Impacts of cetaceans on the structure of Southern Ocean food webs
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Recently, Ballance et al. (2006) revived the hypothesis that cetaceans were a major force in the structuring of Southern Ocean food webs, and suggested that they are still playing a keystone role even as their loss continues (see also review in Mori and Butterworth 2006), a subject that we herein would like to emphasize. According to this hypothesis, following 60 yr of directed industrial whaling (Tønnessen and Johnsen 1982, Baker and Clapham 2002), the demise of the great whales (blue, *Balaenoptera musculus intermedia*; fin, *B. physalus*; and humpback, *Megaptera novaeangliae*) led to changes in populations and demographic parameters among penguins, seals, and minke whales (*B. bonaerensis*; see also Laws 1977, Bengtson and Laws 1985). These changes to populations of the great whales’ competitors came about upon release from trophic competition as a result of the “krill surplus” that ensued (i.e., of Antarctic krill, *Euphausia superba*; Bengtson and Laws 1985). Despite its popularity among Southern Ocean ecologists 25 yr ago, this top-down hypothesis (consumer effects on resources) has been largely replaced by an emphasis on bottom-up explanations (resource effects on consumers), as summarized in Ainley et al. (2007). Penguin populations and demographic parameters are still changing, but it is primarily geophysical causes that are now assigned as the drivers. Climate effects reducing sea ice with subsequent negative effects on krill abundance (cf. Fraser and Hofmann 2003, Atkinson et al. 2004), and in turn affecting predator trends, are the mechanisms most often invoked (e.g., Forcada et al. 2006, Ducklow et al. 2007, Hinke et al. 2007). The longest time series on top trophic species are available for penguins and, indeed, elegant analyses have been conducted on penguin demographics in the Antarctic Peninsula and Adélie Land regions to support the links to climate change. This is clearly shown to be important in the northern Antarctic Peninsula region, but the same explanation has been used to explain negative penguin trends for waters off Adélie Land, East Antarctica, as well (see Barbraud and...

A challenge in attributing trends in populations of upper-trophic level predators to climate and ice-related krill declines alone is highlighted when the full complexity of the system is considered. For example, the humpback whale (M. novaeangliae), a trophic competitor of penguins (Friedlaender et al. 2008a; like penguins, they eat both krill and small fish: Laws 1977), has been increasing by 5% and an astounding 12%–13% per annum in waters off the Antarctic Peninsula and Adélie Land, respectively, with numbers going from near zero a few decades ago to many thousands in each region at present (Branch 2009). Blue whale (B. musculus) numbers are increasing as well in these areas, though far more slowly (Branch et al. 2007). Therefore, these whales have so far been finding sufficient food to sustain their population growth, apparently unlike Adélie (Pygoscelis adeliae) and other penguins of the Antarctic Peninsula and emperor penguins (Aptenodytes forsteri) of Adélie Land, or competing minke whales (Friedlaender et al. 2008b), whose populations have at least been stable though their body condition may be declining (cf. Branch 2006, Konishi et al. 2008). In the absence of further information, including whether whale foraging directly affects that of their competitors as noted elsewhere (e.g., see Ainley et al. 2006a, Friedlaender et al. 2008a, b) or whether differences in ambiits (space–time use patterns) are involved (whales, unlike penguins, are not tied to land colonies), an apparent paradox thus exists regarding decreasing krill availability and supposed effects on upper-level predators. Although they acknowledge that their modeling of upper-trophic-level predators is in its infancy, Mori and Butterworth (2006) concur that more than climate is involved in the explanation of large-scale changes in these species’ populations in the Southern Ocean.

