



HOKKAIDO UNIVERSITY

Title	Seabird reproductive responses to changing climate and prey communities are mediated by prey packaging
Author(s)	Watanuki, Yutaka; Yamamoto, Mariko; Okado, Jumpei et al.
Citation	Marine ecology progress series, 683, 179-194 https://doi.org/10.3354/meps13943
Issue Date	2022
Doc URL	https://hdl.handle.net/2115/87880
Type	journal article
File Information	Manuscript.pdf



2021.10.6

Running title: Climate and productivity of seabirds

Seabird reproductive responses to changing climate and prey communities are mediated by prey packaging

Yutaka Watanuki^{1*}, Mariko Yamamoto¹, Jumpei Okado¹, Motohiro Ito²,
William Sydeman³

¹ Graduate School of Fisheries Sciences, Hokkaido University, 3-1-1 Minato-cho,
Hakodate city, Hokkaido, 041-8611, Japan

²Department of Applied Biosciences, Toyo University, 1-1-1 Izumino, Itakura-cho,
Gunma, 374-0193, Japan

³Farallon Institute, 101 H Street, Petaluma, CA 94952 USA

*Corresponding: ywata@fish.hokudai.ac.jp

Abstract Climatic factors drives changes in forage fish communities and may influence the productivity of piscivorous predators, but specific mechanisms of response remain poorly known. We studied the seabird, Rhinoceros Auklet *Cerorhinca monocerata*, breeding at Teuri Island, Japan, in the western North Pacific between 1984 and 2020. We tested the hypothesis that climate-mediated prey-switching affects “food packaging” (i.e. the way energy is brought to dependent offspring) and breeding success by quantifying relationships between climate, prey energy density, amount of food delivered, and the growth and survival of chicks. Prey composition switched four

1 times: 1988 - 1992, 1997/1998, 2013/2014, and 2017/2018. All but the last of these
2 switches were associated with (lagged) shifts in seawater temperature/Pacific Decadal
3 Oscillation. Rhinoceros Auklets brought multiple fish in each meal-load to chicks and
4 numbers were inversely correlated with size of fish. These relationships varied
5 between fish species. The heaviest meal loads were achieved when diets were
6 dominated by anchovy *Engraulis japonicas*, which occurred during warm phases
7 (1992 – 2013). Chick production, growth rates, and mass at fledgling were also highest
8 during this warm phases. This study shows that climate affects reproduction of seabirds
9 by shifting the manner in which food is selected relative to changes in forage fish
10 community structure and abundance.

11
12 **Key words:** North Pacific, Rhinoceros Auklets, forage fish, meal-loads, switch of prey
13

1. INTRODUCTION

Climate forcing of marine environments changes “bottom-up” trophic effects that may influence the reproduction and population dynamics of top predators through the changes of forage fish communities (Aebischer et al. 1990, Barbraud & Weimerskirch 2001, Boyd & Murray 2001, Sydeman et al. 2015). In responding to changes in forage fish communities, “central-place” foraging top predators that feed at sea but provide food for offspring on land may alter their prey use to match prey availability, with potential effects on how food is delivered (i.e. “food packaging”) and reproductive success (Piatt et al. 2007, Furness 2007, Cury et al. 2011). They change prey species when forage community structure shifts (Montevecchi et al. 1988, Crawford & Dyer 1995, Furness & Tasker 2000). But the responses to the shifts in forage communities are not simple as different prey species have different sizes and energetic values, and may be more or less difficult to procure (Anderson & Piatt 1999).

Rhinoceros Auklets *Cerorhinca monocerata* are piscivorous diving seabirds of the North Pacific, and despite the name are actually in the puffin tribe of the Alcidae (Gaston & Jones 1998). They dive down to 65 m depth, and bring a variety of prey, such as sardine *Sardinops* spp., anchovy *Engraulis* spp., sandlance *Ammodytes* spp., capelin *Mallotus* sp., and squid to colonies to provision chicks in nest burrows (Burger 1991, Gaston and Jones 1998, Kuroki et al. 2003, Thayer et al. 2008, Sydeman et al. 2017, Cunningham et al. 2018). They switch prey use in relation to interannual changes of forage fish communities, and these shifts result in large variation in chick growth and fledging success (Takahashi et al. 2001, Hedd et al. 2006, Thayer & Sydeman 2007, Borstad et al. 2011). Rhinoceros Auklet parents bring fish in their bills (meal-loads or “food package”) usually during evening hours of darkness once per day

(Takahashi et al. 1999). Between-year variation in the energetic value (energy density multiplied by the mass) of meal-loads is thought to be a main factor determining chick growth and production (Watanuki et al. 2009), but this idea has not been thoroughly investigated. Like other puffins, Rhinoceros Auklets bring multiple prey in each meal-load. Therefore, they can compensate for potentially small (large) prey size by bringing more (less) fish (see Fig. 1 a,b), and may therefore have the ability to mitigate the effects of change in prey energy density by increasing mass of meal-load.

In the North Pacific, warm and cold phases of the Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO) cycle at decadal temporal scales (Mantua et al. 1997, Minobe 1997). The PDO index is the first principal component of sea surface temperature north of 20 °N latitude after de-trending and is associated with variability of the Aleutian low and El Nino-Southern Oscillation (ENSO) (Schneider & Cornuelle 2005). Positive PDO in NE Pacific means warmer water, but it means colder water in NW Pacific (Mantua & Hare 2002), so biological effects are expected to be quite different between NW and NE Pacific. Populations of some forage fish track these phase shifts of PDO, SST and other factors in NW and NE Pacific (e.g., cycle of sardines *Sardinops* spp. and anchovies *Engraulis* spp., Chavez et al. 2003, Takasuka et al. 2008). Responses of piscivorous predators to changes of PDO, ENSO and SST have been studied in NE Pacific (Hedd et al. 2006, Lee et al. 2007, Bertram et al. 2009, Hipfner et al. 2020), while little studies have been carried out in NW Pacific.

In northern Japan Sea, NW Pacific, changes in forage fish community have been associated with climatic shifts. A shift from a cold to warm phase was observed in 1988/1989; correspondingly, there was collapse of Japanese sardine *S. melanostictus* and an increase in Japanese anchovy *E. japonicus* stocks (Tian et al. 2008, Takasuka et

al. 2008). Consequently, Rhinoceros Auklets in this region switched prey from cold water related sardine, sand lance *Ammodytes* spp. and Pacific saury *Cololabis saira* to warm water related anchovy (Deguchi et al. 2004a). Shifts in climate, forage fish stocks and auklet diet since the early 1990s have not been re-examined. In this study, using 32 years (1984 --2020) of data from Teuri Island, we investigated how ocean climate drive prey use by Rhinoceros Auklets, and how prey switching affects energy acquisition and chick production.

Specifically, we test the hypothesis that both energy density and amount of prey delivered as a food package affects reproductive success, measured by chick growth, fledging success and fledgling mass in Rhinoceros Auklets breeding at Teuri Island, northern Japan Sea. First, we applied principal component analyses to diet composition to characterize the use of different forage community members use. We also explored whether timing in the change of prey use co-occurred with recent quasi-decadal scale climate shifts indicated by PDO index and seawater temperature. Second, we examined how between-year variation in chick growth and fledging success depended on the energy density (KJ/g) and amount of prey (g) delivered in meal-loads. Third, we explored how the relationships between the number and size of fish affect the amount of prey delivered. In our discussion, we provide explanations for the reproductive consequences of decadal-scale prey switching first in a seabird species that bring multiple fish in a meal-load.

