

FISHBYTE SECTION

Editorial

The eight articles in this issue of *Fishbyte-in-Naga* cover a variety of topics, countries and resources. However, three of these deal with length-weight relationships (LWR) of the form $W=aL^b$, a topic some may view as not worth writing about much, so some explanation may be in order.

Let us list some of the uses to which LWRs can be put:

- i) conversion of length of individual fish to weight, as required, e.g., for visual censuses (see Kulbicki et al.'s paper below);
- ii) estimating the mean weight of the fish of a given length class (see Beyer 1987, *Fishbyte* 5(1):11-13);
- iii) conversion of a growth equation for length into a growth equation for weight, i.e., prediction of weight from age, as required, e.g., for yield-per-recruit models;
- iv) morphological comparisons between population of the same species, or between species, and related investigations (see Caillouet, p. 30).

Estimating the parameters (a , b) of a LWR is usually straightforward — one weighs 10 small, 10 intermediate and 10 large fish of the same stock, runs the resulting 30 data pairs through a (log) linear regression routine and the job is done. And yet, when practical assessment work needs to be undertaken, or some species need to be compared, it is usually difficult to find the required LWRs in the literature. Why? Because many colleagues believe that estimating LWR requires hundreds of fish to be measured and weighed, missing the fact that measuring a *wide range* of fish sizes is more important for the precise estimation of a and b than the *number* of fish they measure, especially if they are all of intermediate sizes.

Also, there are many colleagues who do not engage in activities such as outlined in (i) to (iv) above and hence do not

see the point in estimating LWRs. However, I believe the key problem with LWR is that there is no theory for them.

In science, a theory's role is not only to accommodate (most of) the available facts relevant to a certain set of phenomena, but also to guide research (toward filling remaining gaps), and to provide a basis for expectations (i.e., toward the formulation of testable hypotheses). Thus, while geometry tells us that the parameter b must be equal to 3 (=isometry) if a fish is to maintain its shape as it grows larger, there is no theory that tells us in which case estimated b values can be expected to be below 3 (negative allometry), or above 3 (positive allometry).

Hence, no biological hypothesis is being tested and no advance of one's understanding about anything is made when, for example, a t -test identifies a significant departure from isometry.

The situation is similar with the parameter a of a LWR, which is well defined only in case of isometry, when $b=3$. In this case, a can be interpreted as a "condition factor" (usually a is multiplied by 100 which leads to cf values near unity for trout-shaped, "normal" fish when L is in cm and W in g). Condition factors are expected to vary in the course of a year, to be low when the fish condition is "bad" (e.g., following spawning) and high otherwise. However, in the more frequent case where b is not equal to 3, the values of a cease to be indicators of condition, and tend to vary inversely with b (hence the strong correlation between a and b values in Caillouet, p. 30), not a good attribute if a is to be interpreted in biological terms.

Thus, the field is wide open: who is going to develop a viable theory of (fish) LWR; whose "facts" will be the hundreds of values of a and b presently available (e.g., in FishBase); which will organize these facts, and allow predictions (hypotheses) to be derived? *D. Pauly*

Length-Weight Relationships of Fish from the Lagoon of New Caledonia

M. KULBICKI
G. MOU THAM
P. THOLLOT
L. WANTIEZ

Abstract

Length-weight relationships of 335 species of fish of New Caledonia, belonging to 65 families of coral reef fishes, were computed (80%) or assembled from the literature (20% of all cases) to facilitate, among other things, estimation of coral reef fish biomass from visual census.

Introduction

Length-weight relationships are — in fisheries research — useful for a number of purposes, notably to estimate biomasses from length-frequency data.

The Institut Français de Recherche Scientifique pour le Développement en Coopération (ORSTOM) is presently

conducting in New Caledonia a project involving the estimation of coral reef fish biomasses, wherein visual census is the main method used to estimate the densities of fish of different species and length. Species-specific length-weight relationships are required for the subsequent estimation of individual fish weights from their lengths, with the weights being added up to obtain total biomasses or standing stock (Kulbicki 1988; Kulbicki et al. 1990).

There is a large literature on length-weight relationship of Indo-Pacific fish, but dealing mainly with soft bottom (i.e., trawled) species, and on pelagic fish. This contribution aims at filling an obvious information gap for coral reef fish, and thus to assist future visual censuses.



Materials and Methods

Fish were caught by a number of methods: rotenone, gill nets and spear fishing for reef fishes; and trawl, gill nets, trammel nets and handline for soft bottom and pelagic fishes. Table 1 indicates the precision of our length and weight measurements, which depends on size.

