

Northwest Atlantic



Fisheries Organization

Serial No. N2551

NAFO SCR Doc. 95/42

SCIENTIFIC COUNCIL MEETING - JUNE 1995

JOINT ICES/NAFO WORKING GROUP ON HARP AND HOODED SEALS, 5-9 JUNE 1995
(SEA-73)

Short- and Long-term Fluctuations in the Size and Condition of
Harp Seal (*Phoca groenlandica*) in the Northwest Atlantic

by

D. Chabot¹, G. B. Stenson and N. B. Cadigan²

Science Branch, Department of Fisheries and Oceans
P. O. Box 5667, St. John's, Newfoundland, Canada A1C 5X1

¹ Present address: Institut Maurice-Lamontagne, Department of Fisheries and Oceans, P. O. Box 1000, Mont-Joli, QC, G5H 3Z4

² Present address: Dept. Statistics and Actuarial Science, Faculty of Mathematics, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3G1

Abstract

Harp seals (n=8164) were sampled off Labrador and northeast Newfoundland between November and May of most years between 1979 and 1994, a period during which the seal population increased in size. Data from an additional 640 seals were acquired from other authors (1976-79, 1988-92). In April, males grow to an average of 169.9 cm and 103.3 kg, about 4.7 cm and 4.7 kg more than females. Mass, sculp mass, core mass, girth, blubber thickness and even body length fluctuated significantly between November and May, with maximum and minimum values encountered in February and May, respectively. All seals older than 1 year old displayed similar fluctuations. Juvenile males and females (< 5 y) behaved similarly, but in animals ≥ 5 y, females came back from Arctic waters in better condition than males. The drop in mass seen during the whelping period coincided with a drop in core mass, whereas sculp mass changed little or not at all. Using data for April to remove seasonal variability, young females (< 5 y) were found to grow more slowly in both length and mass in the period 1990-94 than in previous periods (1976-79, 80-84, and 85-89). Young males did not differ in growth rate between periods, but had lower length and mass at a given age in 1990-94 than seals from previous periods. Older seals of both sexes were in worse condition in April 1992 than in April 1982, 83 and 84, but did not differ from those sampled in 1981 or 1979.

Introduction

Northwest Atlantic harp seals (*Phoca groenlandica*) summer in Arctic waters, feeding heavily and accumulating energy reserves mostly as blubber. In the fall they migrate southward to winter off the coast of southern Labrador and eastern Newfoundland or in the Gulf of St. Lawrence (Sergeant 1991). They form large whelping concentrations in late February/early March near the Iles de la Madeleine or off southern Labrador, during which time they reduce their feeding. Following breeding they disperse briefly, and the females at least appear to feed and replenish their energy stores (Sergeant 1991). From mid April to mid May they congregate into large moulting concentrations during which time again they undergo a period of reduced

feeding. Soon after moulting, harp seals migrate northward. The timing of the migrations appears to be variable but generally harp seals enter the study area in October or November and leave in May or June (Stenson, unpublished data).

Although growth and morphometric measurements of harp seals have been published before (Beck *et al.* 1993; Hammill *et al.* in press; Innes *et al.* 1981; Sergeant 1973; Sergeant 1991; Stewart and Lavigne 1980), most of the material was sampled in the Gulf of St Lawrence, with very little information from animals caught off Newfoundland. Furthermore, sample sizes and the temporal distribution of the samples have resulted in a sketchy knowledge of seasonal changes in mass and fat reserves, whereas core mass and length of adult seals have been assumed not to change seasonally. More detailed information on growth and seasonal cycles in morphometric variables is necessary information to evaluate seals energy requirements, their potential effect on prey population, and alternatively, of changes in the latter on the condition and number of harp seals.

Here we combine a very large dataset collected off Newfoundland and Labrador in the period 1979-94 to dataset from other researchers to better define growth in length and in mass in harp seal, and examine monthly changes in mass, sculp mass, core mass, axillary girth, blubber thickness and body length.

A reduction in resource availability, whether or not it is due to changes in seal numbers, environmental changes, or to human activities, can impact on seals in many ways, such as an increase in the age of sexual maturity (Laws 1956; Sergeant 1991), a reduction in the health, growth rate, or size of individuals (Hammill *et al.* in press; Innes *et al.* 1981), or an increase in mortality. Previous authors have attempted to detect an improvement in the size at age when seal numbers were declining (Innes *et al.* 1981), and a reduction in size at age and in condition when seal numbers were increasing (Hammill *et al.* in press). In both cases, results partially supported the hypothesis, but problems with the data prevented firm conclusions. With this larger dataset, we explore the possibility that the growth rate and the condition of harp seals have deteriorated in recent years, which have seen an increase in the size of this seal population (Shelton *et al.* 1995; Stenson *et al.* 1995), as well as climatic changes and the collapse of several stocks of commercial fish in the study area.

Materials and methods

Data collection

Morphometric measurements were obtained from 8164 harp seals between 1979 and 1994, off the coast of Labrador or the north-east coast of Newfoundland, mostly in NAFO areas 2J3KL (the Newfoundland dataset, NF). Seals were collected by D.F.O. researchers or commercial sealers, or as incidental catch in fishing gear. The great majority of seals were collected between the months of November and May (Tables I and II). Most seals were measured within a few hours of being killed, but samples from the Labrador coast were usually frozen, and thawed before measurements were taken.

