2

3

4   # Life history of harbor porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) in Scottish (UK) waters

5

6   **J. A. LEARMONTH**

7   School of Biological Sciences (Zoology), University of Aberdeen, Tillydrone Avenue, Aberdeen, AB24 2TZ, United

8   Kingdom

9   **S. MURPHY**

10   Institute of Zoology, Zoological Society of London, Regent's Park, London NW1 4RY, United Kingdom

11   and

12   Sea Mammal Research Unit, Scottish Oceans Institute, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, Fife, KY16 8LB,

13   United Kingdom

14   **P. L. LUQUE**

15   School of Biological Sciences (Zoology), University of Aberdeen, Tillydrone Avenue, Aberdeen, AB24 2TZ, United

16   Kingdom

17   **R. J. REID, I.A.P. PATTERSON, A. BROWNLOW, H.M. ROSS, J. BARLEY**

18   Wildlife Unit, SAC Veterinary Services, Drummondhill, Stratherrick Road, Inverness, IV2 4JZ, United Kingdom

19   **M.B. SANTOS**

20   Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Centro Oceanográfico de Vigo, P.O. Box 1552, 36200, Vigo, Spain

21   and

22   Oceanlab, Institute of Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Aberdeen, Main Street, Newburgh,

23   Aberdeenshire AB41 6AA, United Kingdom

24   **G. J. PIERCE**

25   Oceanlab, Institute of Biological and Environmental Sciences, University of Aberdeen, Main Street, Newburgh,

26   Aberdeenshire AB41 6AA, United Kingdom

27   and

28   CESAM & Departamento de Biologia, Universidade de Aveiro

29   3810-193 Aveiro, Portugal

30   **E-mail:** g.j.pierce@abdn.ac.uk

31

32   **ABSTRACT**

33   Life history parameters were determined for stranded and bycaught harbor porpoises

34   (*Phocoena phocoena*) from Scottish (UK) waters (1992-2005). Fetal growth rate was 84.4

35   mm/mo and mean size at birth was 76.4 cm (range 65-88 cm). Males and females had a

36   similar range of body lengths (65-170 cm and 66-173 cm, respectively), although

37   asymptotic lengths were higher in females than males (approximately 158 cm and 147 cm

38   respectively). Nonpregnant females were significantly lighter, in relation to their length

39   than males. Maximum estimated age was 20 yr for both sexes. Age at sexual maturity

40   (ASM) was estimated as 4.35 yr in females and 5.00 yr in males. Conception occurred

41   mainly in July and August although reproductively active males were recorded during

42   April to July. Gestation lasted 10-11 mo, with calving mainly between May and July.

43   Lactating females were recorded during June to November, while small calves with solid

44   food in their stomachs were found mainly during February to May. Estimated pregnancy

45   rate (0.34 to 0.40) is lower than recorded elsewhere, but is likely underestimated due to

46   the prevalence of mature females of poor health status in the sample. Nevertheless,

47   cetacean strandings can be an essential source of data on demographic parameters.

48

INTRODUCTION

50   The harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) is the most abundant cetacean species in European

51   Atlantic shelf waters (Evans 1980; Hammond *et al*. 2002, 2013; Reid *et al*. 2003). However, its

52   general biology and ecology are poorly documented for many populations and stocks (Read *et al*.

53   1997; Haug *et al*. 2003). Few areas of biological research relate so directly to species

54   conservation status as studies of life history, which includes examination of traits directly

55   influencing fecundity, survival, and population growth. In marine mammals, age at sexual

56   maturity (ASM), pregnancy rate and juvenile survival are the three parameters most likely to

57   reflect changes in population status (Eberhardt and Siniff 1977; DeMaster 1984, Fowler 1984).

58   Harbor porpoises are subjected to various threats and pressures, including fisheries

59   interactions, pollutants, disease, fatal attacks from bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*), and

60   changes in prey availability (*e.g.*, Ross and Wilson 1996; Foster *et al*. 1999; Jepson *et al*. 2005;

61   MacLeod *et al*. 2007; Pierce *et al*. 2008; Murphy *et al*. 2010; ASCOBANS 2011; Heide-

62   Jørgensen *et al*. 2011). Concern for the species' status led to the Agreement on the Conservation

63   of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Sea (ASCOBANS) and the designation of Special

64   Areas of Conservation for this species is required under the European Community (EC) Directive

65   92/43/EEC on the Conservation of Natural Habitats and of Wild Flora and Fauna (the Habitats

66   Directive). In order to assess the potential effects of these threats on population status, it is

67   important to determine and monitor life history parameters, such as ASM, pregnancy rates, and

68   the timing of the reproductive season, along with information such as distribution, abundance and

69   seasonal movement patterns (Stenson 2003).

70   Data from stranded and bycaught animals, despite some biases and limitations, remain the

71   main (and often only) source of life history information for many populations, as a result of the

72 difficulties involved in observing and studying harbor porpoises in the wild (Palka 1996;

73 Hammond *et al.* 2002) or keeping them in captivity (Kastelein *et al.* 1997).

74   The present study uses samples and postmortem information collected from stranded and

75 bycaught harbor porpoises around Scotland over a 14-year period (1992-2005) to examine

76 biological, reproductive and life history parameters. Porpoises were collected throughout the year

77 and represented the full range of age and reproductive status classes for both males and females.

78

79

80   MATERIALS AND METHODS

81   The Scottish Agricultural College (SAC) Veterinary Services Division at Inverness conduct

82 necropsies on stranded and bycaught cetaceans in Scotland as part of an ongoing DEFRA-funded

83 monitoring and research program. Nine hundred and forty four stranded and bycaught harbor

84 porpoises were recorded by the SAC around Scotland between 1992 and 2005. Necropsy,

85 sampling and data collection procedures follow the recommendations of Kuiken and Hartmann

86 (1991) and Law (1994). Data collected included location and date found for all animals.

87 Necropsies were carried out on 545 animals, this lower figure reflecting both logistic constraints

88 (*e.g.*, funding) and the poor state of preservation of many carcasses. During necropsy, sex, total

89 body length (cm), and mass (to the nearest 0.5 kg) were recorded. Cause of death was determined

90 when possible. Where available, samples of teeth were collected for age estimation and

91 reproductive organs to determine reproductive status. Stomach contents were collected for diet

92 analysis (diet results to May 2005 were published in Santos *et al.* 2004).

93

94 *Age determination*

4

95　　During postmortem examination, teeth were removed from the middle of the lower jaw and

96　　preserved in 10% neutral buffered formalin. Tooth preparation methods were adapted from Hohn

97　　and Lockyer (1995) and Lockyer (1995*b*). Teeth were cleaned and decalcified using a

98　　commercial decalcifying agent (RDO$^{©}$), prior to sectioning at 23-25 μm thickness in a freezing

99　　microtome (-10°C). One tooth from each individual was sectioned parallel to the mandible

100　　(porpoise cut) and the second was cut perpendicular to the mandible (dolphin cut). Both cuts

101　　were made to ensure the optimum sections were obtained. The best sections (those that included

102　　the crown of the tooth and the maximum area of pulp cavity) were selected for each tooth, stained

103　　with either toluidine blue or Ehrlich's hematoxylin, and 'blued' in a weak alkaline solution. Two

104　　stains were used, on duplicate sections, to maximize the likelihood that an accurate age could be

105　　determined for each tooth. Stained sections were permanently mounted on slides using DPX

106　　(BHL Laboratory Supplies, Poole, UK).

107　　Age was estimated by examining the stained tooth sections using a binocular microscope

108　　(x10-50 magnification) and counting the growth layer groups (GLGs), which are thought to be

109　　laid down annually in odontocetes (Perrin and Myrick 1980). All estimates were initially made

110　　'blind' (with no biological information on the animal) and replicate counts were made by at least

111　　two experienced readers. If readers disagreed on the age of the animal, the sections were

112　　examined again. If the difference was greater than one GLG, both readers re-read the tooth, and if

113　　no agreement was reached another tooth from the same animal was sectioned and read by both

114　　readers. Where possible, age was estimated to the nearest 0.25 yr interval for animals aged 2 yr or

115　　less, to the nearest 0.5 yr interval for animals aged 3-4 yr, and to the nearest year for animals

116　　aged over 5 yr. Note, however, that this was not always possible.

117   The animals for which teeth were not collected for age determination included 15 neonates

118   (≤90 cm). These animals were used in analysis of growth rate and to estimate average length of

119   neonates, although not for analysis of size and age at maturity.

120

121   *Fetal growth rate and size of neonates*

122   Fetuses were measured during the necropsy of pregnant females. Following examination of a

123   plot of fetal length against date, a linear regression was fitted to estimate the fetal growth rate

124   (see Huggett and Widdas 1951; Read 1990*b*), treating September, the month in which the

125   smallest fetus was recorded, as the starting point. Since the regression slope was in mm.d^{-1}, the

126   value was multiplied by 30.5 to give a monthly rate.

127   Amongst the smallest stranded animals, all those with length greater than or equal to the

128   smallest animal confirmed not to be an aborted fetus (65 cm) and less than or equal to 90 cm

129   were classed as "neonates" following Lockyer (1995*a*). Note however that, since these may

130   include animals up to around 2 months old, their estimated average length will not be the same as

131   size at birth. Recent births (*n*=8) were identified by the presence of hairs in bristle pits on the

132   rostrum, fetal folds, and/or dorsal fins that were not yet fully erect (Wilkin *et al.* 2012). We

133   followed the approach of Borgesson and Read (2003) in combining these data with data on those

134   fetuses which were larger than the smallest neonate (*n*=6; five were obtained from dystocia (or

135   dystokia, *i.e*., difficult or abnormal birth) cases) to estimate length and mass at birth.

136

137   *Growth: length at age*

138   Gaussian GAMs were fitted to determine whether sex had a significant effect on the

139   relationship between body length (cm) and age. Preliminary analysis indicated no significant

140   effects of month or year so these variables were not included in the subsequent models. A model

141 with separate smoothers for the effect of age for each sex was compared (using ANOVA) with a

142 model that used a common age-smoother for both sexes. The maximum number of knots (k) for

143 the age smoother was set to 4 to avoid overfitting (*i.e.*, avoiding biologically unrealistically

144 complex smoothing curves). The initial model was thus:

145 $$(Y1) \sim a + s(age, k{=}4, by{=}as.factor(Sex)) + factor(sex) + ei$$

146 where, *Y1* is body length, *a* is the intercept, s(*age*) is a smooth function of age and *ei* is the

147 residual (unexplained information or noise, $ei \sim N(0, s2)$). Model validation included checking that

148 residuals were approximately normally distributed, homoscedastic and contained no obvious

149 patterns, and checking "hat" values to ensure there were no serious outliers. Separate models

150 were fitted for each sex to derive approximate 95% confidence limits for the visually identified

151 asymptotic size (since GAM does not fit a formula it is not possible to precisely locate the age at

152 which asymptotic size is achieved). Models were fitted using the "gam" function from the mgvc

153 library in R 2.9.1. Predicted lengths at each age and associated 95% confidence limits were then

154 calculated using the "predict", "boot" and "boot.ci" functions in R 2.9.1.