2. STUDY AREA & METHODS

2.1. Seabird data

Field work was carried out at Teuri Island (44°25'N, 141°19'E), 28 km off mainland of

Hokkaido, Japan, during the chick rearing periods of mid-May to early-August, 1984 to 2020 (excluding 1986, and 1988-1991 due to logistic constraints). Parents landing with fish in their bills, as meal-loads, after sunset were captured by hand or in hand nets in the diet sampling plot (~ 100 m in length) from 30 min after sunset and for about 2 hrs along the road near Akaiwa light house (Fig. S1 in Supplement 1). Meal-loads were collected and placed in individual plastic bags. Samples were brought back to the laboratory where prey was identified. Prey size was measured as fork-length of each prey item (to 1 mm), and each prey item was weighed (to 0.1 g). When multiple numbers of small (<0.1 g) fish (such as age-0 sand lance) were found together, we weighed these as a group but measured the fork-length separately. Prey use sampling was carried out on 12 ± 6.4 (1 – 34) nights every year, mostly once per week throughout the chick rearing period, giving 8 ± 8.1 (1 -- 73) meal-loads each night, 96 ± 30.5 (53 -- 226) each year, and 3,067 in total during the study. The 3,067 meal-loads contained 15,486 individual fish.

We measured chick growth and fledging success (the number of fledglings per nests with chicks) at two monitoring sites. We monitored nests in site A > 50 m distant from the site used for meal-load sampling prior to 2013, and set site B (Fig. S1 in Supplement 1) in 2014 and monitored nests in A and B sites, 200 m apart, since 2014. Although differences in chick growth and fledging success were found between site A and B in 2016 and 2018 respectively, trends were similar in other years (Fig. S2 in Supplement 1). So data of two sites were combined after 2014 for analyzing between year variations. When we found the first sign of hatching (i.e parents carrying meal-loads in the evening or meal-loads on the breeding ground in the morning) by daily observation since early May, we started nest monitoring. We sampled 37 ± 15.3 (10 – 84,

n=32 years) nests where eggs hatched every year. We checked nest contents of all nests on the same day and every 5 days but we sometimes changed the schedule of monitoring depending on the weather condition. For years with detailed records of each nest (2001 – 2020), average interval of nest monitoring was 4.9 ± 0.8 days (3 – 9 days, n=260 intervals) and we found chicks at the first day of monitoring for 19% of 838 nests and age of these chicks were estimated using wing length (Takahashi et al. 2001) and hatch date was back calculated. For others, we assumed that chicks had hatched on the middle day between the nest checks when we saw eggs last time and when we saw chicks first time. All chicks were weighed (± 5 g) using a Pesola spring balance at each day of nest check. The slope of the linear regression of the mass on age (g/ 5 days) between 5- and 20-day-age for those giving $r > 0.9$ was defined as the growth rate of chicks (including ones that may have died). This would exclude the non-linear growth periods after hatching and during weight loss before fledging. We tested if mass or energy density of meal-loads affect annual average of the slopes (chick growth rate) using regression analyses. We assumed that the chicks fledged when they disappeared from nests after 40 days age (Takahashi et al. 2001) and defined the mass of the last day before disappearance as the mass of fledgling.

2.2. Forage community use and energetic value

Sand lance was separated into age-0 (≤ 110 mm in fork-length, Bertram & Kaiser 1993) and age- >1 (> 110 mm) classes since the energy content of these age classes were quite different (Table S1 in Supplement 2). All Japan Sea Greenling *Pleurogrammus azonus* were age-0 class since the fork-length were smaller than 180 mm (Nagasawa & Torisawa 1991). All salmon *Onchorhynchus* sp., except one

Onchorhynchus masou, were smaller than 109 mm and categorized as juvenile.

The mass composition of each of 9 major prey species/types (Table 1) in each year was calculated, excluding other prey species and prey which were not identified to species. To index forage fish prey composition each year, we applied principal component analyses on mass composition of these major prey species/types, and used the first (PC1) and second (PC2) principal components as indices of forage community use. The energy value of average meal-load in each year was estimated using median values of energy densities for each prey species acquired from the literature (Table S1 in Supplement 2), average mass of meal-load and the mass composition of nine major prey species/types in each year.

2.3. Climate change and stock size

To assess climate fluctuations, we used winter (December to February), spring (March to May), summer (June to August), and autumn (September to November) Pacific Decadal Oscillation (PDO) indices averaged over 3 month periods (Mantua et al. 1997, Minobe 1997) (<https://www.ncdc.noaa.gov/teleconnections/pdo/> 2020.9.25). The PDO is related to changes in the phenology, community structure and abundance of phytoplankton, zooplankton, and forage fish in the NW Pacific (Ohshimo et al. 2009, Chiba et al. 2006, 2012, Kuwae et al. 2017, Nakayama et al. 2018).

The maximum foraging range of Rhinoceros Auklets from Teuri Island is estimated to be 164 km (Kato et al. 2003). Variability of interannual and seasonal expansions of Tsushima Current stocks of sardine and anchovy (Muko et al. 2018, Watanabe & Takahashi 2007) possibly make these stocks available to Rhinoceros Auklets breeding at Teuri Island. Stock of age-0 greenling in the northern Japan Sea

off Hokkaido are well within auklet foraging range. Stock sizes of sardine and anchovy in the Tsushima warm current and that of age-0 greenling in the northern Japan Sea off Hokkaido were obtained from stock assessment databases (<http://abchan.fra.go.jp/digests2019/index.html> 2019.9.25. see Hayashi et al. 2018, Morita et al. 2018, Yasuda et al. 2018 also). The stock sizes are assessed by cohort analysis (VPA) and available between 1985 and 2018 for age-0 greenling and between 1984 and 2018 for sardine and anchovy.

2.4. Statistics

To detect decadal-scale shifts in the diet composition and PDO, “sequential t-test analysis of regime shifts” (STARS, Rodionov 2004) was applied to the data from 1980 (four years before the study period) through 2020. To minimize the possibility of the Type II error, 10% was chosen as significance level. To find any potential shifts of PDO index primary value of cut off length (L) was 10 years for examining quasi-decadal shifts and 5-year cut off was used for examining short-term shifts. We did not have time series data before 1992 for the diet composition, mass of meal-loads and productivity (chick growth rate, number of fledglings per nest, fledgling mass) of Rhinoceros Auklets. So shifts of these variables were examined using STARS where 5-year cut off only was used. Huber’s weight parameter (H) to detect outlier was set to 1. VBA procedure from the NOAA website (<https://www.beringclimate.noaa.gov/regimes/> 2017.12.1.) was operated on the macro of Excel 2010 (Microsoft co.).

Linear regression analyses were carried out to examine the effects of 1) annual average meal energy density (calculated) and 2) mass of meal-loads on productivity

(chick growth, number of fledgling, mass of fledgling). Linear and parabolic effects of prey composition as indexed by PC1 and PC2 on the annual average meal-load mass were also tested. Difference in the mass of meal-loads between prey species was examined using the linear model with Bonferonni-test excluding unknown and minor species/type but including mixture of age-0/>1 sand lance types and other multiple species. To understand the mechanism determining the mass of meal-loads in Rhinoceros Auklet that brings multiple number of prey in a meal-load, we examined the relationships between the number and size of fish and the mass of each meal-load using linear and parabolic regression analyses for each species/type (using SPSS ver. 22). To evaluate the appropriateness of either linear or parabolic models in the above regression analyses we used the model selection procedure in addition of value of coefficient of determination (r^2). Candidate Linear Mixed Models (LMM) or Linear Model (LM) were constructed using library lme4 in R ver 3.2.1, (R Development Core Team 2015) and using *glmer* and the model selection was based on corrected Akaike Information Criteria (AICc) using library MuMIn.

3. RESULTS

3.1. Prey switching

The primary prey used by Rhinoceros Auklets were sardine, anchovy, herring *Clupea pallasii*, age-0 and age->1 sand lance, Pacific saury, age-0 Japan Sea Greenling *Pleurogrammus azonus*, juvenile salmon *Onchorhynchus* sp., and squid (Table 1). These 9 species/type comprised 76 - 100% of the composition (by mass) of meal-loads each year and were defined as major prey species/type (Table 1). Most (87%) meal-loads were comprised of a single species/type (Table 1). The thirty-four

percentage of meal loads contained a single prey per meal-load, while 66% contained multiple numbers of prey per meal-load. We attribute PC1 (with 38.1% of explained variance) to a community characterized by the presence of sardine and age->1 sand lance, and absence of anchovy and PC2 (24.1% explained variance) to a community characterized by the presence of squid and age-0 greenling, and absence of Pacific saury (Table 2).