Date, time, location, sex, pelage type, and pelage condition (hair fast or loose) were noted. Standard length (L , to the nearest 0.5 cm), total mass (M_t , to the nearest kg for large animals, and to the nearest 0.5 kg for smaller seals and sculp), axillary girth (G , to the nearest 0.5 cm), anterior length of front and hind flipper (FF and HF, to the nearest 0.5 cm) and blubber thickness (B , to the nearest mm) were measured following the recommendations of the American Society of Mammalogists (1967), except that B excluded the skin. Sculp mass (M_s , to the nearest 0.5 kg), *i.e.* the skin with blubber attached, except for the skin of hind flippers and of the tip of the front flippers, which remained with the carcass, and core girth (G_c , to the nearest 0.5 cm), *i.e.* girth measured at approximately the same site as G , but after removal of the sculp, were also measured. The seals were skinned using the same method as sealers, so a small amount of fat usually remained on the carcass, whereas some flesh was cut off with the sculp. Since the same three observers took the great majority of the measurements for the entire sampling period, this source of error remained relatively constant. M was corrected for the mass of the stomach content, but was not corrected for blood loss in shot animals, nor for the mass of the foetus in pregnant females. For measurements obtained onboard ships, the accuracy of M and S was somewhat reduced by the movements of the ship in rough weather. Age was determined by counting dentinal annuli from a cross-section of a lower canine tooth (Bowen *et al.* 1983) and assuming seals were born on March 5. Age of very young animals was determined using their coat color and condition and the data of Stewart & Lavigne (1984, p. 673).

In addition to the above dataset, D. M. Lavigne provided us with the measurements for

the 204 seals used in Innes et al.'s study (1981), and M. O. Hammill provided us with the measurements for another 436 seals from Hammill et al.'s study (in press). The former (DML) included mostly seals from the Gulf of St Lawrence (4RS), but also 52 seals from the Front, 36 from the Northwest Territories and 5 from West Greenland, whereas the second (MOH) included 326 seals from the Gulf of St Lawrence (4RS) and 11 from Hudson Strait.

The following variables were computed from the measured variables:

- core mass ($M_C = M_t - M_S$)
- sculp ratio ($SR = M_S \times 100/M_t$)
- volume (an estimate of body volume based on an ellipsoidal model of seal shape, $V = \frac{L \times G^2}{6000\pi}$)
- sculp volume ($V_S = V - \frac{2\pi LG}{3000(2\pi - B)}$)
- estimated core girth ($\hat{G}_C = G - 2\pi(B + 0.3)$)

Data validation

To distinguish between "valid" extreme cases and errors (measurement, transcription or keypunching errors) in the NF dataset, we looked for inconsistencies in the ways the morphometric variables varied together by calculating linear regressions between selected measured and calculated variables. Cases with a studentized residual ≥ 3 or ≤ -3 were verified against the original data sheets, and corrected when a mistake was found. Otherwise, cases with a studentized residual ≥ 4 or ≤ -4 were marked as outliers. When studentized residuals are normally distributed, only 0.006% of them should lie outside 4 standard deviations (Runyon and Haber 1971). Therefore, a dataset of 10000 cases should include a single valid data point with such a high studentized residual.

The following tests served to detect outliers:

- regression of $\log_{10}(M_t)$ on $\log_{10}(V)$, for each sex
- regression of $\log_{10}(M_S)$ on $\log_{10}(V_S)$, for each sex
- multiple regression of $\log_{10}(G)$ on $\log_{10}(L)$, $\log_{10}(\sqrt[3]{M_t})$ and $\log_{10}(B)$, for each sex in seals older than 30 d, and for both sexes combined in younger seals
- regression of FF on HF, for each sex
- regression of $\log_{10}(G_C)$ on $\log_{10}(\hat{G}_C)$, for each sex

Thirty-one cases were rejected because one or more of the variables L, M_t or G was suspect, bringing the final sample size in the NF dataset down to 8165. Some variables were set to missing in a few other cases as a result of these analyses: FF and HF in 12 cases, G_C in 7 cases, and M_S and B in 11 cases.

Statistical analyses

Gompertz growth curves of the form $y = y_{\infty} \cdot e^{-(b \cdot e^{-k \cdot \text{age}})}$ (Fitzhugh 1975; Kaufmann 1981) were fitted to M_t and L using the NLIN procedure of SAS (SAS Institute 1989). Two Gompertz growth curves were compared statistically by checking if the asymptotic 95% confidence interval for the estimated difference in any of the growth curve parameters included zero.

Means were compared by analysis of variance (ANOVA, 2-way ANOVA). Regression lines were fitted by the least-square method. Regression lines were compared by first testing for the parallelism of the slopes, and if necessary comparing the intercepts with analysis of covariance (Pedhazur 1982). Post-hoc pairwise comparison of means or of adjusted means with 1 df contrasts (Neter *et al.* 1990) were used to identify which groups differed from each other. The risk of type I error for the family of comparisons was kept at $\alpha = 0.05$ by using Šidák's multiplicative inequality (Kirk 1982). Anovas and regressions were analyzed with SAS version 6 (SAS Institute 1989) or SuperAnova version 1.11 (Abacus Concepts 1989).

Results and discussion

Growth curves

Body length is usually preferred to body mass to study growth in pinnipeds, because of the seasonal variation in fat reserves and thus body mass. However, length too can vary seasonally in pinnipeds (see Trites and Bigg *subm.*). If this was the case for harp seals, the parameters of the growth curve could be influenced by the seasonal distribution of the samples. To reduce seasonal variability, only seals sampled in April were selected in the computation of growth curves. This is the month for which we have the largest sample sizes, and is close to the minimum in condition for the harp seal (see below). Therefore, the resulting growth curves approximate "lean growth".