155

156 *Growth: mass at length*

157 To quantify the length-mass relationship and test for differences between the sexes, we fitted

158 Gaussian GAMs, with mass as the response and length and sex as explanatory variables. Length

159 and mass were first log-transformed. For the length effect, *k* was set to a maximum of 4 to avoid

160 overfitting. Models with separate smoothers for the effect of length for each sex were compared,

161 using ANOVA, with models that used a common length smoother for both sexes. Finally the

162 analysis was repeated excluding pregnant females. These analyses were carried out in Brodgar

163 2.7.1.

164

165   *Gompertz growth models*

166   Gompertz growth curves (Laird 1966, Fitzhugh 1975) were used to describe the growth

167   pattern and to predict length and age at physical maturity, separately for male and female harbor

168   porpoises, by using a three-parameter model in which the first parameter is length at birth (an

169   alternative formulation uses asymptotic length). The form of the Gompertz model used was:

170    $$L = L_0 \times e^{\left(a \times \left(1 - e^{(-b \times Age)}\right)\right)}$$

171   where, L_0 = birth length, a is the specific rate of exponential growth, and b is the rate of decay

172   of exponential growth. Although an independent estimate of L_0 was available from the present

173   study (see above), it was based on a small sample size and, in addition, not all ages of the

174   youngest animals could be estimated to the nearest 0.25 yr. Therefore we allowed the values of

175   all three parameters to be determined by the model. Exploration of two-stage Gompertz models

176   indicated that they offered no improvement of goodness of fit.

177   Equations were initially fitted using the nonlinear regression function in SPSS Version 20,

178   which provides parameter estimates (with 95% confidence limits) and a value for r^2. To generate

179   95% confidence limits for the fitted curve we re-ran the models in R (version 2.9.1) using the

180   "nls" command and bootstrapped the 95% confidence limits using the "boot" and "boot.ci"

181   commands (boot library).

182   In principle, individuals may be considered physically mature if they have a total body length

183   (TBL) equal or greater than the asymptotic value generated by the Gompertz equations. In

184   practice, since approach to an asymptote was slow we regarded the asymptote having been

185   reached once the 95% confidence limits of predicted length encompassed the predicted length at

186   20 yr old (the oldest animals available in this data set). To provide further evidence on asymptotic

187   size we also fitted a simple two-stage linear model, such that the first part had a positive slope

8

188 and the second part had a zero slope, and identified the switching point that minimized the sum of

189 squares.

190

191 *Female reproductive status*

192   During the postmortem examination of females, both ovaries were removed and preserved in

193 10% neutral buffered formalin, and any evidence of lactation or presence of a fetus was recorded.

194 If a fetus was present, it was weighed, sexed if possible, and measured.

195   Both ovaries were examined externally and internally to record the presence and number of

196 *corpora lutea* (CL) and *corpora albicantia* (CA) on the left and right ovaries. Assessment of

197 female reproductive status was based on procedures and terminology recommended by the

198 International Whaling Commission (Perrin *et al*. 1984) and used in similar studies (*e.g*., Read

199 1990*a,* Murphy *et al*. 2009). Females were considered sexually mature if the ovaries contained at

200 least one *corpus luteum* or *albicans*, and as immature if no *corpora* were present. Mature females

201 were assigned to one of the following classes: (a) Pregnant, based on the visible presence of a

202 fetus, but not lactating, based on the absence of milk in the mammary glands, (b) Pregnant and

203 lactating, (c) Lactating but not (visibly) pregnant, or (d) Mature but neither (visibly) pregnant nor

204 lactating (*corpora* were present in the ovaries, providing evidence of previous reproductive

205 activity). This latter class includes 'resting' mature females, ovulating females (based on

206 presence of *corpus luteum* and large Graafian follicles), and females that had recently aborted.

207 Distinguishing among these categories was not always possible and they are therefore grouped

208 together. The indicators used to suggest recent abortion rather than dystocia or parturition,

209 include an open cervix, asymmetric uterine horns, and, in particular, gross or histological

210 evidence of lesions or remodelling in the uterine body. In addition, note that very small fetuses

211 are likely to be missed during necropsy so the number of pregnant animals is likely to be

212 underestimated; this bias is taken into account when estimating pregnancy rate (see below).

213

214 *Male reproductive status*

215 During the postmortem examination of males, both testes were removed, weighed (when

216 possible) and preserved in 10% neutral buffered formalin. Where testes were large in size, a

217 cross-section of the mid-testis was collected for fixation and storage. Sections, approximately

218 $2 \times 2 \times 0.5$ cm, were dissected from the middle of each testis with its associated epididymis, and

219 stored in 70% ethanol before processing for histology. The tissue was dehydrated using 30%,

220 50%, 70%, 80%, and 95% graded ethanol solutions, absolute ethanol, and butanol. The tissue was

221 then embedded in paraffin wax, sectioned at 7 μm, stained with hematoxylin and eosin, and

222 mounted on a glass slide with DPX.

223 The reproductive status of male harbor porpoises was determined based on the mean diameter

224 of the seminiferous tubules, the relative proportion (low, medium, and high) of sertoli cells,

225 interstitial tissue, and germinal cells such as spermatogonia, spermatocytes, spermatids, and

226 spermatozoa. Males were classified as (i) Immature (abundant interstitial tissue and sertoli cells,

227 primary spermatogonia present, diameter of seminiferous tubules <50-60 μm); (ii) Pubescent

228 (reduction in density of interstitial tissue and sertoli cells, some production of spermatocytes,

229 seminiferous tubules ~80 μm); (iii) Active mature (sertoli cells rare, abundant spermatogonia,

230 spermatocytes, spermatids and spermatozoa, epididymis full with spermatozoa and actively

231 secreting epithelium, seminiferous tubules ~200 μm); or (iv) Resting mature (postseason,

232 numerous sertoli cells, few germinal cells or numerous spermatogonia and spermatocytes with

233   some spermatids and spermatozoa in tubules, seminiferous tubules are various sizes) (Hess 1999;

234   Neimanis *et al*. 2000; Murphy *et al*. 2005).

235

236   *Age and length at sexual maturity (ASM and LSM)*

237   The average age and length at attainment of sexual maturity were estimated by fitting binomial

238   GLMs (with logit link function) to data on maturity *vs*. age and maturity *vs*. length, respectively,

239   in both sexes. Age at 50% maturity is given by -a/b where a is the intercept parameter and b is

240   the slope. Confidence limits were estimated by bootstrapping (1,000 runs), using the "boot" and

241   "boot.ci" functions (from the boot library) in R (version 2.9.1). Confidence intervals were

242   calculated using the adjusted bootstrap percentile (BCa) method. Binomials GAMs were also

243   fitted to investigate whether there was any significant departure from a standard logistic curve.

244

245   *Pregnancy rate*

246   The pregnancy rate was estimated as the proportion of pregnant females (*i.e*., those with a

247   fetus present) in the sample of mature females. To avoid missing the presence of early embryos,

248   samples from the period of implantation were excluded from this calculation (Read 1990*a;* Read

249   and Hohn 1995). Different sources of evidence from the present study regarding the conception

250   period were not entirely consistent and calculations were therefore made based on each of the

251   plausible alternatives. As a means of checking how much bias might result from missing early

252   embryos, we also repeated the calculations using mature females from the whole year.

253   The 95% confidence limits of the pregnancy rate estimates were obtained based on

254   approximating the binomial distribution with a normal distribution, as justified by the central

255   limit theorem.

256

257 *Reproductive cycle*

258   The reproductive cycle (ovulation, conception, gestation, calving, and lactation periods) of

259 female harbor porpoises in Scottish waters was determined by examining the reproductive status

260 of male and female porpoises, and the body length of fetuses and neonates (see below), in

261 relation to the reported stranding or bycatch date.

262

263 *Gestation period, dates of conception, birth and lactation period*

264   The gestation period was estimated from fetal growth rate and mean length at birth (from the

265 sample of neonates which retained fetal characters), taking into account the initial lag period or

266 nonlinear phase, while individual conception dates were calculated by subtracting the estimated

267 fetal age (t in days) from the date on which the animal was found (Julian date) (after Börjesson

268 and Read, 2003). Fetal age at birth, equivalent to the duration of gestation, is given by:

269 $$\text{Fetal age} = (L_{\text{birth}}/u) \times 30.5 + t_0$$

270 where, u is the fetal growth rate (equal to the slope of the linear regression of fetal length (mm)

271 on month), L_{birth} is the mean length at birth (mm), 30.5 is the average days in a month, and t_0 is

272 the estimated duration of the lag phase. The estimate for t_0 uses an equation for eutherian

273 mammals from Calder (1982):

274 $$t_0 = 7.25 \times (m_{\text{birth}}{}^{0.19})$$

275 where m_{birth} is the mean mass at birth (g).

276   Probable dates of birth for fetuses were estimated from calculated conception dates and

277 gestation period (*i.e.*, assuming that all fetuses have the same growth rate).

278   Lactation period was estimated based on when lactating females were found and from

279 examination of the stomach contents of neonates and calves. We present data on the occurrence

280 of solid food in stomachs of animals up to 110 cm long (a cut-off point identified retrospectively

281 as the approximate size of 1-yr olds according to fitted growth curves; see below). Length at

282 weaning (Lw) was thus estimated based on the size of the smallest calves found with solid food in

283 the stomach and largest animals with milk in the stomach, as well as by applying the Huang *et al*.

284 (2009) equation:

285 $$Lw = 1.239Lx^{0.877}$$

286 where, Lx is maximum female body length (cm).

287

288 *Data analysis, exploration and quality control*

289 Data were screened for any implausible combinations of length, age, and maturity and any

290 suspect values were checked against original data, where necessary referring back to the necropsy

291 notes. Transcription errors were corrected and any remaining suspect values were deleted from

292 the subsequent analysis. Except where otherwise stated, data exploration and statistical modelling

293 were performed using Brodgar software (version 2.7.2.) (www.brodgar.com) linked to R (version

294 2.9.1) or directly in R 2.9.1.

295

296

297 **RESULTS**

298 Table 1 summarizes the sample composition used in this study and the data available for 944

299 harbor porpoises recorded by the SAC in Scotland between 1992 and 2005.

300

301 *Fetal growth and size of neonates*

302 Fetuses (n=18) had body lengths in the range 5.7-88 cm. Fetal lengths in the five dystocia

303 cases for which intact fetuses were recovered (and which thus represent near fullterm fetuses)

304 ranged between 67-78 cm. A linear regression of fetal length on date (treating September as the

13

305   starting point) provided a reasonably good fit, with month explaining 79.1% of the observed

306   variation in fetus length (Fig. 1). However, a small fetus recorded on 1 May is a clear outlier and

307   excluding this animal, r^2 rises to 89.8% (n=17). The slope of the original regression line indicates

308   a fetal growth rate of 80.40 mm/mo; excluding the outlier, fetal growth rate is 84.4 mm/mo.

309   The two smallest stranded animals were 60 cm in length but neither was sent for postmortem

310   so it cannot be confirmed that they were fullterm. The smallest individuals that were necropsied

311   were 65 and 66 cm in length. Excluding the 60 cm animals, therefore, neonates (n=78, using a

312   cut-off size of 90 cm) had a minimum body length of 65 cm. Average length and mass were 79.1

313   cm (95% CI=77.6-80.5 cm; n=80) and 7.38 kg (95% CI=6.77-7.99 kg; $n=$46) (see Table 2 for

314   further details). It is evident that ≤90 cm individuals occur almost exclusively in May to August

315   (Fig. 1).

