# Functional response of suspension feeding anuran larvae to different particle sizes at low concentrations (Amphibia)

## B. Viertel

Institute of Zoology, Johannes Gutenberg University, Saarstraße 21, D-6500, Mainz, Germany

Received 18 July 1990; in revised form 9 April 1991; accepted 3 July 1991

Key words: anuran larvae, suspension feeding, different particle sizes, food concentrations, larval stages

# Abstract

The influence of particle size, initial particle concentration and larval stage on the ingestion rate, 'retention efficiency', and filtering rate of anuran larvae with varying filter apparatus anatomy and different life histories was investigated for four species. Larvae of premetamorphic Stages 28 and 32 and prometamorphic Stage 40 were selected for filtering experiments on the basis of their different growth rates. Three different sizes of silica gel particles were offered as mock food. Particle concentration was measured photometrically. The Michaelis-Menten model was used to describe the dependency of ingestion rate, filtering rate, and 'retention efficiency' upon initial particle concentration, and to calculate maximum ingestion rate, threshold concentration, and the half-saturation constant.

(1) The highest ingestion rates, filtering rates and 'retention efficiencies' were achieved by *Xenopus laevis* larvae, followed by *Bufo calamita* larvae. *Bufo bufo* larvae lay at the opposite end of the scale. *Rana temporaria* larvae were placed between *B. calamita* and *B. bufo* larvae. This order is attributed to differences in life histories, especially the different breeding environments in which these larvae occur. (2) The larger the particle size and the older the stage, the greater the tendency toward saturation of the ingestion rate, filtering rate and 'retention efficiency'. These filtration parameters are graded according to particle size. The ingestion rate (number of particles), filtration rate and 'retention efficiency' are greatest for PS3. Ingestion volume is greatest for PS1. The difference between PS3 and PS2 on the one hand, and PS1 on the other, is often great; for Stage 28 *X. laevis* it is very great. This shows that larvae ingest large particles more effectively, and that the most effective ingestion takes place at Stages 28 and 32, owing to the growth function of these stages. The ability of larvae to ingest large particles effectively is possibly a very basic phylogenetic characteristic. (3) The threshold concentration is lowest when the particles are at their largest. In accordance with conclusions drawn by other authors, threshold feeding is attributed to regulation by buccal pumping and mucus production. Considerable importance is attributed to threshold feeding with respect to larval adaptation to oligotrophic environments.

# Introduction

Populations of anuran larvae are strongly controlled by nutrient supply and predators. Environmental evaporation also has a catastrophic effect on larval populations. A high nutrient supply, i.e. a high ingestion of exploitable food, leads to large and rapid growth, rapid development and therefore early metamorphosis (Collins, 1979; Hota & Dash, 1986; Murray, 1990; Wilbur, 1977). Larger larvae are the subject of predation less often than smaller larvae (Cronin & Travis, 1986; Formanowicz, 1986; Travis, 1983; Semlitsch, 1990; Semlitsch & Gibbons, 1988). At the same time, the preference of predators for smaller larvae means that the latter no longer exist as food competitors, which, in turn, accelerates the growth of larger larvae (DeBenedictis, 1974). Accelerated development allows the larvae to escape more quickly from aquatic predators and environmental evaporation. The supply and indigestibility (and digestibility) of food therefore has a direct influence on the survival rate of larvae and therefore also on the population dynamics of adults.

It is known that macroinvertebrates (i.e. amphipoda, oligochaeta, mysidacea) have a considerable influence on the composition of the bottom community through sediment feeding (Krezoski *et al.*, 1978). This is also true of anuran larvae. Dickman (1968) describes the considerable effect of periphyton scraping by *Rana aurora* larvae on the sessile community. The influence of anuran larval grazing and ingestion on the community structure of their ecosystems is often large: i.e. effect on algal diversity and productivity, nitrogen flux, phosphorus and organic carbon content (Seale, 1980; Weigmann, 1982).

Evidently, feeding strategy is of central importance for the understanding of anuran larval biology.

Anuran larvae are, with few exceptions, suspension feeders (Wassersug, 1972). The filter apparatus enables them to exploit a wide range of food sources: tadpoles filter suspended food particles such as phytoplankton and detritus from the water. Tadpoles with keratinized mouth parts scrape food off the substrate, suspend it, and filter it. Many anuran larvae are also bottom feeders. These ingest periphyton, detritus and interstitial organisms from the sediment, and also large quantities of indigestible sediment of different particle sizes (Diaz-Paniagua, 1985, 1989; Harrison, 1987; Hendricks, 1973; Löschenkohl, 1985; Datta Munshi *et al.*, 1986; Sabnis & Kuthe, 1980; Sahu & Khare, 1988; Viertel, 1978).

Seale & Wassersug (1979) studied functional

response of Rana sylvatica and Xenopus laevis larvae feeding on Chlorella pyrenoidosa (cell diameter 2.7  $\mu$ m; initial concentrations 5 10<sup>5</sup> to 10<sup>8</sup> algae ml<sup>-1</sup> or 5 10<sup>6</sup> to 10<sup>9</sup>  $\mu$ m<sup>3</sup> ml<sup>-1</sup>) and Anabaena spherica (cell diameter 5.1  $\mu$ m; each colony had an average of 27.9 cells; initial concentrations 6  $10^6$  to 1.5  $10^8 \,\mu\text{m}^3 \,\text{ml}^{-1}$ ). They demonstrated a lower and upper limit of initial food concentration for filtering and ingestion, as well as a peak in the filtering rate at a critical concentration (definitions see 'Materials and methods, Statistical analysis'). Seale & Beckvar (1980) investigated the ingestion and filtering of Anabaena sphaerica and Chlorella pyrenoidosa by Rana catesbeiana, Hyla crucifer and Bufo woodhousei fowleri larvae. All species regulate food intake as a function of volume and biomass and distinguish between different food sources. Ingestion was maximum and constant over a wide range of initial concentrations (*H. crucifer*: 2  $10^{7}$  to 4  $10^{7} \mu m^{3} m l^{-1}$ ; **B.** woodhousei fowleri:  $1.5 \ 10^7$  to  $4 \ 10^7 \ \mu m^3 \ ml^{-1}$ ; *R*. catesbeiana:  $1 \ 10^7$  to  $4 \ 10^7 \ \mu m^3 \ ml^{-1}$ ), and declined at lower concentrations. Threshold feeding was demonstrated. Seale et al. (1982) analysed the threshold feeding of X. laevis on yeast cells (diameter 3 to  $5 \,\mu m$ , Wassersug, 1972) and described a functional response similar to that of suspension feeding zooplankton (crustaceans).