Figure 1 shows the growth in length and in mass of female harp seals sampled in April. Figure 2 shows the growth of males. Despite a range of about 40 cm and 60 kg for any given age, the Gompertz model provided a good fit: age explained 83 to 89% of the variation in length or mass for both sexes. For L all three parameters of the Gompertz curves differed significantly between sexes, whereas for M_t only $M_{t\infty}$ and k were different. The differences in k and b (for length curves) were small, and only the large sample sizes allowed their detection. Their biological significance is small, however, considering the scatter of points about the fitted curve. Asymptotic size for both L and M_t remained different between sexes even when a common b and k were used. Therefore, asymptotic values of length and mass were slightly but significantly larger in males than in females. Fisher (1955) and Innes et al. (1981) found no differences in L_{∞} between sexes, but sample sizes were smaller than in the present study. Furthermore, data from March through September were pooled in Innes et al. (1981). Sivertsen (1941) found a difference between L of female (168 cm, $n=104$) and male (172 cm, $n=173$) "saddle" harp seals sampled in the White Sea in March through May. Using his data, we found that this difference was significant (Mann-Whitney, normal approximation, $Z=-3.69$, $p=0.0002$). Hammill et al. (*in press*) also found males to grow longer than females, although they found no difference in the other parameters of the growth curve, possibly because of a smaller sample size than in our study, or because of the added variability due to pooling data from different months. Hammill et al. (*in press*) noted that the presence of very large females in the dataset of Innes et al. (1981) explained the lack of difference between L_{∞} of both sexes in that study. The fact that Innes et al. (1981) obtained a higher proportion of females than males in March and in the summer months in the Arctic, when L is higher (see below), is probably another contributing factor.

L_{∞} was 169.9 cm for both sexes in Innes et al. (1981), 165.3 and 170.4 cm for females and males respectively in Hammill et al. (*in press*), and 164.1 and 168.8 cm for females and males in the present study. Lower asymptotic length in the present study was due to the fact that unlike the other studies, fat seals from February or March, or seals from Arctic waters in the summer, were excluded. This also explains the much lower asymptotic mass seen in Figure 1 (98.6 kg) and 2 (103.3 kg) relative to that in the study of Innes et al. (1981, 129.9 kg).

Because no newborn were included in the calculation of the Gompertz curves, it is useful to add some descriptive statistics for newborns ($n=70$). There were no difference between females and females for all variables tested, and both sexes were pooled before computing summary statistics (Table III). Length and mass at birth were 85.99 cm and 9.26 kg, respectively.

For some of the analyses that follow, it was useful to regroup the subjects into age-classes with similar morphometric characteristics. Although growth in L and M_t is reduced after 5 y, we wanted to define one age-class where growth would be virtually nil, to facilitate some seasonal and annual comparisons. Thus adults were defined as the age-class when an average seal had completed 95% of its growth in length in April (growth = $L_{\infty} - L_0$, where L_{∞} is the asymptotic length in April, and L_0 is length at birth from our sample of 70 newborns). The cutoff value was set at 8 y, when harp seals have completed more than 95% of their growth in length, and more than 91% of their growth in mass (in April). By that age, females and males had reached about 98% of L_{∞} and 93% of $M_{t\infty}$. Pups were seals < 1 y, juveniles displayed rapid growth, the cutoff value being the inflection point (fitted by eye), 5 y. Adolescents grew more slowly ($5 \leq \text{age} < 8$). At age 5, harp seals have completed at least 85% of their growth in length, and reached 93% of L_{∞} .

Seasonal fluctuations

It is well known that harp seals accumulate thick blubber during the winter months. Figures 3 shows the extent of the monthly fluctuations in M_t . Pups grow fairly steadily from

birth to February, and won't be discussed further here. The other age-classes display a similar pattern of mass fluctuations. Generally, mass peaks in February, then declines by about 30% through April (when growth curves were computed), and drops by another 10-15% by May, when a minimum was reached. Data are too scant between June and October (shaded area in Figure 3) to assess whether seals continue to loose mass, and to judge the extent of fattening when the seals are in Arctic waters, but if they gain much mass (as suggested by the points for August), they loose a good proportion of it during their migration back. By November, when seals are abundant again in the study area, their M_t is about 20% off peak values. Therefore, harp seals are feeding in the study area when they gain the remainder of their M_t . Beck et al. (1993) also found a further increase in fat reserves of harp seals after they entered the Gulf of St Lawrence.

A 2-way Anova (sex x month) was performed on each panel of Figure 3. In juveniles, sexes did not differ in mass each month, nor in the pattern of changes between months. The interaction was significant in adolescents and adults, however, in part because females enter the study area heavier than males, although they are of about the same mass (adolescents) or lighter than males (adults) in Jan-April. The decline in mass observed between February and March was significant for all three older age-classes and both sexes. The time scale used, however, does not allow us to confirm the increase in M_t of females between parturition and moulting seen by Sivertsen (1941) and Sergeant (1973; 1991).

Figure 4 shows similar fluctuations in sculp mass. Again, juveniles of both sexes could not be discriminated, whereas the sex, month, and the interaction term were all significant in adolescent and adults. The results for November and December of the 2 older age-classes confirm that the gain in M_t observed in Figure 3 was mostly due to fat accumulation in the blubber. However, a significant decline in M_s is only seen in adult males, even though all age-classes and sexes lost M_t during this period. Even in adult males, the sculp loss (averaging 4.5 kg) is insufficient to fully explain the reduction of M_t (20 kg) between February and March.