Here we present three ecological scenarios that demonstrate how cetaceans may influence the structure and dynamics of the Southern Ocean food web. These should be considered in addition to those suggested by Ballance et al. (2006, and references therein), Ainley et al. (2007), Willis (2007), and the seeming paradox described above. Marine trophic cascades resulting from top-predator removal are of course not a novel concept; examples in other ocean systems were recently summarized by Baum and Worm (2009). While we acknowledge the correlative nature of our examples, we nonetheless contend that these results indicate fruitful directions for current and future research in the Southern Ocean. Data from the Southern Ocean are most easily attained by remote sensing, which sheds light on why researchers are preoccupied with physical factors that lend themselves to this technology as ecosystem drivers (e.g., Forcada et al. 2006, Ducklow et al. 2007, Hinke et al. 2007, Jenouvrier et al. 2009). While much of what we relate cannot be easily resolved using remote sensing, and instead requires direct observation, we hope our perspectives will enable the establishment of a broader scientific basis for management of Antarctic marine resources, which are increasingly coming under the pressure of cumulative impacts from climate change, fishing, and other anthropogenic factors (Blight and Ainley 2008).
Barbraud and Cotté (2008) proposed that the International Whaling Commission (IWC) database on killer whale take and diet be consulted for evidence supporting our earlier hypothesis (Ainley et al. 2007) that a major removal of minke whales led to prey switching in killer whales, thus resulting in increased mortality of adult male emperor penguins during the late 1970s at Pointe Géologie, Adélie Land. We therefore examined the IWC database for the area within 65°−66°S, 139°−141°E (Pointe Géologie: 66.8°S, 140.1°E; Fig. 1). A large number of killer whales were taken by Russian whalers from this small area over 3 yr, 1978–1980 inclusive (Fig. 2), coincident with a return of adult emperor penguin survival rates to the approximately 20-yr mean (Fig. 2). None of this species was taken before, or after in that area.

None of the killer whales in the database was recorded as having penguin remains in their stomachs, but this absence is not definitive. Springer et al. (2008) pointed out the difficulty in gaining insights on diet from investigating killer whale stomach contents, given the common absence even of well-known prey items. Remains in killer whale stomachs provide useful information, but only constitute a dietary snapshot; the absence of penguin remains does not mean killer whales never eat penguins. For example, the IWC database also contains nine killer whales taken in the vicinity of Îles Crozet (46°−47°S, 50°−53°E), where it is very well known that king penguins (A. patagonicus) are regularly eaten by killer whales (Guinet 1991, 1992). All nine of these whales lacked penguin remains in their stomachs. Like emperors, king penguins are large enough so that pursuing and catching them has an energetic reward for these large predators. In fact, no penguin remains are recorded in the database for any of the ∼550 killer whales taken south of 44°S since 1923 with identified stomach contents (81 more contained unidentifiable remains). Killer whales are also well known to regularly take king penguins at Marion Island (47°S, 38°E; Condy et al. 1978), and at Macquarie Island, 54°S, 159°E; EW, personal observation). Marion Island is one location where the “cultural” aspects of predation have been studied, i.e., many killer whale behaviors are found only in isolated family groups and passed down by teaching within the group (Tosh et al. 2008; see also Ford et al. 1998, for discussion of sociobiological aspects of killer whale diet elsewhere). The taking of penguins may be a cultural attribute that is not widespread among killer whales in general and would therefore be difficult to quantify from ocean-wide, undirected sampling, which is the basis of the IWC database (see below).

Also relevant here is the work of Williams et al. (2004), who showed how just a few killer whales can have a major impact on K-selected prey populations such as sea otters (Enhydra lutris). In terms of food value, an adult emperor penguin (body mass 22–24 kg at the end of chick rearing, twice that at the start of breeding; Williams 1995) would be energetically equivalent to a sea otter (23–34 kg) and approaching the energy density of a 40-kg Steller sea lion (Eumetopias jubatus) pup in the Williams et al.’s (2004) energetic modeling. Following the Williams et al. model, it would thus have required very few killer whales to have had significant impacts on the emperor penguin colony at Pointe Géologie. Pertinent, too, is the study by
Figure 1. The Antarctic and Southern Ocean, showing locations mentioned in the text: IWC Areas I–VI, and the following by number: 1, Pointe Géologie; 2, Ross Island; 3, Law Dome; 4, James Ross Island; 5, Islas Orcadas (South Orkney Islands). Also shown are a series of storms of typical extent that move clockwise around the continent. Infrared satellite composite image (1500 UTC, 23 March 2009) made from a combination of geostationary and polar orbiting satellites (AMRC, SSEC, University of Wisconsin-Madison).