Forage fish communities exploited by auklets apparently varied among years (Fig. 2a, see Table S2 in Supplement 2 also). During 1984 – 1987 PC1 was positive and PC2 was negative (Fig. 2b). After 1992, the sequential analyses of 5-year cut off showed that PC1 shifted to negative in 1997/1998, then shifted to positive in 2013/2014, and to greater degree in 2019/2020 (Fig. 2b). PC2 was shifted to positive in 2013/2014, then diminished to lower values in 2017/2018. Thus, PCA revealed five different forage communities used by auklets over the study period (Fig. 2b). Prey communities shifted in species composition between 1) sardine, age->1 sand lance, and Pacific saury in 1984 – 1987, 2) anchovy and age-0 greenling in 1992 – 1997, 3) mostly anchovy in 1998 – 2013, 4) age-0 greenling and squid in 2014 – 2017, and 5) age-0 and age->1 sand lance in 2018 – 2020 (Fig. 2a,b).

3.2 Climate and stock size

Sequential analyses of 10-year cut off showed that summer and autumn PDO shifted from positive (cold) to negative (warm) in 1997/1998, spring PDO shifted in 1998/1999, and winter PDO shifted in 2007/2008, and then spring to autumn PDO shifted from negative to positive in 2013/2014 and winter PDO did in 2014/2015 (Fig. 2c). Using a 5-year cut off winter PDO shifted from positive to negative in 1988/1989,

1 summer and autumn PDO did in 1997/1998 and spring PDO did in 1998/1999, and all
2 shifted in 2013/2014 to positive. Last, spring and summer PDO shifted to negative in
3 2019/2020. In summary, we had shifts in 1) late 1988 -- early 1989, 2) late 1997 --
4 early 1999, and then maybe shifts in 3) 2007 -- 2008, something short term in 4) 2013
5 -- 2014, and maybe in 5) 2019/2020.

6 The Tsushima stock of sardine decreased dramatically from 1987 to 1992 and
7 remained low thereafter with a slight increase in the late 2010s (Fig. 3a, b). The
8 Tsushima stock of anchovy was relatively high in 1992 – 2008 (Fig. 3b). Stock size of
9 age-0 greenling in northern Hokkaido decreased since 2008 (Fig. 3c). Between-year
10 changes of PDO in all seasons did not linearly explain the stock size of sardine,
11 anchovy and age-0 greenling ($r^2=0.001 - 0.009$, $P>0.05$).

12

13 **3.3. Prey use and fish stock**

14 The choice of prey used by auklets appeared to be partly related to the change of stock
15 size. The between-year variation of the mass proportion of each prey species in the
16 meal-loads was explained by its stock size for sardine ($r^2=0.668$, $F_{(1,28)}=56.259$,
17 $P<0.001$, Fig. 4a) and anchovy ($r^2=0.148$, $F_{(1,28)}=4.853$, $P=0.036$, Fig. 4b), but not for
18 age-0 greenling ($r^2=0.016$, $F_{(1,27)}=0.432$, $P=0.516$, Fig. 4c), and in fact, greenling
19 consumption was highest during the years of lowest greenling abundance. The
20 proportion of anchovy in diet inversely correlated with sardine stock size ($r^2=0.253$,
21 $F_{(1,28)}=9.469$, $P=0.005$). The use of age-0 greenling did not change with either sardine
22 ($r^2=0.005$, $F_{(1,28)}=0.135$, $p=0.716$) or anchovy stock size ($r^2=0.041$, $F_{(1,28)}=1.196$,
23 $P=0.283$) but it seems to have peaked after 2013 when both sardine and anchovy were
24 lowest level

1

2 **3.4. Meal-load and productivity**

3 The sequential analyses of 5-year cut off after 1992 showed that the mass of meal-load
4 (Fig. 5a) and chick growth rate (Fig. 5b) shifted to lower levels in 2013/2014. The
5 number of fledglings produced also shifted to lower levels in 2012/2013, but recovered
6 to pre-shift levels in 2017/2018 (Fig. 5c). In years of high chick growth rate, the number
7 of fledgling was greater ($r^2=0.370$, $P<0.001$, $n=32$) and fledgling mass was heavier
8 ($r^2=0.525$, $P<0.001$, $n=29$).

9 Between-year variation of productivity (chick growth rate, number of fledglings
10 and the mass of fledglings) related linearly and positively with the mass of meal-loads
11 (Fig. 6a,b,c). The linear relationships were significant (Table 3). Coefficient of
12 determinants (r^2) were greater for the effects of the mass of meal-loads than for the
13 energy density of meal-loads (Table 3). Models including the mass or the mass and
14 energy density were more appropriate than those including the energy density only
15 (Table 3, see Table S3 in Supplement 2 also). Thus we focused on the effects of food
16 packaging on the mass of meal-loads.

17

18 **3.5. Food packaging**

19 PC1 score as an index of forage community use was related to the annual average mass
20 of meal-load in parabolic rather than linear manner (Table S4 in Supplement 3);
21 indicating that Rhinoceros Auklets brought heavier meal-loads on average in years
22 when the forage community was dominated by sardine and age->1 sand lance or by
23 anchovy (Fig. 7a). PC2 score also showed a parabolic rather than linear effect (Fig. 7b,
24 see Table S4 in Supplement 3 also); indicating that they brought smaller meal-loads in

years when the forage community was dominated by age-0 greenling and squid or by Pacific saury.

This was because the mass of meal-loads varied between the types ($F_{(10,3015)}=78.589$, $P<0.001$, $n=3,026$, Table 1). The meal-loads comprised of sardine were heaviest, followed by those containing anchovy or herring, then by age->1 sand lance, age-0 greenling or Pacific saury, and finally, by those comprised of squid, age-0 sand lance or juvenile salmon, which were smallest (Table 1, Bonferonni Post-hoc, $P<0.05$, see Fig. S3 in Supplement 3 also,). Those with mixture of age-0 and age->1 sand lance laid between sardine and those with multiple species and the latter was between sardine, anchovy or age->1 sand lance and juvenile salmon or age-0 sand lance (Fig. S3 in Supplement 3).

This species difference of the mass of meal-load can be explained by the trade-off between number and size of fish. The number of fish in a meal-load varied between 1 and 59 (Table 1). Using meal-loads containing single species/type of fish with intact bodies (2,203 meal-loads), relationships between the number and the mean fork-length of fish and the total mass of meal-loads were analyzed. When Rhinoceros Auklets brought back larger numbers of fish, average fish size in a meal-load was smaller for all species/types (Table S5, Fig. S4 in Supplement 3 also). Further, in meal-loads comprised of either anchovy, age-0 greenling, or age-0 sand lance (84% of single-species meal-loads, Table 1), the number of fish showed a parabolic relationship with mass (Fig. 8 a, b, c, Table 4, see Table S6 in Supplement 3 also). Using these parabolic equations (Table 3), the specific number of fish was expected to give the maximum meal-load mass for anchovy (3.3 fish, 45.4g, Fig. 8a), age-0 greenling (6.2 fish, 34.3g, Fig. 8b), and age-0 sand lance (23.0 fish, 22.6g, Fig. 8 c). When the

number of fish was greater, the mass of meal-loads were greater for age->1 sand lance but smaller for Pacific saury (Fig. 8 e, f, Table 4, see Table S6 in Supplement 3 also). Reversal parabolic relationship was found for herring (Fig. 8 d) while no clear relationships were found for juvenile salmon, sardine and squids (Fig. 8 g, h, i).