This apparent discrepancy is due to a significant decline in core mass between February and March for all age-classes and sexes (Figure 5). This is contrast with the finding of Stewart and Lavigne (1984), who found core mass not to change significantly during March in each of 4 years (1976, 1978-80), whereas sculp mass declined during each one of these years. However, their study and ours have a different time resolution, and a direct comparison of changes in sculp and core mass should be interpreted cautiously. In future work, we will reanalyze our results on a finer time scale. It is not clear at this point if lipids (about 9% of the harp seals' lipid reserves in winter are in the carcass, Beck et al. 1993) or proteins are utilized, or if the amount of water in the core changes. This decline in M_c suggests that it is beneficial for the animals to maintain blubber thickness at this time of the year, presumably for thermoregulation, even in a situation of negative energy balance (see Beck et al. 1993, p. 1379). It is a bit surprising that the decline in M_c between February and April was so similar for adults of both sexes, considering that females lost pup and placenta during this period. The decline in M_t from March to May was due to a loss of both M_s and M_c (Figure 5 and 6), even though past studies attributed it almost exclusively to a loss of blubber (Sivertsen 1941)

Girth should increase and decrease with M_t for any given age-class, since it does not discriminate between mass gains due to blubber or core. This is confirmed in Figure 6, which shows seasonal changes in G that are identical to those found in M_t . Figure 7 illustrates monthly changes in blubber thickness. Fluctuations in B are in good agreement with Sergeant's results (1973, p. 23). In both studies, B of males remains high until April, just as did M_s . Both studies also found B of large females to decline during March, period during which they did not experience a decline in M_s . This discrepancy is unexplained at the moment. Finally, Figure 7 shows that females have thicker blubber than males in November and December, which accounts for their heavier M_t and M_s at the time.

Body length is usually regarded as constant in fully grown phocid seals, an implicit assumption when data from different times of the year are pooled to compute a growth curve. Figure 8 shows that in harp seals, L cycles in parallel with M_t , although the oscillations in L are less pronounced than those in M_t . Such oscillations in L have been reported for northern fur seals (*Callorhinus ursinus*) (McLaren 1993; Trites and Bigg subm.). In all 3 age-classes, L changed similarly between months for both sexes. In adults, the oscillations in length were of about 7 cm or 4%. They increased to 11.6 cm (7%) in adolescents, and to 22 cm (15%) in juveniles. This is at odds with a comparison of Gompertz growth curves fitted to February and April data (Figure 9). For each sex, the curves for the two seasons were significantly different, for both L and M_t . However, the amplitude of the oscillations increased with age until seals are fully grown. This discrepancy is in part due to the fact that the growth curves contrast the month of February and April, not February and May. Furthermore, an artifact is introduced by pooling seals into age

classes. On the growth curves, L in April is either compared to L during the preceding or the following February (seals 0.167 y younger or 0.833 y older, respectively). But in Figure 8, age in April was 1.668, 1.411, 1.115 and 1.005 y less than in February for juvenile females, juvenile males, adolescent females and adolescent males, respectively (Table IV). Age was based on a birth date of March 5; as a result, samples taken in April contained many seals that had just entered a new age class, and conversely, samples taken in February contained seals just about to enter a new, larger, age-class.

Fisher (1955, p. 27) thought that a thick blubber layer would result in a tightening of the skin which "pulled in" the animals so that they did not stretch out as much when laid out on the ground. Our results show that the opposite happens: L increases with M_t . When laying seals on the ground to measure L, one often notices that quite a bit of variation in L can be obtained according to how much the head protrudes from the neck. We try to place the head in a natural position, but it is possible that the head is less likely to be "pulled in" if the skin around the neck has a thick blubber layer. It is also possible that body mass exerts more stress upon the vertebral column in a fat seal than in a thin seal, resulting in an apparent increase in L (Trites and Bigg subm.). Bigg (1979, cited in Trites and Bigg subm.) proposed that seasonal variation in water content of the cartilage and connective tissues separating the body components, driven by changes in levels of pregnancy hormones, could explain seasonal changes in L of females. This appears unlikely here, because both males and females, and even immature animals, showed this cycle in L. It is possible that changes in body water content due to causes other than pregnancy hormones are involved. The last hypothesis examined by Trites & Bigg (subm.) was that because of the effect of gravity on the vertebral column, seals that are out of water for extended periods might be shorter. This hypothesis is ruled out for the harp seal, because seals spend quite a bit of time out of water in March, yet they are longer than seals in April or May. Furthermore, it is unclear whether gravity would shorten an animal whose vertebral column is held horizontally.

Figure 9 also illustrates the potential impact of pooling data from different months in comparing morphometric measurements or growth curves of harp seals: the difference in asymptotic length of curves only two months apart is greater than the difference between males and females for either month.

Many studies of pinnipeds make use of condition indices to compare the amount of fatness in different months or years:

$\frac{G \times 100}{L}$ or Smirnov's fatness index (Smirnov, 1924, cited in Sivertsen 1941), used by Sivertsen (1941) and Sergeant (1973; 1991);

$\frac{(M_s - \text{skin mass}) \times 100}{M_t}$ or proportion of blubber mass to total mass, used by Sivertsen (1941);

$\sqrt{\frac{L}{M_t}} \times B$ used by Ryg et al. (1990) as an estimate of proportion of blubber to total mass.

Such indices are supposed to make the measure of fatness independent of L (Sivertsen 1941), and are often used to pool data from animals that vary widely in size. Figure 10, however, shows that these indices are still correlated with body length. We calculated a condition index (CI) similar to the one used by Trites & Bigg (1992):

$$CI = \frac{M_t}{\hat{M}_t} \quad \text{where } \hat{M}_t = aL^b \text{ (Figure 11).}$$

Seals younger than 1 y were excluded from the mass-length relationship because they were beaters in post-weaning fast, and were light compared with older seals of similar length. Because pups were excluded from the computation of the mass-length relationship, CI is not independent of size for very short seals. However, there is no correlation between CI and L for seals longer than about 110 cm.