Table 1. Precision of the length and weight measurements used for estimating length-weight relationships.

Length (cm) Interval	Weight Precision	
	Length (cm) Precision	Weight Precision
0-5	0.5	0.5g
5-10	0.5	1.0g
10-30	1.0	5.0g
30-100	1.0	1-5%
>100	5.0	5%

total length (T) for sharks. Given our ultimate aim — biomass estimation from visual census data — the sexes were not differentiated, although we are aware that they generally have different length-weight relationships.

The parameters *a* and *b* of relationships of the form

$$W = a \cdot L^b \quad \dots 1)$$

were estimated through logarithmic transformation, i.e.,

$$\ln(\text{weight}) = \ln a + b \cdot \ln(\text{length}) \quad \dots 2)$$

with *a* and *b* estimated by ordinary least-squares regressions.

Results and Discussion

Our results identify species following Rivaton et al. (1989) and other sources, and are arranged by families according to Eschmeyer (1990) (Table 2). For each species-*a* and *b* values, the number of fish available in the study (N), the correlation coefficient for the log-transformed L-W data pairs (*r*) — suggesting the presence of outliers when below 0.95, and the length of the smallest (*L*_{min}) and largest (*L*_{max}) fish measured — are given.

Table 2 combines both our original data ("no data") and those from the literature (see numbers under Ref.). As might be seen, the information (beyond *a* and *b*) may be incomplete for some of the relationships from the literature, referring mainly to soft bottom and pelagic species loosely associated with coral reefs.

Our original data cover 279 species, representing 30% of the reef fish species of New Caledonia, and 20% of the other lagoon species. Together, these species represent 70% of the biomass in the lagoon of New Caledonia (Kulbicki 1988; Kulbicki et al. 1990, 1992; Kulbicki and Wantiez 1990; Thollot 1992).

Despite the rather comprehensive coverage of Table 2, there is still little information on the small coral reef species which, although they may not be major contributors to total biomass, contribute to the bulk of coral reef fish production.

Table 2. Length-weight relationships of 335 species of fish occurring in New Caledonia, with column headings as defined in the text.