316   The small subset (n=8) of neonates displaying diagnostic characteristics (*i.e.*, presence of fetal

317   folds and/or hairs still present in bristle pits) ranged in length from 66-84 cm (mean 76.2 cm) and

318   4.6-7.9 kg (mean 6.43 kg). Taking these animals together with the largest fetuses (lengths above

319   66 cm, n=6), we estimate average birth length and mass as 76.4 cm and 6.84 kg (Table 2).

320

321   *Postnatal body length, mass and age*

322   Excluding fetuses, body length ranged from 60-175 cm (n=861, although as noted above the

323   smallest animals may not have been fullterm) and body mass from 4.5-72.9 kg (n=463), with

324   females and males having a similar range of body lengths (Table 2). Body mass was available for

325   19 pregnant females and ranged from 38.0-69.2 kg (54.70±8.04 kg). There was no evidence from

326   the postmortem to suggest that the heaviest female (72.9 kg) was pregnant. Ages of both sexes

327   ranged from <1 yr to 20 yr (n=358, Table 2). Seventy-seven animals (22%) were <1 yr old. The

328   majority (approximately 61%) were aged ≤5 yr, with only 7.5% aged 12 yr or older.

14

329

Growth: length at age

GAM results confirmed that a model with separate smoothers for effects of age on length in males and females was a better fit than one with a common smoother for age (ANOVA, F=4.59, P=0.0047), confirming a sex-related difference in the growth trajectory. In addition, females are significantly longer at age than males (t=5.87, P<0.0001). This model explained 80.1% of deviance in length. Based on separate GAMs for both sexes (Fig. 2), asymptotic length is reached at around age 12 yr. At age 12 yr males have a (fitted) length of 147.2 cm (SE=1.66, 95% CI=143.95-150.5 cm) and females aged 12 yr have a length of 158.4 cm (SE=2.69, 95% CI=153.1-163.8 cm).

The Gompertz curves (Fig. 3) provided a moderately good fit to the length-at-age data for both sexes (r^2=0.810 in males and 0.783 in females). Both curves suggest that physical maturity is reached at around 12 yr, by which age the 95% confidence intervals for fitted length encompass the fitted length at 20 yr old. At 12 yr old, the fitted body length for males is 148.3 cm (95% CI=146.3-150.0 cm) and that for females is 160.7 cm (95% CI=157.7-163.8 cm), *i.e.*, slightly larger than predicted by the GAM fit. At age 20, fitted length for males was 149.7 cm long (95% CI=147-.1-152.3 cm) and that for females was 163.0 cm (95% CI=158.8-167.4 cm).

A simple two-stage linear fit (not illustrated) suggested that a switch between positive and zero growth occurred at 5.9 yr (SE=0.37) and 145.9 cm (95% CI=140.7-151.2) in males and 5.8 yr (SE=0.34) and 156.1 cm (95% CI=153.2-159.1) in females. Sums of squares for these fits were slightly lower than for the Gompertz curves and the distributions of residuals were satisfactory.

Growth: mass at length

353   GAMs were also used to investigate length-mass relationships. Results of an F test (F=4.93,

354   P=0.0081) confirmed that the fitted length-mass relationship differed significantly between the

355   sexes. The difference remained significant if pregnant females were excluded (F=3.26,

356   P=0.0394).

357   The fitted curve for nonpregnant females was somewhat closer to linear (*i.e.*, closer to a

358   simple power curve fit for untransformed data) than that for males (*estimated degrees of freedom*,

359   edf=1.97 for females, 2.41 for males). In males, the slope of the mass-length relationship is

360   reduced at higher lengths. Nonpregnant females were significantly lighter, in relation to their

361   length (t=4.12, P<0.0001) than males, although the fitted curves suggest that this would not be

362   the case in the very smallest and largest animals (Fig. 4). The separate model for males explained

363   90.7% of deviance, as compared to 91.9% for the model for nonpregnant females.

364   Based on the fitted models, predicted lengths at age 0 were 98.2 cm for males and 99.2 cm for

365   females. These relatively high values reflect the fact that not all "age 0" animals were neonates.

366

367   *Female reproductive status*

368   Reproductive status was determined for 178 female porpoises, of which 76 were mature and

369   102 immature. In addition there were 15 neonate females, which can be assumed to have been

370   immature. Of the mature females, 21 were pregnant (with a fetus present), including two which

371   were pregnant and lactating, while a further 11 were lactating but not pregnant. The remaining 44

372   mature females were neither pregnant nor lactating and classed as resting mature.

373   Ovary masses were available for 90 females. Combined ovary mass (left and right) for

374   immature females (0.88±0.57 g, n=58) was, as expected, smaller than that of mature females

375   (5.52±2.23 g, n=32) and the highest masses were recorded for the ovaries of pregnant females

376 (8.27±1.95 g, *n*=6; Table 3). Masses for the left ovaries in both immature and mature females

377 were generally greater than those for the right ovaries (Table 3).

378

379 *Male reproductive status*

380   Based on histological analysis of samples from 143 male porpoises, reproductive status could

381 be determined for 141 males. Of these males, 55 were classified as mature, 12 pubertal and 74

382 immature. In addition, four neonate males were assumed to be immature. Fifteen of the 55 mature

383 males were classed as active.

384   Testis mass (left and right gonads) was available for 35 males (see Table 4 for details). The

385 combined testis masses of immature males (maximum of 84 g, ≤0.25% of body mass) were

386 smaller than those of pubescent and resting mature males (in which combined testis mass ranged

387 between 0.5% and 1.1% of body mass), while active mature males had considerably larger testis

388 masses (a maximum of 3.8 kg combined testis mass, and ranging from 1.3% to 6.8% of body

389 mass. There was not much difference in the left and right testis masses, with the exception of one

390 pubescent male in which the right testis weighed 186g while the left was only 21g.

391

392 *Age and length at sexual maturity (ASM and LSM)*

393   Seventy-eight (96.3%) of the 81 immature female porpoises with length data were ≤140 cm in

394 length. This included four neonates (66-79 cm length) while the remaining immature animals

395 ranged from 93-148 cm. Ages ranged from <1 yr to 5 yr, with the majority (88%) aged <4 yr old.

396 There were 63 mature females, the majority (95%) being ≥140 cm and 97% aged ≥4 yrs. The

397 smallest mature female was 119 cm long and 3 yr old, which is unusual. Excluding this animal,

398 body lengths of mature females ranged from 137-173 cm and ages from 3.5-20 yr.

17

399   Immature male porpoises had body lengths from 84-130 cm (*n*=59) and all but one (5 yr old)

400   were aged ≤3.5 yr. Pubescent males ranged from 119-153 cm and were aged 1-7 yr (*n*=7). Aside

401   from the youngest (and smallest) animal, which would appear to be unusually precocious, the

402   range was 2-7 yr and 123-153 cm. The active mature male porpoises (*n*=14) had body lengths

403   between 135-157 cm and were aged 6-15 yr. Resting mature males (*n*=32) had body lengths

404   between 116-160 cm and ages ranged from 4-20 yr. The two smallest mature males (116 and 126

405   cm) were both 4 yr old.

406   GAM results showed that maturity in both sexes was strongly related to age (*P*<0.001 in both

407   cases) and fitted smoothers for the effect of age were linear (df=1), justifying the use of GLM for

408   the final models. A binomial GLM (see Table 5 for model parameters) for maturity at age in

409   females (*n*=144) estimated an ASM of 4.35 yr (95% CI=3.93-4.71, 83.6% of deviance

410   explained). For males, the estimate was 5.00 yr (95% CI=4.03-5.88, 82.3% of deviance

411   explained).

412   LSM was estimated at 138.8 cm (95% CI=135.9-141.6; 79.7% of deviance explained) for

413   females (*n*=190) and at 132.2 cm (95% CI=129.1-135.6; 69.7% of deviance explained) in males

414   (*n*=145). Model parameters and standard errors are given in Table 5.

415

416   *Pregnancy rate*

417   Taking the range of conception dates to be 26 May to 14 September, and excluding mature

418   females recorded between these dates to reduce error due to missing early term fetuses, there

419   were 42 mature females of which 17 were pregnant (with a fetus present), giving a pregnancy rate

420   of 0.40 (95% CI=0.26-0.55). Excluding mature females from the entire May to September period

421   leaves 35 mature females of which 13 were pregnant, giving a pregnancy rate of 0.37 (95%

422   CI=0.21-0.53). Taking into account the presence of active mature males from April onwards and

18

423 therefore excluding mature females from April to September, estimated pregnancy rate 0.34

424 (95% CI=0.17-0.52), based on 29 mature females of which 10 were pregnant. These figures

425 equate to a mature female becoming pregnant on average once every 2.5 to 3 yr. Only two of the

426 21 pregnant females (9.5%) sampled were also lactating, which suggests these porpoises are

427 rarely simultaneously pregnant and lactating.

428 The estimate of pregnancy rate including mature females collected all year round would have

429 been 0.28 (95% CI=0.18-0.38), based on 21 of 76 mature females being pregnant.

430 Unsurprisingly, given the low sample sizes, the considerable overlap in 95% confidence limits

431 indicates that these various estimates are not significantly different.

432

433 *Reproductive cycle*

434 Pregnant females with a fetus (n=19) present but not lactating were found between November

435 and June, the two females that were both pregnant and lactating were found in September and

436 November, while lactating (nonpregnant) females (n=11) were present during June to November,

437 most (63.64%) being recorded in June and July. Mature females classified as 'resting' (n=44)

438 were found in every month, with the highest number (25%) recorded in June.

439 Reproductively active mature males (n=15) were recorded from April to July, resting mature

440 males (n=40) were recorded in every month, except April and July, while pubescent males (n=12)

441 were found between March and June and in September (n=1) and October (n=1).

442

443 *Gestation period and dates of conception*

444 Based on a mean mass at birth of 6.8 kg (see above), the lag phase of fetal growth would last

445 38.8 d. Based on the smallest confirmed neonate (4.1 kg) and largest fetus (9.5 kg) the lag phase

446 would be 35.2 and 41.3 d respectively. Using the figure of 38.8 d, and applying the higher fetal

19

447   growth rate calculated previously, gives a gestation period of 314.9 d (10.3 mo), as compared to

448   328.6 d (10.8 mo) if the lower growth rate estimate were used.

449   The seasonal distributions of female reproductive status and of neonate and fetus body lengths

450   are also consistent with a gestation period of around 10-11 mo. Intact fetuses were recorded

451   between September and June, with the smallest fetus recorded in September (5.7 cm) and the

452   largest (88 cm) in May.

453   Similarly, taken together, the seasonal distributions of pregnant females, lactating females and

454   reproductively active males, and neonate and fetus body lengths, suggest that conception usually

455   takes place before September (the smallest fetus, 5.7 cm long, was recorded in September). Back-

456   calculating the date of conception for each fetus by subtracting the estimated fetal age (based on

457   fetal length, and using the higher growth rate estimate) from the date found gives a range of

458   conception dates, from 26 May (for the 88 cm fetus recorded in May 2003) to 14 September (a 51

459   cm fetus recorded in April 2003). However, all but three estimated conceptions (*n=17*, excluding

460   the previously identified outlier) occurred in July and August, with the mean date of conception

461   calculated as the 4 August (*SD=26.6 d*). Using the lower growth rate estimate would shift the

462   mean conception date back to 26 July (*SD=28.2 d*).