Figure 12 shows the seasonal changes in CI for the 4 age classes. CI does not discriminate between changes in accumulation of blubber or in core mass. Therefore, Figure 12 shows pretty much the same trends as did Figure 3. The small but significant seasonal changes in L cause CI to slightly underestimate the amplitude of seasonal changes in M_t (Table V). This is because seals are, on average, longer in February than in April, and thus \hat{M}_t is overcorrected for L.

It is important to notice that the use of such a condition index does not guarantee that all sizes and ages can be pooled in comparisons between months or between years. Even after

removing the effect of L, there remain differences in CI due to age, both because age affects condition even in the month for which CI was designed to produce 1.0, and because seals of a different age may have different seasonal cycles of mass changes. For instance, juveniles reach a lower maximal CI in January and February than older seals. This is perhaps better seen in Figure 13. Even in April, when the mass-length relationships were computed, seals about 5 y or younger are lighter, relative to their length, than older seals. Furthermore, seals need to reach about 10 y to have the largest fluctuations in condition between winter and spring (see also Figure 9, growth in M_t in February and April). Figure 13 also shows that males of all ages reach very low condition values in May, whereas older females remain at the levels they had reached in April, but this is probably an artifact of the small number old females sampled in May. Males of all ages arrive in our waters in relatively poor condition, whereas females 5 y and older are in much better condition. However, males' condition improves very fast between December and January. Females ≥ 18 y seem to reach maximum condition later (February) than younger females (January), but this appear to be an artifact of the very small number of older females sampled in January.

Long term fluctuations

Previous attempts at relating the impact of increased population levels on the health of harp seals relied on comparisons of growth curves computed for different periods of data collection. Innes et al. (1981) found that a growth curve fitted to their sample resulted in a larger size at age 0, and a larger L_∞ than when the same curve was fitted to data collected when seals were more numerous. But no statistical comparison was done because of problems with the older dataset. Hammill et al. (in press) were able to compare growth curves of harp seals computed for two time periods statistically, but were not able to make definitive conclusions as to a possible deterioration in growth accompanying the increase in harp seal population. The authors noted that differences in the distribution of ages and dates of collection for both samples impaired the analyses, and the results shown in the present study emphasize the potential impact of such problems.

Comparing growth curves is not the most sensitive technique to detect possible effect of increasing seal population or declining food resources on seals, because animals from different age-classes are likely to respond differently. Studies in terrestrial mammals have shown that foetal growth, as well as neonatal growth during lactation, can be affected by the condition of the mother and/or the quality and quantity of food available to her (Geist 1978; Thorne *et al.* 1976), and the same has been suggested for harp seals (Smirnov 1927, cited in Sivertsen 1941). Young, growing animals should show reduced growth when resources are limiting. Since growth in length seems to stop at around 8 y, the length of older individuals probably reflects conditions encountered during gestation, lactation and the first few years of life, rather than current resource conditions (Smirnov 1927, cited in Sivertsen 1941; Stewart and Lavigne 1984). Even though Trites & Bigg (1992, p. 130) found differences in non-parametric growth curves of northern fur seals (*Callorhinus ursinus*) for different time periods (e.g., 1958-62, 1963-68, and 1969-74), the curves for all 3 periods converged in older animals. Thus parameters other than asymptotic size are probably the most important ones to compare. Such comparisons are probably better done by excluding older animals: the parameters of a Gompertz curve are often correlated, and the presence of older animals whose present size does not reflect resources availability could affect all parameters.

Therefore we decided to look for differences in growth rate as well as in size at age when comparing young animals sampled in different periods, whereas we looked for differences in condition, not size, in older animals collected in different time periods.

Birth mass and pup growth

Birth mass was 9.3 kg (Table I) for the period 1980-1994 (with the bulk of the data from 1982, 1983 and 1990, with 21, 15 and 16 newborns respectively). This was 1.5 kg (14 %) lower than that of Stewart & Lavigne (1980, mean of 10.8, $n=40$), whose data were collected between 1976 and 1979. Growth rate during lactation, however, was 2.7 kg/d (Figure 14), a bit higher than the 2.2 to 2.5 reported in Stewart & Lavigne (1980).

We tested for differences in "maternal care" between years by selecting years with at least 30 pups aged 9 d or younger, and subjecting the logarithm of body mass (to remove heteroscedasticity) to a 2-way Anova (coat stage \times year). Both factors were significant ($p < 0.0001$). However the interaction term was also significant, and body mass was not consistently low for all coat stages in any given year (Figure 15). Although whitecoats were relatively light in

1983 and 1984, this analysis did not reveal a deterioration of neonatal growth with increasing population density. It is possible that the duration of each coat stage is affected by nutrition (Stenson, unpublished data), so that growth could indeed be decreased in years when resources are less available to the mother, without size achieved at the end of each stage being affected much.

Growth in length and mass of juveniles

Only juvenile (i.e. fast growing) seals (1-5 y) were selected for this analysis. Furthermore, to remove the variability due to seasonal fluctuations in L and M_t (see above), only seals sampled in April were selected. The study period was divided into 4 periods of about 5 y. For each sex, an analysis of covariance was performed on L and another on M_t , with period as the factor and age as the covariate. The relationship between L or M_t and age was made linear by taking the square root of age, expressed in days (Trites and Bigg 1992).