Family/Species	a	b	N	r	Length type	Length min	Length max	Ref.
Carcharhinidae								
<i>Carcharhinus albimarginatus</i>	3.05E-03	3.243		NA	T			4
<i>Carcharhinus amblyrhynchos</i>	1.97E-02	2.914	17	0.919	T	51	120	
<i>Carcharhinus plumbeus</i>	1.42E-03	3.310		0.984	T			25
<i>Galeocerdo cuvier</i>	6.21E-03	3.160		0.994	T			9
<i>Galeocerdo cuvier</i>	2.62E-03	3.357		0.993	T			25
Sphyrnidae								
<i>Sphyrna lewini</i>	1.27E-02	2.959	13	0.965	T	38	57	
<i>Sphyrna mokarran</i>	1.23E-03	3.240		0.991	T			24
Dasyatidae								
<i>Dasyatis kuhlii</i>	3.56E-02	2.984	63	0.923	D	17	49.5	
Megalopidae								
<i>Megalops cyprinoides</i>	9.67E-02	3.065	42	0.991	F	17	41.5	
Muraenidae								
<i>Thyrsoidea macrura</i>	5.79E-03	2.305	61	0.996	S	22	260	
Muraenesocidae								
<i>Muraenesox bagio</i>	5.26E-03	2.781	17	0.987	S	56	106	
Clupeidae								
<i>Amblygaster clupeioides</i>	3.42E-03	3.180		0.999	F			6
<i>Amblygaster sirm</i>	3.49E-03	3.171		0.999	F			6
<i>Anodontostoma chacunda</i>	1.81E-02	3.048	777	0.996	F	3.5	24	
<i>Dussumieria acuta</i>	2.36E-02	2.631		0.982	F			5
Herklotsichthys								
<i>quadrifaculatus</i>	1.24E-02	3.005	132	0.919	F	5	10.5	
<i>Nematolosa come</i>	3.05E-02	2.947	92	0.993	F	3.5	24	
<i>Sardinella fijiense</i>	1.67E-02	2.980	54	0.993	F	5.5	15.5	
<i>Sardinella melanura</i>	3.58E-02	2.750		0.935	F			21
<i>Spratelloides gracilis</i>	9.50E-03	3.000		0.980	F			8
<i>Spratelloides gracilis</i>	2.27E-03	3.228		0.994	F			6
Engraulidae								
<i>Stolephorus delicatula</i>	2.14E-03	3.287		0.993	F			6
<i>Stolephorus devisi</i>	2.80E-03	3.340		0.990	F			8
<i>Stolephorus devisi</i>	1.40E-03	3.914		0.903	F			12
<i>Stolephorus devisi</i>	1.61E-03	3.328		0.988	F			6
<i>Stolephorus heterolobus</i>	2.40E-03	3.350		0.980	F			8
<i>Stolephorus heterolobus</i>	1.20E-03	3.380		0.994	F			6
<i>Stolephorus indicus</i>	4.10E-03	3.325		0.979	F			5
<i>Stolephorus indicus</i>	3.13E-03	3.159		0.996	F			6
<i>Stolephorus insularis</i>	2.61E-03	3.217		0.994	F			6
<i>Thryssina baelama</i>	2.33E-03	3.317	130	0.967	F	5	11.5	
Chirocentridae								
<i>Chirocentrus dorab</i>	1.12E+02	2.125	17	0.911	F	32.5	62	
Chanidae								
<i>Chanos chanos</i>	2.28E-03	3.354	44	0.994	F	14.5	31	
Synodontidae								
<i>Saurida gracilis</i>	4.59E-03	3.153	57	0.978	F	7	19	
<i>Saurida nebulosa</i>	4.08E-03	3.183	12	0.995	F	8	18.5	
<i>Saurida undosquamis</i>	1.15E-02	2.967	809	0.963	F	6.5	33	
<i>Synodus dermatogenis</i>	2.53E-03	3.307	33	0.984	F	8	16.5	
<i>Synodus hosinonis</i>	1.32E-03	3.409	45	0.965	F	9	19	
<i>Synodus variegatus</i>	2.68E-03	3.300	20	0.994	F	5	21.5	
Atherinidae								
<i>Atherinomorus lacunosus</i>	8.03E-03	3.090	50	0.968	F	6.5	13	
<i>Hypopatherina ovaloa</i>	2.14E-03	3.270		0.985	F			6
Belontiidae								
<i>Strongylura incisa</i>	5.24E-03	2.445	12	0.943	F	36.5	72.5	
<i>Strongylura leiura</i>	3.00E-03	2.515	21	0.846	F	43.5	75	
<i>Strongylura uroilli</i>	2.99E-03	3.298	28	0.991	F	29	73.5	
<i>Tylosurus crocodilus</i>	6.04E-04	3.165	21	0.983	F	29.5	60	
Holocentridae								
<i>Myripristis berndtii</i>	2.97E-02	2.988	85	0.995	F	4.5	22.5	
<i>Myripristis kutee</i>	1.46E-02	3.151	81	0.953	F	6	14	
<i>Myripristis melanostica</i>	2.97E-02	3.007	49	0.994	F	4	19.5	
<i>Myripristis pralinia</i>	2.05E-02	3.069	41	0.996	F	5	15	
<i>Myripristis violacea</i>	5.14E-02	2.903	118	0.992	F	3.5	17	
<i>Neoniphon argenteus</i>	5.32E-02	2.802	57	0.996	F	4.5	16.5	
<i>Neoniphon sammara</i>	4.85E-02	2.822	99	0.995	F	4.5	19	
<i>Sargocentron diadema</i>	3.73E-02	2.890	276	0.990	F	5	15	
<i>Sargocentron microstoma</i>	1.80E-03	3.851		0.989	F			22
<i>Sargocentron rubrum</i>	3.50E-02	2.949	173	0.981	F	8.5	23	
<i>Sargocentron spiniferum</i>	1.70E-02	3.056	32	0.985	F	11.5	31.5	
Fistulariidae								
<i>Fistularia petimba</i>	2.14E-04	3.158	43	0.993	F	19	44	
Scorpaenidae								
<i>Dendrochirus brachypterus</i>	8.05E-03	3.201	32	0.986	F	4	12	
<i>Inimicus didactylus</i>	3.72E-02	2.829	14	0.994	F	6.5	21.5	
Platycephalidae								
<i>Onigicia spinosa</i>	1.52E-02	2.418	26	0.990	F	6	19	
<i>Onigocia macrolepis</i>	7.30E-03	2.584	39	0.988	F	6	17	
Suggrundidae								
<i>Suggrundus staigeri</i>	2.57E-03	3.205	12	0.998	F	19.5	52	
Ambassidae								
<i>Ambassis interruptus</i>	5.28E-02	2.793	15	0.897	F	5.5	7.5	0
Serranidae								
<i>Cephalopholis argus</i>	1.55E-02	3.022	12	0.975	F	25.5	44	
<i>Cephalopholis boenak</i>	1.06E-02	3.081	73	0.993	F	5.5	30.5	
<i>Cephalopholis miniata</i>	6.55E-02	2.757	67	0.928	F	24	45	
<i>Cephalopholis sonnerati</i>	1.36E-02	3.048	62	0.967	F	24	50	
<i>Cephalopholis urodeta</i>	1.38E-02	3.173		0.986	F			16

continued

Table 2. continued

Table with columns: Family/Species, a, b, N, r, Length type, Length min, max, Ref. Rows include Dascyllus aruanus, Neopomacentrus taeniurus, Pomacentrus amboinensis, etc.

