

4-1987

Feeding Habits of Sheepshead, *Archosargus probatocephalus*, in Offshore Reef Habitats of the Southeastern Continental Shelf

George R. Sedberry
South Carolina Marine Resources Research Institute

DOI: 10.18785/negs.0901.03

Follow this and additional works at: <https://aquila.usm.edu/goms>

Recommended Citation

Sedberry, G. R. 1987. Feeding Habits of Sheepshead, *Archosargus probatocephalus*, in Offshore Reef Habitats of the Southeastern Continental Shelf. *Northeast Gulf Science* 9 (1).
Retrieved from <https://aquila.usm.edu/goms/vol9/iss1/3>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by The Aquila Digital Community. It has been accepted for inclusion in Gulf of Mexico Science by an authorized editor of The Aquila Digital Community. For more information, please contact Joshua.Cromwell@usm.edu.

FEEDING HABITS OF SHEEPSHEAD, *Archosargus probatocephalus*, IN OFFSHORE REEF HABITATS OF THE SOUTHEASTERN CONTINENTAL SHELF

George R. Sedberry

South Carolina Marine Resources Research Institute
P.O. Box 12559, Charleston, South Carolina 29412

ABSTRACT: The feeding habits of sheepshead, *Archosargus probatocephalus*, were studied by examining contents of digestive tracts from fish collected on offshore live bottom reefs in the South Atlantic Bight. Sessile invertebrates were the most important prey for sheepshead. Smaller sheepshead (<350 mm standard length) had a diet dominated by bryozoans. Larger sheepshead also fed heavily on bryozoans, but included more bivalves, echinoderms and ascidians in the diet. Barnacles and decapods were consumed in lesser amounts by both size classes. Foraminiferans, cnidarians, polychaetes, gastropods and small arthropods were also eaten. The sessile species utilized as prey by sheepshead are common colonial organisms found on offshore reefs. Motile epifaunal species consumed by sheepshead were common species associated with hard substrates or sessile species. Predation by sheepshead may be important in regulating the structure of epifaunal communities in reef habitats.

The sheepshead, *Archosargus probatocephalus* (Walbaum), is distributed from Nova Scotia to Rio de Janeiro and is commonly associated with hard substrates such as piers and jetties in estuarine and shallow inshore waters (Johnson, 1978; Ogburn, 1984). Sheepshead are also found on the continental shelf of the South Atlantic Bight where they are associated with artificial and natural "live bottom" reefs (Struhsaker, 1969; Sedberry and Van Dolah, 1984). Although the sheepshead is common and constitutes a recreationally important species (Randall and Vergara, 1978), little is known of its life history. Johnson (1978) summarized existing information on the early life history, during which sheepshead spend their time in shallow-water grass beds, feeding on soft-bodied invertebrates. Darnell (1958) reviewed early reports on feeding habits, provided additional data on the food of sheepshead, and concluded that vegetation and hard-shelled invertebrates were the most important foods for sheepshead in shallow waters. Springer and Woodburn

(1960) reported some plant material in addition to the mollusks, crustaceans (mainly amphipods) and polychaetes they found in stomachs collected in Tampa Bay. Overstreet and Heard (1982) reported a great diversity of invertebrates (mainly polychaetes, mollusks and crustaceans) and fishes from sheepshead collected in Mississippi Sound, and Ogburn (1984) reported that sheepshead fed primarily on intertidal algae and mollusks on North Carolina jetties. Little is known, however, of the ecology of sheepshead in offshore reef habitats, and the food of sheepshead in those reef areas is unknown. The purpose of this report is to describe the feeding habits of sheepshead collected from offshore live bottom reefs and to relate feeding habits to the ecology of live bottom reefs.