Females had different growth rates for L among the 4 periods ($F_{[3,1403]}=3.21$, $p=0.022$), and slower growth rates were observed in the second half of the study period (Figure 16, slope = 1.59, 1.50, 1.37 and 1.42 $\text{cm} \cdot \text{d}^{-0.5}$ in 1976-79, 1980-84, 1985-89 and 1990-94, respectively). The results for growth in M_t were identical. Slopes differed among the study periods ($F_{[3,1127]}=19.5$, $p<0.0001$), declining as the study progressed (slope = 1.86, 1.64, 1.14 and 1.31 $\text{kg} \cdot \text{d}^{-0.5}$, but note the very small n in 1985-89). With males, growth rates for L ($F_{[3,1609]}=1.45$, $p=0.23$) as well as for M_t ($F_{[3,1305]}=1.63$, $p=0.18$) did not differ between the 4 periods (Figure 17). However, multiple pairwise comparisons of adjusted means showed that males were significantly shorter (4-5 cm) and lighter (6-10 kg) in 1990-94 than in the previous 3 periods (again, note the small sample sizes in 1985-89).

Seals $\geq 5y$

Although adult seals have reached their final length (excluding seasonal fluctuations), they can be expected to have varying degrees of fatness depending on food availability. To increase sample size, we wanted to pool adolescent and adult seals. This precluded using W_t , which differs in the two age-classes. We used CI, which was independent of length for seals ≥ 110 cm or ≥ 5 y in April (Figures 10 and 13). A 2-way Anova on CI (sex x year) was computed for seals ≥ 5 yr sampled in April of the years for which n was large enough (1979, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, and 1992). The interaction term ($F_{(5,1261)}=1.07$, $p=0.37$) and the sex effect ($F_{(1,1261)}=1.59$, $p=0.21$) were not significant, but there was a year effect ($F_{(5,1261)}=11.43$, $p<0.0001$). Multiple comparisons of means demonstrated that CI was significantly lower in 1992 than in 1982, 1983 or 1984 (Figure 17), but not from 1979 (p was 0.0042, but p for significance with 15 comparisons was 0.0034), nor from 1981 (which had a small sample size. The only other significant difference was between 1981 and 1982).

Although no causal relationship is implied, we have demonstrated a reduction in growth rate or size at age for harp seals aged between 1 and 5 occurring in recent years, when seal numbers have increased (Shelton *et al.* 1995; Stenson *et al.* 1995). Similarly, older seals were in poorer condition in 1992 relative to the period 1982-84. This decrease in condition in the early 90s is paralleled by a decrease in pregnancy rate, and an increase in the mean age of sexual maturity in female harp seals (Sjare *et al.* 1995). However, we found no differences in size or growth rates of seals during their first 9 d of life, although this conclusion would be invalidated if the relationship between coat pattern and pup age was affected by environmental conditions.

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank D. M. Lavigne (Dept. of Zoology, University of Guelph) and M. O. Hammill (D.F.O., Institut Maurice-Lamontagne) for making available to us the morphometric data for additional seals. We are also grateful to D. Bowen (Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Bedford Institute of Oceanography) and I-H. Ni, (Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Centre) for their efforts in getting samples for many years of the study. We thank the captains and crew members of the vessels involved in the collection of data: many fishermen from Newfoundland and Labrador and many employees of the Department of Fisheries and Oceans. We are especially grateful to W. Penny, D. Wakeham and D. McKinnon, who measured the majority of the seals. In addition, W. Penny determined the age of the seals, and D. Wakeham compiled the dataset and updated it regularly. We would also like to thank M. C. S. Kingsley (D.F.O., Institut Maurice-Lamontagne) for his helpful discussions on growth curves.

References

Abacus Concepts. 1989. SuperAnova. Abacus Concepts Inc., Berkeley, CA. 322 p.