463

464   *Calving period*

465   Recent births (*n=8*) were recorded between 30 May and 27 July, while dystocia cases (*n=8*)

466   occurred between 16 May and 1 August (all but two in May and June). Furthermore, 73 (91.25%)

467   of the 80 "neonates" (≤90 cm, likely 0-2 mo old) were recorded during May to August, with the

468   majority (*n=52; 65%*) recorded in June and July (Fig. 1).

469   Estimated dates of birth of the fetuses (*n=17*, again excluding the outlier), based on estimated

470   dates of conception and gestation period (314.9 d), and the higher fetal growth rate estimate,

471   ranged from 6 April to 26 July, with a mean of 15 June (*SD*=26.6 d). Note that the earliest

472   estimated birth date relates to the largest fetus, which was on 18 May. Excluding this animal

473   shifts the earliest estimated birth date to 22 May and the mean to 20 June. Adopting the slower

474   growth rate estimate (and gestation period of 328.6 d) results in a mean birth date of 20 June (24

475   June if the largest fetus is excluded).

476

477   *Lactation period and weaning*

478   Lactating females (*n*=13) were recorded between June and November. Milk was found in the

479   stomachs of only two neonates, in June and July 2001 (79 and 84 cm respectively). Remains of

480   solid food were found in the stomachs of 41 animals <110 cm long and these were recorded all

481   year round, although predominantly (65%) during February to May. The ten smallest individuals,

482   ranging in length from 86 to 101 cm in length, were recorded during February to September, six

483   of them in February. These smallest animals had eaten mainly whiting (*Merlangius merlangus*),

484   gobies (Gobiidae) or sepiolids (Sepiolidae). Considering all 41 animals <110 cm long, the diet

485   between January and mid-March was dominated numerically by these three prey categories, with

486   small numbers of clupeids, sandeels (Ammodytidae) and other gadoids also recorded. From mid-

487   March to September, sandeels assumed greater importance. For full quantitative details of diet,

488   see Santos *et al.* (2004). We tentatively suggest that weaning occurs mainly from February to

489   May.

490   Using the Huang *et al.* (2009) equation, length at weaning was estimated to be 105.3 cm (95%

491   CI=102.2–108.5 cm) based on the estimated asymptotic body length (158.4 cm, 95% CI=153.1-

492   163.8 cm) or 113.7 cm based on a maximum observed female body length of 173 cm.

493

494

DISCUSSION

As a source of information on biological, reproductive and life history parameters, the 944 harbor porpoises stranded and bycaught over the 14-year study period represent only a small fraction of the extant population, estimated as 385,617 animals (*CV*=0.20, 95% CI=261,266-569,153) in the summer of 2005 for the North Sea and adjacent waters (SCANS-II survey area) (Hammond *et al*. 2013). However, for such a widespread and numerous species there is no realistic possibility of monitoring the living population to derive life history parameters, unlike (for example) the situation with small resident bottlenose dolphin populations (*e.g.*, Grellier *et al*. 2003; Wells *et al*. 2005).

Adult body size

The harbor porpoise is one of the smallest cetaceans and body size varies with geographic location. Porpoises from Scottish waters (1992-2005) have a similar maximum recorded body length (175 cm, *n*=861) to porpoises from Iceland (174 cm, *n*=1266), are slightly larger than animals from West Greenland (166 cm, *n*=176), and smaller than animals from Spain (202 cm, *n*=59), Portugal (202 cm, *n*=37) and indeed smaller than porpoises previously studied around the British Isles (1985-94) (189 cm, *n*=210) (Lockyer 1995*a*, 2003*a*; Sequeira 1996; Lens 1997; Ólafsdóttir *et al*. 2002). Most of the studies cited were based on relatively small sample sizes, with closest agreement being obtained with the study with the largest sample size. Nevertheless, it is apparent that iberian porpoises reach a larger maximum size than those in northern Europe.

Fetal growth and size at birth

The estimated fetal growth rate in porpoises from Scottish waters was approximately 84 mm/mo, which is very similar to the estimated growth rate of 83 mm/mo of porpoises from the

519   Kattegat and Skagerrak Seas, and historic data from the North and Black Seas (Börjesson and

520   Read 2003).

521   The estimated average length at birth (76.4 cm) is also similar to values reported in other

522   studies, including Iceland, Kattegat and Skagerrak Seas and California, although slightly greater

523   than estimates from Denmark and UK (Hohn and Brownell 1990; Sørensen and Kinze 1994;

524   Lockyer 1995*a*; Börjesson and Read 2003; Lockyer and Kinze 2003; Ólafsdóttir *et al.* 2002).

525   There was a wide range of length at birth, which is consistent with the other studies, suggesting

526   that a wide range of birth sizes is usual.

527   In the present study the smallest neonates were 60 cm in length, although it cannot be

528   confirmed that these were fullterm as they were not necropsied. The next smallest animals were

529   65 and 66 cm, while those neonates recorded as displaying fetal characters ranged in length from

530   66 to 84 cm. The largest recorded fetus was 88 cm long although this appears to be exceptional

531   (and if it grew at the average rate it should have been born some 6 wk prior to the date its mother

532   died) and the next largest fetuses were 77-78 cm. However, as noted above, it is possible that the

533   smallest neonate lengths represent premature births and that the largest fetus were abnormally

534   large - several (although not the largest) were associated with maternal mortality due to birth

535   difficulties.

536

537   *Postnatal growth and sexual dimorphism*

538   The fitted Gompertz growth models suggest that physical maturity is not reached until around

539   12 yr for both sexes. However it is apparent from the 2-stage linear fits that a shift from rapid

540   growth to slow or zero growth can be identified at approximately 6 yr in both sexes and the

541   relatively wide variation in size at age in both sexes makes it difficult to identify the age at

542   physical maturity with any certainty. Lockyer (1995*a*) found most porpoises reached a maximum

23

543 size by the age of around 8 yr in a sample of 234 stranded and bycaught animals from the British

544 Isles between 1985 and 1994, and for female porpoises from the Bay of Fundy the estimated age

545 of physical maturity was 7 yr (Read and Tolley 1997).

546   The Gompertz growth model has been used to describe the growth of several cetacean species,

547 including the harbor porpoise, and appears to provide the best fit for most cetaceans (*e.g.*, Read

548 and Gaskin 1990; Read and Tolley 1997; Stolen *et al.* 2002; Richardson *et al.* 2003). A single

549 Gompertz growth curve was used in the current study, as asymptotic values obtained from this

550 plot were thought to be sufficient for assessing if individuals had attained a stable adult size (after

551 Murphy and Rogan 2006). An improved fit was not obtained using a 2-stage Gompertz curve;

552 indeed a 2-stage linear model was a slightly better fit than the Gompertz model, which likely

553 reflects the high variability in length at age in both sexes. In our study, Gompertz models

554 provided moderately satisfactory fits to the data while the application of GAMs allowed the

555 capture of departures from the growth form assumed by the Gompertz curve.

556   Harbor porpoises are sexually dimorphic, with females being larger than males (Yurick and

557 Gaskin 1987; Gaskin 1984; Read 1999; Lockyer 2003*a*), which was also found in this study. Our

558 results confirm a significant sex-related difference in the growth trajectory, as also reported by

559 many authors (*e.g.,* Gaskin and Blair 1977; van Utrecht 1978; Stuart and Morejohn 1980; Noldus

560 and De Klerk 1984; Read and Gaskin 1990; Read and Tolley 1997; Galatius 2005), with females

561 having faster growth rates than males (*i.e.*, they are longer at a given age), while males of a given

562 length are heavier than females. It is thought that female harbor porpoises attain a larger size than

563 males to allow the birth of larger calves, which would have better chance of survival in the cold

564 waters inhabited by harbor porpoises (Stuart and Morejohn 1980; Read and Tolley 1997; Galatius

565 2005). However, as noted above, the largest adult sizes in this species are seen in Spanish and

566 Portuguese Atlantic waters.

24

567

Age and lifespan

569   The estimated life expectancy of harbor porpoises in captivity is 43-47 yr, based on brain and

570 body mass regressions (Sacher 1980). In our sample the maximum age recorded was 20 yr, while

571 24 yr was the maximum age recorded by Lockyer (1995*a*) in the UK (1985-94) and in Denmark,

572 with examples of harbor porpoises of more than 20 yr also reported from Iceland and California

573 (Lockyer 2003*a*; Ólafsdóttir *et al.* 2002).

574   The majority of harbor porpoises that have been examined generally have a short life, with

575 most not reaching physical maturity (*e.g.*, Lockyer and Kinze 2003), a result also found in our

576 sample, with only 7.5% of porpoises aged ≥ 12 yr. It is possible that the sampled age (at death)

577 distribution is not fully representative of the porpoise population inhabiting Scottish waters.

578 However, even if this is the case, calculation of most life history parameters (*e.g.*, length-at-age,

579 age at sexual maturity), and comparisons between different subsets of porpoises (*e.g.*, males *vs.*

580 females) should still be valid.

581

Age of sexual maturity

583   In early maturing cetacean species, such as harbor porpoises, small changes in age of sexual

584 maturity (and hence first pregnancy) can produce large changes in the rate of population growth

585 (Hohn 1989); therefore ASM is an important criteria in evaluating the status of a population

586 (DeMaster 1978). Age of sexual maturity has been used as an index of the condition of a

587 population or the relative carrying capacity of an area (Eberhardt and Siniff 1977; DeMaster

588 1984; Fowler 1984). For example, higher density populations tend to have a greater average age

589 of sexual maturity (DeMaster 1984).

590   ASM in both female (4.4 yr) and male (5.0 yr) porpoises from Scottish waters were higher

591   than estimates available from other areas, such as Iceland (3.2 and 2.9 yr), Gulf of Maine (3.4 and

592   >3 yr), Denmark (3.6 and 2.9 yr) and West Greenland (3.6 and 2.45 yr for females and males,

593   respectively) (Sørensen and Kinze 1994; Read and Hohn 1995; Lockyer *et al*. 2001, 2003;

594   Ólafsdóttir *et al*. 2002). Geographical differences in ASM could arise for many reasons,

595   including consequences of differences in porpoise population density and/or prey availability or

596   other habitat characteristics. For example, in the Bay of Fundy changes in the age and length at

597   sexual maturity of female porpoises have been observed and are thought to be linked to a

598   decrease in porpoise density caused by incidental mortality in commercial fisheries and/or linked

599   to increased prey availability (Read and Gaskin 1990). However, it is also possible that the

600   estimates of ASM in our study are biased (slightly upwards) due to the high incidence of deaths

601   resulting from poor health (*i.e*., pathological conditions) in the animals sampled (28% of

602   necropsies), in that poor health may delay individual maturation. The majority of porpoises

603   sampled (approximately 61%) had not reached ASM (*i.e*., aged ≤5 yr).