In Bufo calamita, Rana temporaria, Bufo bufo (Gosner Stages 28, 32, 40) and X. laevis (Nieuwkoop and Faber Stages 51, 53 and 57) ingestion of Chlorella fusca algae (cell diameter 5.8 µm, cell volume 102.2  $\mu$ m<sup>3</sup>) occurred far below the initial food concentrations tested by Seale and Wassersug (1979) for Rana sylvatica (i.e., below 5  $10^5$ Chlorella pyrenoidosa ml<sup>-1</sup>, or 5  $10^6 \mu m^3 ml^{-1}$ ). Apart from B. bufo, the early larval stages attained the highest suspension feeding efficiency, corresponding with the high growth rates of these stages. In B. bufo only the older larvae showed ingestion at low initial concentrations. Threshold feeding behaviour (threshold concentration) in younger larvae is probably caused by reduction of buccal pumping and mucus production (Viertel, 1990).

Since food particles that were considerably larger (over 150  $\mu$ m) than those hitherto used in

suspension feeding experiments were found in the intestine of anuran larvae (algae colonies, bacteriophytes, sedimentary particles; Diaz-Paniagua, 1985, 1989; Datta Munshi et al., 1986; Viertel, 1978), several questions arise: (1) It seems probable that tadpole species which develop in environments that are rich in sediment but also oligotrophic, and/or are subject to high food competition, achieve a higher suspension feeding efficiency with larger particles both in the lowest and in high concentrations than species which inhabit nutrient rich waters. The first species depend on being able to exploit every available source of food, such as large plankton, large periphyton and interstitial organisms. This presupposes ingestion even of indigestible bottom sedimentary particles of all sizes and concentrations (substratum feeders). It may also be supposed that species that develop in oligotrophic environments are capable of exploiting the lowest particle concentrations. (2) What influence does higher particle size, i.e. particle volume, have on functional response? Knowledge of the various filter apparatus morphologies and their function (see Viertel 1985, 1987, 1989, 1991; Wassersug, 1972; Wassersug & Hoff, 1979; Wassersug & Rosenberg, 1979) leads to the conclusion that this occurs in different ways. (3) Is suspension feeding efficiency stage dependent under these circumstances? (4) Is functional response comparable with that of suspension feeding crustaceans.

# Materials and methods

# Selection of species and stages

*R. temporaria*, *B. calamita* and *B. bufo* have a similar filter apparatus. They represent Ortons' (1953) larval Type IV, are bottom feeders and scrape off periphyton with their horny beaks and the toothlets of their oral discs. They are less frequently observed suspension feeding in the water column (see also Löschenkohl, 1985). *B. calamita* larvae are found in small ephemeral and frequently oligotrophic ponds (Beebee, 1983; Bregulla, 1986, 1988; Strijbosch, 1979; Viertel, 1976). *B. bufo* adults spawn in larger, nutrient-

rich, permanent bodies of water (Heusser, 1958, 1960; Viertel, 1976, 1978). R. temporaria spawn in both nutrient-rich, permanent water and in temporary water (Savage, 1961; Strijbosch, 1979). X. laevis is a pipid larval Type I (Orton, 1953) whose filter apparatus is quite different to that of the species above. It is a microphagous midwater suspension feeder, lacking a horny beak and oral disc, but can also feed facultatively from the bottom and on deposit (Wassersug, 1972; Wassersug, personal communication). This African species also spawns in small ephemeral ponds (Channing; Fischer & Hinkel, personal communications). Furthermore, X. laevis is the species whose suspension feeding and filtering mechanism have been investigated most, and which therefore offers valuable opportunities for comparison.

Larvae of *R. temporaria*, *B. bufo* and *B. calamita* were collected and staged using normal tables (Gosner, 1960). *X. laevis* larvae were staged according to Nieuwkoop & Faber (1956). Only criteria of hindlimb development were used. This character is the only diagnostic criterium common to both larval Type I and IV. Stage 51 of Nieuwkoop and Faber corresponds to Stage 28 of Gosner, Stage 53 to Stage 32 (premetamorphic stages according to Etkin, 1968) and Stage 57 to Stage 40 (prometamorphic stages).

# Apparatus and adjustment

Grain-sized fractional silica gel (SiO<sub>2</sub>, specific gravity 2.6) in three different particle sizes (PS1, PS2, PS3, see Fig. 1) was offered to the larvae as food. Since the larvae under investigation are facultative sediment feeders under natural conditions and generally take in plankton of hard consistency (see above), it may be assumed that this mock food can be used without significantly distorting the results. An experimental chamber of blackened nickel plate was set up with a temperature controlled water-jacket and two cuvette windows for measurement. The total volume of the test chamber was 2000 ml. Measurements using emission spectroscopy revealed that 26 ppb



Fig. 1. Percental distribution of particle sizes. Encircled numbers indicate particle sizes PS1, PS2 and PS3. The dashed lines indicate the particles washed away before application. Numbers in  $\mu$ m demonstrate the diameters of 50% of the total sample.

copper, 20 ppb antimony, 60 ppb arsenic and no nickel (precise to 0.1 ppb) was released into the test water in two hours. It is presumed that these quantities had no influence on the tadpoles during the 30 min. experiments (Scheinberg, 1984). Toxic effects were therefore not expected to arise: WHO/FHO recommends maximal concentration of 20-50 ppb arsenic for drinking-water!

photometric measurement Α unit was mounted: An electric light bulb (6 V, 0.4 A, 2.4 W, emission spectrum 380-2000 nm) fed by a constant current transformer (Philips PE 1507, 0.15 V, 700 mA) was used as light source. The transmission (Tevini & Häder, 1985) supplied a silicon photocell BPY 47 P (see Siemens Opto-Halbleiter Datenbuch, 1981/82) attached to a compensation recorder. A rejection voltage had to be interposed to compensate for the contrast between low measurement intervals and high open-circuit voltage while taking exact readings in the 0.5-50 mV range. An electronic lowcut-filter (0.1 Hz) eliminated disturbance caused by individual silica gel particles drifting past the silicon photocell.