METHODS

Fish stomachs analyzed for feeding habits were collected during seasonal cruises in 1980 (two cruises, one in winter (January-March) and one in summer

(August-September) and 1981 [four cruises, one each winter, spring (May-June), summer, and fall (October-November)] from seven live bottom stations. Stations were located in two depth zones representing the inner (16-22 m depth, three sites) and middle (23-37 m, four sites) shelf. Inner shelf stations were located off of Charleston, South Carolina, Sapelo Island, Georgia (in Gray's Reef National Marine Sanctuary) and Jacksonville, Florida; the middle shelf stations were located off of South Carolina and Georgia. Delineation of depth zones was based on distribution of fish assemblages as noted in previous studies and on community analysis of catches in the present study (Struhsaker, 1969; Miller and Richards, 1980; Sedberry and Van Dolah, 1984; Sedberry, MS). Fish were collected primarily from standard-distance tows with a roller-rigged 40/54 high rise trawl (Hillier, 1974). This net is very effective in sampling fishes on rough bottom (Smith, 1977). Some larger fish were collected with speargun. Sampling for fishes was conducted on reef habitat which was mapped for each station using underwater television and diver observations. Detailed descriptions of station locations and fish sampling techniques are described elsewhere (Sedberry and Van Dolah, 1984; Sedberry, MS).

Sheepshead were measured (standard length, SL) at sea and their entire gastrointestinal tracts removed, individually labeled, and preserved in 10% seawater-formalin. In the laboratory, the contents of the anterior fourth of the digestive tract (to avoid bias due to differential digestion in the more posterior sections of the gut) were examined in the laboratory, sorted by taxa, counted and measured volumetrically. Colonial forms were counted as one organism. Because of the bias inherent in some methods of

quantifying food habits, (Hynes, 1950; Pinkas *et al.*, 1971; Windell, 1971), the relative contribution of food items to the diet was determined using three methods: (1) percent frequency occurrence (F), (2) percent numerical abundance (N), and (3) percent volume displacement (V). Percent frequency, number and volume were calculated for prey species and for prey items grouped into higher taxonomic groups for two length categories.

RESULTS

Sheepshead were caught only occasionally by trawl at inner (1.7 per tow) and middle shelf (0.2 per tow) stations. Underwater television and diver observations (Sedberry and Van Dolah, 1984; pers. obs.), however, indicate that they are common at the stations that were sampled. Their low abundance in trawl catches probably reflects trawl avoidance or their cryptic habits.

The 42 sheepshead guts examined contained a diversity (approximately 125 species) of sessile and motile organisms. Bryozoans, pelecypod mollusks, and barnacles (Cirripedia) were the most frequently consumed taxa and each occurred in more than 70 percent of stomachs with food (Table 1). Amphipods and ascidians were also frequently consumed and several other taxa occurred in more than 50% of the stomach samples. Amphipods and barnacles were the most abundant prey; however many colonial organisms could not be counted. Bryozoans, ascidians, echinoids, and pelecypods made up most of the prey volume. Most organisms eaten by sheepshead were sessile or tubicolous forms that are firmly attached to the substrate or to other sessile animals. These included all hydroids and anthozoans, some polychaetes (e.g. *Filograna*

Table 1. Percent frequency (F), percent number (N), and percent volume (V) of prey items found in sheephead (*Archosargus probatocephalus*) stomachs.

