# Comprehensive assessment for controlling factor of total Hg level in skipjack tuna from Western North Pacific Ocean

## Background

- Rasmussen, 2006). To assess diet composition is critical point for mass balance modelling (Ferriss & Essington, 2014).
- Migratory pelagic marine species such as tuna are particularly significant source of MeHg to human (Sunderland, 2007; Yasutake et al., 2003). • Even among the same species, considerable geographical variation have been reported (Hisamichi et al., 2010; Sunderland, 2007). Although age/size dependent increase of Hg has commonly observed, this trend can not be explained solely by bioenergetic process (Trudel &
- In this study, we discuss about controlling factor of THg level in skipjack tuna considering size, trophic position, regional variation, and stable isotope signatures.





0.50

 $\delta^{202}$ Hg

1.0

-0.50



#### Fig. 3 Latitudinal change of (a) $\Delta^{199}$ Hg. and (b) $\delta^{202}$ Hg. Fig. 4 Relationship between $\delta^{202}$ Hg and $\Delta^{199}$ Hg.

The  $\delta^{202}$ Hg and  $\Delta^{199}$ Hg of overall samples were ranged from -0.41 to 1.04‰, 1.90 to 3.77‰, respectively (Fig. 3). These variations are much larger than Blum et al. (2013), which measured same species in Hawaii, showing  $\delta^{202}$ Hg and  $\Delta^{199}$ Hg: 0.63  $\pm$  0.08‰ and 2.71  $\pm$  0.17‰, respectively (2SD, n = 3). This indicates isotope signal is variable depending on the region even among the same species.

Takaaki Itai, – Department of Earth and Planetary Science, The University of Tokyo, Japan, itai@eps.s.u-tokyo.ac.jp Toshiki Kamei and Shinsuke Tanabe, – Center for Marine Environmental Studies, Ehime University, Japan





#### Assumption

MeHg is predominantly formed below mixed layer.  $\Delta^{199}$ Hg value is controlled by mixing of residual MeHg, which formed in the mixed layer, and that formed below mixed layer.

# Conclusions

**PSW** (Polar Subarctic Water): Small size, low THg, high  $\Delta^{199}$ Hg (foraging diet from shallower water). Kuroshio: Large size, high THg, low  $\Delta^{199}$ Hg (foraging diet from deeper water). **NEQ** (Near Equator): Large size, low THg, intermediate  $\Delta^{199}$ Hg.

Implications: Variation of Δ<sup>199</sup>Hg possibly the function of foraging depth. Accepting this assumption, body size dependent increase of THg is attributed to the foraging from deep water having higher MeHg concentration. Further study for depth vs isotope signature will be important.



### Fig. 6 Relationship between $\Delta^{199}$ Hg and $\Delta^{201}$ Hg.

- <sup>a</sup> Bergquist and Blum (2007) MMHg photodegradation experiment.
- <sup>b</sup> Bergquist and Blum (2007) Hg<sup>II</sup> photoreduction experiment.

Overall slope being 1.20 is same to the other data of marine biota (e.g., Blum et al. 2013).

## Fig. 7 Relationship between $\Delta^{199}$ Hg and falk length

## **Clear negative correlation**

=> Smaller individuals (PSW) forage diet from shallower water, while bigger individuals (Kuroshio, NEQ) are from deeper water.

Increasing size increase thermal inertia and heat production via metabolism. (Barkley et al., 1978)



References



# **Correlation among variables**

 
 Table 1. The pearson's correlation coefficient and statistical significance
of stepwise linear-regression analyses. The bold faces indicate p value <0.05. THg<sub>corr</sub> represents normalized THg by body length.