Owing to its specific gravity, the silica gel sedimented. It was maintained in suspension using a propeller (diameter 45 mm, three vanes, pitch 24 mm) with a rotation speed of ca 200 rev min<sup>-1</sup>. A net prevented the larvae from mutilation by the propeller. In order to estimate the influence of this current on ingestion, the buccal pump strokes were counted by eye both in turbulent and still particle-free water. The resulting percentage differences in the buccal pump strokes with and without turbulence were included in the ingestion calculations (Fig. 2). Control experiments revealed that a loss of silica gel from suspension nevertheless occurred (PS1 = 25%, PS2 = 25%, PS3 = 20%).

A particle weight-particle number relationship was established by weighing a silica gel sample and counting the particles in this unit of weight under the reversed microscope (Utermöhl, 1958). This allowed the calculation of silica gel weights required to provide particle concentration at 5  $10^4$ , 1  $10^5$ , 2  $10^5$ , 3.3  $10^5$ , 1  $10^6$ , 1.5  $10^6$  and 2  $10^6$ per 2 liter test volume. The recording indicated the standard transmission measurement for a specific concentration of a specific particle size.

All experiments were carried out at  $22 \pm 0.2$  °C. The oxygen concentration was 6.8 ppm (equals 80% saturation, according to Truesdale *et al.*, 1955; cited in Höll, 1979). The oxygen measurements were taken with a Clark electrode (WTW Oxi Digi 88). The carbon dioxide concentration was 2.2 ppm (titration according to Schwörbel, 1966).

## Experimental procedure

To prevent photometric disturbance resulting from faeces defecated by the tadpoles, the latter were incubated for 4.5 h in a solution of Vivasorb at a concentration of roughly 80 mOsmol (see also Viertel, 1990). Vivasorb is a clinical food concentrate of essential and non-essential amino acids, essential fatty acids, glucose, oligosaccarides, minerals, vitamins and trace nutrients (Pfrimmer & Co., Pharmazeutische Werke Erlangen). Vivasorb is fully absorbed in the alimentary tract and therefore faeces are not produced. Test feeding with comercially dried fish food and with silica gel showed that the tadpoles resumed ingestion of food and silica gel immediately under these conditions, as was confirmed by examining the alimentary tract. The buccal pump stroke frequency of the larvae incubated in Vivasorb was found to be normal when these were compared with the normally fed larvae. Feeding behaviour is, therefore, assumed to be normal during filtering experiments. Following Vivasorb treatment the tadpoles were introduced into 22 °C AOACwater (after Ashworth & Crozier, 1972; concentration: 10 mOsmol, hardness: 10 °dH equivalent to 3.57 mval, conductivity:  $650 \mu$ S, pH 7.3) for 24 h in order to acclimate them to the water and temperature used in the experiments.

According to the transmission adjustment measurements (standards) the photometric measurement unit was switched on and maintained with the propeller running for about 45 min until temperature and transmission measurement read constant. After reaching constant transmission silica gel was introduced into the experimental chamber according to the standard transmission measurement (initial concentration of silica gel,  $C_i$ ). The tadpoles (total mass 1.5–2 g) were introduced into the experimental chamber and ingestion led to a gradual increase in transmission. In order to ensure that the transmission record was running without disturbance, the propeller was switched off 30 min after the start of the experiment causing both silica gel sedimentation and a return to basic transmission (as a control for undisturbed measurement). For the same reason, the whole transmission measurement was repeated: transmission was controlled by resuspending the silica gel with the use of the propeller and allowing it to sediment until basic transmission was reestablished.

To prevent pollution by faeces produced during the experiments by the ingestion of silicagel particles the experimental time was shorter than the clearance time (time for food passing through gut) (Altig & McDearman, 1975; authors' observation).

# Critical assessment of methods

In order to discuss the effect of propeller turbulence on buccal pump stroke frequency, particularly for X. laevis, it is necessary to verify the results. The effect on the other species was calculated at between 10 and 20%; it was above 20% only at Stage 28 R. temporaria. Thus the influence of turbulence may be considered identical for B. calamita, R. temporaria and B. bufo. Although buccal pump stroke frequencies were measured in clear water, they are comparable to rates within the experimental range of particle concentrations. Seale et al. (1982) established that Stage 30-34 X. laevis adjust their buccal pump stroke frequency and buccal pumping volume to  $C_i$ . Continuous pumping with about 117 pump strokes min<sup>-1</sup> occurs with  $C_i = 9 \ 10^5$  yeast cells ml<sup>-1</sup>. The Stage 28 and 32 X. *laevis* buccal pump stroke frequency in particle-free water was calculated at ca 100 and 90 pump strokes min<sup>-1</sup>, which is not far from the 117 pump strokes min<sup>-1</sup> counted by Seale et al. (1982). Consequently it may be assumed that the low concentrations of silica gel suspension used had no significant effect



Fig. 2a-d. Buccal pump strokes. Open columns =  $\overline{x}$  of experiments without turbulence, hatched columns =  $\overline{x}$  of experiments with turbulence; significances of  $\overline{x}$  differences see Table 3; vertical lines = standard deviations;  $\Delta$ % indicate the differences of tests without and with turbulence; St = stage.



on the buccal pump stroke frequency and therefore did not effect the buccal pumping volume rate of X. *laevis* larvae. The order established here for suspension feeding efficiency of different species and stages (see 'Results') is identical with that found by Viertel (1990) in filtering experi-



Fig. 3a-c. Xenopus laevis. Ingestion- and filtering rates plotted against initial concentration. - = PS1,  $- \Delta - = PS2$ ,  $\cdots \bigcirc \cdots = PS3$ .

ments with *Chlorella fusca*, and *X. laevis*, *B. calamita*, *R. temporaria* and *B. bufo* larvae. The congruence of these results obtained from two entirely different methods (Viertel, 1990; Coulter Counter technology) supports their veracity.