4. DISCUSSION

Our long-term study showed that 1) prey switching coincided with the timing of oceanic climate shifts demarcated by changes in water temperature associated with the Pacific Decadal Oscillation, and, 2) prey switching resulted in “food packaging” that affected various aspects of Teuri auklet’s breeding productivity

4.1. Climate change and prey switching.

A shift in the PDO from cold to warm phase occurred in late 1988 to early 1989 (Fig. 2c) and again more dramatically in late 1997- early 1999. These shifts of PDO roughly coincided with the timing when the seawater temperature in winter and spring at 50 m depth of western Japan Sea shifted to warmer levels (1986 – 1989, Tian et al. 2006, 2008) and that in the summer and autumn further shifted warmer (1996 – 1998 or in 1999, Yasunaka & Hanawa 2005, Tameishi et al. 2005, Tian et al. 2006, 2008), respectively. Note that the relationship between PDO and water temperatures is opposite that observed in the NE Pacific, where negative PDO values are associated with warmer water temperatures (Newman et al. 2016). Thus, the prey switching by Rhinoceros Auklets coincided with 1986 – 1989 and 1996 – 1999 shifts of PDO/sea water temperature and can be explained by the change of forage fish community.

Japanese sardine and Japanese anchovy are alternately abundant in the cold

1 and warm phases, respectively, in the Japan Sea (Tian et al. 2008). The same relations
2 are observed on the Pacific side of Japan where the range of suitable water
3 temperatures for spawning and larval survival were lower for Japanese sardine than
4 Japanese anchovy (Takasuka et al. 2008). Thus climate-induced shift in the forage fish
5 community (*regime-shifts*) rather than linear effects of climate index and SST affected
6 the prey switching and diet of the seabirds (e.g., Anderson & Piatt 1999). The stock
7 size of sardine and anchovy explained the importance by mass of these prey species in
8 the diet. This is presumably because with the increase in stock size the distribution of
9 these species expands into the foraging range of the birds, making prey more
10 accessible. Expansion of sardine to the north with the increase of the Tsushima stock in
11 1980's (Muko et al. 2018) made this species available to Rhinoceros Auklets at Teuri
12 Island during the cold phase of the PDO. Similarly, anchovy reached the foraging
13 range of Rhinoceros Auklets at Teuri Island with its expansion during warm phase in
14 the 1990's (Watanabe & Takahashi 2007).

15 Relation between climate and the third and fourth prey switch after 2013 are
16 unclear. Age-0 greenling distributes in waters of relatively low SST (8 – 13 C) in our
17 region (Ishigaki & Nakamichi 1958). The prey switch from anchovy to age-0 greenling
18 in 2013/2014 coincided with the shift of PDO in 2013/2014 (Fig. 2b, c). This negative
19 to positive PDO shift, that is also suggested in Kuroda et al (2020), implies the start of
20 cold phase, but we have no evidence of the decrease of SST in 2013/2014 (Fig. S5).
21 After 2014 the stock size of anchovy was small and that of sardine was negligible (Fig.
22 3a, b). Considering the ecology of anchovy, which expands and contracts in
23 distribution according to the stock size (Watanabe & Takahashi 2007, Hayashi et al.
24 2019), anchovy might not extend its distribution to the foraging range of Rhinoceros

Auklets at Teuri Island during the recent low stock size period. Therefore age-0 greenling might be only available forage fish even if its stock size was smaller than before (Fig. 3c). In the most recent few years, Rhinoceros Auklets switched prey to age-0/>1 sand lance (Fig. 2 a, b) in 2017/2018. Although the shifts of PDO, either 5- or 10-year scale, were not detected by STARS in this period, PDO started to decrease and might shift in 2019/2020 (Fig. 2c). Catch of age-0 sand lance in our study region was around 100 – 1200 t before 1995 but no substantial catch occurred there after (Watanuki & Ito 2012). However, warmer waters may have enhanced sand lance recruitment and population stock size (Sydeman et al. 2017).

To conclude this section, climate variability in the 1980's and 1990's induced change in the availability of sardine and anchovy and hence the use of these species by Rhinoceros Auklets. Thus Rhinoceros Auklets can be reliable and effective samplers of the marine environment as other puffin species (Hatch & Sanger 1992, Bertram & Kaiser 1993, Sydeman et al. 2017). During the 2000's and 2010's, when availability of both sardine and anchovy were decreased, age-0 greenling and age-0/>1 sand lance dominated in diets, but environmental factors affecting availability of the latter two prey species were unclear. This may be related to conclusions of a recent review study that “some major marine fisheries resources around Japan showed decadal increases or decreases beginning in the mid-2000s, and appeared to respond to the unconventional SST changes in their early life stages (Kuroda et al. 2020)”. Anomalously high SST in NE Pacific (heat wave) was associated with El Nino and high PDO index in 2013 -- 2016 (Leising et al. 2015, Tseng et al. 2017) and impacted seabirds (Piatt et al. 2020). In the same period (2013 – 2016) Rhinoceros Auklets were impacted (Fig. 5) but SST of northern Japan Sea did not show apparent increase or decrease (Fig. S5 in Supplement

4).

4.2. Prey size-number trade-off

Shifts in the prey community available to Rhinoceros Auklets affected their productivity because 1) the most of the meal-loads were comprised of a single species, and 2) the mass of meal-loads varied with prey species taken and low for multi-species loads, and 3) the mass of meal-loads was the key determinant of chick productivity between climate phases.

Between-year difference in the energy density of prey species explains reproductive success in other seabirds (Litzow et al. 2002, Wanless et al. 2005, Grémillet et al. 2008). Energy density is lower in juvenile salmon, squids, age-0 sand lance, and age-0 greenling (3-5 KJ/g) than sardine, anchovy and age->1 sand lance (5-10 KJ/g, Table S1 in Supplement 2). Thus energy density of prey was higher on average in either cold or warm phases when Rhinoceros Auklets fed on dominant sardine and anchovy, than later when they fed on age-0 greenling and age-0 sand lance. However, in this study we found the mass more important to productivity than the energy density. Presumably, this is because the variation of the energy density of average meal-loads between years observed in this study (4.29 – 6.60 KJ/g or 154%) was smaller than that in the average mass (16.6 – 35.9 g or 216%) (Table S2 in Supplement 2). Same is true for Tufted Puffins *Fratercula cirrhata*, where prey species ranges from lean juvenile walleye pollock *Theragra chalcogramma* to fatty capelin *Mallotus villosus* and myctophids, but they do just fine raising chicks on walleye pollock by bringing larger packages (Schoen et al. 2018).

Rhinoceros Auklets brought back heavier meal-loads in years when they fed

1 mainly on sardine or anchovy than years when their diet was more diverse and
2 included age-0 greenling, squids and age-0 sand lance (Fig. 4 a,b). In Great Crested
3 Terns *Thalasseus bergii*, the size of anchovy in meal-loads was smaller when the
4 parents brought multiple number of anchovy (Gaglio et al. 2018). We found similar
5 relationships in Rhinoceros Auklets, but with large species difference (Table S5, Fig.
6 S4 in Supplement 3). With these species-specific size-number relationships, we
7 expected that the maximum mass of meal-load would vary between species. The
8 expected maximum mass of three major prey species (Fig. 5 a,b,c) was anchovy >
9 age-0 greenling > age-0 sand lance. This order was the same as found in the average
10 mass of meal-loads (Table 1). Parents may change the number of fish brought back
11 depending on species to achieve maximum delivery mass. The mechanisms of this
12 species-specific size-number trade-offs is unclear.

13 Other species of seabirds show different food packaging. Murres *Uria* spp,
14 guillemots *Cheppus* spp. and terns are obligatory bringing single prey for chicks so the
15 size and energy density of individually-selected fish is always a direct effect on
16 production as shown for the North Sea and Baltic Sea (Wanless et al. 2005, Österblom
17 et al. 2006). Parents of murres *U. aalge* can compensate for smaller fish by increasing
18 feeding rates (Kadin et al. 2016). Many species of seabirds, including penguins,
19 albatrosses, shearwaters, petrels, cormorants and gulls bring food in their stomachs so
20 may show different responses. We suggest that food packaging is one of factors
21 influencing the reproductive responses of central-place foraging seabirds to the change
22 of fish community.