PREY ITEM	F	N	V	PREY ITEM	F	N	V
Foraminifera				Mollusca			
<i>Puteolina pseudodiscoidea</i>	12.9	0.4	<0.1	Gastropoda			
<i>Pyrgo subsphaerica</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1	<i>Astyris lunata</i>	22.6	1.9	<0.1
<i>Quinqueloculina lamarkiana</i>	9.7	0.3	<0.1	<i>Caecum cooperi</i>	9.7	0.2	<0.1
<i>Trochammina inflata</i>	6.4	0.2	<0.1	<i>Calliostoma pulchrum</i>	12.9	1.3	0.1
Total Foraminifera	22.6	1.0	<0.1	<i>Colubraria lanceolata</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1
Cnidaria				<i>Costoanachis avara</i>	29.0	1.8	0.1
Hydrozoa				<i>Crepidula aculeata</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1
<i>Aglaophenia</i> sp.	3.2	0.1	<0.1	<i>Diodora cayenensis</i>	3.2	0.1	0.1
<i>Aglaophenia latecarinata</i>	12.9	0.3	<0.1	Gastropoda undetermined	3.2	0.1	<0.1
<i>Dynamena cornicina</i>	25.8	0.6	<0.1	<i>Marginella</i> sp.	3.2	0.2	<0.1
<i>Dynamena quadridentata</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1	<i>Natica canrena</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1
<i>Halecium</i> sp. A	9.7	0.2	0.6	Total Gastropoda	45.2	5.9	0.3
<i>Monostaechas quadrindens</i>	6.4	0.2	<0.1	Pelecypoda			
<i>Sertularella</i> sp. A	6.4	0.2	0.1	<i>Anadara transversa</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1
<i>Sertularella conica</i>	9.7	0.2	<0.1	<i>Arca imbricata</i>	3.2	0.2	7.4
<i>Sertularella pinnigera</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1	<i>Arca zebra</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1
<i>Sertularia marginata</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1	<i>Brachiodontes modiolus</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1
<i>Synthecium tubitheca</i>	6.4	0.2	<0.1	<i>Cerithiopsis emersoni</i>	6.4	0.2	<0.1
<i>Thyroscyphus marginatus</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1	<i>Chama</i> sp.	3.2	0.1	0.1
Total Hydrozoa	54.8	2.3	0.8	<i>Chama macerophylla</i>	6.4	0.2	0.2
Anthozoa				<i>Chione grus</i>	6.4	0.2	<0.1
<i>Leptogorgia virgulata</i>	3.2	0.1	0.1	<i>Chione intapurpurea</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1
<i>Teleso fruticososa</i>	48.4	1.2	1.4	<i>Chione latilirata</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1
Total Anthozoa	51.6	1.3	1.5	<i>Crassinella lunulata</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1
Annelida				<i>Ervilia concentrica</i>	6.4	0.2	<0.1
Polychaeta				<i>Macrocallista maculata</i>	3.2	0.2	<0.1
Arabellidae undetermined	3.2	0.1	<0.1	Macridae undetermined	3.2	0.1	<0.1
<i>Ceratonereis mirabilis</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1	<i>Musculus lateralis</i>	29.0	1.0	<0.1
Chaetopteridae undetermined	3.2	0.1	<0.1	<i>Payridea soleniformis</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1
<i>Cistenides gouldii</i>	3.2	0.2	<0.1	<i>Pteria colymbus</i>	41.9	2.2	2.6
<i>Crucigera websteri</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1	Total Pelecypoda	74.2	5.0	10.4
<i>Exogone dispar</i>	3.2	0.2	<0.1	Arthropoda			
<i>Filograna implexa</i>	6.4	1.4	<0.1	Pycnogonida			
<i>Hydroides</i> sp. A	9.7	0.2	<0.1	<i>Anoplodactylus petiolatus</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1
<i>Hydroides</i> sp. D	3.2	0.1	<0.1	Crustacea			
<i>Lumbrineris</i> sp.	3.2	0.1	<0.1	Cirripedia			
<i>Lysidice ninetta</i>	6.4	0.2	<0.1	<i>Balanus trigonus</i>	48.4	5.1	1.8
Maldanidae undetermined	3.2	0.1	<0.1	<i>Balanus venustus</i>	45.2	7.6	1.2
Nereidae undetermined	3.2	0.1	<0.1	Total Cirripedia	71.0	12.6	3.0
<i>Nereis</i> sp.	6.4	0.3	<0.1	Isopoda			
<i>Nichomache trispinata</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1	<i>Carpas bermudensis</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1
<i>Owenia fusiformis</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1	<i>Erichsonella filiformis</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1
<i>Potamilla</i> sp. B	3.2	0.1	<0.1	Total Isopoda	6.4	0.2	<0.1
<i>Sabellaria vulgaris</i>	6.4	0.2	<0.1				
<i>Syllis gracilis</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1				
Terebellidae undetermined	3.2	0.1	<0.1				
<i>Websterinereis tridentata</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1				
Total Polychaeta	51.6	3.9	0.1				

32 Sedberry, G.R.

Table 1. Cont.