#### Statistical analysis

To understand functional response, dependence of feeding parameters on particle size and particle concentration must be analyzed. The para-



meters are: the maximum ingestion rate  $(I_{max})$ , the maximal filtering rate  $(F_{max})$ , the threshold concentration (TC) at which ingestion begins, the retention efficiency (RE), and the critical concentration (CC) at which  $F_{max}$  occurs. CC is synonymous with the term 'incipient limiting level' in zooplankton filter feeders. Ingestion rate is the number of particles captured per individual or per unit of biomass and time and is the gauge of actual nutrient exploitation by a suspension feeder. Filtering is the water volume cleared of suspended particles (Harvey, 1937; Jorgensen, 1966). The filtering rate characterizes the ability of a suspension feeder to react to a nutrient suspension by increasing or lowering the water current (Jorgensen, 1983). The filtering rate is identical with pumping rate if retention efficiency reaches 100%. The volume of water pumped per unit of time through the filter apparatus is the pumping rate. Retention efficiency is the percentage of food particles of a defined diameter removed from a given nutrient concentration (see Randlov & Riisgard, 1979: RE = 1-exhaled concentration divided by inhaled concentration). It is the gauge of the filtering efficiency of a filter apparatus. In the present study RE is only the percentage of particles removed from the initial concentration of silicagel particles in the experimental chamber. It is therefore apostrophized as 'retention efficiency' ('RE').

The difference between initial transmission measurement of silica gel and final transmission was converted to number of particles according to the adjustment. The silica gel loss by sedimentation was subtracted from this, leaving the number of particles ingested by the tadpoles. The percentage reduction in buccal pump stroke frequency due to propeller turbulence was added (see Fig. 2). The weight of a defined silica gel particle number was known (see above in 'Apparatus and adjustment'). The number of particles was converted to particle volume (weight per particle divided by the specific gravity 2.6). This allowed the calculation of the particle diameter. Although the silica gel particles are in fact polygonal, they were taken to be round for the purposes of this experiment (radius = <sup>3</sup>particle volume divided by  $4/3 \pi$ ). Ingestion rates, as number of particles  $(I_n)$  and volume of particles  $(I_{\nu})$ , were calculated based on 1 g larval biomass (live weight) and 30 min experimental duration  $(I_n = n \text{ particles } g^{-1} 30 \text{ min}^{-1} \text{ or}$  $I_v = \mu m^3$  particle volume  $g^{-1} 30 min^{-1}$ ). For purposes of comparison of the different stages and species, it was necessary to relate ingestion to biomass rather than to larval individuals, since it is not possible to maintain constant larval growth. This also fails in cultures. Therefore larval growth leads to differences in weight not only of different species but also of identical stages of the same species.

Filtering rate (F), as ml water filtered  $g^{-1}$ 30 min<sup>-1</sup>, was calculated from  $I_n$  ( $F = I_n C_i^{-1}$ , see Bergman & Richman, 1974; Frost, 1972). In this study the filtering rate is the mere mathematical relationship between I and  $C_i$  because 100% retention efficiency cannot be assumed. The 'retention efficiency' ('RE') was calculated from F ('RE' = F 1000 ml<sup>-1</sup> 100%). This expresses the percentage of particles removed from 1000 ml of water. It is calculated to enable comparison of ingestion of different particle sizes within this study.

The Michaelis-Menten equation was used to fit a curve to the data (one point in diagrams (Figs 3-6) represents one feeding trial) and thus also to express the dependence of I and F on  $C_i$ and to characterize the expected saturations. Mullin *et al.* (1975) modified this equation to include threshold concentration in the description of feeding dynamics. They used the expression  $C_i$ -TC from the Ivlev-Parsons-LeBrasseur-Fulton equation ( $I = I_{max} (1 - e^{-\delta(C_i - TC)})$ ) thereby mathematically modifying  $C_i$  ( $I = I_{max} (C_i - TC)$ ( $K_2^1 + (C_i - TC)$ )<sup>-1</sup>). I is  $I_n$ ,  $I_{max}$  is the maximum  $I_n$  and  $K_2^1$ , as the half-saturation constant, is the  $C_i$  in which half of  $I_{max}$  is reached.

In order to compare the 'retention efficiencies' of the different species and stages in relation to different particle sizes, the computed values for  $I_{\text{max}}$ ,  $K_2^1$  and TC and the same  $C_i$ 's in each case were inserted into the Michaelis-Menten equation and  $I_n$  calculated (Fig. 7).

Mathematical models used to describe the dependence of I and F on  $C_i$  have often been the subject of discussion. The simplest method is the rectilinear model (Frost, 1972), following the least squares method. Its main disadvantage is that the alignment of points must be divided fairly arbitrarily when fitting the curve into ascent and plateau. The Ivlev equation was modified by Parsons

et al. (1967) for the description of ingestion and filtering rates  $(I = I_{max} (1 - e^{-\delta(C_i - TC)}); -\delta$  is a constant). The modified Ivlev equation was equated by Mullin et al. (1975) and Muck & Lampert (1980) with the Michaelis-Menten model and the rectilinear model. These authors are of the opinion that none of these models suitably describes the relationships of I to  $C_i$  and of F to  $C_i$ . My opinion of that  $I_{max}$  and TC should be computed by fitting the saturation curves. It is also worth knowing  $K_2^1$  for control purposes. Thus, I have chosen the Michaelis-Menten model.

In considering absolute test values and size ranges, recall that F and  $F_{max}$  were calculated from I and  $C_i$ , and were not the result of direct measurement. If the regulative factors in anuran suspension feeding are as effective as the discussion below suggests, then F is directly influenced by buccal pump stroke frequency and buccal pump stroke volume. However, increased mucous extrusions at moderately high  $C_i$  and reduced mucous extrusions at very high  $C_i$ , and possibly at low  $C_i$ , would influence I directly, thereby falsifying the mathematically derived Fand CC. At very low  $C_{i}$ , on the other hand, a high F and low CC are calculated despite low I. This must be understood as a mere mathematical effect of the low  $C_i$  and does not indicate high F and low CC in the experiment. As far as anuran larvae are concerned, therefore, CC cannot be seen as a 'turning point' of the kind Rigler (1961) posits for Daphnia magna before which F increases in proportion to  $C_i$  and after which F remains constant regardless of  $C_i$ .