604

605   *Female reproductive status*

606   Female reproductive status was determined based on postmortem findings and histological

607   examination of the ovaries. Combined ovary mass was taken when possible; however, due to the

608   overlap between immature and mature females, it was not found to be a reliable indicator of

609   female reproductive status. All CL present on the ovaries of female porpoises in this study were

610   associated with an actual or recent pregnancy. However, not all CA appear to be derived from CL

611   of pregnancy, as several females had higher numbers of CA than would be expected if they were

612   related to pregnancy, even when taking into account variation in the age of attainment of sexual

26

613   maturity. CA can result from both the regression of a CL of pregnancy and from an unfertilised

614   ovulation, but there is no clear or definitive method to distinguish between both (Gaskin *et al.*

615   1984, Perrin *et al.* 1984). Therefore, further analysis would be useful to assess the persistence of

616   these scars in porpoises (*cf.*, Dabin *et al.* 2008 for common dolphins).

617

618   *Male reproductive status*

619   Male reproductive status was determined based on histological analysis. However testis mass

620   can also provide a rough indication, as there was a distinct difference in combined testis mass for

621   immature, pubescent and mature males, although some overlap between pubescent and mature

622   resting males.

623   Reproductively active mature males were recorded from April to July while most estimated

624   conception dates for the fetuses recorded were in July or August; a larger sample size might help

625   to illuminate this apparent discrepancy. The distinct seasonal change in male testes may reflect

626   the energetic cost of maintaining large active testes all year (Gaskin *et al*. 1984; Neimanis *et al*.

627   2000). In active mature males from Scottish waters the combined mass of both testes ranged from

628   1.3% to 6.75% of the total body mass. In sperm whales (*Physeter macrocephalus*), the equivalent

629   percentage is only about 0.01%, with little evidence of any seasonal change (Gaskin *et al*. 1984).

630   Greater testis size is generally related with a polygynandrous (promiscuous) mating system (*e.g.*,

631   Perrin and Mesnick 2003).

632   In harbor porpoises, the relative large size of the male testes, sexual dimorphism in which the

633   females are larger, the absence of secondary sexual characteristics, observations of solitary

634   individuals and small group sizes, and no indication of aggressive behavior between males (such

635   as the absence of scarring) all suggests sperm competition plays a major role in the mating

636   system (Fontaine and Barrette 1997; Read and Tolley 1997).

637

Pregnancy rate and senescence

The estimated pregnancy rate determined in our study (0.34-0.40) is equivalent to mature females becoming pregnant, on average, once every 2.5 to 3 yr and is substantially lower than estimates for Denmark (0.73), Bay of Fundy (0.74), Gulf of Maine (0.93) or Iceland (0.98) (Read 1990*a*; Sørensen and Kinze 1994; Read and Hohn 1995; Ólafsdóttir *et al.* 2002), all of which were based on bycaught porpoises. The presence of two pregnant and lactating females in our sample, suggest that porpoises in Scottish waters can give birth annually. An annual breeding cycle has been reported for porpoises in the Bay of Fundy, Baltic Sea, West Greenland, and Iceland (Møhl-Hansen 1954; Gaskin *et al.* 1984; Lockyer *et al.* 2003; Ólafsdóttir *et al.* 2002).

Many factors could contribute to differences in pregnancy rates, including differences in age at sexual maturity, general health, nutritional condition, the quality and quantity of available food and exposure to contaminants (such as endocrine disrupting chemicals, *e.g.*, Aguilar *et al.* 1999). PCB concentrations recorded in the blubber of female porpoises from Scotland during 2001-03 were above the threshold at which effects on reproduction might be expected in almost 40% of individuals (Pierce *et al.* 2008).

It is likely, however, that our figure of 0.34 to 0.40 is an underestimate. The present study was based mainly on stranded animals (94.6%), among which there were relatively few mature females sampled outside the implantation period when small foetuses could be missed (between 29 and 42 animals depending on how the implantation period is estimated). Of these mature females, around two-thirds were diagnosed as having died from health-related causes (*i.e.*, pathological conditions, such as disease, parasitism, *etc.*).

Cause of death was established for 14 of the pregnant females (*n*=21), five of which had died due to poor health / pathological conditions and five due to dystocia. There were also three

661 additional records of dystocia, one in which the fetus was recorded as "macerating" and two in

662 which no evidence of a fetus was found; these animals were therefore not recorded as pregnant.

663 These findings highlight two potential issues: firstly, the birth rate will be lower than the

664 pregnancy rate, due to abortions and deaths of pregnant females. Secondly, strandings include a

665 high proportion of animals which were to varying degrees suffering from poor health and less

666 healthy females may have both lower pregnancy rates and a lower incidence of successful

667 pregnancies than healthy mature females. Thus pregnancy rate is likely to be underestimated

668 from stranded animals.

669 Senescence, expressed as a substantial age-related decline in fecundity, has been identified in

670 several odontocete species (Perrin *et al.* 1984; Marsh and Kasuya 1984, 1986; Myrick *et al.* 1986;

671 Chivers 2002). Senescence seems not to be documented for (the relatively short-lived) harbor

672 porpoise, although Ólafsdóttir *et al.* (2002) speculated that the single nonpregnant mature female

673 sampled in Iceland, which was 17 years old, may have been senescent. Although the number of

674 older female porpoises recorded in the present study was small, two pregnant females were aged

675 15 yr, and the oldest female in the study (aged 20 yr) showed possible evidence of a recent

676 pregnancy. Thus, there was no indication of senescence in female harbor porpoises from Scottish

677 waters. Similarly, Read (1990*a*) found no evidence of reproductive senescence or declining

678 fertility with age in female harbor porpoises from the Bay of Fundy.

679

680 *Reproductive seasonality and cycle*

681 There is a distinct reproductive seasonality in the harbor porpoise (Read and Hohn 1995;

682 Börjesson and Read 2003). There can be several selective advantages to seasonal reproduction.

683 For example, if food availability is seasonal, as generally occurs at higher latitudes, then females

684 may time the reproductive season so that periods of high energetic demands, such as early

685   lactation, coincide with periods of high prey availability. Other considerations include ensuring

686   the availability of suitable prey at the time of weaning and ensuring that calves are born when

687   water temperatures are warmer and the weather is calmer to increase survival and/or reduce

688   energy expenditure (Whitehead and Mann 2000). In addition, the timing of conception may relate

689   to factors such as the nutritional condition and health of a female (Sørensen and Kinze 1994).

690   In the present study, all active mature males were sampled between the months April and July.

691   Although the occurrence of reproductively active males suggests that conceptions could occur as

692   early as April, estimated conception dates were mainly in July and August, which is similar to

693   results for several other areas of the North Atlantic (Hohn and Brownell 1990; Read 1990*b*;

694   Sørensen and Kinze 1994; Bandomir-Krischack 1996). The lack of samples of active males from

695   August could reflect a sampling bias as healthy active mature males, like healthy pregnant

696   females, may be   underrepresented in strandings. The timing of conception in porpoises is

697   thought to relate to the annual photoperiod cycle, which could act as a rough cue to predict the

698   optimal time to give birth (Sørensen and Kinze 1994). Gestation period would not be expected to

699   vary greatly between individuals or areas and the gestation period of harbor porpoises in Scottish

700   waters (10-11 mo) is consistent with published estimates from other studies, which range from 10

701   to 12 mo (Møhl-Hansen 1954; van Utrecht 1978; Read 1990*b*; Sørensen and Kinze 1994;

702   Bandomir-Krischack 1996; Börjesson and Read 2003). In Scottish waters calving probably

703   mainly takes place between May and July, when sea temperatures are increasing, again similar to

704   results from other studies in Europe and North America (Møhl-Hansen 1954; van Utrecht 1978;

705   Hohn and Brownell 1990; Read 1990*b*; Sørensen and Kinze 1994; Bandomir-Krischack 1996;

706   Börjesson and Read 2003).

707   Several cetacean species show variation in the lactation period and weaning age/size, between

708   populations and between individuals (Whitehead and Mann 2000; Evans and Stirling 2001). The

30

709 length of lactation and size at weaning can significantly affect calf survival, have serious

710 implications for the health of the mother and, therefore, potentially, long-term viability of a

711 population.

712   Based on the available evidence it is not possible to determine the duration of the lactation

713 period with any great certainty. Lactating females were found only during June to November;

714 neonates with milk in the stomach were found only in June and July while evidence of very small

715 porpoises feeding on solid food was evident mainly from February onwards. Estimates of 8-9 mo

716 have been obtained from other areas (Møhl-Hansen 1954; Read 1990*b*; Sørensen and Kinze

717 1994). Weaning in harbor porpoises is thought to start at an age of around 8 mo, although calves

718 may not feed entirely independently until about 10 mo old (Lockyer 2003*a*). Visual identification

719 of milk in the digestive tract is possible only if death happened very soon (<3-4 h) after feeding.

720 After that, the milk is likely to resemble normal gut fluid contents. A possible solution would be

721 to use an assay for milk sugars in gut contents.

722   Applying the Huang *et al.* (2009) method to the maximum female size recorded in the present

723 study, length at weaning was estimated to be 113.7 cm, similar to estimates of 115.1 cm by

724 Huang *et al*. (2009) and 114.7 cm (Lockyer *et al*. 2001). However, if we used the estimated

725 asymptotic size of females, the estimated size at weaning would be reduced to 105.3 cm. In fact,

726 solid food was present in stomachs of some individuals from 86 cm in length upwards.

727   While some calves evidently start to take solid food as early as February, the timing of

728 weaning of the majority of harbor porpoises in Scottish waters (March through May) coincides

729 with the availability of sandeels, an important and relatively energy-rich major component of

730 porpoise diet during the second and third quarters of the year in Scotland (Santos *et al.* 2004).

731 Diet of the smallest individuals generally showed a similar seasonality to that previously

732 described for the whole dataset (to 2003) in Santos *et al.* (2004), with sandeels assuming

31

733 prominence from mid-March through to September, the other main prey categories being

734 whiting, gobies and sepiolids.

735

736 *Stranding data: sampling biases and value*

737   Previous estimates of life history parameters of harbor porpoises have been variously based on

738 material from directed lethal sampling, fishery bycatches, and strandings, all of which can

739 involve some biases. Strandings, for example, may be biased towards very young, sick, and (to a

740 lesser extent) very old animals (*i.e*., they are representative of the age structure of deaths rather

741 than the age structure of the living population) and towards animals living in coastal waters.

742 However, most "Scottish" porpoises are found relatively close to the coast: in July 1994 the

743 SCANS survey identified two major concentrations of porpoise abundance in the North Sea,

744 along the Danish coast and along the coasts of Scotland and northern England. In 2005, although

745 the highest densities of animals were seen off the east coast of southern England, and there also

746 seemed to be a lower density immediately adjacent to the coast, most animals were seen within

747 around 100 miles of the coast (see Hammond *et al.* 2013). Strandings data in general will also be

748 influenced by carcass buoyancy (dead porpoises seem to float quite well; A. Brownlow Pers.

749 Obs.) and the drift process (affected by prevailing currents), and biased towards those animals

750 notable enough for the public to report (*e.g.* Peltier *et al.* 2013).

