} 17 (1.98) 34 (6.07) Diaphus A group ^{0,p} 131 (9.18) Average 2061 Callionymidae ^{n,b} 33 (3.87) Callionymidae ^{n,b} 78 (5.50) 36 (1.57) 98 (4.22) Triglidae ^{n,b} 31 (3.74) Ophichthidae ^{n,b} 98 (4.22) 98 (3.58) 98 (1.57) Trichlurus ⁶ 28 (3.38) Bothidae ^{h,b} 13 (0.99) 75 (3.26) 98 (4.22) Trizhourus ⁶ 24 (2.84) Cymoglossus sp. ^{n,b} 63 (3.58) 63 (2.72) Terapondae ^h 22 (2.62) Vincigueria nimbaria ^{6,b} 29 (2.01) 23 (1.01) Gadidae ^h 22 (2.60) Ostracidae ^h 47 (2.02) 100 Other species 66 (18.18) 26 (13.07) Sa (1.51) Ceratoscopilus warming ^{n,b} 33 (2.80) Lophidae ^b 33 (1.36) Percophidae ^h 33 (1.36) 22 (0.94) 22 (0.94) Average 68 168 Myctophum orientale ^{0,b} 31 (1.36) 98 Percophidae ^h 21 (0.91) 22 (0.94) Everatoscopilus enaroutad ^h 22 (0.94)	Scomber spp. ^{n,p}	52 (6.16)		Sciaenidae ^{n,b}		139 (6.03)	Total	10304 (100)
Callionymidae ^{n,b} 33 (3.87) Callionymidae ^{n,b} 78 (5.50) 36 (1.57) Triglidae ^{n,b} 31 (3.74) Ophichthidae ^{n,b} 98 (4.22) Trichiurus (patruss) 28 (3.38) Bothidae ^{n,b} 13 (0.89) 75 (3.26) Bregmaceros spp. ⁰ 26 (3.04) Apogontidae ⁿ 63 (2.72) Terapon jarbua ⁿ 22 (2.62) Vinciguerra imbaria ^{n,b} 29 (2.11) 23 (1.01) Godidae ⁿ 22 (2.60) Ostacildae ^{n,b} 43 (1.84) Total 750 (100) 505 (100) Seranidae type 1 ^b 13 (0.92) 26 (1.13) Average 68 168 Myctophum asperum ^{0,p} 37 (2.61) 5 (1.51) Certatoscopelus warmingr ^{0,b} 33 (2.30) Lophidae ^b 31 (1.36) Ophidide ^b 31 (1.36) Ophidide ^b 21 (0.22) Percophidae ^b 21 (0.22) 11 (1.34) Engrauis japonicus ^{0,p} 24 (1.02) Pleuronecitade ^{n,b} 22 (0.94) Decapterus maruada ⁿ 22 (0.94) Decapterus maruada ⁿ 22 (0.94) Mullidae ⁿ 21 (0.29) Maurolicus sp. ⁿ </td <td>Saurida sp.^{n,b}</td> <td>17 (1.98)</td> <td>34 (6.07)</td> <td>Diaphus A group^{o,p}</td> <td>131 (9.18)</td> <td></td> <td>Average</td> <td>2061</td>	Saurida sp. ^{n,b}	17 (1.98)	34 (6.07)	Diaphus A group ^{o,p}	131 (9.18)		Average	2061
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Callionymidae ^{n,b}	33 (3.87)		Callionymidae ^{n,b}	78 (5.50)	36 (1.57)		
Trichurus leptunus ⁶ 28 (3.38) Bordidae ^{n,b} 13 (0.89) 75 (3.26) Bregmaceros spp. ⁹ 26 (3.04) Apogontidae ⁿ 83 (3.58) Teraponidae ⁿ 22 (2.62) Vinciguerria nimbaria ^{0,b} 29 (2.01) 23 (1.01) Gadidae ⁿ 22 (2.62) Vinciguerria nimbaria ^{0,b} 29 (2.01) 23 (1.01) Other species 66 (18.85) 26 (13.97) Gobidae ^{n,b} 43 (1.84) Total 750 (100) 505 (100) Serranidae type 1 ^b 13 (0.92) 26 (1.13) Average 68 168 Myctophum asperum ^{0,p} 37 (2.61) Benthosema pterotum ^{n,b,o,p} 35 (1.51) Ceratoscopelus warming ^{10,b} 33 (2.30) Lophidae ^b 31 (1.36) Ophidiae ^b 31 (1.35) Percophidae ^b 31 (1.35) Percophidae ^b 22 (0.94) Decapterus maruads ⁿ 22 (0.94) Decapterus maruads ⁿ 20 (0.87) 20 (0.87) 21 (0.90) Leiognathidae ⁿ 20 (0.87) Decapterus sp. ^{0,a} 19 (0.82) Lampanytots sp. ^{0,b} 15 (1.02) Notoscopelus sp. ^{0,a} 19 (0.82) Leiognathidae ⁿ 20 (0.87) Decapterus sp. ^{0,a} <td>Triglidae^{n,b}</td> <td>31 (3.74)</td> <td></td> <td>Ophichthidae^{n,b}</td> <td></td> <td>98 (4.22)</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Triglidae ^{n,b}	31 (3.74)		Ophichthidae ^{n,b}		98 (4.22)		
Bregmaceros spp.° 26 (3.04) Apogontidae ⁿ 88 (3.58) Terapon Jarbua ⁿ 24 (2.84) Cynoglossus sp. ^{nb} 63 (2.72) Torapon Jarbua ⁿ 22 (2.62) Vinciguerria nimbaria ^{nb} 29 (2.01) 23 (1.01) Gdidae ⁿ 22 (2.63) Ostraciidae ⁿ 47 (2.02) Other species 66 (18.85) 26 (13.97) Gobiidae ^{nb} 43 (1.84) Total 750 (100) 505 (100) Serranidae type 1 ^b 13 (0.92) 26 (1.13) Average 68 168 Myclophum asperum ^{non} 37 (2.61) 55 (1.51) Ceratoscopelus warning ^{nob} 33 (2.30) Lophiidae ^b 31 (1.35) Percophildae ^b 31 (1.34) Engraulis japonicus ^{non} 22 (0.94) Mullidae ^b 21 (0.92) Maurolicus sp. ⁿ 21 (0.92) Maurolicus sp. ^{non} 19 (0.82) 21 (0.90) Leiognathidae ⁿ 20 (0.87) 21 (0.90) Leiognathidae ⁿ 20 (0.87) 19 (0.82) Maurolicus sp. ^{non} 19 (0.82) 28 (0.94) Docapterus spn ^{non}	Trichiurus lepturus ^o	28 (3.38)		Bothidae ^{n,b}	13 (0.89)	75 (3.26)		
Teraponidae ⁿ 24 (2.84) Cynoglossus sp. ^{n.b} 63 (2.72) Terapon Jarbua ⁿ 22 (2.62) Vincigueria nimbaria ^{0b} 29 (2.01) 23 (1.01) Gadidae ⁰ 22 (2.60) Gobiidae ^{n.b} 43 (1.84) Total 750 (100) 505 (100) Serranidae type 1 ^b 13 (0.92) 26 (1.13) Average 68 168 Myctophum asperum ^{0,o} 37 (2.61) 55 (1.51) Ceratoscopelus warmingi ^{0,b} 33 (1.35) Fercophidae ^b 31 (1.36) Ophidiae ^b 31 (1.35) Percophidae ^b 31 (1.36) Ophidae ^b 31 (1.35) Percophidae ^b 21 (0.94) Decapterus maruads ⁿ 22 (0.94) Mullidae ^b 21 (0.92) Maurolicus sp. ⁰ 21 (0.92) Maurolicus sp. ^{0,0} 21 (1.48) Myctophum orientale ^{0,0} 21 (0.92) Maurolicus sp. ^{0,0} 21 (0.92) Mullidae ^{10,0} 22 (0.94) Mullidae ^{10,0} 22 (0.94) Mullidae ^{10,0} 21 (0.92) Notoscopelus sp. ^{0,0,0} 15 (1.03) Genephylidae ^{10,0,0,0} 19 (0.82) 10.99) Lampanyctus	Bregmaceros spp.º	26 (3.04)		Apogontidae ⁿ		83 (3.58)		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Teraponidae ⁿ	24 (2.84)		<i>Cynoglossus</i> sp. ^{n,b}		63 (2.72)		
	Terapon jarbua ⁿ	22 (2.62)		Vinciguerria nimbaria ^{o,b}	29 (2.01)	23 (1.01)		