Boveng et al. (1998), who showed the extreme sensitivity of fur seal (Arctocephalus gazella) populations to predation by leopard seals (Hydrurga leptonyx), even when the predation is directed towards pups rather than the more demographically sensitive adults.

It is worthy to note that Andrews et al. (2008) attached a satellite tag to a type-B killer whale (see Pitman and Ensor 2003, for definition of ecotypes) in the vicinity of Cape Royds; the whale, and its pod, in an apparent “trap-line” sort of strategy, visited
Figure 2. Top, number of breeding pairs of emperor penguins at Pointe Géologie, 1965–2000. Bottom, annual survival of adult male emperor penguins at Pointe Géologie (line; data from Barbraud and Weimerskirch 2001), 1969–1988 (no data collected on survival before or thereafter), overlaying the number of potential predators, killer whales, removed from waters immediately off Pointe Géologie during a short time span (gray bars; from IWC database). Survival of adult penguins before 1969 and after 1988 was generally constant at the level indicated for these respective years, as the population did not vary during those times (see Barbraud and Weimerskirch 2001, Jenouvrier et al. 2009).

the sites of emperor penguin colonies as it moved north along the Victoria Land coast over subsequent weeks. Type-B killer whales have been observed patrolling one of these areas: the fast ice edge off the emperor penguin colony at Cape Washington (SO, personal observation), and have also been seen pursuing emperor penguins at Cape Royds (DGA and JP, personal observation). Lauriano et al. (2007) and Richlen and Thomas (2008; also PRW, personal observation) describe the behavior of killer whales in the western Ross Sea hunting Adélie penguins, although the extent of actual predation was uncertain (see also Visser et al. 2008, Ballard and Ainley 2005).

With these results in mind, the pattern presented in Figure 2 may indicate that the dramatic rebound in emperor penguin survival at Pointe Géologie was due to release from predation by the removal of an unprecedented ∼100 killer whales within 3 yr
from an area of just 185.2 km \(\times\) 185.2 km immediately offshore from the colony. Modeling by Barbraud and Weimerskirch (2001) showed that much of the penguin decrease was due to an adult mortality “event.” The lack of population growth since has been related to reduced breeding success, corresponding to a “regime shift” in which increased winds and thinning ice has led to increased instability of the fast ice platform on which the penguins nest (cf. Ainley et al. 2005, Jenouvrier et al. 2005, Stammerjohn et al. 2008).

Such an “experiment,” i.e., assessment of penguin demographic rates and colony trends upon removal of a major predator, was of course unintended, but it no doubt devastated the local killer whale population. Unfortunately, as is often a problem with “natural experiments,” results were confounded by other factors that could not be controlled—in this case by a coincident regime shift in meteorological conditions, as noted above. Other examples in which an upper-level predator population has coped with a regime shift, only to be reduced by an unrelated mortality event later, and from which it could not recover, have been reported for penguins and auks in the Galápagos Islands and coastal California, respectively (summarized in Ainley and Divoky 2001). We suggest that this removal experiment could also have extinguished or significantly reduced a “culture” (taking emperor penguins) among these killer whales. Explanation for the 1-yr return to low penguin survival 5 yr later (Fig. 2) is problematic, especially since data on numbers of killer whales in the vicinity do not exist for comparison with climate-related explanations (cf. Jenouvrier et al. 2009).

The 60% reduction in the colony to just a couple of thousand pairs could have made it a less attractive food source for predators; only a portion of the population would be foraging at any given time. Nonetheless, a large dip in population size, which accompanied the increased mortality of the 1970s, had not been reported before nor since in this penguin population (Fig. 2).

Regardless of the observational evidence, the role of predation in emperor penguin demography remains a hypothesis to be further explored. Clearly, predation is unable to explain all of the variation in fluctuation of these penguins’ population, some of which is almost certainly related to climate-related processes, particularly with respect to breeding/foraging effort and chick productivity (Jenouvrier et al. 2009). Extent and thickness of fast ice and divergence of pack ice is likely involved (Ainley et al. 2005, Massom et al. 2009), including perhaps an indirect influence of increased risks (i.e., foraging when predators are present) taken by starving male emperor penguins (cf. Alonzo 2002). These males fast for 4 mo during incubation, and likely hold an energetic debt until after the breeding process is completed (Williams 1995).