751   Different biases may apply to bycatch, the incidence of which may reflect a complex

752 combination of seasonal changes in cetacean and fisheries distributions as well as behavioral

753 processes that can vary with age, sex and reproductive status (Donovan and Bjørge 1995;

754 Lockyer 2003*a, b*).

755   Where possible, the potential biases and limitations associated with using stranded animals in

756 this study have been addressed. However, this has not always been possible, for example, a

757 probable source of bias in this data set is that unhealthy animals may be less likely to become

758 pregnant than those with good health status.

759   The fact that only around a third of strandings yielded age and reproductive status data reflects

760 the fact that necropsies were usually not carried out for animals which were in a poor state of

761 preservation, as well as logistic (*e.g.* related to transport) and financial constraints. It should be

762 noted that teeth could normally be extracted even from badly decomposed animals and collection

763 and analysis of such samples would significantly enhance the data available in future.

764   Despite possible limitations, data from stranded and bycaught animals remain a valuable

765 source of biological and life history information and this long-term study of a large and varied

766 (*i.e.*, ages and times of year for both males and females) sample set, where porpoises had died

767 from different causes (including bycatch, attacks from *Tursiops truncatus*, live stranding and

768 various pathological conditions) offered a unique opportunity to determine the biological and life

769 history parameters of harbor porpoises in Scottish waters.

770   The value of data available from strandings is gaining increasing recognition, for example in

771 relation to patterns of species richness and relative abundance (Pyenson 2011). The establishment

772 of monitoring strategies for small cetaceans is needed under various international agreements and

773 directives (such as ASCOBANS and the European Union's Marine Strategy Framework

774 Directive). In this context, cetacean stranding data have an important role to play, notably

775 because stranded cetaceans constitute the main source of biological material on which vital rates

776 can be estimated, potentially providing early warning of changes in population size. Alternative

777 methods such as photo-identification and serial dedicated surveys also have their limitations and

778 biases. Consequently monitoring strategies will have to rely on several complementary methods

779 and data sources.

780   While the second UK report on implementation of the EU Habitats Directive assessed the

781   conservation status of harbor porpoise in UK waters as favorable (with medium confidence)

782   (Joint Nature Conservation Committee 2007), surveys indicate a southward shift in summer

783   distribution in the North Sea between 1994 and 2005 (Hammond *et al.* 2013). In addition, several

784   of the recorded causes of porpoise mortality in Scotland (disease, starvation, bottlenose dolphin

785   attacks, fishery bycatch) represent potential future threats at population level and high

786   concentrations of POPs have been recorded in porpoises in the northeast Atlantic (*e.g.* Pierce *et*

787   *al.* 2008; Law *et al.* 2010). To assess and model the impacts of any of these threats, we need to

788   know the rate at which the population will grow in the absence of the threat (Stenson 2003). This

789   depends on parameters such as age at sexual maturity and age-specific mortality and birth rates,

790   which can be derived from life history studies. Changes in any of these parameters will affect

791   population growth and, hence, impact on abundance (for example, DeMaster 1978; Fowler 1984;

792   Winship *et al.* 2007; Murphy *et al.* 2009). Use of life history data from strandings monitoring

793   clearly presents challenges, not least to quantify and understand the nature of biases. However,

794   we argue that such data represent an important and arguably undervalued resource.

795

796

810

811

812   **LITERATURE CITED**

813   ASCOBANS. 2011. Sixteenth Compilation of Annual National Reports to ASCOBANS:

814   http://www.ascobans.org/pdf/ASCOBANS_AnnualNationalReportCompilation_2011.pdf

815   Aguilar, A., A. Borrell and T. Pastor. 1999. Biological factors affecting variability of persistent

816   pollutant levels in cetaceans. Pages 83-116 *in* P. J. H. Reijnders, A. Aguilar and G. P.

817   Donovan, eds. Chemical pollutants and cetaceans. Report of the International Whaling

818   Commission Special Issue 1, International Whaling Commission, Cambridge.

819   Bandomir-Krischack, B. M. 1996. Preliminary results on reproduction of harbor porpoises in

820   German coastal waters. European Research on Cetaceans 9:212-214.

821   Börjesson, P. and A. J. Read. 2003. Variation in timing of conception between populations of the

822   harbor porpoise. Journal of Mammalogy 84(3):948-955.

823   Calder, W. A., III. 1982. The pace of growth: an allometric approach to comparative embryonic

824   and post-embryonic growth. Journal of Zoology 198:215–225.

825   Chivers, S. J. 2002. Cetacean life history. Pages 221-225 *in* W. F. Perrin, B. Würsig and J. G. M.

826   Thewissen, eds. Encyclopedia of marine mammals. Academic Press, San Diego.

35

827   Dabin, W., C. F. Cossais, G. J. Pierce and V. Ridoux. 2008. Do ovarian scars persist with age in

828   all Cetaceans: new insight from the short-beaked common dolphin (*Delphinus delphis*

829   Linnaeus, 1758). Marine Biology 156:127–139.

830   DeMaster, D. P. 1978. Calculation of the average age of sexual maturity in marine mammals.

831   Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada 35:912-915.

832   DeMaster, D. P. 1984. Review if the techniques used to estimate the average age at attainment of

833   sexual maturity in marine mammals. Pages 175-179 *in* W. F. Perrin, J. R. L. Brownell and D.

834   P. DeMaster, eds. Reproduction in whales, dolphins and porpoises. Report of the

835   International Whaling Commission Special Issue 6, International Whaling Commission,

836   Cambridge.

837   Donovan, G. P. and A. Bjørge. 1995. Harbor porpoises in the North Atlantic: edited extract from

838   the report of the IWC Scientific Committee, Dublin 1995. Pages 3-25 *in* A. J. Bjørge and G.

839   P. Donovan, eds. Biology of phocoenids. Report of the International Whaling Commission

840   Special Issue 16, International Whaling Commission, Cambridge.

841   Eberhardt, L. L. and D. B. Sinif. 1977. Population dynamics and marine mammal management

842   policies. Journal of the Fisheries Research Board of Canada 34:183-190.

843   Evans, P. G. H. 1980. Cetaceans in British Waters. Mammal Review 10:1-52.

844   Evans, P. G. H. and I. Stirling. 2001. Life history strategies of marine mammals. Pages 7-62 *in* P.

845   G. H. Evans and J. A. Raga, eds. Marine mammals: biology and conservation. Kluwer

846   Academic/Plenum Publishers, New York.

847   Fitzhugh, H. A. J. 1975. Analysis of growth curves and strategies for altering their shape. Journal

848   of Animal Science 42:1036–1051.

849   Fontaine, P. M. and C. Barrette (1997) Megatestes: anatomical evidence for sperm competition in

850   the harbour porpoise. Mammalia 61(1): 65-71.

851   Foster, G., I. A. P. Patterson and D. S. Munro. 1999. Monophasic group B *Salmonella* species

852   infecting harbor porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) inhabiting Scottish coastal waters.

853   Veterinary Microbiology 65: 227-231.

854   Fowler, C. W. 1984. Density dependence in cetacean populations. Pages 373-379 *in* W. F. Perrin,

855   J. R. L. Brownell and D. P. DeMaster, eds. Reproduction in whales, dolphins and porpoises.

856   Report of the International Whaling Commission Special Issue 6, International Whaling

857   Commission, Cambridge.

858   Galatius, A. 2005. Sexual dimorphic proportions of the harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*)

859   skeleton. Journal of Anatomy 206:141-154.

860   Gaskin, D. E. 1984. The harbor porpoise *Phocoena phocoena* (L.): regional populations, status,

861   and information on direct and indirect catches. Report of the International Whaling

862   Commission 34:569-586.

863   Gaskin, D. E. and B. A. Blair. 1977. Age determination of harbor porpoise, *Phocoena phocoena*

864   (L.), in the western North Atlantic. Canadian Journal of Zoology 55:18-30.

865   Gaskin, D. E., G. J. D. Smith, A. P. Watson, W. Y. Yasui and D. B. Yurick. 1984. Reproduction

866   in the porpoises (Phocoenidae): implications for management. Pages 135-148 *in* W. F.

867   Perrin, J. R. L. Brownell and D. P. DeMaster, eds. Reproduction in whales, dolphins and

868   porpoises. Report of the International Whaling Commission Special Issue 6, International

869   Whaling Commission, Cambridge.

870   Grellier, K., P. S. Hammond, B. Wilson, C. A. Sanders-Reed and P. M. Thompson. 2003. Use of

871   photo-identification data to quantify mother-calf association patterns in bottlenose dolphins.

872   Canadian Journal of Zoology 81:1421-1427.

873   Hammond, P. S., P. Berggren, H. Benke, *et al.* 2002. Abundance of harbor porpoise and other

874   cetaceans in the North Sea and adjacent waters. Journal of Applied Ecology 39:361-376.

875   Hammond, P. S., K. Macleod, P. Berggren, *et al.* 2013. Cetacean abundance and distribution in

876   European Atlantic shelf waters to inform conservation and management. Biological

877   Conservation 164:107-122.

878   Haug, T., G. Desportes, G. A. Vikingsson and L. Witting, eds. 2003. Harbor porpoises in the

879   North Atlantic, Volume 5. NAMMCO Scientific Publications. The North Atlantic Marine

880   Mammal Commission, Tromsø.

881   Heide-Jørgensen, M. P., M. Iversen, N. H. Nielsen, C. Lockyer, H. Stern and M. R. Ribergaard

882   (2011) Harbor porpoises respond to climate change. Ecology and Evolution Open Access

883   doi: 10.1002/ece3.51.

884   Hess, R. A. 1999. Spermatogenesis, Overview. Encyclopedia of Reproduction. Volume 4.

885   Academic Press: 539-545.

886   Hohn, A. A. 1989. Variation in life-history traits: the influence of introduced variation. PhD

887   Thesis, University of California, Los Angeles.

888   Hohn, A. A. and J. R. L. Brownell. 1990. Harbor porpoise in central California waters: life

889   history and incidental catches. IWC Report SC/42/SM47. International Whaling

890   Commission, Cambridge.

891   Hohn, A. A. and C. Lockyer. 1995. Report of the harbor porpoise age determination workshop,

892   Oslo, 21-23 May 1990. Appendix 3: Protocol for obtaining age estimates from harbor

893   porpoise teeth. Pages 494-496 *in* A. J. Bjørge and G. P. Donovan, eds. Biology of

894   phocoenids. Report of the International Whaling Commission Special Issue 16, International

895   Whaling Commission, Cambridge.

896   Huang, S.-L., L.-S. Chou and I.-H. Ni. 2009. Comparable length at weaning in cetaceans. Marine

897   Mammal Science 25:875–887.

898   Huggett, A. St G. and W. F. Widdas. 1951. The relationship between mammalian foetal weight

899   and conception age. Journal of Physiology 114:306-317.

900   Jepson, P. D., P. M. Bennett, R. Deaville, C. R. Allchin, J. R. Baker and R. J. Law. 2005.

901   Relationships between polychlorinated biphenyls and health status in harbor porpoises

902   (*Phocoena phocoena*) stranded in the United Kingdom. Environmental Toxicology and

903   Chemistry 24:238–248.

904   Joint Nature Conservation Committee. 2007. Second Report by the UK under Article 17 on the

905   implementation of the Habitats Directive from January 2001 to December 2006. JNCC,

906   Peterborough. Available from: www.jncc.gov.uk/article17.

907   Kastelein, R. A., M. J. Bakker and C. Staal. 1997. The rehabilitation and release of stranded

908   harbor porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*). Pages 9-61 *in* A. J. Read, P. R. Wiepkema and P. E.