Other species 66 (18.85) 26 (13.97) Gobilidae ^{n,b} 43 (1.84) Total 750 (100) 505 (100) Serranidae type 1 ^b 13 (0.92) 26 (1.13) Average 68 168 Myctophum asperum ^{0,p} 37 (2.61) Benthosema pterotum ^{0,b,o,p} 33 (2.30) Caratoscopelus warning ^{0,b} 33 (2.30) Lophidae ^b 31 (1.36) Ophidiidae ^b 31 (1.34) Engraulis japonicus ^{n,p} 24 (1.02) Pleuronetidae ^{n,b} 22 (0.94) Decapterus maruadsi ⁿ 22 (0.94) Decapterus maruadsi ⁿ 21 (0.92) Multidae ⁿ 21 (0.92) Maurolicus sp. ⁰ 21 (0.92) Multidae ⁿ 20 (0.87) Decapterus sp. ⁿ 19 (0.82) Lampanyctus sp. ^{0,op} 15 (1.03) Gemplidae ^{n,b,op} 15 (1.02) Notoscopelus sp. ^{0,op} 15 (1.02) Notoscopelus sp. ^{0,op} 15 (1.03) Gemplidae ^{n,b,op} 15 (1.02) Notoscopelus sp. ^{0,op} 14 (0.99) Dentex tumifrons ⁿ 11 (0.80) 210 (100) 210 (100)	Gadidae ^o	22 (2.60)		Ostraciidae n		47 (2.02)		
Total 750 (100) 505 (100) Serranidae type 1 ^b 13 (0.92) 26 (1.13) Average 68 168 Myctophum asperum ^{0,0} 37 (2.61) Benthosema pterotum ^{0,0,0} 33 (2.30) Serranidae type 1 ^b 33 (2.30) Lophidiade ^b 31 (1.36) Serranidae type 1 ^b 31 (1.36) Percophidae ^b 31 (1.34) Engraulis japonicus ^{n,0} 22 (0.94) Multidae ⁿ 22 (0.94) Multidae ⁿ 21 (0.92) Multidae ⁿ 21 (0.92) Multidae ⁿ 20 (0.87) Decapterus sp. ⁰ 17 (1.19) Vices 20 (0.87) Decapterus sp. ^{0,0,0} 15 (1.02) Notoscopelus sp. ^{0,0,0} 15 (1.02) Notoscopelus sp. ^{0,0,0} 15 (1.02) Notoscopelus sp. ^{0,0,0,0,0,0} 15 (1.02) Notoscopelus sp. ^{0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,}	Other species	66 (18.85)	26 (13.97)	Gobiidae ^{n,b}		43 (1.84)		
Average 68 168 Myctophum asperum ^{o.p} 37 (2.61) Benthosema pterotum ^{0,b.o.p} 35 (1.51) Ceratoscopelus warming ^{iob} 33 (2.30) Lophidiae ^b 31 (1.36) Ophidiae ^b 31 (1.34) Engraulis japonicus ^{n.p} 24 (1.02) Pleuronectidae ^{n.b} 22 (0.94) Mullidae ⁿ 21 (0.92) Maurolicus sp. ⁰ 21 (1.48) Myctophum orientale ^{0.p} 20 (0.87) Leopidiae ⁿ 20 (0.87) Decapterus sp. ⁰ 19 (0.82) Lampanyctus sp. ^{0.p.op} 15 (1.02) Notoscopelus sp. ^{0.p.op} 15 (1.02) Notoscopelus sp. ^{0.p.op} 15 (1.02) Notoscopelus sp. ^{0.p.op} 11 (4.89) Other species 280 (19.56) Other species 280 (19.56) Average 286 289	Total	750 (100)	505 (100)	Serranidae type 1 ^b	13 (0.92)	26 (1.13)		
Benthosema pterotum $35 (1.51)$ Ceratoscopelus warmingi $33 (2.30)$ Lophildae $31 (1.36)$ Ophildidae $31 (1.34)$ Percophidae $31 (1.34)$ Engraulis japonicus $24 (1.02)$ Pleuronectidae $22 (0.94)$ Maurolicus sp.° $21 (0.92)$ Maurolicus sp.° $21 (0.92)$ Mourolicus sp.° $15 (1.02)$ Decapterus sp.° $15 (1.03)$ Gempylidae ^{nbacp} $15 (1.02)$ Notoscopelus sp.° $14 (0.99)$ Dentex tumifrons $11 (0.80)$ Other species $280 (19.56)$ Total $1428 (100)$ Average 286 280 289	Average	68	168	Myctophum asperum ^{o,p}	37 (2.61)			