# Results

The smaller the particle size, the higher was the  $I_n$ ,  $I_{max}$ , F, the maximal filtering rate  $F_{max}$  and 'RE' for all tadpole species and stages (Figs 3-7, Table 1): The only exception was Stage 28 X. *lae-vis* larvae, which showed a slightly higher  $I_n$ ,  $I_{max}$ ,  $F_{max}$  and 'RE' with PS1 than with PS2 (Fig. 3a, Table 1).  $I_v$  of the larger PS1 was ten times higher than the smaller PS3. The tendency toward saturation indicated by  $I_n$ ,  $I_v$ , F and 'RE' increased

| Stage           | PS | $I_{\max}$ particles<br>g <sup>-1</sup> 30 min <sup>-1</sup> | $K_{\frac{1}{2}}$ particles ml <sup>-1</sup> | TC particles ml <sup>-1</sup> | $\frac{F_{\max}}{g^{-1}} \frac{\text{ml}}{30 \text{min}^{-1}}$ | CC particles ml <sup>-1</sup> |
|-----------------|----|--|--|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|
| Xenopus laevis  |    |  |  |                               |  |                               |
| 28              | 1  | 2302.3   | 199.92                                       | 9.66                          | 770  | 50                            |
| 28              | 2  | 2122.5   | 213.82                                       | 11.08                         | 650  | 60                            |
| 28              | 3  | 10386.0  | 995.67                                       | 10.98                         | 850  | 100                           |
| 32              | 1  | 1461.5   | 387.30                                       | 1.23                          | 330  | 20                            |
| 32              | 2  | 3489.4   | 1004.80                                      | 5.09                          | 290  | 60                            |
| 32              | 3  | 5303.1   | 883.02                                       | 21.08                         | 440  | 120                           |
| 40              | 1  | 1043.9   | 303.31                                       | 8.93                          | 240  | 50                            |
| 40              | 2  | 2080.9   | 455.91                                       | 9.49                          | 340  | 70                            |
| 40              | 3  | 2230.8   | 300.03                                       | 12.38                         | 510  | 80                            |
| Bufo calamita   |    |  |  |                               |  |                               |
| 28              | 2  | 6128.7   | 1206.00                                      | 54.13                         | 330  | 300                           |
| 28              | 3  | 6850.5   | 1346.50                                      | 61.53                         | 330  | 300                           |
| 32              | 2  | 2097.5   | 417.25                                       | 20.50                         | 330  | 110                           |
| 40              | 1  | 947.3  | 511.97                                       | 9.88                          | 130  | 60                            |
| 40              | 2  | 1768.0   | 405.79                                       | 9.48                          | 320  | 70                            |
| 40              | 3  | 3703.0   | 401.60                                       | 19.51                         | 610  | 110                           |
| Rana temporaria |    |  |  |                               |  |                               |
| 28              | 1  | 1683.5   | 358.90                                       | 9.16                          | 340  | 60                            |
| 28              | 2  | 3280.7   | 650.05                                       | 35.84                         | 320  | 170                           |
| 32              | 1  | 645.3  | 300.58                                       | 9.73                          | 140  | 60                            |
| 32              | 2  | 1363.8   | 507.90                                       | 11.49                         | 190  | 80                            |
| 32              | 3  | 2461.9   | 504.58                                       | 7.54                          | 370  | 70                            |
| 40              | 1  | 400.2  | 208.63                                       | 9.00                          | 110  | 50                            |
| 40              | 2  | 752.7  | 311.80                                       | 10.19                         | 160  | 60                            |
| 40              | 3  | 1571.5   | 313.31                                       | 27.22                         | 290  | 110                           |
| Bufo bufo       |    |  |  |                               |  |                               |
| 28              | 2  | 1257.1   | 356.76                                       | 17.30                         | 220  | 90                            |
| 32              | 2  | 1178.1   | 418.52                                       | 9.13                          | 210  | 70                            |
| 32              | 3  | 2308.1   | 250.48                                       | 8.72                          | 640  | 70                            |
| 40              | 1  | 965.4  | 366.40                                       | 15.35                         | 170  | 80                            |
| 40              | 2  | 1532.9   | 385.87                                       | 16.13                         | 260  | 80                            |
| 40              | 3  | 2015.5   | 398.02                                       | 10.45                         | 360  | 80                            |

Table 1. Parameters of Michaelis-Menten equation and by  $C_i^{-1}$  transformed Michaelis-Menten equation ( $F_{max}$  CC).

with increasing particle size and age of the larvae (Figs 3-7, Tables 1 and 2). The filtering rate rose steeply to CC in each experiment and than fell again gradually at a  $C_i$  that was only slightly higher. The smaller the particle size, the higher was the CC (Table 1). The TC tended to be lower with large PS1 than with small PS3, and in some cases also lower than with PS2 (Table 1). All the species (apart from *B. calamita* at low  $C_i$  and *B. bufo* with PS2) showed a tendency toward a

much larger  $I_n$ ,  $I_v$ , F,  $F_{max}$  and 'RE' in Stage 28 than in the later stages (Figs 3-7, Table 1). In most cases, Stage 32 also showed higher values than Stage 40. This was consistent with results of the control experiments on the effect of turbulence (Fig. 2). X. *laevis* larvae in particular showed their highest buccal pump stroke frequency in Stage 28 and 32 (Fig. 2a, Table 3). Stage 28 *B. calamita* showed the highest buccal pump stroke frequency, and Stage 32 higher buccal

Table 2. 'Retention efficiency'. Comparison of stages and particle sizes.