23 Parents of Rhinoceros Auklets bring meal-loads in the evening and do not forage
24 at sea during the night (Kuroki et al. 2003). So, they feed chicks once per night at

maximum (Takahashi et al. 1999). Therefore, the mass of meal-loads is the key. In our study, chick growth rate was greater in years with heavier meal-load, and the number of fledgling was greater and fledgling mass was heavier in years with higher chick growth rate as reported in the previous study of this species on the same island (Deguchi et al. 2004b). In an experimental study, Rhinoceros Auklet chicks that received heavier meals per day grew faster, fledged younger and heavier with more fat (Takenaka et al. 2005). In Manx Shearwaters *Puffinus puffinus* and Tufted Puffins *Fratercula cirrhata*, post-fledgling survival is greater and age at first return to the colony is shorter for fledglings having greater body mass (Perrins et al. 1973, Morrison et al. 2009). Therefore the decadal scale changes of fledging success and fledging mass associated with the change of forage fish community we found in this study may influence the population of Rhinoceros Auklets.

4.3. Conclusion

Teuri Island Rhinoceros Auklets switched prey species in accordance with changes in forage fish communities that were partly affected by ocean climate. They showed highest productivity when the birds used anchovy as prey. Species-specific trade-offs between the composition, size and number of prey in meal-loads, i.e. “food packaging” explained the linkage between food resources in the environment and their breeding productivity. The manner in which food is packaged for offspring could be a new response to climate change impacts on marine ecosystems and effects on central-place foraging predators.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank A Kato, M Kuroki, Y Niizuma, A Takahashi, K Iseki, M Takenaka, T Kagami, T Deguchi, K Matsumoto, D Ochi, Y Manabe, H Nomura, Y Tanaka, M Shikata, T Tanaka, A Kubo, N Sato, A Umeyama, S Hashimoto, U Shimabukuro, T Kitagawa, N Nagatani, R Sato and E Iida for their field assistance, M Aotsuka, R Yorozuya and Y Kusakabe for their hospitality on Teuri Island. A Takahashi gave invaluable comments on a draft of the paper. The field work was carried out under permits from the Agency for Cultural Affairs and the Ministry of the Environment. This study was supported by JSPS Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (#16108002 to M. Kishi, #17370007 to Y.W.), by the 21st Century Centers of Excellence (COE) program ‘Neo-Science of Natural History’, led by H. Okada, and 2017 Summer Institute Program, Hokkaido University (to W.S.). Two anonymous reviewers and J Piatt gave useful and helpful comments on the manuscript.

LITERATURE CITED

- Aebischer NJ, Coulson JC, Colebrook JM (1990) Parallel long-term trends across four marine trophic levels. *Nature* 347:753-755.
- Anderson PJ, Piatt JF (1999) Community reorganization in the Gulf of Alaska following ocean climate regime shift. *Mar Ecol Progr Ser* 189:117-123.
- Barbraud C, Weimerskirch H (2001) Emperor penguins and climate change. *Nature* 411:183-186.
- Bertram DF, Kaiser GW (1993) Rhinoceros Auklets (*Cerorhinca monocerata*) nestling diet may gauge Pacific sand lance (*Ammodytes hexapterus*) recruitment. *Can J Fish Aquat Sci* 74:1906-1915.
- Bertram DF, Harfenist A, Hedd A (2009) Seabird nestling diets reflect latitudinal

1 temperature-dependent variation in availability of key zooplankton prey populations.
2 Mar Ecol Prog Ser 393: 199–210

3 Borstad G, Crawford W, Hipfner JM, Thomson R, Hyatt K (2011) Environmental
4 control of the breeding success of rhinoceros auklets at Triangle Island, British
5 Columbia. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 424:285-302.

6 Boyd IL, Murray AWA (2001) Monitoring a marine ecosystem using responses of
7 upper trophic level predators. J Anim Ecol 70:747-760.

8 Burger AE (1991) Maximum dive depths and underwater foraging in alcids and
9 penguins. Canadian Wildlife Service Occasional Papers 68:9-15.

10 Chiba S, Tadokoro K, Sugisaki H, Saino T (2006) Effects of decadal climate change on
11 zooplankton over the last 50 years in the western subarctic North Pacific. Glob
12 Change Biol 12:907-920

13 Chiba S, Batten S, Sasaoka K, Sasai Y, Sugisaki H (2012) Influence of the Pacific
14 Decadal Oscillation on phytoplankton phenology and community structure in the
15 western North Pacific. Geophys Res Lett 39, L15603, doi: 10.1029/2012GL052912

16 Chavez FP, Ryan J, Lluch-Cota SE, Niquen MC (2003) From anchovies to sardines
17 and back: multidecadal change in the Pacific Ocean. Science 299:217-221.

18 Crawford RJM, Dyer BM (1995) Responses by four seabird species to a fluctuating
19 availability of Cape anchovy *Engraulis capensis* off South Africa. Ibis 137:329-339.

20 Cunningham JT, Elliott KH, Cottenie K, Hatch SA, Jacobs SR (2018) Individual
21 foraging location, but not dietary, specialization: implications for rhinoceros auklets
22 as samplers of forage fish Mar Ecol Prog Ser 605: 225–240.

23 Cury PM, Boyd IL, Bonhommeau S, Anker-Nilssen T, Crawford RJM, Furness RW,
24 Mills JA, Murphy EJ, Osterblom H, Paleczny M, Piatt JF, Roux J-P, Shannon L,

1 Sydemann WJ (2011) Global seabird response to forage fish depletion? one-third for
2 the birds. *Science* 334: 1703–1706.

3 Deguchi T, Watanuki Y, Niizuma Y, Nakata A (2004a) Interannual variations of the
4 occurrence of epipelagic fish in the diets of the seabirds breeding on Teuri Island,
5 northern Hokkaido, Japan. *Prog Oceanogr* 61:267-275.

6 Deguchi T, Takahashi A, Watanuki Y (2004b) Proximate factors determining fledging
7 age and mass in Rhinoceros Auklets: a study of within- and inter-year variations.
8 *Auk* 121:452-462.

9 Furness RW (2007) Responses of seabirds to depletion of food fish stocks. *J Ornithol*
10 148:S247-S252.

11 Furness RW, Tasker ML (2000) Seabird-fishery interactions: quantifying the sensitivity
12 of seabirds to reduction in sandeel abundance, and identification of key areas for
13 sensitive seabirds in the North Sea. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 202:253-264.

14 Gaglio D, Cook TR, Sherley RB, Ryan PG (2018) How many can you catch? Factors
15 influencing the occurrence of multi-prey loading in provisioning Greater Crested
16 terns. *Ostrich* 89:145-149.

17 Gaston AJ, Jones IL (1998) *The Auks*, Oxford University Press, Oxford. pp. 270-282.

18 Grémillet D, Pichegru L, Kuntz G, Woakes AG, Wilkinson S, Crawford RJM, Ryan P.
19 (2008) A junk-food hypothesis for gannets feeding on fishery waste. *Proc R Soc B*
20 275:1149-1156.

21 Hayashi A, Yasuda T, Kuroda H, Takahashi M (2018) Stock assessment and evaluation
22 for Japanese anchovy Tsushima Warm Current subpopulation (fiscal year 2017). In
23 Fisheries Agency and Fisheries Research and Education Agency of Japan (ed)
24 Marine fisheries stock assessment and evaluation for Japanese waters (fiscal year

2017/2018), p 884–912. <http://abchan.fra.go.jp/> (accessed 9 May 2019, in Japanese).