PREY ITEM	F	N	V	PREY ITEM	F	N	V
Amphipoda				<i>Microporella ciliata</i>	19.4	0.5	0.1
<i>Ampelisca</i> sp.	9.7	0.2	<0.1	<i>Nellia tenella</i>	29.0	0.7	<0.1
<i>Ampelisca schellenbergi</i>	9.7	0.4	<0.1	<i>Petraliella bisinuata</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1
<i>Caprella equilibra</i>	25.8	3.4	<0.1	<i>Schizoporella cornuta</i>	58.1	1.4	32.3
<i>Caprella penantis</i>	3.2	0.2	<0.1	<i>Schizoporella errata</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1
<i>Ceradocus</i> sp. A	3.2	0.1	<0.1	<i>Schizoporella floridana</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1
<i>Cerapus tubularis</i>	32.3	3.9	<0.1	<i>Scrupocellaria regularis</i>	6.4	0.2	<0.1
<i>Erichthonius brasiliensis</i>	58.1	18.0	0.1	<i>Stylopoma informata</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1
<i>Luconacia incerta</i>	38.7	11.0	0.1	<i>Sundanela sibogae</i>	29.0	0.7	0.1
<i>Lysianopsis alba</i>	3.2	0.2	<0.1	<i>Turbicellepora dichotoma</i>	41.9	1.0	0.2
<i>Melita appendiculata</i>	9.7	0.4	<0.1	Total Bryozoa	80.6	9.2	37.5
<i>Photis pugnator</i>	51.6	11.6	0.1	Echinodermata			
<i>Phtisica marina</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1	Echinoidea			
<i>Podocerus</i> sp.	9.7	0.4	<0.1	<i>Arbacia punctulata</i>	6.4	0.2	<0.1
<i>Stenothoe georgiana</i>	12.9	0.3	<0.1	Clypeasteroidea undetermined	9.7	0.2	12.7
Total Amphipoda	64.3	50.3	0.4	Total Echinoidea	16.1	0.4	12.7
Decapoda				Ophiuroidea			
<i>Batrachonotus fragosus</i>	6.4	0.3	0.1	<i>Axiognathus squamatus</i>	6.4	0.2	<0.1
Brachyuran megalopae	3.2	0.1	<0.1	<i>Ophiothrix angulata</i>	9.7	0.2	<0.1
<i>Hypoconcha sabulosa</i>	3.2	0.2	0.2	Total Ophiuroidea	16.1	0.4	<0.1
<i>Macrocoeloma camptocerum</i>	3.2	0.2	0.2	Holothuroidea			
<i>Megalobrachium soriatum</i>	3.2	0.2	<0.1	<i>Ocnus pygmaeus</i>	6.4	0.2	0.4
<i>Metoporphaphis calcarata</i>	6.4	0.4	1.3	Chordata			
<i>Mithrax forceps</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1	Ascidiacea			
<i>Mithrax pleuracanthus</i>	9.7	0.3	0.2	<i>Apidium</i> sp.	3.2	0.1	3.0
<i>Neopanope sayi</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1	<i>Ascidia</i> sp.	6.4	0.9	1.5
<i>Osachila tuberosa</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1	Ascidiacea undetermined	9.7	0.2	0.6
<i>Paguristes</i> sp.	3.2	0.1	0.1	<i>Didemnum candidum</i>	12.9	0.3	4.4
<i>Pagurus carolinensis</i>	9.7	0.3	<0.1	<i>Molgula</i> sp.	6.4	0.2	0.7
<i>Pagurus hendersoni</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1	<i>Molgula</i> (?) sp.	6.4	0.2	1.4
<i>Pagurus piercei</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1	<i>Molgula occidentalis</i>	3.2	0.1	0.9
<i>Pelia mutica</i>	3.2	0.2	0.2	<i>Perophora</i> sp.	3.2	0.1	<0.1
<i>Pilumnus</i> sp.	6.4	0.5	0.1	<i>Pyura vittata</i>	3.2	0.1	0.3
<i>Pilumnus dasypodus</i>	9.7	0.6	<0.1	<i>Styela plicata</i>	19.4	0.5	17.5
<i>Pilumnus sayi</i>	9.7	0.6	0.5	Total Ascidiacea	61.3	2.6	30.2
<i>Pinnotheres maculatus</i>	6.4	0.2	<0.1				
<i>Synalpheus townsendi</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1				
Total Decapoda	45.2	4.5	2.9				
Sipunculida				Number of stomachs examined:		42	
<i>Golfingia</i> sp.	3.2	0.1	<0.1	Examined stomachs with food:		31	
Bryozoa							
<i>Aeverillia setigera</i>	9.7	0.2	<0.1				
<i>Amathia alternata</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1				
<i>Amathia distans</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1				
<i>Antropora leucocypha</i>	12.9	0.3	<0.1				
<i>Bugula turrita</i>	9.7	0.2	<0.1				
<i>Celleporaria albirostris</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1				
<i>Celleporaria magnifica</i>	12.9	0.3	1.5				
<i>Chaperia galeata</i>	3.2	0.1	<0.1				
<i>Crisia</i> sp. A	71.0	1.8	2.6				
Ctenostomata undetermined	6.4	0.2	0.3				
<i>Cupuladria doma</i>	9.7	0.2	<0.1				
<i>Diaperocelia floridana</i>	12.9	0.3	<0.1				
<i>Discoporella umbellata</i>	9.7	0.2	0.2				
<i>Hippaliosina rostrigera</i>	6.4	0.2	<0.1				