Ceratoscopelus warming^{o.D}33 (2.30)Lophiidae ^b 31 (1.36)Ophidildae ^b 31 (1.35)Percophidae ^b 31 (1.34)Engraulis japonicus ^{p.p} 24 (1.02)Pleuronectidae ^{n.b.} 22 (0.94)Decapterus maruadsi ⁿ 22 (0.94)Multidae ⁿ 21 (0.92)Maurolicus sp. ⁰ 21 (1.48)Myctophum orientale ^{0.p.} 21 (0.90)Leiognathidae ⁿ 20 (0.87)Decapterus sp. ^{n.b.} 15 (1.03)Gemplidae ^{n.b.o.p.} 15 (1.03)Synagrops sp. ^{n.b.} 15 (1.03)Gemplidae ^{n.b.o.p.} 15 (1.02)Notoscopelus sp. ^{0.p.o.p.} 14 (0.99)Dentex tumifrons ⁿ 11 (0.80)Other species280 (19.56)Average286289				Benthosema pterotum ^{n,b,o,p}		35 (1.51)		
Lophididae ^b 31 (1.36) Ophidiidae ^b 31 (1.35) Percophidae ^b 31 (1.36) Engraulis japonicus ^{n,b} 24 (1.02) Pleuronectidae ^{n,b} 22 (0.94) Decapterus maruadsi ⁿ 22 (0.94) Mullidae ⁿ 21 (0.92) Maurolicus sp. ^o 21 (1.48) Myctophum orientale ^{0,p} 20 (0.87) Decapterus spn ⁿ 19 (0.82) Lampanyctus spp. ^{0,p} 15 (1.02) Notoscopelus spp. ^{0,p} 15 (1.02) Notoscopelus spp. ^{0,p} 14 (0.99) Dentex turnifrons ⁿ 11 (0.80) Other species 280 (19.56) Average 286				Ceratoscopelus warmingi ^{o,b}	33 (2.30)			
Ophidiidae ^b 31 (1.35)Percophidae ^b 31 (1.34)Engraulis japonicus ^{n.p} 24 (1.02)Pleuronectidae ^{n,b} 22 (0.94)Decapterus maruadsi ⁿ 22 (0.94)Multidae ⁿ 21 (0.92)Maurolicus sp.°21 (1.48)Myctophum orientale ^{0,p} 20 (0.87)Decapterus sp. ^{nb} 15 (1.03)Decapterus sp. ^{nb,b} 15 (1.02)Notoscopelus sp. ^{0,p} 15 (1.02)Notoscopelus sp. ^{0,p} 14 (0.99)Denter tumifrons ⁿ 11 (0.80)Other species280 (19.56)451 (19.53)Total1428 (100)Average286286289				Lophiidae		31 (1.36)		
Percophidae $31 (1.34)$ Engraulis japonicus ^{n,p} $24 (1.02)$ Pleuronectidae ^{n,b} $22 (0.94)$ Decapterus maruadsi ⁿ $22 (0.94)$ Mullidae ⁿ $21 (0.92)$ Maurolicus sp. ⁰ $21 (1.48)$ Myctophum orientale ^{0,p} $20 (0.87)$ Decapterus sp. ⁿ $19 (0.82)$ Lampanyctus sp. ^{0,bp} $15 (1.03)$ Gemplidae ^{nboxp} $15 (1.02)$ Notoscopelus sp. ^{n,bp} $15 (1.02)$ Notoscopelus sp. ^{0,cp} $14 (0.99)$ Dentex tumifrons ⁿ $11 (0.80)$ Other species $280 (19.56) 451 (19.53)$ Total $1428 (100) 2310 (100)$				Ophidiidae ^b		31 (1.35)		
Engraulis japonicus ^{h,p} 24 (1.02)Pleuronectidae ^{n,b} 22 (0.94)Decapterus marudsi ⁿ 22 (0.94)Mullidae ⁿ 21 (0.92)Maurolicus sp.°21 (1.48)Myctophum orientale ^{o,p} 20 (0.87)Decapterus sp. ⁿ 19 (0.82)Lampanyctus spp. ^{n,p} 15 (1.03)Gempylidae ^{h,o,p} 15 (1.02)Notoscopelus spp. ^{n,p} 15 (1.02)Notoscopelus spp. ^{n,p} 14 (0.99)Dentex turnifrons ⁿ 11 (0.80)Other species280 (15.56)Asti (19.53)TotalTotal1428 (100)Average286286289				Percophidae ^b		31 (1.34)		