Hatch SA, Sanger GA (1992) Puffins as samplers of juvenile Pollock and other forage fish in the Gulf of Alaska. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 80:1-14

Hayashi A, Goto T, Takahashi M, Watanabe Y (2019) How Japanese anchovy spawn in northern waters: start with surface warming and end with day length shortening. *Ichthyol Res* 66:79–87

Hedd A, Bertram DF, Ryder JL, Jones IL (2006) Effects of interdecadal climate variability on marine trophic interactions: rhinoceros auklets and their fish prey. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 309: 263–278

Hipfner JM, Galbraith M, Bertram DF, Green DJ (2020) Basin-scale oceanographic processes, zooplankton community structure, and diet and reproduction of a sentinel North Pacific seabird over a 22-year period. *Progr Oceanogr* 182,102290. Doi: 10.1016/j.pocean.2020.102290

Ishigaki T, Nakamichi Y (1958) A study of Japan Sea greenling (IV), behaviour, diet and habitat. *Hokusuishi-Geppou* 15:4-13 (In Japanese)

Kadin M, Olsson O, Hentani-Sundberg J, Ehrning EW, Blenckner T (2016) Common Guillemot *Uria aalge* parents adjust provisioning rates to compensate for low food quality. *Ibis* 158:167-178.

Kato A, Watanuki Y, Naito Y (2003) Foraging behaviour of chick-rearing Rhinoceros Auklets *Cerorhinca monocerata* at Teuri Island, Japan, determined by acceleration-depth recording micro data loggers. *J Avian Biol* 34: 282-287.

Kuroda H, Saito T, Kaga T, Takasuka A, Kamimura Y, Furuichi S and Nakanowatari T (2020) Unconventional Sea Surface Temperature Regime Around Japan in the

1 2000s–2010s: Potential Influences on Major Fisheries Resources. *Front Mar Sci*
2 7:574904. doi: 10.3389/fmars.2020.574904

3 Kuroki M, Kato A, Watanuki Y, Niizuma Y, Takahashi A, Naito Y (2003) Diving
4 behavior of an epipelagically-feeding alcids, the Rhinoceros Auklets (*Cerorhinca*
5 *monocerata*). *Can J Zool* 81:1249-1256.

6 Kuwae M, Yamamoto M, Sagawa T, Ikehara K, Irino T, Takemura K, Takeoka H,
7 Sugimoto T (2017) Multidecadal, centennial, and millennial variability in
8 sardine and anchovy abundances in the western North Pacific and climate–fish
9 linkages during the late Holocene. *Progr Oceanogr* 159:86–98.

10 Lee DE, Nur N, Sydeman WJ (2007) Climate and demography of the planktivorous
11 Cassin’s auklet *Ptychoramphus aleuticus* off northern California: implications for
12 population change. *J Anim Ecol* 76:337–347.

13 Leising AW, Schroeder ID, Bograd SJ, Abell J, Durazo R, Gaxiola-Castro G,
14 Bjorkstedt EP, Field J, Sakuma K, Robertson RR (2015) State of the California
15 Current 2014-15: impacts of the warm-water “blob”. *California Cooperative*
16 *Oceanic Fisheries Investigations Reports* 56:31-68.

17 Litzow MA, Piatt JF, Prichard AK, Robby D 2002 Response of pigeon guillemots to
18 variable abundance of high-lipid and low-lipid prey. *Oecologia* 132:286-295.

19 Mantua NJ, Hare SR, Zhang Y, Wallace JM, Francis RC (1997) A pacific interdecadal
20 climate oscillation with impacts on salmon production. *Bull Am Meteorol Soc* 78:
21 1069-1079.

22 Mantua NJ, Hare SR (2002) The Pacific decadal oscillation. *J Oceanogr* 58:35-44.

23 Minobe S (1997) A 50-70 year climatic oscillation over the North Pacific and North
24 America. *Geophys Res Lett* 24: 683-686.

1 Morita S, Yamashita Y, Hamatsu T, Yamashita N (2018) Stock assessment and
2 evaluation for arabesque greenling Northern Japan Sea subpopulation (fiscal year
3 2017). In Fisheries Agency and Fisheries Research and Education Agency of Japan
4 (ed) Marine fisheries stock assessment and evaluation for Japanese waters (fiscal
5 year 2017/2018), p 884–912. <http://abchan.fra.go.jp/> (accessed 9 May 2019, in
6 Japanese).

7 Montevecchi WA, Birt VL, Cairns DK (1988) Dietary changes of seabirds associated
8 with local fisheries failures. *Biol Oceanogr* 5:153-161.

9 Morrison KW, Hipfner JM, Gjerdrum C, Green DJ (2009) Wing length and mass at
10 fledging predict local juvenile survival and age at first return in Tufted puffins.
11 *Condor* 111:433-441.

12 Muko S, Ohshimo S, Kurota H, Yasuda T, Fukuwaka M (2018) Long-term change in
13 the distribution of Japanese sardine in the Sea of Japan during population
14 fluctuations. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 593: 141–154.

15 Nagasawa K, Torisawa M (1991) Fish and marine invertebrates of Hokkaido: biology
16 and fisheries. Kita-nihon Kaiyo Center, Sapporo. (In Japanese).

17 Nakayama S, Takasuka A, Ichinokawa M, Okamura H (2018) Climate change and
18 interspecific interactions drive species alternations between anchovy and sardine in
19 the western North Pacific: detection of causality by convergent cross mapping. *Fish.*
20 *Oceanogr* 27:312–322.

21 Newman M, Alexander MA, Ault TR, Cobb KN, Deser C, Di Lorenzo E, Mantua NJ,
22 Miller AJ, Minobe S, Nakamura H (2016) The Pacific Decadal Oscillation,
23 Revisited. *J Climate* 29:4399-4427.

24 Ohshimo S, Tanaka H, Hiyama Y (2009) Long-term stock assessment and growth

1 changes of the Japanese sardine (*Sardinops melanostictus*) in the Sea of Japan and
2 East China Sea from 1953 to 2006. *Fish Oceanogr* 18:346-358

3 Österblom H, Casini M, Olsson O, Bignert A (2006) Fish, seabird and trophic cascades
4 in the Baltic Sea. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 323:233-238.

5 Perrins CM, Harris MP, Britton CK (1973) Survival of Manx Shearwaters *Puffinus*
6 *puffinus*. *Ibis* 115:535-548.

7 Piatt JF, Harding AMA, Shultz M, Speckman SG, van Pelt TI, Drew GS, Kettle AB
8 (2007) Seabirds as indicators of marine food supplies: Cairns revisited *Mar Ecol*
9 *Prog Ser* 352: 221–234, doi: 10.3354/meps07078

10 Piatt JF, Parrish JK, Renner HM, Schoen SK, Jones TT, Arimitsu ML, Kuletz KJ,
11 Bodenstein B, Garcia-Reyes M, Duerr RS, Corcoran RM, Kaler RSA, McChesney
12 GJ, Golightly RT, Coletti HA, Suryan RM, Burgess HK, Lindsey J, Lindquist K,
13 Warzybok PM, Jahncke J, Roletto J, Sydeman WJ (2020) Extreme mortality and
14 reproductive failure of common murres resulting from the northeast Pacific marine
15 heatwave 2014 -- 2016. *PLoS ONE* 15:e0226087.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0226087>

17 R Development Core Team (2015) *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical*
18 *Computing*. Vienna, R Foundation for Statistical Computing.

19 Rodionov SN (2004) A sequential algorithm for testing climate regime shifts. *Geophys*
20 *Res Lett* 31: 2-5.

21 Schneider N, Cornuelle BD (2005) The forcing of the Pacific decadal oscillation. *J*
22 *Climate* 18:4355-4373.

23 Schoen SK, Piatt JF, Arimitsu ML, Heflin BM, Madison EN, Drew GS, Renner M,
24 Rojek NA, Douglas DC, DeGang AR (2018) Avian predator buffers against

1 variability in marine habitats with flexible foraging behavior. Mar Biol 165,
2 doi:10.1007/s00227-018-3304-4.