Table 2. continued

Table with columns: Family/Species, a, b, N, r, Length type, Length min, max, Ref. Rows include Zanclus cornutus, Acanthuridae, Acanthurus blochii, Acanthurus dussumieri, etc.

References

1Acharya, P. and S.N. Dwivedi. 1985. Some aspects of the biology of Trypauchen vagina off Bombay coast. J. Indian Fish. Assoc. 14-15:1-15. 2Azad, J.S. and K.S. Udupa. 1989. Length-weight relationship of the Indian mackerel off Mangalore. Indian J. Anim. Sci. 59(1):202-206.

7Dalzell, P. 1987. The biology of surgeon fishes with particular emphasis on Acanthurus nigricauda and A. xanthopterus from northern PNG. University of Newcastle upon Tyne, England. 285 p. M.Sc. thesis. 8Dalzell, P.J. and J.W. Wankowski. 1980. The biology, population dynamics and fisheries dynamics of exploited stocks of three baitfish species: Stolephorus heterolobus, S. devisi and Spratelloides gracilis in Ysabel Passage, New Ireland Province. PNG Department of Primary Industry (Port Moresby) Res. Bull. 22, 124 p.

- 77 p. B.Sc. thesis.
- ¹³Kulbicki, M. 1988. Patterns in the trophic structure of fish populations across the S.W. lagoon of New Caledonia, p. 89-94. In Proceedings of the 6th International Coral Reef Symposium. Vol. 2, Townsville Australia.
- ¹⁴Kulbicki, M., P. Doherty, J.E. Randall, G. Bargibant, J.L. Menou, G. Mou Tham and P. Tirard. 1990. La campagne CORAIL 1 du N.O. Coriolis aux îles Chesterfield (du 15 août au 4 septembre 1988): données préliminaires sur les peuplements ichthyologiques. Rapp. Sci. Tech. Biol. Mar. (ORSTOM, Nouméa, New Caledonia) 57, 88 p.
- ¹⁵Kulbicki, M. and L. Wantiez. 1990. Variations in the catch composition in the Bay of St. Vincent, New Caledonia, as determined by experimental trawling. Aust. J. Mar. Freshwat. Res. 41(1):121-144.
- ¹⁶Kulbicki, M., P. Thollot and L. Wantiez. Life-history strategies of fish assemblages from reef, soft bottom and mangroves from New Caledonia. Proceedings of the 7th International Coral Reef Symposium, 22-26 June 1992, Guam. (In press).
- ¹⁷Loubens, G. 1980. Biologie de quelques espèces de poissons du lagon néo-calédonien III - Croissance. Cahiers Indo-Pac. 2(2):101-153.
- ¹⁸Palomares, M.L.D. and C.R. Pagdila. 1986. Estimating the food consumption per unit biomass of a population of *Epinephelus fuscoguttatus*. In Contributions to tropical fisheries biology. FAO Fish. Rep. 389:432-442.
- ¹⁹Ralston, S. 1988. Length-weight regression and condition indices of lutjanids and other deep slope fishes from Mariana Archipelago. Micronesica 21:189-197.
- ²⁰Rivatón, J., P. Fourmanoir, P. Bourret and M. Kulbicki. 1989. Checklist of fishes from New Caledonia. Catalogues Sciences de la Mer, ORSTOM, Nouméa, New Caledonia. 170 p.
- ²¹Schroeder, R.E. 1982. Length-weight relationships of fishes from Honda Bay, Palawan, Philippines. Fish. Res. J. Philipp. 7(2):50-53.
- ²²Smith, A. and P. Dalzell. 1992. Fisheries resources and management investigations in Woleai Atoll, Yap State, Federated States of Micronesia. South Pacific Commission, Nouméa, New Caledonia. Preliminary report. 80 p.
- ²³Sousa, M.I. 1983. Relatório do cruzeiro realizado no Banco de Sofala pelo navis "Pantikapey" de 7 a 23 Junho de 1981: peixes pelagicos e fauna acompanhante de carapau e cavala. Rev. Invest. Pesq. (Maputo) 4:33-66.
- ²⁴Stevens, J.D. and J.M. Lyle. 1990. Biology of three hammerhead sharks (*Euphyra blochii*, *Sphyrna mokarran* and *S. lewini*) from Northern Australia. Aust. J. Mar. Freshwat. Res. 40:129-146.
- ²⁵Stevens, J.D. and K.J. McLoughlin. 1991. Distribution, size and sex composition, reproductive biology and diet of sharks from Northern Australia. Aust. J. Mar. Freshwat. Res. 42:151-199.
- ²⁶Tampubolon, G.H. 1986. Growth and mortality estimation of Indian mackerel (*Rastrelliger kanagurta*) in the Malacca strait, Indonesia. In Contributions to tropical fisheries biology. FAO Fish. Rep. 389:372-384.
- ²⁷Thollot, P. 1992. Les poissons de mangrove du lagon sud-ouest de Nouvelle-Calédonie. University of Aix-Marseille II, France. 405 p. Ph.D. thesis.
- ²⁸Tobias, W.J. 1976. Ecology of *Siganus argenteus* in relation to its mariculture potential on Guam. In Studies on the genus *Siganus* in Guam waters. University of Guam Marine Laboratory Technical Report 29:58-93.
- ²⁹Uchida, R.N. and U. Uchiyama. 1986. Fishery atlas of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands. NOAA Tech. Rep. NMFS 39, 142 p.
- ³⁰Uchiyama, J.H., S.H. Kuba and D.T. Tagam. 1984. Length-weight and standard-fork length relationships of deepsea handline fishes from the northwestern Hawaiian islands. Proc. Res. Inves. NWHI-UNIH/Seagrant-MR-84-01(2):209-225.