Pleuronectidae ^{n.b} 22 (0.94) Decapterus maruads ⁿ 22 (0.94) Multidae ⁿ 21 (0.92) Maurolicus sp. ^o 21 (1.48) Myctophum orientale ^{op} 21 (0.90) Leiognathidae ⁿ 20 (0.87) Decapterus sp. ^{no} 17 (1.19) Synagrops spp. ^{0,b} 15 (1.03) Gempylidae ^{n,b,o,p} 15 (1.02) Notoscopelus sp. ^{0,o,p} 14 (0.99) Dentex tumifrons ⁿ 11 (0.80) Other species 280 (19.56) 451 (19.53) Total 1428 (100) 2310 (100)				Engraulis japonicus ^{n,p}		24 (1.02)		
Decapterus maruadsi ^h 22 (0.94) Mullidae ⁿ 21 (0.92) Maurolicus sp. ⁰ 21 (1.48) Myctophum orientale ^{0,p} 21 (0.90) Leiognathidae ⁿ 20 (0.87) Decapterus sp. ⁿ 19 (0.82) Lampanyctus spp. ^{0,b} 15 (1.03) Synagrops spp. ^{0,b} 15 (1.02) Notoscopelus spp. ^{0,p} 14 (0.99) Dentex tumifrons ⁿ 11 (0.86) Other species 280 (19.56) Total 1428 (100) 2310 (100)				Pleuronectidae ^{n,b}		22 (0.94)		
Mullidae" $21 (0.92)$ Maurolicus sp.° $21 (0.92)$ Myctophum orientale° $21 (0.90)$ Leiognathidae" $20 (0.87)$ Decapterus sp.° $19 (0.82)$ Lampanyctus spp.° $17 (1.19)$ Synagrops spp.° $15 (1.03)$ Gempylidae ^{10.60} $15 (1.02)$ Notoscopelus spp.° $14 (0.99)$ Detex tumifrons" $11 (0.80)$ Other species $280 (19.56)$ Average $286 (289)$				Decapterus maruadsi"		22 (0.94)		
Maurolicus sp.° 21 (1.48) Myctophum orientale ^{op} 21 (0.90) Leiognathidae ⁿ 20 (0.87) Decapterus sp.° 17 (1.19) Synagrops sp.°.b 15 (1.03) Gempylidae ^{nb.o.p} 15 (1.02) Notoscopelus spp.°.o ^{op} 14 (0.99) Dentex tumifrons ⁿ 11 (0.80) Other species 280 (19.56) 451 (19.53) Total 1428 (100) 2310 (100) Average 286 289				Mullidae"		21 (0.92)		
Myctophum orientale ²⁰⁰ 21 (0.90) Leiognathidae ⁿ 20 (0.87) Decapterus sp. ⁿ 19 (0.82) Lampanyctus spp. ^{nb} 15 (1.03) Synagrops spp. ^{nb} 15 (1.02) Notoscopelus spp. ^{nb} 15 (1.02) Dentex tumifrons ⁿ 11 (0.80) Other species 280 (19.56) Total 1428 (100) Average 286				Maurolicus sp.°	21 (1.48)			
Leiognatinicate 20 (0.87) Decapterus spn 19 (0.82) Lampanyctus spp. ^{0.p} 15 (1.03) Synagrops spp. ^{0.b} 15 (1.02) Notoscopelus spp. ^{0.p} 14 (0.99) Dentex tumifrons ⁿ 11 (0.80) Other species 280 (19.56) 451 (19.53) Total 1428 (100) 2310 (100) Average 286 289				Myctophum orientale ^o		21 (0.90)		
						20 (0.87)		
Synagrops spp. ^{b.} 15 (1.03) Gempylidae ^{n.b.o.p} 15 (1.02) Notoscopelus spp. ^{0.p.} 11 (0.80) Dentex tumiforns ⁿ 11 (0.80) Other species 280 (19.56) 451 (19.53) Total 1428 (100) 2310 (100) Average 286 289				Lamanyotus sp.	17 (1 10)	19 (0.82)		
Syndgrup:spp. 15 (1.03) Gempyliden ^{10,00} 15 (1.02) Notoscopelus spp. ^{0,p} 14 (0.99) Dentex turnifrons ¹⁰ 11 (0.80) Other species 280 (19.56) Total 1428 (100) Average 286				Suparone enn ^{n,b}	15 (1.19)			