| Stage   | $C_i$ particles ml <sup>-1</sup>  | PS1-PS2 (%)  | PS1-PS3 (%)  | PS-PS3 (%)   |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Xenopus laevis  |   | ······································                                   |  | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·  |
| 28  | 100   | - 4.6  | 6.8  | 11.4   |
| 32  | 100   | 0.2  | 6.9  | 6.7  |
| 40  | 100   | 5.2  | 13.2   | 7.0  |
| 28  | 300   | - 2.4  | 16.2   | 18.6   |
| 32  | 300   | 2.6  | 10.6   | 8.0  |
| 40  | 300   | 5.0  | 9.7  | 4.7  |
| 28  | 500   | - 1.5  | 17.9   | 19.4   |
| 32  | 500   | 3.3  | 10.5   | 7.2  |
| 40  | 500   | 4.2  | 7.4  | 3.1  |
| 28  | 1000  | - 0.9  | 16.3   | 17.2   |
| 32  | 1000  | 3.4  | 87   | 53   |
| 40  | 1000  | 3.2  | 4.6  | 1.6  |
| <b>P</b> ufo calamita   |   |  |  |  |
| Dujo calamila<br>28   | 100   |  |  | 17   |
| 28  | 100   | - 0.1  | -  | - 1.7  |
| 19  | 200   | 9.1  | 23.9   | 14.8   |
| 20  | 300   | _  | -  | -0.1   |
| 40  | 500   | 0.0  | 20.0   | 13.1   |
| 28  | 500   | _  | -  | 0.3  |
| 40  | 500   | 5.0  | 15.6   | 10.5   |
| 28  | 1000  | -  | -  | 0.6  |
| 40  | 1000  | 3.2  | 10.0   | 5.8  |
| Rana temporaria   |   |  |  |  |
| 28  | 100   | - 2.3  | -  | -  |
| 32  | 100   | 2.7  | 11.6   | 9.0  |
| 40  | 100   | 2.3  | 8.8  | 6.4  |
| 28  | 300   | 3.2  | _  | -  |
| 32  | 300   | 3.0  | 9.8  | 6.8  |
| 40  | 300   | 2.2  | 8.3  | 6.2  |
| 28  | 500   | 3.9  | -  | -  |
| 32  | 500   | 2.7  | 8.2  | 5.5  |
| 40  | 500   | 1.8  | 6.7  | 4.9  |
| 28  | 1000  | 3.6  | -  | -  |
| 32  | 1000  | 2.0  | 5.7  | 3.7  |
| 40  | 1000  | 1.2  | 4.2  | 3.1  |
| Bufo bufo   |   |  |  |  |
| 32  | 100   | _  | -  | 20.3   |
| 40  | 100   | 4.7  | 4.8  | 9.5  |
| 32  | 300   | _  |  | 12.7   |
| 40  | 300   | 3.8  | 3.3  | 7.1  |
| 32  | 500   | -  | _  | 8.9  |
| 40  | 500   | 3.0  | 2.6  | 5.6  |
| 32  | 1000  | _  | <b>-</b> ···   | 51   |
| 40  | 1000  | 2.0  | 1.6  | 3.7  |
| 40<br>28<br>32<br>40<br>Bufo bufo<br>32<br>40<br>32<br>40<br>32<br>40<br>32<br>40<br>32<br>40<br>32<br>40 | 500<br>1000<br>1000<br>1000<br>1000<br>300<br>300<br>500<br>500<br>1000<br>10 | 1.8<br>3.6<br>2.0<br>1.2<br>-<br>4.7<br>-<br>3.8<br>-<br>3.0<br>-<br>2.0 | $ \begin{array}{c} 6.7 \\ - \\ 5.7 \\ 4.2 \\ - \\ 4.8 \\ - \\ 3.3 \\ - \\ 2.6 \\ - \\ 1.6 \\ \end{array} $ | 4.9<br>-<br>3.7<br>3.1<br>20.3<br>9.5<br>12.7<br>7.1<br>8.9<br>5.6<br>5.1<br>3.7 |

pump stroke frequency than Stage 40 (Fig. 2b, Table 3). In R. temporaria stage dependent differences of buccal pump stroke frequency are not

confirmed (Fig. 2c, Table 3). By contrast, *B. bufo* larvae had their lowest buccal pump stroke frequencies in Stage 28 (Fig. 2d, Table 3).