	Body length vs.					$\delta^{15}$ N vs.		$\delta^{13C}$ vs.		$\delta^{202}$ Hg vs.		$\Delta^{199}$ Hg vs.	
	THg	$\delta^{15}N$	$\delta^{13}C$	$\delta^{202}$ Hg	$\Delta^{199}$ Hg	THg	δTHg <sub>corr</sub>	THg	THg <sub>corr</sub>	THg	THg <sub>corr</sub>	THg	THg <sub>corr</sub>
Overal	l												
n	68	58	58	68	58	58	58	58	58	68	68	68	68
R	0.6568	0.1508	0.4821	0.3796	-0.9053	0.1190	0.0354	0.0680	-0.2227	0.3204	0.0415	-0.7514	-0.2313
p	0.0076	0.6314	0.0873	0.1990	<0.0001	0.7060	0.9113	0.8301	0.4731	0.2887	0.8959	0.0006	0.4549
<b>KOTR</b>	l												
n	23	21	21	23	23	21	21	23	23	23	23	23	23
R	0.7833	0.1194	-0.5408	0.3592	-0.5899	0.0978	0.0299	-0.2180	0.4154	0.1464	-0.3031	-0.5898	0.0868
p	0.0007	0.7078	0.0563	0.2371	0.0311	0.7593	0.9256	0.4876	0.1634	0.6446	0.3260	0.0312	0.7855
KOTR2	2												
n	9	8	8	9	9	8	8	8	8	9	9	9	9
R	-0.0508	-0.1221	0.1419	0.0854	-0.6404	0.6623	0.5943	-0.7305	-0.6760	0.6076	0.2588	-0.1164	0.4022
p	0.8768	0.7106	0.6663	0.7943	0.0336	0.0314	0.0581	0.0148	0.0273	0.0461	0.4248	0.7219	0.2074
KR1													
n	9	7	7	9	9	7	7	7	7	9	9	9	9
R	0.0926	0.2563	0.4257	0.0563	-0.2170	0.5449	0.3943	0.8855	0.6913	-0.5226	-0.4072	-0.6842	-0.4746
p	0.7772	0.4401	0.1970	0.8635	0.5048	0.0950	0.2329	0.0018	0.0292	0.0938	0.2014	0.0209	0.1320
KR2													
n	10	9	9	10	10	9	9	9	9	10	10	10	10
R	0.4650	0.2525	-0.2929	0.6059	-0.4022	0.5702	0.5397	-0.3587	-0.2147	0.8164	0.6700	-0.6581	-0.5525
p	0.1353	0.4364	0.3649	0.0426	0.2022	0.0642	0.0822	0.2637	0.5093	0.0021	0.0214	0.0245	0.0694
ECS													
n	8	6	6	8	8	6	6	6	6	8	8	8	8
R	-0.5428	0.0316	0.7188	-0.5708	0.0526	-0.0143	-0.0531	-0.4340	-0.4988	0.3717	0.4228	-0.5949	-0.5254
p	0.0870	0.9252	0.0308	0.0703	0.8732	0.9661	0.8747	0.2023	0.1429	0.2525	0.1906	0.0578	0.0987
NEQ	-	_		-		_	_	_	_	_	_		
n	9	7	7	9	7	7	7	7	7	9	9	9	9
R	0.5614	0.5745	0.8205	-0.6313	-0.0034	0.5959	N/A	0.1903	N/A	-0.7605	N/A	0.2316	N/A
p	0.0691	0.0772	0.0062	0.0368	0.9918	0.0659	N/A	0.5667	N/A	0.0076	N/A	0.4762	N/A

## **MIF signature vs THg**

Barkley, R.A. et al. (1978) Fishery Bull. 76, 653-662.; Bergquist, B.A. & Blum, J.D. (2007) Science 318, 417-420.; Blum, J.D. et al., (2013) Nature Geosci. 6. 79-884.; Feriss, B.E. & Essington, T.E. (2014) Ecol. Model. 278, 18-28.; Hisamichi, Y. et al. (2010) Environ. Sci. Tech. 44, 5971-5978.; Munson, A. et al. (2015) Global Biogeochem. Cycles 29, 656-676.; Sunderland, E. (2007) Environ. Health Persp. 115, 235.; Trudel, M. & Rasmussen, J.B. (2006) Can. J. Fish. Aqua. Sci. 63. 1890-1902.