We look forward to continued recording and reporting of top-predator depredation events in the future (e.g., Visser et al. 2008). That these are rarely reported is perhaps more indicative of the limited opportunities for observers to spend time at sea in high southern latitudes than it is to the absolute rarity of such events (see also Springer et al. 2008, who discussed the overall rarity with which killer whale predation events are observed).
Figure 3. Annual variation in the number of Adélie penguins in the colony at Pétrels Island, Pointe Géologie, Adélie Land, 1984–2001, compared to that at two Ross Island colonies, Capes Royds and Bird, Victoria Land, by year 1975–2001. Data are from Wilson et al. (2001) and Jenouvrier et al. (2006), with numbers at Pétrels and Bird divided by 10 in order to be graphically comparable to those at the smaller Royds colony. The Pétrels data were used for Point Géologie as they did not show the effects, exhibited by other colonies in the area, of airfield construction at the Dumont d’Urville Station (see Jenouvrier et al. 2006 for details).

MINKE WHALES AS TROPHIC COMPETITORS OF PENGUINS

Barbraud and Cotté (2008) also suggested that if the reasoning of Ainley et al. (2007) is correct—that is, the removal of minke whales in IWC Area V led to an increase in food availability and subsequent competitive release of Adélie penguins in Victoria Land, eastern portion of Area V—then the same pattern should have occurred among penguins at Pointe Géologie, Adélie Land in the western portion of Area V (Fig. 1). Minke whales and Adélie penguins are direct trophic competitors (see Ainley et al. 2006a, b and references therein). The removal of 20,164 minke whales by commercial whaling in IWC Area V during ~15 yr in the 1970s and 1980s (see Brown and Brownell 2001) would not be ecologically trivial, particularly to penguins, even if this represents just 20% of the total minke population as noted by Barbraud and Cotté (2008). Even a small number of whales can have major impact on an area’s food web structure and carbon flux (e.g., Tynan 2004), and as whales are slow to reproduce, their population would not have rebounded quickly and thus the effects would have been long lived. In Area V, the majority of the minke whale take was in waters off George V Land coast and Terre Adélie, the region where many Victoria Land penguins spend their non-breeding period (G. Ballard et al., unpublished data).

Inspection of penguin population change at colonies in East and West Area V do indeed show closely similar trends (Fig. 3); key is the point that an increase in the Pointe Géologie population was already underway when annual censuses began.
in 1984. Indeed, Jenouvrier et al. (2006, p. 420) state that the “Adélie penguin population at Pointe Géologie Archipelago increased between 1984 and 2003 and showed similar fluctuations to Adélie populations on Ross Island [Victoria Land] between 1959 and 1997 . . . .” It is unfortunate that Adélie Land census data were not available earlier to compare with the earlier Ross Island data. Nonetheless, the comparison shows that it is plausible to conclude that whatever was influencing population trends of Victoria Land Adélie penguins was also affecting those of Adélie Land (Pointe Géologie). Whether all this translates to a mechanism driving regional penguin population trends is certainly speculative, but is consistent with the earlier tenets of the “krill surplus” resulting from whale removal, and past explanations of changes in whale-penguin-seal populations elsewhere (Ballance et al. 2006). We conclude here by suggesting that both bottom-up and top-down factors have been involved in interrelated ways in this scenario (see Ainley et al. 2005, 2007; Jenouvrier et al. 2006).

**WHALES, KRILL, AND THE METHANESULFONIC ACID RECORD OF EAST ANTARCTIC ICE CORES**

Whales may figure in another much-researched phenomenon as well, with their removal perhaps contributing to a region-wide shift and trophic cascade involving the plankton and nekton communities. Recently, Ainley et al. (2007) hypothesized that the decrease of krill in the Southwest Atlantic sector (SWAS, or IWC Area II and western Area III; Fig. 1) beginning in the 1970s (Atkinson et al. 2004) was a possible factor behind a decrease in methanesulfonic acid (MSA) detected in glacial ice cores during the same period (Curran et al. 2003). MSA is one of the two (with sulfur dioxide) major end products of dimethylsulfide (DMS), which itself originates from dimethylsulfoniopropionate (DMSP) produced by phytoplankton. When krill graze on phytoplankton (especially diatoms) and break down their cell walls, DMSP is released into seawater, whereas grazing by pelagic salps (Salpa thompsoni) does not release DMSP as the salps do not destroy the cell walls during ingestion (Kasamatsu et al. 2004). Salp prevalence has been increasing in the SWAS since the 1970s, replacing krill (Atkinson et al. 2004); thus, this replacement might affect atmospheric levels of MSA.