| of stages         begin of<br>experiment $n_2 - 2$ Xenopus laevis         28-32         0         2.31         63         0.02           28-32         15         1.97         63         0.10           28-32         30         1.44         63         0.22           28-32         30         1.44         63         0.00           28-40         0         7.86         64         0.00           28-40         30         12.59         64         0.00           32-40         0         4.23         63         0.00           32-40         15         7.46         63         0.00           32-40         30         9.76         63         0.00           28-32         0         1.25         64         0.00           28-32         15         10.52         64         0.00           28-32         30         9.90         64         0.00           28-40         0         11.96         64         0.00           28-40         30         14.33         64         0.00           32-40         15         1.39.0         64         0.00       | Comparison      | Min after  | t     | $n_1 + -$ | <i>P</i> < |
|--|-----------------|------------|-------|-----------|------------|
| experiment           Xenopus laevis         28-32         0         2.31         63         0.02           28-32         15         1.97         63         0.16           28-32         30         1.44         63         0.02           28-40         0         7.86         64         0.00           28-40         15         11.69         64         0.00           28-40         30         12.59         64         0.00           32-40         0         4.23         63         0.00           32-40         30         9.76         63         0.00           Bufo calamita         28-32         0         1.25         64         0.00           28-32         15         10.52         64         0.00           28-32         30         9.90         64         0.00           28-32         30         9.90         64         0.00           28-40         0         11.96         64         0.00           28-40         30         14.33         64         0.00           32-40         0         8.45         62         0.00           28-32 | of stages       | begin of   |       | $n_2 - 2$ |            |
| Xenopus laevis $28-32$ 0 $2.31$ $63$ $0.02$ $28-32$ 15 $1.97$ $63$ $0.10$ $28-32$ 30 $1.44$ $63$ $0.22$ $28-40$ 0 $7.86$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ 15 $11.69$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ 0 $4.23$ $63$ $0.00$ $32-40$ 0 $4.23$ $63$ $0.00$ $32-40$ 30 $9.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $32-40$ 30 $9.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $28-32$ 0 $1.25$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-32$ 30 $9.90$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ 0 $11.96$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ 30 $14.33$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ 30 $14.33$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-32$ 0 $2.68$ $63$ $0.01$ $28-32$ 0 $2.68$ $63$ $0.01$   |                 | experiment |       |           |            |
| 28-32       0 $2.31$ $63$ $0.02$ $28-32$ 15 $1.97$ $63$ $0.10$ $28-32$ 30 $1.44$ $63$ $0.20$ $28-40$ 0 $7.86$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ 30 $12.59$ $64$ $0.00$ $22-40$ 0 $4.23$ $63$ $0.00$ $32-40$ 30 $9.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $32-40$ 30 $9.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $32-40$ 30 $9.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $28-32$ 0 $1.25$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-32$ 30 $9.90$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ 0 $11.96$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ 30 $14.33$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ 30 $14.33$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-32$ 0 $2.68$ $63$ $0.00$ $28-32$ 0 $2.68$ $63$ $0.00$ $32-40$ 0   | Xenopus laevis  |            |       |           |            |
| 28-32       15 $1.97$ $63$ $0.16$ $28-32$ $30$ $1.44$ $63$ $0.26$ $28-40$ $0$ $7.86$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ $30$ $12.59$ $64$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $0$ $4.23$ $63$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $30$ $9.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $30$ $9.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $30$ $9.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $30$ $9.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $28-32$ $0$ $1.25$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-32$ $30$ $9.90$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ $0$ $11.96$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ $30$ $14.33$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ $30$ $14.33$ $63$ $0.01$ $28-32$ $0$ $2.68$ $63$ $0.00$ $28-32$ $0$ $2.68$ $63$ $0.01$ $2$  | 28-32           | 0          | 2.31  | 63        | 0.025      |
| 28-32 $30$ $1.44$ $63$ $0.22$ $28-40$ $0$ $7.86$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ $30$ $12.59$ $64$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $0$ $4.23$ $63$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $30$ $9.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $30$ $9.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $30$ $9.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $28-32$ $0$ $1.25$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-32$ $15$ $10.52$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-32$ $30$ $9.90$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ $0$ $11.96$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ $30$ $14.33$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ $30$ $14.33$ $63$ $0.01$ $28-40$ $30$ $14.33$ $63$ $0.01$ $28-32$ $0$ $2.68$ $63$ $0.01$ $28-32$ $0$ $2.68$ $63$ $0.01$ <t< td=""><td>28-32</td><td>15</td><td>1.97</td><td>63</td><td>0.10</td></t<>  | 28-32           | 15         | 1.97  | 63        | 0.10       |
| 28-40       0       7.86       64       0.00 $28-40$ 30       12.59       64       0.00 $32-40$ 0       4.23       63       0.00 $32-40$ 15       7.46       63       0.00 $32-40$ 30       9.76       63       0.00 $32-40$ 30       9.76       63       0.00         Bufo calamita       28-32       0       1.25       64       0.00 $28-32$ 30       9.90       64       0.00 $28-32$ 30       9.90       64       0.00 $28-40$ 15       13.90       64       0.00 $28-40$ 30       14.33       64       0.00 $28-40$ 30       14.33       64       0.00 $32-40$ 0       8.45       62       0.00 $32-40$ 30       1.56       63       0.11 $28-32$ 30       1.56       63       0.11 $28-32$ 30       1.56       63       0.11 $28-32$ 30       0.56       63       0.70  | 28-32           | 30         | 1.44  | 63        | 0.20       |