implexa, *Hydroidea* spp.), some pelecypods (e.g. *Ptereria colymbus*, *Arca* spp.), barnacles, some amphipods (e.g. *Cerapus tubularis*), and all bryozoans and ascidians. It is apparent that sheepshead are heavy grazers on live bottom reefs. Most fishes had full guts at all times of the day and a large volume of food was usually present in the entire gut.

Attached sessile fauna dominated the volume of prey in both size groups of sheepshead examined, though larger attached pelecypods (e.g., *Arca* spp.) made up a greater portion of the diet of larger fish than that of smaller sheepshead and bryozoans were much more important in the diet of smaller sheepshead (Table 2). Barnacles were consumed in nearly the same frequency, number, and volume in both size classes. Amphipods were consumed in large numbers by both size classes, and gastropods were consumed more by smaller fish.

DISCUSSION

Previously published studies of the food of sheepshead in inshore habitats reveals striking differences in the prey of this fish between inshore and offshore habitats. Darnell (1958) found that filamentous algae and submerged aquatic tracheophytes dominated the prey volume in stomachs of 11 fish (218-410mm long) he examined. Mollusks, especially bivalves, sponges, crabs and fishes were also found. Amphipods, copepods, and polychaetes were found in 11 stomachs of small juvenile sheepshead (<50 mm) from inshore seagrass beds around Tampa Bay (Springer and Woodburn, 1960). Springer and Woodburn (1960) found that larger juveniles (51-100 mm) fed mainly on mollusks and barnacles, and some small crustaceans and algae were also noted. Wardle (1980) reported digeneic trematodes, whose intermediate host is a mussel (*Ischadium recurvum*) often consumed by sheepshead in shallow Gulf of Mexico waters (Darnell, 1958; Overstreet and Heard, 1982), from the hindgut of sheepshead from Texas. Overstreet and Heard (1982) found over 113 species of plants and animals in 125 sheepshead guts from Mississippi