- Abelbeck Software. 1993. KaleidaGraph™ reference guide. 346 p.
- American Society of Mammalogists. 1967. Standard measurements of seals. *J. Mammal.* **48**:459-462.
- Beck, G.G., T.G. Smith and M.O. Hammill. 1993. Evaluation of body condition in the Northwest Atlantic harp seal (*Phoca groenlandica*). *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **50**:1372-1381.
- Bowen, W.D., D.E. Sargeant and T. Øritsland. 1983. Validation of age determination in the harp seal, *Phoca groenlandica*, using dentinal annuli. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **40**:1430-1441.
- Fisher, H.D. 1955. Studies on reproduction in the harp seal *Phoca groenlandica* Erxleben in the northwest Atlantic. Ph. D. thesis, McGill University.
- Fitzhugh, H.A., Jr. 1975. Analysis of growth curves and strategies for altering their shape. *J. Anim. Sci.* **42**:1036-1051.
- Geist, V. 1978. Life strategies, human evolution, environmental design - Toward a biological theory of health. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Hammill, M.O., M.C.S. Kingsley, G.G. Beck and T.G. Smith, in press. Growth and condition in the Northwest Atlantic harp seal. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.*
- Innes, S., R.E.A. Stewart and D.M. Lavigne. 1981. Growth in Northwest Atlantic harp seals *Phoca groenlandica*. *J. Zool., Lond.* **194**:11-24.
- Kaufmann, K.W. 1981. Fitting and using growth curves. *Oecologia* **49**:293-299.
- Kirk, R.E. 1982. Experimental design: procedures for the behavioral sciences. 2nd. ed. Brooks/Cole Pub. Comp., Monterey, CA.
- Laws, R.M. 1956. Growth and sexual maturity in aquatic mammals. *Nature* **178**:193-194.
- Lawson, J.W., G.B. Stenson and D.G. McKinnon. 1993. Diet of harp seals (*Phoca groenlandica*) in 2J3KL during 1991-93. NAFO SCR Doc. 93/36: 15 p.
- McLaren, I. 1993. Growth in pinnipeds. *Biol. Review* **68**:1-79.
- Neter, J., W. Wasserman and M.H. Kutner. 1990. Applied linear statistical models - Regression, analysis of variance, and experimental design. Richard D. Irwin Inc., Homewood, Illinois, 1181 p.
- Pedhazur, E.J. 1982. Multiple regression in behavioral research - Explanation and prediction. 2nd ed. Hold, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Runyon, R.P. and A. Haber. 1971. Fundamentals of behavioral statistics. Addison-Wesley Pub. Co., Reading, Massachusetts. 251 p.
- Ryg, M., C. Lydersen, N.H. Markussen, T.G. Smith and N.A. Øritsland. 1990. Estimating the blubber content of phocid seals. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **47**:1223-1227.
- SAS Institute. 1989. SAS/STAT® User's guide, Version 6. SAS Institute Inc., Cary, N.C. 943 p.
- Sergeant, D.E. 1973. Feeding, growth, and productivity of Northwest Atlantic harp seals (*Pagophilus groenlandicus*). *J. Fish. Res. Board Can.* **30**:17-29.
- Sergeant, D.E. 1991. Harp seals, man and ice. Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa. 153 p.
- Shelton, P.A., G.B. Stenson, B. Sjare and W.G. Warren. 1995. Model estimates of harp seal numbers at age for the Northwest Atlantic. Joint ICES/NAFO Working Group on Harp and Hooded Seals, Dartmouth, NS, 5-9 June 1995. NAFO SCR Doc 95/20, 23 p.
- Sivertsen, E. 1941. On the biology of the harp seal *Phoca groenlandica* Erxl. Investigations carried out in the White Sea 1925-1937. *Hvalrådets Skrifter* **26**:1-166.
- Sjare, B., G.B. Stenson and B. Warren. 1995. Summary of female harp seal reproductive parameters. Joint ICES/NAFO Working Group on Harp and Hooded Seals, Dartmouth, NS, 5-9 June 1995. NAFO SCR Doc 95/37, 23 p.
- Stenson, G.B., M.O. Hammill, M.C.S. Kingsley, B. Sjare, W.G. Warren and R.A. Myers. 1995. 1994 pup production of Northwest Atlantic harp seals, *Phoca groenlandica*. Joint ICES/NAFO Working Group on Harp and Hooded Seals, Dartmouth, NS, 5-9 June 1995. NAFO SCR Doc 95/17, 20 p.
- Stewart, R.E.A. and D.M. Lavigne. 1984. Energy transfer and female condition in nursing harp seals *Phoca groenlandica*. *Holarct. Ecol.* **7**:182-194.
- Stewart, R.E.A. and R.M. Lavigne. 1980. Neonatal growth in northwest Atlantic harp seals (*Pagophilus groenlandicus*). *J. Mammal.* **61**:670-680.

Thorne, E.T., R.E. Dean and W.G. Hepworth. 1976. Nutrition during gestation in relation to successful reproduction in elk. *J. Wildl. Manage.* 40:330-335.

Trites, A.W. 1992. Fetal growth and the condition of pregnant northern fur seals off western North America from 1958 to 1972. *Can. J. Zool.* 70:2125-2131.

Trites, A.W. and M.A. Bigg. 1992. Changes in body growth of northern fur seals from 1958 to 1974: density effects or changes in the ecosystem? *Fisheries Oceanography* 1:127-136.

Trites, A.W. and M.A. Bigg. *subm.* Physical growth of northern fur seals: seasonal fluctuations and migratory influences. *Can. J. Zool.*

Table I. Number of female harp seals collected each month during the period 1979-1994[§].

Year	Month											TOTAL	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	11	12		
1979		3	4	220									227
1980	1	29	13	31	64						1		139
1981	35	43	78	110	97							10	373
1982	5	9	134	207	12								367
1983			55	483	66								604
1984			46	250									296
1985			2		20						2		24
1986	8	1	44		22							66	141
1987	9	23		92	36	47				1	70		278
1988				47	29	7			2	43	48		176
1989	2		13		8				1	15	27		66
1990	14		68			17	1			23	30		153
1991		7	4	8	1	6			4	29	47		106
1992	10	10		291	11	10	8			70	49		459
1993	5	16		1	42	12	22		5	72	8		183
1994	14	15	73		6					1			109
TOTAL	103	156	534	1740	414	99	31		12	254	358		3701

[§] These samples sizes include seals of known age only. Another 16 males were sampled but were excluded from most analyses. 584 seals of known age were missing L, M₁ or G.

Table II. Number of male harp seals collected each month during the period 1979-1994[§].

Year	Month											TOTAL	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	10	11	12		
1979		2	7	170									179
1980	7	56	7	39	67						3		179
1981	31	64	42	175	114						14		440
1982	3	20	91	434	18								566
1983			29	500	78								607
1984			16	306	4								326
1985					40						3		43
1986	5	13	13		23						79		133
1987	21	55		117	31	39	1			3	135		402
1988				40	23	8			1	15	50		137
1989			7		10	1			6	7	35		66
1990	9		22			15		1		13	60		120
1991		39	4	5		7			1	18	46		120
1992	14	44		603	13	13	8			90	23		808
1993	4	22			41	26	21		2	71	6		193
1994	31	25	23		8								87
TOTAL	125	340	261	2389	470	109	30	1	10	217	454		4406

[§] These samples sizes include seals of known age only. Another 41 males were sampled but were excluded from most analyses. 699 subjects of known age were missing L, M₁ or G.

