77 p. B.Sc. thesis.

[13]Kulbicki, 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.

[14]Kulbicki, 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.

[15]Kulbicki, 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.

[16]Kulbicki, 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).

[17]Loubens, G. 1980. Biologie de quelques espèces de poissons du lagon néo-calédonien III - Croissance. Cahiers Indo-Pac. 2(2):101-153.

[18]Palomares, M.L.D. and C.R. Pagdilao. 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.

[19]Ralston, S. 1988. Length-weight regression and condition indices of lutjanids and other deep slope fishes from Mariana Archipelago. Micronesica 21:189-197.

[20]Rivaton, 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.

[21]Schroeder, R.E. 1982. Length-weight relationships of fishes from Honda Bay, Palawan, Philippines. Fish. Res. J. Philipp. 7(2):50-53.

[22]Smith, 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.

[23]Sousa, M.I. 1983. Relatorio do cruzeiro realizado no Banco de Sofala pelo navis "Pantikapey" de 7 a 23 Junho de 1981: peixes pelagicos e fauna accompanhante de carapau e cavala. Rev. Invest. Pesq. (Maputo) 4:33-66.

[24]Stevens, 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.

[25]Stevens, 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.

[26]Tampubolon, 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.

[27]Thollot, P. 1992. Les poissons de mangrove du lagon sud-ouest de Nouvelle-Calédonie. University of Aix-Marseille II, France. 405 p. Ph.D. thesis.

[28]Tobias, 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.

[29]Uchida, R.N. and U. Uchiyama. 1986. Fishery atlas of the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands. NOAA Tech. Rep. NMFS 39, 142 p.

[30]Uchiyama, 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-UNIHI/Seagrant-MR-84-01(2):209-225.

M. KULBICKI, G. MOU THAM, P. THOLLOT, L. WANTIEZ *are from Institut Français de Recherche Scientifique pour le Développement en Cooperation (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*, lna, L_{max} and $\ln L_{max}$ were correlated. Highly significant ($P < 0.01$) negative correlations between *b* and lna ($r = -0.868$) and between lna 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*, lna, 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*, lna, 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*, lna, L_{max} and $\ln L_{max}$. I then conducted product-moment correlation analyses to examine all bivariate relationships among b, a, lna, L_{max} and $\ln L_{max}$.

Results and Discussion

Descriptive statistics for *b*, *a*, lna, L_{max} and $\ln L_{max}$ are presented in Table 1. The distributions of b, lna 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

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for *b*, *a*, lna, L_{max} and lnL_{max}.[a]

	b	*a*	lna	L_{max}	lnL_{max}
Mean	2.877	4.873×10^{-5}	-11.010	129.3	4.568
Standard Deviation	0.302	1.227×10^{-4}	1.505	119.8	0.740
Skewness coefficient	-0.465	6.438	-0.312	2.651	0.390
Kurtosis coefficient	1.700	48.100	0.729	8.805	-0.068
Minimum	1.88	2.16×10^{-7}	-15.35	20	3.00
Maximum	3.84	1.09×10^{-3}	-6.82	740	6.61
Shapiro-Wilk[b] *W*	0.975	0.375	0.976	0.722	0.968
Prob. of a smaller *W*	0.259	0.0	0.275	0.0	0.065

[a]Based on data from Torres (1991). Sample size n = 122 species.
[b]Shapiro and Wilk (1965). Small values of *W* lead to rejection of the null hypothesis of normality.

1982), may have been influenced by variations in lna which in turn may have been influenced by variations in the maximum size of individuals of each species. I suspect that such relationships exist for other multispecies groups.

Not only is L_{max} (and therefore lnL_{max}) species-dependent, but it also could be study-dependent, because different investigators may not have access to the same range of W and L pairs for a given species, or to the entire range that is characteristic of the species. Because least-squares regression is greatly influenced by extreme observations in the sample, adding a few larger fish could strongly affect the regression results. This problem could be avoided by limiting the regression for each species to a similar range of sizes. Comparisons of W-L relationships among different temporal-spatial groupings of individuals of the same species are affected similarly (Cone 1989).