Sound. In contrast to the present study, they found a relatively low frequency of bryozoans and ascidians, and a greater frequency of plant material and fishes. Fishes, which were not consumed by sheepshead in the present study, were most frequent in the diet of sheepshead >350mm SL. Ogburn (1984) noted a diet dominated by intertidal algae and mussels (*Brachidontes exustus*) in sheepshead (<350mm SL) collected from jetties in North Carolina, and small sheepshead (<300mm SL, N = 4) collected from inshore waters of South Carolina (1 m depth) fed on algae and mollusks (*B. exustus*) that were abundant on the rock jetty where they were collected (Van Dolah *et al.*, 1984). Smaller sheepshead that occur in inshore waters feed heavily on algae and mollusks and apparently move to offshore reefs as they become adults, where algae become less important in their diet. Benthic algae are not common on live bottom reefs off of South Carolina, Georgia and Florida (South Carolina Wildlife and Marine Resources Department, 1981), and sheepshead found in these habitats apparently switch their diet to more abundant organisms such as bryozoans and ascidians. Although cordgrass (*Spartina alterniflora*), a source of food for many estuarine detritus feeding fishes, including sheepshead (Darnell, 1958; Overstreet and Heard, 1982), accumulates under rock outcrops and in crevices in some inner shelf live bottom areas (Office of Coastal Zone Management, 1980), vascular plant detritus was not found in any sheepshead guts in the present study.

Randall (1967) examined the stomach contents of 212 species of West Indian reef fishes and grouped species into the following categories: 1) plant and detritus feeders, 2) zooplankton feeders, 3) sessile animal feeders, 4) "shelled" in-

Table 2. Percent frequency occurrence (F), percent number (N) and percent volume (V) of higher taxonomic groups of food in the diet of *Archosargus probatocephalus*, by length interval.

Prey	Length Intervals (mm SL)					
	<350			≥350		
	F	N	V	F	N	V
Foraminifera	22.2	0.9	<0.1	23.1	1.3	<0.1
Cnidaria						
Hydrozoa	55.6	2.3	0.3	53.8	2.4	1.1
Anthozoa	66.7	1.7	2.6	30.8	0.7	0.6
Annelida						
Polychaeta	50.0	4.8	0.3	53.8	2.8	0.1
Mollusca						
Gastropoda	44.4	7.0	0.4	46.2	4.4	0.2
Pelecypoda	72.7	5.3	2.4	76.9	4.6	16.4
Arthropoda						
Pycnogonida	5.6	0.1	<0.1			
Cirripedia	77.8	14.4	3.0	61.5	10.3	3.0
Isopoda	5.6	0.1	<0.1	7.7	0.2	<0.1
Amphipoda	61.1	44.9	0.4	69.2	57.2	0.3
Decapoda	38.9	5.0	2.2	53.9	3.9	3.4
Sipunculida	5.6	0.1	<0.1			
Bryozoa	83.3	9.3	76.2	76.9	9.2	8.5
Echinodermata						
Echinoidea	11.1	0.3	<0.1	23.1	0.6	22.1
Ophiuroidea	22.2	0.6	0.1	7.7	0.2	<0.1
Holothuroidea	5.6	0.3	0.7	7.7	0.2	0.2
Chordata						
Ascidiacea	55.6	2.8	11.4	69.2	2.2	44.2
Number of stomachs examined:		26			18	
Examined stomachs with food:		18			13	
Mean length of fish with food:		304.7			410.5	

vertebrate feeders, 5) generalized carnivores on motile invertebrates and fishes, 6) ectoparasite feeders, and 7) fish feeders. Sheepshead apparently function in two of Randall's (1967) feeding guilds, being omnivorous but feeding primarily on plant material in in-shore habitats and functioning as sessile animal feeders in offshore reef habitats. Sessile invertebrates dominated the volume of prey in sheepshead guts by far, and included some of the most frequently occurring species found in live

bottom habitats (i.e. *Microporella ciliata*, *Crisia* sp. A, *Schizoporella cornuta*, *Balanus trigonus*) (Wenner *et al.*, 1983). Many individuals of motile crustaceans that are associated with the sessile prey of sheepshead were incidentally consumed, but they made up little of the prey volume. These motile species were mainly abundant live bottom species of amphipods that build tubes on sessile organisms (*Erichthonius brasiliensis*, *Cerapus tubularis*) or that cling to and feed on sessile organisms (*Caprella*

equilibra) (Wenner *et al.*, 1983; Wenner *et al.*, 1984; Knott *et al.*, in prep.)