Curran et al. (2003) detected a change in MSA deposition in glacial cores and attributed this solely to a reduction in sea ice during the 1950s–1960s in Areas II and III. Eschewing any biologically driven processes, it has been suggested that the krill–phytoplankton association with the marginal ice zone is involved (Kawaguchi et al. 2005, but see Atkinson et al. (2008), who argue for equally high krill abundance away from ice edges). Alternate explanations for the MSA decrease seem necessary, however, as Curran et al. (2003) pointed out that the correlation between pack ice extent and prevalence of MSA in glacial ice cores from East Antarctica was not valid everywhere around Antarctica (Röthlisberger and Abram 2009), nor even globally (O’Dwyer et al. 2000). Moreover, well-considered papers in physical oceanography have questioned whether any large-scale sea ice reduction would have been possible in this region during the 1950s–1960s (cf. Murphy et al. 1995; De La Mare 1997,
The most conclusive results come from Jacobs (2006), who found no evidence for changes in surface salinity in the Southern Ocean hydrographic record during the period in question. This is the only direct record that overlaps the entire period 1950s to the present, other than the ice core record itself. Such a salinity change would have to have happened if any large-scale reduction occurred in sea ice extent, a result indirectly confirmed by Cotté and Guinet (2007) who noted that any ice decrease would have been local and short term. Surface salinity, along with temperature, is one of the most conservative, easily-determined and long-standing measures of water mass characteristics.

In the context of this background, what factors were behind the change in MSA in the East Antarctic ice cores? Ultimately, as noted by Curran et al. (2003), the exclusive source of MSA in ice cores is marine phytoplankton (e.g., see also Yoch 2002). Importantly, their glacial ice core site, Law Dome (66°S, 110°E; Fig. 1), projects far into the Southern Ocean, is greatly influenced by marine air from the prevailing westerly winds and has substantial annual snow accumulation rates. Therefore, the MSA in the Law Dome cores must be from the ocean to the west, i.e., the SWAS. As salps have been replacing krill in the region (above), the atmospheric availability of DMS/MSA to Law Dome should be decreasing (see Ainley et al. 2007). Despite the distances involved, movement of air-borne compounds from the SWAS to Law Dome is easily tenable considering the eastward movement of fronts and storms in the region (Fig. 1)—South American dust blown southeastward is found in ice cores obtained from the Antarctic Peninsula (McConnell et al. 2007, Fig. 1), and dust from Asia blown eastward is a major component in the analysis of ice cores of Greenland (see Alley 2000, Mayewski and White 2002).