Investigators might capitalize on the strong relationship between *b* and lna. Perhaps both *b* and lna should be incorporated, for example through covariance analysis based on linear regressions of *b* on lna, in comparing multispecies samples of fishes from different studies, or in conducting interspecific comparisons using samples of individuals of the same species from different temporal-spatial groupings.

Table 2. Product moment correlation statistics for *b*, *a*, lna, L_{max} and lnL_{max}.[a]

	Correlation coefficient, r	P[b]
b vs *a*	-0.653	0.0001
b vs lna	-0.868	0.0001
b vs L_{max}	0.160	0.0789
b vs lnL_{max}	0.106	0.2446
a vs L_{max}	0.008	0.9285
a vs lnL_{max}	-0.011	0.9069
lna vs L_{max}	-0.313	0.0004
lna vs lnL_{max}	-0.276	0.0021

[a]Based on data from Torres (1991). Sample size n = 122 species. Correlations between L_{max} and lnL_{max} and between a and lna were highly significant ($P < 0.01$), but were not meaningful.
[b]Probability of a greater |r| due to chance alone, under the null hypothesis that r = 0.

a and L_{max} were not normal. Torres (1991) also showed that the distribution of *b* was normal for this 122-species sample. However, Torres (1991) found that the mean of *b*, 2.88, was significantly lower ($P = 0.01$) than a mean *b* of 3, reported for other multispecies samples of fishes by Carlander (1969) and Cinco (1982).

I detected highly significant ($P < 0.01$) negative correlations between *b* and *a*, *b* and lna, lna and L_{max}, and lna and lnL_{max} (Table 2). The correlation, r = -0.868, between *b* and lna was very strong (Fig. 1). However, the correlation, r = -0.276, between lna and L_{max} was not very strong, though highly significant. There were no significant ($P > 0.05$) correlations between *b* and L_{max}, *b* and lnL_{max}, *a* and L_{max}, or *a* and lnL_{max}. In the strictest sense, only those correlations for which both variates were normally distributed (i.e., those for *b vs* lna, lna *vs* lnL_{max}, and *b vs* lnL_{max}) should be considered valid.

The very strong and highly significant correlation between *b* and lna, and the weaker, but highly significant correlation between lna and lnL_{max}, suggest that Torres's (1991) mean of *b* for this 122-species group of fishes, and his comparison of this mean with 3 (Carlander 1969; Cinco



Fig. 1. ***Scatter plot, linear regression equation and coefficient of determination (r^2) for the relationship between b and lna, based on data from Torres (1991).***

Acknowledgements

My interest in the relationship between parameters of the L-W relationship was stimulated by discussions with Kenneth Carlander, Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa, USA during the early 1960s. James Matis, Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas, USA, and Richard Condrey, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, USA reviewed the manuscript. James Nance, NMFS Galveston Laboratory, Galveston, Texas, USA, prepared the figure.

References

Beyer, J.E. 1987. On length-weight relationships. Part I: Computing the mean weight of the fish in a given length class. Fishbyte 5(1):11-13.

Beyer, J.E. 1991. On length-weight relationships. Part II: Computing mean weights from length statistics. Fishbyte 9(2):50-54.

Carlander, K. 1969. Handbook of freshwater fishery biology. Vol. 1. Iowa State University Press, Ames, Iowa.

Cinco, E. 1982. Length-weight relationship of fishes, p. 34-37. *In* D. Pauly and A. N. Mines (eds.) Small-scale fisheries of San Miguel Bay, Philippines: biology and stock assessment. ICLARM Tech. Rep. 7, 124 p.

Cone, R.S. 1989. The need to reconsider the use of condition indices in fishery science. Trans. Am. Fish. Soc. 118:510-514.

Shapiro, S.S. and M.B. Wilk. 1965. An analysis of variance test for normality (complete samples). Biometrika 52:591-611.

Torres, F., Jr. 1991. Tabular data on marine fishes from southern Africa, Part I: length-weight relationships. Fishbyte 9(1):50-53.

van der Elst, R. 1981. A guide to the common sea fishes of southern Africa. C. Struik, Cape Town. 367 p.

C.W. Caillouet, Jr. *is from the National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Southeast Fisheries Center, Galveston Laboratory, 4700 Avenue U, Galveston, Texas 77551-5997 USA.*