Predation can be an important factor in regulating the structure of sessile communities (Peterson, 1979). Because sheephead feed heavily on live bottom sessile invertebrates, they may be important in contributing to the high diversity (Wenner *et al.*, 1983, Wenner *et al.*, 1984) found in the live bottom sessile fauna. Sutherland (1978) reported that *Schizoporella unicornis* (= *S. errata* of later authors), an encrusting bryozoan very similar in form and functional role to *S. cornuta*, and the ascidian *Styela plicata* are able to colonize available space to the exclusion of other species. *Styela plicata* is also capable of invading space occupied by other species. Both of these species serve to stabilize the fouling community at a low diversity level (Sutherland, 1978). *Styela plicata* and *S. cornuta* (similar to *S. unicornis*) may function in a similar manner if left undisturbed in hard bottom habitat, i.e. they may monopolize and stabilize the community at a low diversity level. However, these two species were the top ranking prey, by volume, for sheephead. If these species function in live bottom areas as they do in shallow water fouling communities (Sutherland, 1978) then sheephead are probably very important in controlling the structure of sessile invertebrate communities in live bottom habitats by reducing the abundance of these competitively superior species.

Predation by sheephead may also be a contributing factor in the regulation of the structure of live bottom motile epifauna communities. Some of the most abundant motile prey species found in sheephead guts are species that are prolific and opportunistic [as indicated by their early colonizing ability (Knott *et al.*, in prep.)] inhabitants of live bottom communities, such as *Erichthonius*

brasiliensis and *Caprella equilibra*. By cropping off these opportunistic species, predation by sheephead may allow more motile epifaunal species to co-exist (Dayton and Hessler, 1972; Virnstein, 1977; Peterson, 1979).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

For their help in identification and confirmation of prey items, I thank the following: P.H. Wendt, hydroids and bryozoans; C.B. O'Rourke and E.C. Roland, polychaetes; and E.L. Wenner, ascidians. M.R. Collins, C.J. Moore and P.H. Wendt provided helpful reviews of the manuscript. Thanks are extended to the many scientific and vessel personnel who assisted in the field work. This work was supported with funds provided by the Bureau of Land Management (Contract No. AA551-CT9-27) and the Minerals Management Service (Contract Nos. AA551-CT1-18 and 14-12-0001-29185), U.S. Dept. of the Interior. Partial defrayal of publication cost was provided by the National Marine Fisheries Service under contract 50-WCNF-7-06004. This is contribution 224 from the South Carolina Marine Resource Center.

LITERATURE CITED

- Darnell, R.M. 1958. Food habits of fishes and larger invertebrates of Lake Pontchartrain, Louisiana, an estuarine community. *Inst. Mar. Sci.*, 5:355-416.
- Dayton, P.K, and R.R Hessler. 1972. Role of biological disturbance in maintaining diversity in the deep sea. *Deep-Sea Res.*, 19:199-208.
- Hillier, A.J. 1974. URI high rise series bottom trawl manual. *Univ. Rhode Island Mar. Bull.*, 20.
- Hynes, H.B.N. 1950. The food of freshwater sticklebacks (*Gasterosteus aculeatus* and *Pygosteus pungitius*),