Notoscopelus sp.º.p 14 (0.99) Dentex tumifrons ⁿ 11 (0.80) Other species 280 (19.56) 451 (19.53) Total 1428 (100) 2310 (100) Average 286 289				Gempulidae ^{n,b,o,p}	15 (1.03)			
Dentex tumifrons ^h 11 (0.80) Other species 280 (19.56) 451 (19.53) Total 1428 (100) 2310 (100) Average 286 289				Notoscopelus spn ^{0,p}	14 (0.99)			
Other species 280 (19.56) 451 (19.53) Total 1428 (100) 2310 (100) Average 286 289				Dentex tumifrons ⁿ	11 (0.80)			
Total 1428 (100) 2310 (100) Average 286 289				Other species	280 (19.56)	451 (19.53)		
Average 286 289				Total	1428 (100)	2310 (100)	-	
				Average	286	289	-	

The ecological information of species at adult stage was remarked: ⁿ neritic; ^o oceanic; ^b benthic; ^p pelagic.







Fig. 1. Locations of the larval fish sampling stations in the northeasterly monsoon season (crosses), the southwesterly monsoon season (open circles) and both seasons (open circles with cross) in ECS, 2008.







Fig. 2. Satellite images of monthly mean sea surface temperature in ECS in the months of January and July 2008.







Fig. 3. Current conditions (length of arrow, current speed with a scale of 1 m s^{-1} ; arrow direction, current direction) at the depths of 10 m (**a**,**b**) and 50 m (**c**,**d**) in ECS derived from the OPeNDAP ocean database, January and July 2008.



Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Fig. 4. Spatial distributions of temperature and salinity isopleths at the depths of 10 m in ECS, 2008 (open circles, stations with CTD data only; solid circles, stations with both CTD data and the data from the fish larval sampling).







Fig. 5. CPUEs $(ind./1000 \text{ m}^3)$ of larval fish in the northeasterly monsoon season **(a)** and the southwesterly monsoon season **(b)** (open circles, daytime sampling; solid circles, nighttime sampling).







Fig. 6. Relationships between CPUE of larval fish and each of the environmental variables, sea surface temperature, primary production, and zooplankton wet weight.







SST: sea surface Temp. SSS: sea surface Sal. DO: bottom DO N: surface NO3 P: surface PO₄ Si: surface SiO3 PP: primary production Wt: zoop lankton wet weight Bre: Bregmaceros spp. Call: Callionymid larvae Di A: Diaphus A Di B: Diaphus B Eng: Engraulis japonicus Gt1: Gobiid type 1 Gt2: Gobiid type 2 Sau: Saurida spp. Sco: Scorpaenid larvae Sig: Sigmops gracilis Val: Valamugil sp.



Fig. 7. Ordination diagram of canonical correlation analysis (CCA) showing the relationships between hydrographic factors and abundance of dominant larval fish taxa in the northeasterly monsoon season **(a)** and the southwesterly monsoon season **(b)**.