909   Nachtigall, eds. The biology of the harbor porpoise. De Spil Publishers, Woerden.

910   Kuiken, T. and M. G. Hartmann. 1991. Cetacean pathology: dissection techniques and tissue

911   sampling. Proceedings of the first European Cetacean Society workshop on cetacean

912   pathology: dissection techniques and tissue sampling, Leiden, The Netherlands.

913   Laird, A. K. 1966. Postnatal growth of birds and mammals. Growth 30:349–363.

914   Law, R. J. 1994. Collaborative UK marine mammal project: summary of data produced 1988-

915   1992. Fisheries Research Technical Report 97. MAFF Directorate of Fisheries Research,

916   Lowestoft.

917   Law, R. J., Bersuder, P., Barry, J., Deaville, R., Reid, R. J. and Jepson, P. D. 2010.

918   Chlorobiphenyls in the blubber of harbour porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) from the UK:

919   levels and trends 1991-2005. Marine Pollution Bulletin 60:470-473.

920   Lens, S. 1997. A note on the harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) in the coastal waters of

921   Spain. Report of the International Whaling Commission 47:841-847.

922   Lockyer, C. 1995*a*. Investigations of aspects of the life history of the harbor porpoise, *Phocoena*

923   *phocoena,* in British waters. Pages 189-197 *in* A. J. Bjørge, and G. P. Donovan, eds. Biology

924   of phocoenids. Report of the International Whaling Commission Special Issue 16,

925   International Whaling Commission, Cambridge.

926   Lockyer, C. 1995*b*. A review of factors involved in zonation in odontocete teeth, and an

927   investigation of the likely impact of environment factors and mayor life events on harbor

928   porpoise tooth structure. Pages 511-529 *in* A. J. Bjørge, and G. P. Donovan, eds. Biology of

929   phocoenids. Report of the International Whaling Commission Special Issue 16, International

930   Whaling Commission, Cambridge.

931   Lockyer, C. 2003*a*. Harbor porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) in the North Atlantic: biological

932   parameters. Pages 71-90 *in* T. Haug, G. Desportes, G. A. Vikingsson and L. Witting, eds.

933   Harbor porpoises in the North Atlantic, Volume 5. NAMMCO Scientific Publications,

934   Tromsø.

935   Lockyer, C. 2003*b*. A review of methods for defining population structure in the harbor porpoise

936   (*Phocoena phocoena*). Pages 41-70 *in* T. Haug, G. Desportes, G. A. Vikingsson and L.

937   Witting, eds. Harbor porpoises in the North Atlantic, Volume 5. NAMMCO Scientific

938   Publications, Tromsø.

939   Lockyer, C. and C. C. Kinze. 2003. Status, ecology and life history of harbor porpoises

940   (*Phocoena phocoena*), in Danish waters. Pages 143-176 *in* T. Haug, G. Desportes, G. A.

941   Vikingsson and L. Witting, eds. Harbor porpoises in the North Atlantic, Volume 5.

942   NAMMCO Scientific Publications, Tromsø.

943   Lockyer, C., M. P. Heide-Jørgensen, J. Jensen, C. C. Kinze and T. B. Sørensen. 2001. Age,

944   length and reproductive parameters of harbor porpoises *Phocoena phocoena* (L.) from West

945   Greenland. ICES Journal of Marine Science 58:154-162.

946   Lockyer, C., M. P. Heide-Jorgensen, J. Jensen and M. J. Walton. 2003. Life history and ecology

947   of harbor porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) from West Greenland. Pages 177-194 *in* T. Haug,

948   G. Desportes, G. A. Vikingsson and L. Witting, eds. Harbor porpoises in the North Atlantic,

949   Volume 5. NAMMCO Scientific Publications, Tromsø.

950   MacLeod, C.D., M. B. Santos, R. J. Reid, B. E. Scott and G. J. Pierce. 2007. Linking sandeel

951   consumption and the likelihood of starvation in harbor porpoises in the Scottish North Sea:

952   could climate change mean more starving porpoises? Biological Letters 3:185-188.

953   Marsh, H. and T. Kasuya. 1984. Changes in the ovaries of the short-finned pilot whale,

954   *Globicephala macrorhynchus*, with age and reproductive activity. Pages 311-335 *in* W. F.

955   Perrin, J. R. L. Brownell and D. P. DeMaster, eds. Reproduction in whales, dolphins and

956   porpoises. Report of the International Whaling Commission Special Issue 6, International

957   Whaling Commission, Cambridge.

958   Marsh, H. and T. Kasuya. 1986. Evidence for reproductive senescence in female cetaceans. Pages

959   57-74 *in* G. P. Donovan, ed. Behaviour of whales in relation to management. Report of the

960   International Whaling Commission Special Issue 8. International Whaling Commission,

961   Cambridge.

962   Møhl-Hansen, U. 1954. Investigations of reproduction and growth for the porpoise (*Phocaena*

963   *phocaena* (L.)) from the Baltic. Viddenskaplige Meddelelser fra den Danske Naturhistoriske

964   Forening 116:369-396.

965   Murphy, S., A. Collet and E. Rogan. 2005. Mating strategy in the male common dolphin

966   (*Delphinus delphis*): What gonadal analysis tells us. Journal of Mammalogy 86:1247-1258.

967   Murphy, S and E. Rogan. 2006. External morphology of the short-beaked common dolphin,

968   *Delphinus delphis*: growth, allometric relationships and sexual dimorphism. Acta Zoologica

969   (Stockholm) 87: 315-329.

970 Murphy, S., A. Winship, W. Dabin, *et al.* 2009. Importance of biological parameters in assessing

971 the status of *Delphinus delphis*. Marine Ecology Progress Series 388:273-291.

972 Murphy, S., G. J. Pierce, R. J. Law, *et al.* 2010. Assessing the effect of persistent organic

973 pollutants on reproductive activity in common dolphins and harbor porpoises. Journal of

974 Northwest Atlantic Fishery Science 42:153-173.

975 Myrick Jr, A. C., A. Hohn, J. Barlow and P. A. Sloan. 1986. Reproductive biology of female

976 spotted dolphins, *Stenella attenuata*, from the Eastern Tropical Pacific. Fishery Bulletin 84:

977 247-259.

978 Neimanis, A. S., A. J. Read, R. A. Foster and D. E. Gaskin. 2000. Seasonal regression in

979 testicular size and histology in harbour porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) from the Bay of

980 Fundy and Gulf of Maine. Journal of Zoology, London 250: 221-229.

981 Noldus, L. P. J. J. and R. J. J. De Klerk. 1984. Growth of the skull of the harbor porpoise,

982 *Phocoena phocoena* (Linnaeus, 1758), in the North Sea, after age determination based on

983 dentinal growth layer groups. Zoologische Meddedelingen 58:213-239.

984 Ólafsdóttir, D., G. A. Vikingsson, S. D. Halldórsson and J. Sigurjónsson. 2002. Growth and

985 reproduction in harbor porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) in Icelandic waters. Pages 195-210 *in*

986 T. Haug, G. Desportes, G. A. Vikingsson and L. Witting, eds. Harbor porpoises in the North

987 Atlantic, Volume 5. NAMMCO Scientific Publications, Tromsø.

988 Palka, D. 1996. Effects of Beaufort sea state on the sightability of harbor porpoises in the Gulf of

989 Maine. Report of the International Whaling Commission 46:575-582.

990 Peltier, H., H. J. Baagøe, K. C. J. Camphuysen, R. Czeck, W. Dabin, P. Daniel, R. Deaville, J.

991 Haelters, T. Jauniaux, L. F. Jensen, P. D. Jepson, G. O. Keijl, U. Siebert, O. Van Canneyt

992 and V. Ridoux. 2013. the stranding anomaly as population indicator: the case of harbour

993   porpoise *Phocoena phocoena* in North-Western Europe. PLoS ONE 8(4): e62180.

994   doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0062180.

995   Perrin, W. F. and A. C. Myrick, eds. 1980. Age determination of toothed whales and sirenians.

996   Report of the International Whaling Commission Special Issue 3. International Whaling

997   Commission, Cambridge.

998   Perrin, W. F. and S. L. Mesnick (2003) Sexual ecology of the spinner dolphin, *Stenella*

999   *longirostris*: geographic variation in mating systems. Marine Mammal Science 19(3): 462-

1000   483.

1001   Perrin, W. F. and S. B. Reilly. 1984. Reproductive parameters of dolphins and small whales of

1002   the family Delphinidae. Pages 97-125 *in* W. F. Perrin, J. R. L. Brownell and D. P. DeMaster,

1003   eds. Reproduction in whales, dolphins and porpoises. Report of the International Whaling

1004   Commission Special Issue 6, International Whaling Commission, Cambridge.

1005   Perrin, W. F., J. R. L. Brownell and D. P. DeMaster, eds. 1984. Reproduction in whales,

1006   dolphins and porpoises. Report of the International Whaling Commission Special Issue 6.

1007   International Whaling Commission, Cambridge.

1008   Pierce, G. J., M. B. Santos, S. Murphy, *et al.* 2008. Bioaccumulation of persistent organic

1009   pollutants in female common dolphins (*Delphinus delphis*) and harbor porpoises (*Phocoena*

1010   *phocoena*) from western European seas: Geographical trends, causal factors and effects on

1011   reproduction and mortality. Environmental Pollution 153:401-415.

1012   Pyenson, N. D. 2011. The high fidelity of the cetacean stranding record: insights into measuring

1013   diversity by integrating taphonomy and macroecology. Proceedings of the Royal Society of

1014   London B. 278:3608-3616.

1015   Read, A. J. 1990*a*. Age at sexual maturity and pregnancy rates of harbor porpoises *Phocoena*

1016   *phocoena* from the Bay of Fundy. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science

1017   47:561-565.

1018   Read, A. J. 1990*b*. Reproductive seasonality in harbor porpoises, *Phocoena phocoena*, from the

1019   Bay of Fundy. Canadian Journal of Zoology 68:284-288.

1020   Read, A. J. 1999. Harbor porpoise *Phocoena phocoena* (Linnaeus, 1758). Pages 323-355 *in* S. H.

1021   Ridgeway and R. R. Harrison, eds. Handbook of marine mammals, Volume 6. Academic

1022   Press, San Diego.

1023   Read, A. J. and D. E. Gaskin. 1990. Changes in growth and reproduction of harbor porpoises,

1024   *Phocoena phocoena*, from the Bay of Fundy. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic

1025   Sciences 47:2158-2163.

1026   Read, A. J. and A. A. Hohn. 1995. Life in the fast lane: the life history of harbor porpoises from

1027   the Gulf of Maine. Marine Mammal Science 11:423-440.

1028   Read, A. J. and K. A. Tolley. 1997. Postnatal growth and allometry of harbor porpoises from the

1029   Bay of Fundy. Canadian Journal of Zoology 75:122-130.

1030   Read, A. J., P. R. Wiepkema and P. E. Nachtigall. 1997. The harbor porpoise (*Phocoena*

1031   *phocoena*). Pages 3-6 *in* A. J. Read, P. R. Wiepkema and P. E. Nachtigall, eds. The biology

1032   of the harbor porpoise. De Spil Publishers, Woerden.