M. KULBICKI, G. MOUTHAM, P. THOLLOT, L. WANTIEZ are from Institut Français de Recherche Scientifique pour le Développement en Coopération (ORSTOM), BP A 5 Nouméa, New Caledonia.

On Comparing Groups of Fishes Based on Length-Weight Relationships

CHARLES W. CAILLOUET, JR.

Abstract

F. Torres, Jr., in a 1991 *Fishbyte* article, presented length-weight relationships derived from 122 graphs in van der Elst's 1981 *A guide to the common sea fishes of southern Africa*. This author analyzes Torres's tabulated results to determine whether or not a , b , $\ln a$, L_{\max} and $\ln L_{\max}$ were correlated. Highly significant ($P < 0.01$) negative correlations between b and $\ln a$ ($r = -0.868$) and between $\ln a$ and $\ln L_{\max}$ ($r = -0.276$) were detected. Thus, Torres's mean of b for this sample of 122 species may have been influenced not only by the species composition of the sample, but also by the range in size of individuals of each species.

Introduction

For each of 122 species from 93 genera and 44 families of marine fishes, Torres (1991) extracted four weight (W , in kg) and length (L , in cm) data pairs from L-W graphs presented by van der Elst (1981). Using least-squares regression, of the form $\log_{10} W = \log_{10} a + b \log_{10} L$, to fit the L-W relationship, Torres (1991) estimated b and a for each species, then tabulated these estimates along with the maximum size (L_{\max} , in cm) of each species. He conducted a Student's t-test to compare the mean $\bar{b} = 2.88$, of this sample of 122 species with 3, the average b reported for different multispecies samples of fishes by Carlander (1969) and Cinco (1982). Coincidentally, 3 also is the expected

value of b when growth in W and L is isometric (Beyer 1987; Cone 1989; Beyer 1991).

Using Torres's (1991) tabulated results for his 122-species sample of marine fishes, I examined the frequency distributions of b , a , $\ln a$, L_{\max} and $\ln L_{\max}$ to determine which if any were normal. I then examined all possible bivariate, product-moment correlations among b , a , $\ln a$, L_{\max} and $\ln L_{\max}$ to determine if any were significant.

Materials and Methods

I extracted b , a and L_{\max} data for each of the 122 species of marine fishes from Torres's (1991) tabulation, and conducted univariate analyses of b , a , $\ln a$, L_{\max} and $\ln L_{\max}$. I then conducted product-moment correlation analyses to examine all bivariate relationships among b , a , $\ln a$, L_{\max} and $\ln L_{\max}$.

Results and Discussion

Descriptive statistics for b , a , $\ln a$, L_{\max} and $\ln L_{\max}$ are presented in Table 1. The distributions of b , $\ln a$ and $\ln L_{\max}$ were normal, as indicated by high values of the Shapiro-Wilk statistic (Shapiro and Wilk 1965), W , and skewness and kurtosis coefficients approaching 0, but the distributions of