3 Sydeman WJ, Poloczanska E, Reed TE, Thompson SA (2015) Climate change and
4 marine vertebrates. Science 350:772-777

5 Sydeman WJ, Piatt JF, Thompson SA, Garcia-Reyes M, Hatch SA, Arimitsu ML,
6 Slater L, Williams JC, Rojek NA, Zador SG, Renner HM (2017) Puffins reveal
7 contrasting relationships between forage fish and ocean climate in the North Pacific.
8 Fish Oceanogr 26:379-395.

9 Takahashi A, Kuroki M, Niizuma Y, Watanuki Y (1999) Parental food provisioning is
10 unrelated to manipulated offspring food demand in a nocturnal single-provisioning
11 alcid, the rhinoceros auklet. J Avian Biol 30: 486-490.

12 Takahashi A, Kuroki A, Niizuma Y, Kato A, Saitoh S, Watanuki Y (2001) Importance
13 of the Japanese anchovy (*Engraulis japonicus*) to breeding rhinoceros auklets
14 (*Cerorhinca monocerata*) on Teuri Island, sea of Japan. Mar Biol 139: 361-371.

15 Takasuka A, Oozeki Y, Kubota H, Lluch-Cota S. E. (2008). Contrasting spawning
16 temperature optima: Why are anchovy and sardine regime shifts synchronous across
17 the North Pacific? Prog Oceanogr 77:225–232.
18 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pocean.2008.03.008>

19 Takenaka M, Niizuma Y, Watanuki Y (2005) Resource allocation in fledglings of the
20 Rhinoceros Auklet under different feeding conditions: an experiment manipulating
21 meal size and frequency. Can J Zool 83:1476-1485.

22 Tameishi H, Fujii S, Maebayashi A (2005) Relationship between Regime-shifts of SST
23 and fisheries condition (Spanish Mackerel and Yellowtail) in Japan Sea. Bull Coast
24 Oceanogr 42:125–131 (In Japanese).

- 1 Thayer JA, Sydeman WJ (2007) Spatio-temporal variability in prey harvest and
2 reproductive ecology of a piscivorous seabird, *Cerorhinca monocerata*, in an
3 upwelling system. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 329: 253–265
- 4 Thayer JA, Bertram DF, Hatch SA, Hipfner MJ, Slater L, Sydeman WJ, Watanuki Y
5 (2008) Forage fish of the Pacific Rim as revealed by diet of a piscivorous seabird:
6 synchrony and relationships with sea surface temperature. Can J Fish Aquat Sci
7 65:1610–1622.
- 8 Tian Y, Kidokoro H, Watanabe T (2006) Long-term changes in the fish community
9 structure from the Tsushima warm current region of the Japan/East Sea with an
10 emphasis on the impacts of fishing and climate regime shift over the last four
11 decades. Progr Oceanogr 68: 217-237.
- 12 Tian Y, Kidokoro H, Watanabe T, Iguchi N (2008) The late 1980s regime shift in the
13 ecosystem of Tsushima warm current in the Japan/East sea: evidence from historical
14 data and possible mechanisms. Progr Oceanogr 77: 127-145.
- 15 Tseng Y-H, Ding R, Huang X-m (2017) The warm Blob in the northeast Pacific-the
16 bridge leading to the 2015/16 El Nino. Environmental Research Letters 12: 054019.
17 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aa67c3>
- 18 Wanless S, Harris MP, Redman P, Speakman J (2005) Low energy values of fish as a
19 probable cause of a major seabird breeding failure in the North Sea. Mar Ecol Prog
20 Ser 294:1-8.
- 21 Watanabe Y, Takahashi M (2007) Ecology of sardine/anchovy and regime shift. In: T
22 Kawasaki, K Hanawa, A Taniguchi, A Nihira (eds), Regime Shift: Climate change
23 and Management of Biological resources, Seizando Shoten, Tokyo, 141-155 (In
24 Japanese)

- 1 Watanuki Y, Ito M, Deguchi T, Minobe S (2009) Climate-forced seasonal mismatch
2 between the hatching of Rhinoceros Auklets and the availability of anchovy. *Mar*
3 *Ecol Prog Ser* 393:259-271.
- 4 Watanuki Y, Ito M (2012) Climatic effects on breeding seabirds of the northern Japan
5 Sea. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 454:183–196.
- 6 Yasunaka S, Hanawa K (2005) Regime shift in the global sea-surface temperatures: Its
7 relation to El Nino-southern oscillation events and dominant variation modes. *Int J*
8 *Climatol* 25: 913-930.
- 9 Yasuda T, Kuroda H, Hayashi A, Yoda M, Suzuki K, Takahashi M (2018) Stock
10 assessment and evaluation for Japanese sardine Tsushima Warm Current
11 subpopulation (fiscal year 2017). In Fisheries Agency and Fisheries Research and
12 Education Agency of Japan (ed) Marine fisheries stock assessment and evaluation
13 for Japanese waters (fiscal year 2017/2018), p 57–95. <http://abchan.fra.go.jp/>
14 (accessed 9 May 2019, in Japanese)

15

FIGURE LEGENDS

Fig. 1. Rhinoceros auklets bring back variable number of fish as a meal-load. A parent bring back eight of age-0 greenlings (a) and one anchovy (b). Photo by M.I.

Fig. 2. Between-year changes in the mass proportion of prey species/type in meal-load (a), the scores of the first (PC1, red closed circle) and second (PC2, black closed circle) principal component of the mass composition of prey species with dominant prey species (b), and PDO index (thin lines) in winter (Dec to Feb, PDOW), spring (Mar to May, PDUSp), summer (June to Aug, PDOSu) and autumn (Sep to Nov, PDOA) (c). The weighted average values during each phase between the shifts determined by sequential t test analysis (STARS) using 5-year cut off for PC1 (PCA-V5, red broken line) and PC2 (PCA-V5, black broken line) are shown in (b) and those using 10-year cut off (broken thick line, 10AV) and 5-year cut off (broken thin line, 5AV) for PDO index are in (c). The shifts determined by STARS and that assumed by the change of PC1 and PC2 are shown by closed and open triangles, respectively in (b) and (c). The two shifts in 50 m depth water temperature and PDO reported in the previous studies (Tian et al. 2006, 2008, Yasunaka and Hanawa 2005, Tameishi et al. 2005) are shown by thin broken lines.

Fig. 3. Between year changes in Tsushima Warm Current stock size of sardine (a), Tsushima Warm Current stock size of anchovy (b), and the stock size of age-0 Japan Sea greenling in northern Japan Sea off Hokkaido (c). Shifts of PDO using 10-year and 5-year cut off are shown by thin broken lines (see Fig. 2 c).

Fig. 4. Relationships between stock sizes of sardine (a) and anchovy (b) in the Tsushima warm current and that of age-0 greenling in the northern Japan Sea off Hokkaido (c) and the mass proportion of each prey species in diet. Linear regression line and 95% confidence interval are shown for (a) and (b) where the relationships are significant.

Fig. 5. Between year changes in average $\pm$ SD of the mass of meal-loads (a), the growth rate of chicks (b), and the number of fledglings per nests with chicks (c). Weighted average values given by STARS with 5-year cut off are shown by broken lines. Shifts of PDO using 10-year and 5-year cut off are shown by thin broken line (see Fig. 2 c).

Fig. 6. Linear relationships between the annual averages of the mass of meal-load and the growth rate of chicks (a), the number of fledglings per nest with chicks (b) and the mass of fledglings (c). Linear regression lines with 95% confidence interval are show. Sample size is 32 years but 29 years for the mass of fledglings since no chicks fledged in 2014 – 2016. Crosses, open circles, closed circles, open squares and closed squares refer to 1) sardine, age->1 sand lance, and Pacific saury period in 1984 – 1987, 2) anchovy and age-0 greenling period in 1992 – 1997, 3) mostly anchovy period in 1998 – 2013, 4) age-0 greenling and squid period in 2014 – 2017, and 5) age-0 and age->1 sand lance period in 2018 – 2020, respectively (Fig. 2 a, b). See Table 4 for regression equation and statistics.