- with a review of the methods used in studies of the food of fishes. *J. Anim. Ecol.*, 19:36-58.
- Johnson, G.D. 1978. Development of fishes of the Mid-Atlantic Bight IV: Carangidae through Ehippidae. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Services Program FWS/OBS-78/12. 314p.
- Knott, D.M. *et al.* (in prep.) The motile epifauna of marine fouling communities in the South Atlantic Bight.
- Miller, G.C. and W.J. Richards. 1980. Reef fish habitat, faunal assemblages and factors determining distributions in the South Atlantic Bight. *Proc. Gulf Caribb. Fish. Inst.*, 32:114-130.
- Office of Coastal Zone Management. 1980. Draft environmental impact statement on the proposed Gray's Reef Marine Sanctuary. U.S. Dept. Commerce. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Office of Coastal Zone Management. Washington, D.C. 193 p., appendices.
- Ogburn, M.V. 1984. Feeding ecology and the role of algae in the diet of sheepshead *Archosargus probatocephalus* (Pisces: Sparidae) on two North Carolina jetties. M.S. Thesis, Univ. North Carolina, Wilmington. 68p., appendices.
- Overstreet, R.M., and R.W. Heard. 1982. Food contents of six commercial fishes from Mississippi Sound. *Gulf Res. Rep.*, 7(2):137-149.
- Peterson, C.H. 1979. The importance of predation and competition in organizing the intertidal epifaunal communities of Barnegat Inlet, New Jersey. *Oecologia*, 39:1-24.
- Pinkas, L., M.S. Oliphant, and I.K.L. Iverson. 1971. Food habits of albacore, bluefin tuna, and bonito in California waters. *Calif. Dep. Fish Game Fish. Bull.*, 152:105p.
- Randall, J.E. 1967. Food habits of reef fishes of the West Indies. *Stud. Trop. Oceanogr. Miami*, 5:665-847.
- _____ and R. Vergara. 1978. Sparidae. *In*: W. Fisher, ed., *FAO Species Identification Sheets for Fishery Purposes, Western Central Atlantic*. FAO of the United Nations, Rome.
- Sedberry, G.R. (MS). A temporal and spatial study of fish communities associated with hard bottom habitats in the South Atlantic Bight.
- _____ and R.F. Van Dolah. 1984. Demersal fish assemblages associated with hard bottom habitat in the South Atlantic Bight of the U.S.A. *Env. Bio. Fish.*, 11(4):241-258.
- Smith, D. 1977. Use of the URI high-rise trawl off South Carolina. *In*: D.M. Cupka, P.J. Eldridge and G.R. Huntsman, eds. *Proceedings of Workshop on the Snapper/Grouper Resources of the South Atlantic Bight*. South Carolina Mar. Res. Center Tech. Rep., 27:13-15.
- South Carolina Wildlife and Marine Resources Department. 1981. South Atlantic OCS Area Living Marine Resources Study. Vol. I. An investigation of live bottom habitats south of Cape Fear, North Carolina. Final Report prepared for Bureau of Land Management, under contract AA551-CT9-27. 297p.
- Springer, V.G. and K.D. Woodburn. 1960. An ecological study of the fishes of the Tampa Bay area. *Fla. Board Conserv. Mar. Res. Lab. Prof. Pap. Ser. 1*, 104 p.
- Struhsaker, P. 1969. Demersal fish resources: composition, distribution and commercial potential of the continental shelf stocks off the southeastern United States. *Fish. Ind. Res.*, 4: 261-300.
- Sutherland, J.P. 1978. Functional roles of *Schizoporella* and *Styela* in the fouling community at Beaufort, North

- Carolina. *Ecology*, 59: 257-264.
- Van Dolah, R.F., D.M. Knott, and D.R. Calder. 1984. Ecological effects of rubble weir jetty construction at Murrells Inlet, South Carolina. Vol. I: Colonization and community development on new jetties. U.S. Army, Corps of Engineers, Waterways Experiment Station. Environmental Impact Research Project. Tech. Rept. EL-84-4, 125 p.
- Virnstein, R.W. 1977. The importance of predation by crabs and fishes on benthic infauna in Chesapeake Bay. *Ecology*, 58: 1199-1217.
- Wardle, W.J. 1980. On the life cycle stages of *Proctoeces maculatus* (Digenea: Fellodistomidae) in mussels and fishes from galveston Bay, Texas. *Bull. Mar. Sci.*, 30(3): 737-743.
- Wenner, E.L., D.M. Knott, R.F. Van Dolah, and V.G. Burrell, Jr. 1983. Invertebrate communities associated with hard bottom habitats in the South Atlantic Bight. *Est. Coast. Shelf Sci.*, 17, 143-158.
- _____, P. Hinde, D.M. Knott and R.F. Van Dolah. 1984. A temporal and spatial study of invertebrate communities associated with hard-bottom habitats in the South Atlantic Bight. NOAA Tech. Rep. NMFS 18, 104 p.
- Windell, J.T. 1971. Food analysis and rate of digestion, *In: Methods for assessment of fish production in fresh water*, p. 215-226. Ed. by W.E. Ricker. London: Blackwell Scientific Publications.