1033   Reid, J. B., P. G. H. Evans and S. P. Northridge, eds. 2003. Atlas of cetacean distribution in

1034   North-West European waters. Joint Nature Conservation Committee, Peterborough.

1035   Richardson, S. F., G. B. Stenson and C. Hood. 2003. Growth of the harbor porpoise (*Phocoena*

1036   *phocoena*) in eastern Newfoundland, Canada. Pages 211-222 *in* T. Haug, G. Desportes, G. A.

1037   Vikingsson and L. Witting, eds. Harbor porpoises in the North Atlantic, Volume 5.

1038   NAMMCO Scientific Publications, Tromsø.

1039   Ross, H. M., and B. Wilson. 1996. Violent interactions between bottlenose dolphins and harbor

1040   porpoises. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B 263:283-286.

1041   Sacher, G. A. 1980. The constitutional basis for longevity in the Cetacea: do the whales and

1042   terrestrial mammals obey the same laws? Pages 209-213 *in* W. F. Perrin and A. C. Myrick,

1043   eds. Age determination of toothed whales and sirenians. Report of the International Whaling

1044   Commission Special Issue 3. International Whaling Commission, Cambridge.

1045   Santos, M. B., G. J. Pierce, J. A. Learmonth *et al.* 2004. Variability in the diet of harbor

1046   porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) in Scottish waters 1992-2003. Marine Mammal Science

1047   20:1-27.

1048   Sequeira, M. 1996. Harbor porpoise, *Phocoena phocoena*, in Portuguese waters. Report of the

1049   International Whaling Commission 46:583-586.

1050   Sørensen, T. B. and C. C. Kinze. 1994. Reproduction and reproductive seasonality in Danish

1051   harbor porpoises, *Phocoena phocoena*. Ophelia 39:159-176.

1052   Stenson, G. B. 2003. Harbor porpoise (*Phocoena phocoena*) in the North Atlantic: abundance,

1053   removals, and sustainability of removals. Pages 271-302 *in* T. Haug, G. Desportes, G. A.

1054   Vikingsson and L. Witting, eds. Harbor porpoises in the North Atlantic, Volume 5.

1055   NAMMCO Scientific Publications, Tromsø.

1056   Stolen, M. K., D. K. Odell and N. B. Barros. 2002. Growth of bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops*

1057   *truncatus*) from the Indian River lagoon system, Florida, USA. Marine Mammal Science

1058   18:348-357.

1059   Stuart, L. J. and G. V. Morejohn. 1980. Developmental patterns in osteology and external

1060   morphology in *Phocoena phocoena*. Pages 133-142 *in* W. F. Perrin and A. C. Myrick, eds.

1061   Age determination of toothed whales and sirenians. Report of the International Whaling

1062   Commission Special Issue 3. International Whaling Commission, Cambridge.

1063   van Utrecht, W. L. 1978. Age and growth in *Phocoena phocoena* Linnaeus, 1758 (Cetacea,

1064   Odontoceti) from the North Sea. Bijdragen Tot De Dierkunde 48:16-28.

1065   Wells, R.S., V. Tornero, A. Borrell, *et al*. 2005. Integrating life history and reproductive success

1066   data to examine potential relationships with organochlorine compounds for bottlenose

1067   dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*) in Sarasota Bay, Florida. Science of the Total Environment

1068   349:106-119.

1069   Whitehead, H. and J. Mann. 2000. Female reproductive strategies of cetaceans: life histories and

1070   calf care. Pages 219-246 *in* J. Mann, R. C. Connor, P. L. Tyack and H. Whitehead, eds.

1071   Cetacean societies: Field studies of dolphins and whales. The University of Chicago Press,

1072   Chicago.

1073   Wilkin, S. M., J. Cordaro, F. M. D. Gulland *et al.* 2012. An unusual mortality event of harbor

1074   porpoises (*Phocoena phocoena*) off central California: increase in blunt trauma rather than an

1075   epizootic. Aquatic Mammals 38: 301-310.

1076   Winship, A. J., R. Deaville, P. D. Jepson, J. A. Learmonth, S. P. Northridge and P. S. Hammond.

1077   2007. Framework for estimating the growth rate of harbor porpoise populations in the North

1078   Sea and European Atlantic using a population model and data on abundance, life history and

1079   bycatch. IWC Paper SC/59/SM26. International Whaling Commission, Cambridge.

1080   Yurick, D. B. and D. E. Gaskin. 1987. Morphometric and meristic comparisons of skulls of

1081   harbor porpoise *Phocoena phocoena* (L.) from the North Atlantic and North Pacific. Ophelia

1082   27:53-75.

1083

1084

1085

FIGURE LEGENDS

1087

1088 **Figure 1.** Lengths of fetuses (filled diamonds), confirmed neonates (filled circles), neonates

1089 (length ≤90 cm; open triangles) and other animals up to 130 cm (filled triangles) *vs.* date for

1090 harbor porpoises from Scottish waters (1992-2005). September is treated as month 1. The

1091 regression line fitted to fetal length data excludes the outlier (31 cm fetus from 1 May, shown as

1092 open diamond). Note that some lengths of larger animals were estimated.

1093

1094 **Figure 2.** Length at age curves based on predictions from GAMs for male and female harbor

1095 porpoises from Scotland, with 95% confidence limits on the predictions.

1096

1097 **Figure 3**. Age at length for male and female harbor porpoises from Scotland, with fitted

1098 Gompertz curves (with upper and lower 95% confidence limits).

1099

1100 **Figure 4.** Mass at length curves based on predictions from GAMs (fitted to log-transformed

1101 data) for male and female harbor porpoises from Scotland.

1102

47

TABLES

Table 1. *Sample composition and data available for stranded and bycaught harbor porpoises*
around Scotland (1992-2005)

Sample	Females	Males	Unknown sex	Total
All stranded & bycaught porpoises	294	324	326	944
Location				
- east coast	165	196	170	531
- north coast	35	38	36	109
- west coast	91	92	118	301
Necropsy	266	276	3	545
Cause of Death				
- pathological condition	86	66	0	152
- live stranding	3	5	0	8
- physical trauma	5	6	0	11
- dolphin attack	76	87	1	164
- bycatch	14	37	0	51
- starvation	24	18	0	42
- starvation (neonate)	20	14	0	34
- stillborn	3	3	0	6
- dystocia	8			8
- not established	27	40	2	69
Length data	289	320	252	861
Mass data	222	241	0	463
Age data	170	176	12	358
Reproductive status data	178	143	-	321
Reproductive status & age data	144	112	-	256
Fetuses	8	10	0	18
Neonates	26	28	26	80

1110 **Table 2.** *Range, sample sizes (n), mean and standard deviation (SD) for body length, mass and*

1111 *age of stranded and bycaught harbor porpoises around Scotland (*nonpregnant females).*

1112 *Females > 158 cm and males > 147 cm are those that have reached asymptotic length (see*

1113 *Results). "Recent births" are those animals in which fetal folds and/or hairs in bristle pits were*

1114 *evident. The combined category "Recent births and largest foetuses" represents our best estimate*

1115 *of size at birth. The category "Animals ≤90 cm" length comprises all newborn and young*

1116 *animals within the previously reported cutoff length for neonates.*

1117

Sample	*Length(cm)*		*Mass (kg)*		*Age(yr)*	
	Range (n)	*Mean (SD)*	*Range (n)*	*Mean (SD)*	*Range (n)*	*Mean (SD)*
All (excluding fetuses)	60-175 (861)	-	4.5-72.9 (463)	-	<1-20 (358)	-
Females	66-173 (289)	127.73 (25.84)	4.6-72.9 (222)	30.84 (16.15)	<1-20 (170)	4.33 (3.93)
Females >158 cm	158-173 (43)	164.21 (4.18)	33.5-72.9 (27)*	51.45 (8.55)*	4-20 (31)	8.98 (3.77)
Males	65-170 (320)	124.11 (22.69)	4.5-61.2 (241)	30.06 (14.55)	<1-20 (176)	4.97 (4.48)
Males >147 cm	147-170 (58)	153.55 (4.60)	31.0-61.2 (43)	45.98 (6.19)	5-16 (34)	9.32 (2.86)
Fetuses	5.7-88 (18)	50.62 (22.92)	08-9.5 (16)	3.85 (3.11)	-	-
Recent births	66-84 (8)	76.2 (5.5)	4.6-7.9 (8)	6.43 (1.13)	-	-
Recent births +_ largest fetuses	66-88 (14)	76.4 (5.9)	4.1-9.5 (14)	6.84 (1.59)	-	-
Animals ≤90 cm	65-90 (78)	79.05 (6.35)	4.5-12.8 (46)	7.38 (2.06)	-	-

1118

1119

1120

1121 **Table 3.** *Ovary mass (range, mean and standard deviation) for stranded and bycaught female*

1122 *harbor porpoises around Scotland (1992 and 2005)*

1123

Females	Ovary mass (g)		
	Left	Right	Combined
Immature (*n*=58)	0.17-1.78	0.10-1.24	0.30-3.02
	0.47±0.30	0.41±0.23	0.88±0.52
Mature (*n*=31)	0.95-8.27	0.43-3.35	1.37-10.39
	4.08±1.86	1.44±0.68	5.51±2.26
Resting mature (*n*=20)	0.95-6.16	0.43-3.35	1.37-8.70
	3.53±1.51	1.29±0.64	4.82±2.00
Pregnant (*n*=6)	4.00-8.27	0.95-2.80	5.61-10.39
	6.44±1.78	1.83±0.72	8.27±1.95
Lactating & recently pregnant (*n*=5)	2.07-4.47	0.96-2.73	4.32-5.93
	3.54±0.92	1.54±0.69	4.99±0.70

1124

1125

1126 **Table 4.** Testis *mass (range, mean and standard deviation) for stranded and bycaught male*

1127 *harbor porpoises around Scotland (1992 and 2005)*

1128

Males	Testis mass (g)		
	Left	Right	Combined
Immature (*n*=20)	7-44 14.30±10.34	6-40 13.15±8.50	13-84 27.45±18.78
Pubescent (*n*=3)	21-175 122.67±88.06	155-186 171.33±15.57	207-348 294.00±76.07
Active mature (*n*=4)	299-1925 1103.50±704.57	296-1889 1022.00±671.96	595-3814 2125.50±1372.19
Resting mature (*n*=8)	132-290 230.13±51.79	121-290 197.63±55.39	253-580 427.75±99.25

1129

1130

1131

1132

1133 **Table 5.** *Coefficient values (mean with standard error in parentheses) for binomial GLM fits for*

1134 *age and length at 50% maturity. Deviance explained and sample sizes are also given.*

1135

Model	Intercept coefficient	Age or length coefficient	Deviance explained (and sample size)
Age (females)	-9.3615 (2.3334)	2.1544 (0.541)	0.836 (144)
Age (males)	-6.3602 (1.5465)	1.2728 (0.2894)	0.823 (115)
Length (females)	-33.6385 (5.8790)	0.2423 (0.0419)	0.797 (190)
Length (males)	-26.1822 (4.4001)	0.1980 (0.0331)	0.697 (145)

1136