Table III. Descriptive statistics for the main morphometric variables of newborn harp seals. There was no difference between males and females for all variables, and both sexes were pooled.

	Mean	Std. Error	n	Minimum	Maximum
L	85.993	.626	70	74.000	100.500
M_t	9.263	.186	70	4.900	11.800
M_s	2.621	.068	67	1.300	4.200
M_c	6.736	.138	67	3.600	8.700
G	46.370	.422	69	38.000	55.000
G_c	36.481	.539	26	31.000	41.000
FF	17.029	.173	70	11.000	19.500
HF	22.393	.181	70	18.000	26.000
B	.117	.045	70	0	3.100

Table IV. Mean age of harp seals by sex, age class and month.

Sex	Age class	Month	Mean	Std. Error	n		
Female	Juvenile	1	3.172	.141	64		
		2	3.909	.146	49		
		3	2.699	.134	68		
		4	2.241	.034	979		
		5	1.810	.059	210		
		11	3.346	.096	129		
		12	3.121	.072	218		
		Adolescent	1	6.634	.308	8	
			2	6.958	.133	36	
			3	6.028	.079	108	
			4	5.843	.047	262	
			5	6.006	.207	16	
	11		6.369	.101	50		
	Adult	12	6.491	.130	40		
		1	15.588	1.414	28		
		2	18.412	.769	83		
		3	15.075	.281	320		
		4	13.652	.402	184		
		5	14.739	1.054	26		
		11	15.693	.962	53		
		12	14.477	.723	59		
		Male	Juvenile	1	3.543	.140	59
				2	3.757	.139	70
				3	2.518	.166	58
4				2.346	.033	1101	
5	1.778			.056	237		
11	3.344			.105	104		
12	3.097			.061	293		
Adolescent	1			6.580	.164	24	
	2			7.001	.113	61	
	3			5.990	.126	41	
	4			5.996	.038	457	
	5			6.031	.273	12	
	11		6.459	.116	52		
Adult	12		6.464	.100	63		
	1		15.664	.920	53		
	2		18.569	.492	227		
	3		13.720	.477	135		
	4		13.843	.275	476		
	5		15.560	2.238	11		
	11		12.934	.661	45		
	12		13.604	.545	79		

Table V. Effect of seasonal changes in body length on the magnitude of seasonal changes in CI relative to changes in body mass. Only adult seals are included.

month	sex	L	M _t	CI	% error	CI _c §
Feb.	M	174.5	143.7	1.34		1.47
April	M	167.9	100.8	1.03		1.03
ratio Feb/April	M	1.04	1.43	1.30	-9.13	1.43
Feb.	F	170.2	133	1.28		1.42
April	F	164.3	97.6	1.03		1.03
ratio Feb/April	F	1.04	1.36	1.24	-9.69	1.38

§ Body length used in computation of CI_c for February was divided by 1.04 to estimate the length in April.




Figure 1. Growth in length and mass of female harp seals sampled in April.




Figure 2. Growth in length and mass of male harp seals sampled in April.




Figure 3. Seasonal fluctuations in body mass for 4 age-classes of harp seals of both sexes. Means and standard errors are displayed. Pups are < 1 y, juveniles are ≥ 1 y and < 5 y, adolescents are ≥ 5 y and < 8 y, and adults are ≥ 8 y. The shaded area represents the period when sample sizes were small. These points were excluded from statistical analyses.




Figure 4. Seasonal fluctuations in sculp mass for 4 age-classes of harp seals of both sexes. Details are as in Figure 3.




Figure 5. Seasonal fluctuations in core mass for 4 age-classes of harp seals of both sexes. Details are as in Figure 3.




Figure 6. Seasonal fluctuations in axillary girth for 4 age-classes of harp seals of both sexes. Details are as in Figure 3.




Figure 7. Seasonal fluctuations in blubber thickness for 4 age-classes of harp seals of both sexes. Details are as in Figure 3.




Figure 8. Seasonal fluctuations in body length for 4 age-classes of harp seals of both sexes. Details are as in Figure 3.




Figure 9. Comparison of Gompertz growth curves of harp seals calculated for two seasons.




Figure 10. Relation between various indices of condition and body length. All indices were computed using seals sampled in April. Upper left panel: Smirnov's index (1924, cited in Sivertsen 1941); upper right panel: ratio of sculp to total mass, a close approximation of Sivertsen's proportion of blubber to total mass (1941), since M_s is highly correlated with blubber mass in harp seal (Beck *et al.* 1993); lower left panel: Ryg *et al.*'s (1990) estimate of Sivertsen's proportion of blubber to total mass; lower right panel: condition index used in this study, computed as the ratio of measured total mass to mass expected from the mass-length relationship observed in April. The lines were fitted by the locally weighted (60%) least squared error method (Abelbeck Software 1993).




Figure 11. Relationship between M_t and L in female and male harp seals sampled in April.




Figure 12. Seasonal fluctuations in condition for 4 age-classes of harp seals of both sexes. Details are as in Figure 3.




Figure 13. Effect of age and season on the condition of female and male harp seals. Fitted lines are as in Figure 10.




Figure 14. Neonatal growth rate. Age was estimated by pelage type.




Figure 15. Mean value and 95% CI of body mass (after logarithmic transformation) of harp seal pups by pelage type and by year. Only years with at least 30 pups aged 9 days or less were included.




Figure 16. Growth curves in length and body mass of male and female juvenile harp seals during four time-periods.




Figure 17. Changes in condition of harp seals ≥ 5 y between years. Means, 95% confidence intervals and sample sizes are displayed.