Indeed, the MSA record presented in Curran et al. (2003) shows a long period of increase beginning ~1910 and peaking in the 1950s (Fig. 4). This trend corresponds closely with the cumulative take of krill foraging, long-lived baleen whales during the Antarctic industrial whaling era, most of which was in Areas II and III (cf. Tønnessen and Johnsen 1982, Tynan 1998; Fig. 1). The effect would have been cumulative because the great whales are slow to reproduce and normally live on the order of 100 yr or longer. Storminess, i.e., the frequency and intensity of storms moving eastward from Area I to III (Fig. 1), would also affect the amount of MSA available for incorporation into snow, and ultimately glacial ice, on the continent, as noted by Curran et al. (2003, supplementary material). Controlling for this (two-way linear regression) and using the amount of South American dust in Antarctic Peninsula ice cores as a storminess index (McConnell et al. 2007), a highly statistically significant relationship is shown between MSA and cumulative barrels of oil (a proxy for whale loss and the krill surplus; $r^2 = 0.59$, $P < 0.001$; Fig. 5). This model accounts for upward bulges in MSA that occurred in 1920–1927 and again 1936–1946 (Fig. 4), with elevated dust concentrations occurring in ice cores indicating increased storminess in the region during those periods. Therefore, the MSA record may well be a strong proxy for ecosystem effects of the removal of whales and the purported krill surplus (see, again, Ballance et al. 2006). This trophic cascade involving multiple trophic levels is worth further investigation as such.
Sub-peaks of MSA in the mid-1800s (see Curran et al. 2003) are consistent as well with the hypothesis of Emslie and Patterson (2007) that an apparent major dietary shift from fish to krill in Adélie penguins began at that time, which was when millions of krill-eating fur seals were hunted to near extinction in the SWAS. The penguins apparently switched to the growing superabundance of Antarctic krill (Emslie and Patterson 2007). We hypothesize, therefore, that vastly increased abundance of krill in the SWAS led to increased release of DMS/MSA from the mid-1800s to the 1960s. Thereafter, MSA prevalence in the ice cores decreased, consistent with (see fig. 1 in Ainley et al. 2007): (1) eventually reduced krill production in response to grazing by whales (Willis 2007); (2) the rise of salps—replacing krill—owing to release from predation due to extensive depletion of their fish predators (especially nototheniids) beginning in the 1960s, and concurrent climate factors (Loeb et al. 1997, Ainley and Blight 2009); and (3) the increasing effects in recent decades of climate and sea ice forces bearing directly and negatively on krill abundance, as discussed by Atkinson et al. (2004).

If further analyses of the Curran et al. (2003) findings indicate that MSA concentration in ice cores is a proxy, at least in part, for the relative abundance of Antarctic krill (and their grazing) in the SWAS, rather than being due just to the amount of sea ice cover and storminess, it would be a paradigm-changing discovery. East Antarctic
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**Figure 4.** The cumulative barrels of whale oil taken from the Antarctic (bars; data from Tønnessen and Johnsen 1982), as a proxy for the extraction of krill-grazing whales and thus an increase in the abundance of krill foraging on diatoms (the “krill surplus”), compared to the MSA record in the Law Dome ice core (solid line; from Curran et al. 2003), by year 1895–1970. Given that the whales taken would normally live on the order of 100 yr, the effect of removal would be cumulative for the period of study. Tønnessen and Johnsen (1982) acknowledged incomplete records, which account for some of the plateaus and other patterns in the figure (e.g., no whaling during WWII); these authors also indicated that Antarctic whale populations were already being depleted in the 1890s by whaling on wintering grounds at lower latitudes. See Ainley et al. (2007, fig. 1) for a closer look at the period after the late 1950s, when climate factors may have begun to affect krill abundance and in turn MSA availability.
Figure 5. The relationship between storminess-corrected MSA (µM, i.e., the residual in a regression for MSA concentration on storminess), with MSA data from Law Dome (#3 in Fig. 1; data from Curran et al. 2003), as indexed by the amount of South American dust in Antarctic Peninsula ice cores (James Ross Island, #4; and Islas Orcadas, #5 in Fig. 1; data from J. McConnell), vs. the krill surplus, as indexed by the cumulative barrels of whale oil taken 1905–1957 ($r^2 = 0.59, P < 0.001$; data from Tønnessen and Johnsen 1982) mostly from IWC Areas II and III (as shown in Tynan 1998).

ice cores could then be used to track relative changes in the prehistoric, historic, and future abundance of Antarctic krill in the SWAS and perhaps elsewhere in the Southern Ocean.

CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

The above three sections present a suite of hypotheses on the direct role of top-down pressures involving cetaceans in structuring Southern Ocean food webs. Recent population fluctuations of cetaceans, as top predators, appear to play an important role in past and present changes seen in the Antarctic marine ecosystem (see also Mori and Butterworth 2006). Incorporating ecological processes of trophic cascades, competition, predation, and facilitation into models attempting to address climate effects on populations should result in a more realistic understanding of these systems. Indeed, owing to simplification via the loss of top-most predators and the ongoing removal of other predators (large fish), much of the Southern Ocean ecosystem is currently in a potentially fragile state, further compromising its ability to withstand rapid climate change (see Österblom et al. 2007, Cury et al. 2008, Watermeyer et al. 2008a, b).
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