Fig. 7. Parabolic relationships between the mass of meal-loads and the diet

1 composition indexed by the score of the first axis of principal component (PC1) of the
2 mass composition of prey species (a) and that of the second axis (PC2) (b). Parabolic
3 regression lines with 95% confidence intervals are show. Annual average values of
4 each year are used (n=32 years). Prey species with positive and negative PC loadings
5 are shown (See Table 2). See explanation of Fig. 6a for symbols.

6

7 Fig. 8. Parabolic or linear relationships between the number of prey and the mass of
8 food-loads in anchovy (a), age-0 greenling (b), age-0 sand lance (c), herring (d),
9 Pacific saury (e), age->1 sand lance (f), juvenile salmon (g), sardine (h) and squids (i).
10 Significant regression lines and 95% confidence interval are shown. No significant
11 effects were observed in juvenile salmon, sardine and squids. See Table 4 for
12 regression equation and statistics.

13

Table 1. The mass (average±SD) of meal-loads and the number of fish in those comprized of a single major or minor species of fish. We categorized the species as major and minor if the number of meal-loads including these fish species was greater than 14 meal-loads and if the number was smaller than 13 meal-loads, respectively. The meal-loads comprized of mixture of age-0 and age->1 sand lance and those including multiple species were categorized as multiple types.

Species/age classe	Mass of meal-load (g)	No. of fish per meal-load	No. of meal-load
Major species			
Sardine (<i>Sardinops melanostictus</i>)	40.3±9.3	1~5	71
Anchovy (<i>Engraulis japonicus</i>)	32.9±11.6	1~15	1,395
Herring (<i>Clupea pallasii</i>)	27.8±14.1	1~23	53
Age-0 sand lance (<i>Ammodytes</i> spp.)	18.5±9.4	1~59	401
Age->1 sand lance(<i>Ammodytes</i> spp.)	27.6±10.7	1~6	159
Age-0 Japan Sea Greenling (<i>Pleurogrammus azonus</i>)	25.5±11.4	1~20	414
Pacific saury (<i>Cololabis saira</i>)	22.1±12.8	1~6	70
Juvenile salmon (<i>Onchorhynchus</i> sp.)	11.0±4.9	1~7	14
Squid	20.0±10.9	1~6	57
Minor species			
Capeline (<i>Mallotus villosus</i>)	31.2	5	1
Smelt (<i>Hypomesus</i> sp)	26.6±15.9	1~5	4
Walleye pollock (<i>Gadus chalcogrammus</i>)	14.5±4.5	5~18	7
Naked sandlance (<i>Hypoptychus dybowskii</i>)	0.9	5	1
Spottybelly greenling (<i>Hexagrammos agrammus</i>)	14.2±8.9	1~15	13
White-edged rockfish (<i>Sebastes taczanowskii</i>)	0.6	3	1
Ocalled blenny (<i>Opisthocentrus ocellatus</i>)	6.1	1	1
Purple puffers (<i>Takifugu porphyreus</i>)	16.0	1	1
Puffers (<i>Takifugu</i> sp.)	34.4±3.0	1	3
Snailfish (<i>Liparis</i> sp.)	16.2	1~4	2
Three spined stickle back (<i>Gasterosteus aculeatus</i>)	3.1±1.0	1	3
Masu salmon (<i>Oncorhynchus masou</i>)	33.0	1	1
Unidentified pelagic fish	14.8	6	1
Unknow	5.6	1~2	2
Multiple types			
Age-0/age->1 sandlance	29.9±10.0	2~21	38
Multiple species	23.2±12.7	2~38	354
Total	27.9±12.8		3,067

Table 2 Loadings of each species/type along Principle Component 1 (PC1) and 2 (PC2) given by principal component analysis of the proportional mass composition of prey species in the meal-loads in each year.

Species/Type	PC1	PC2
Sardine	0.769	-0.460
Anchovy	-0.921	-0.317
Herring	0.562	0.064
Age-0 sand lance	0.521	0.222
Age->1 sand lance	0.795	-0.490
Pacific saury	0.643	-0.534
Age-0 greenling	0.334	0.660
Juvenile salmon	0.391	0.437
Squid	0.312	0.805

1

2

Table 3. Linear effects of annual average of the mass (BLM, g) and the energy density (EDN, KJ/g) of meal-loads on the chick growth rate (CG, g/5 days), the number of fledglings per nests with chicks (NF, n/nest), and the mass of fledglings (FLM, g). Coefficients of determination (r^2) and significance level (P) are shown. No apparent curvilinear effects are observed (Figure 6). Sample size is 32 years for the chick growth rate and the number of fledglings but 29 years for the mass of fledglings as no chicks fledged in the study plots in 3 years. To see importance of factors, model selection is performed basing on AICc (Table S3). Better models with smaller AICc in those including either BLM or EDN as an explanatory factor are in bold. Linear effect of the energy value of meal-load (EVU, KJ) is examined separately as EVU is calculated as BLM x EDN in this study.

	r^2	F-value	P	AICc
Chick growth rate (CG)				
CG=-17.775+2.029BLM	0.665	62.475	<0.001	225.2
CG=-40.193+13.831EDN	0.396	21.3	<0.001	244.1
CG=-3.517+0.263EVU	0.677	65.917	<0.001	
Number of fledglings				
NF=-0.337+0.034BLM	0.408	22.394	<0.001	-4.1
NF=-0.408+0.177EDN	0.127	5.503	0.026	8.3
NF=-0.021+0.04EVU	0.319	15.531	<0.001	
Mass of fledglings				
FLM=-37.074+12.383BLM	0.62	46.754	<0.001	304.4
FLM=159.594+24.894EDN	0.007	1.207	0.282	331.1
FLM=96.330+1.327EVU	0.416	20.943	<0.001	

Table 4. Linear and parabolic regressions of the number of fish in meal-loads (N) on the mass of meal-loads (M). Meal-loads including only fish with intact body are used. Model selection is performed using AICc (see Table S6). Better models giving smaller AICc in the linear or parabolic equations and that giving significant coefficient of determination (r^2) are in bold.

Species (sample size)	Effects	Equations	r^2	P	AICc
Anchovy (1,230)	Parabolic	$M=3.455+26.488N-3.875N^2$	0.503	<0.001	8643
	Linear	$M=17.140+10.560N$	0.39	<0.001	8897.2
Age-0 greenling (284)	Parabolic	$M=14.247+6.462N-0.521N^2$	0.188	<0.001	2138.1
	Linear	$M=21.811+1.718N$	0.099	<0.001	2165.7
Age-0 sand lance (315)	Parabolic	$M=5.079+1.522N-0.033N^2$	0.152	<0.001	2265.6
	Linear	$M=14.392+0.276N$	0.06	<0.001	2296.1
Age->1 sand lance (148)	Linear	$M=22.592+2.960N$	0.097	<0.001	1107.9
	Parabolic	$M=23.899+1.602N+0.247N^2$	0.099	0.001	1109.7
Sardine (62)	Linear	$M=43.118-1.054N$	0.004	0.61	443.7
	Parabolic	$M=26.088+19.352N-3.498N^2$	0.029	0.423	444.5
Pacific saury (66)	Linear	$M=27.874-3.064N$	0.083	0.019	523.8
	Parabolic	$M=31.998-7.369N+0.791N^2$	0.094	0.045	525.3
Herring (34)	Parabolic	$M=48.506-14.416N+1.098N^2$	0.21	0.026	272.7
	Linear	$M=34.587-0.963N$	0.02	0.423	277.5
Juvenile salmon (11)	Linear	$M=9.935+0.569N$	0.049	0.512	75.1
	Parabolic	$M=12.924-1.803N+0.321N^2$	0.091	0.682	80
Squid (52)	Linear	$M=16.589+2.470N$	0.029	0.23	401
	Parabolic	$M=13.801+5.797N-0.784N^2$	0.032	0.455	403.2



Fig. 1.

1
2





Fig. 2.

Fig. 3.






Fig. 4.




Fig. 5




Fig. 6.




Fig. 7.

1
2




Fig. 8.