| 28-40       15 $11.69$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ 30 $12.59$ $64$ $0.00$ $32-40$ 15 $7.46$ $63$ $0.00$ $32-40$ 30 $9.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $32-40$ 30 $9.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $32-40$ 30 $9.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $28-32$ 0 $1.25$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-32$ 30 $9.90$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-32$ 30 $1.96$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ 0 $11.96$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ 30 $14.33$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ 30 $14.33$ $64$ $0.00$ $32-40$ 0 $8.45$ $62$ $0.00$ $28-32$ 0 $2.68$ $63$ $0.01$ $32-40$ 30 $1.56$ $63$ $0.10$ $28-32$ 30 $1.56$ $63$ $0.10$ $28-32$ 30 <td>28-40</td> <td>0</td> <td>7.86</td> <td>64</td> <td>0.001</td>   | 28-40           | 0          | 7.86  | 64        | 0.001      |
| 28-40 $30$ $12.59$ $64$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $15$ $7.46$ $63$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $30$ $9.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $30$ $9.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $30$ $9.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $30$ $9.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $30$ $1.25$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-32$ $30$ $9.90$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ $0$ $11.96$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ $30$ $14.33$ $64$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $0$ $8.45$ $62$ $0.00$ $28-32$ $0$ $2.68$ $63$ $0.01$ $28-32$ $0$ $2.68$ $63$ $0.01$ $28-32$ $0$ $2.68$ $63$ $0.01$ $28-40$ $30$ $1.56$ $63$ $0.11$ $28-40$ $30$ $0.48$ $62$ $0.76$  | 28-40           | 15         | 11.69 | 64        | 0.001      |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | 28-40           | 30         | 12.59 | 64        | 0.001      |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | 32-40           | 0          | 4.23  | 63        | 0.001      |
| 32-40 $30$ $9.76$ $63$ $0.00$ Bufo calamita $28-32$ $0$ $1.25$ $64$ $0.22$ $28-32$ $15$ $10.52$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-32$ $30$ $9.90$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-32$ $30$ $9.90$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ $15$ $13.90$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ $30$ $14.33$ $64$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $0$ $8.45$ $62$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $15$ $4.14$ $62$ $0.00$ Rana temporaria $28-32$ $0$ $2.68$ $63$ $0.01$ $28-32$ $15$ $1.83$ $63$ $0.10$ $0.69$ $0.220$ $28-40$ $0$ $1.29$ $62$ $0.26$ $0.26$ $0.26$ $28-40$ $0$ $0.28$ $62$ $0.66$ $0.00$ $28-40$ $30$ $0.48$ $62$ $0.76$ $0.206$ $28-40$ $30$ $0.48$  | 32-40           | 15         | 7.46  | 63        | 0.001      |
| Bufo calamita $28-32$ 0 $1.25$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-32$ $30$ $9.90$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-32$ $30$ $9.90$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ $0$ $11.96$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ $15$ $13.90$ $64$ $0.00$ $28-40$ $30$ $14.33$ $64$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $0$ $8.45$ $62$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $30$ $4.69$ $62$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $30$ $4.69$ $62$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $30$ $4.69$ $62$ $0.00$ $28-32$ $0$ $2.68$ $63$ $0.01$ $28-32$ $0$ $2.68$ $63$ $0.01$ $28-40$ $0$ $1.29$ $62$ $0.20$ $28-40$ $30$ $0.48$ $62$ $0.70$ $32-40$ $0$ $0.19$ $63$ $0.90$ $32-40$ $30$ $7.68$ $62$ <   | 32-40           | 30         | 9.76  | 63        | 0.001      |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | Bufo calamita   |            |       |           |            |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | 28-32           | 0          | 1.25  | 64        | 0.25       |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | 28-32           | 15         | 10.52 | 64        | 0.001      |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | 28-32           | 30         | 9.90  | 64        | 0.001      |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | 28-40           | 0          | 11.96 | 64        | 0.001      |
| 28-40 $30$ $14.33$ $64$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $15$ $4.14$ $62$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $30$ $4.69$ $62$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $30$ $4.69$ $62$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $30$ $4.69$ $62$ $0.00$ $8-32$ $0$ $2.68$ $63$ $0.01$ $28-32$ $15$ $1.83$ $63$ $0.10$ $28-32$ $30$ $1.56$ $63$ $0.10$ $28-40$ $0$ $1.29$ $62$ $0.22$ $28-40$ $30$ $0.48$ $62$ $0.76$ $28-40$ $30$ $0.48$ $62$ $0.76$ $32-40$ $0$ $0.19$ $63$ $0.96$ $32-40$ $30$ $0.38$ $63$ $0.76$ $8ufo$ $bufo$ $28-32$ $0$ $7.68$ $62$ $0.00$ $28-32$ $30$ $9.69$ $62$ $0.00$ $28-40$ $0$ $0.00$ $0.00$ <t< td=""><td>28-40</td><td>15</td><td>13.90</td><td>64</td><td>0.001</td></t<>  | 28-40           | 15         | 13.90 | 64        | 0.001      |
| 32-40       0 $8.45$ $62$ $0.00$ $32-40$ 15 $4.14$ $62$ $0.00$ $32-40$ 30 $4.69$ $62$ $0.00$ $8-32$ 0 $2.68$ $63$ $0.01$ $28-32$ 15 $1.83$ $63$ $0.10$ $28-32$ 30 $1.56$ $63$ $0.10$ $28-32$ 30 $1.56$ $63$ $0.10$ $28-32$ 30 $1.56$ $63$ $0.10$ $28-40$ 0 $1.29$ $62$ $0.20$ $28-40$ 15 $0.28$ $62$ $0.84$ $28-40$ 30 $0.48$ $62$ $0.76$ $32-40$ 0 $0.19$ $63$ $0.90$ $32-40$ 30 $0.38$ $63$ $0.76$ $8ufo$ $bufo$ $28-32$ $0$ $7.68$ $62$ $0.00$ $28-32$ 30 $9.69$ $62$ $0.00$ $28-40$ $0$ $8.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $28-40$ <   | 28-40           | 30         | 14.33 | 64        | 0.001      |
| 32-40 $15$ $4.14$ $62$ $0.00$ $32-40$ $30$ $4.69$ $62$ $0.00$ Rana temporaria $28-32$ $0$ $2.68$ $63$ $0.01$ $28-32$ $15$ $1.83$ $63$ $0.01$ $28-32$ $30$ $1.56$ $63$ $0.10$ $28-32$ $30$ $1.56$ $63$ $0.10$ $28-32$ $30$ $1.56$ $63$ $0.10$ $28-40$ $0$ $1.29$ $62$ $0.22$ $28-40$ $15$ $0.28$ $62$ $0.88$ $28-40$ $30$ $0.48$ $62$ $0.70$ $32-40$ $0$ $0.19$ $63$ $0.90$ $32-40$ $30$ $0.38$ $63$ $0.70$ $8ufo$ $bufo$ $28-32$ $0$ $7.68$ $62$ $0.00$ $28-32$ $30$ $9.69$ $62$ $0.00$ $28-40$ $0$ $8.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $28-40$ $30$ $11.48$ $63$ <td>32-40</td> <td>0</td> <td>8.45</td> <td>62</td> <td>0.001</td>  | 32-40           | 0          | 8.45  | 62        | 0.001      |
| 32-40 $30$ $4.69$ $62$ $0.00$ Rana temporaria $28-32$ $0$ $2.68$ $63$ $0.01$ $28-32$ $15$ $1.83$ $63$ $0.10$ $28-32$ $30$ $1.56$ $63$ $0.10$ $28-32$ $30$ $1.56$ $63$ $0.10$ $28-32$ $30$ $1.56$ $63$ $0.10$ $28-40$ $0$ $1.29$ $62$ $0.20$ $28-40$ $30$ $0.48$ $62$ $0.76$ $28-40$ $30$ $0.48$ $62$ $0.76$ $32-40$ $0$ $0.19$ $63$ $0.96$ $32-40$ $30$ $0.38$ $63$ $0.76$ $32-40$ $30$ $0.38$ $63$ $0.76$ $8ufo$ $bufo$ $8.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $28-32$ $30$ $9.69$ $62$ $0.00$ $28-40$ $0$ $8.76$ $63$ $0.00$ $28-40$ $30$ $11.48$ $63$ $0.00$ <td>32-40</td> <td>15</td> <td>4.14</td> <td>62</td> <td>0.001</td>  | 32-40           | 15         | 4.14  | 62        | 0.001      |
| Rana temporaria $28-32$ 0 $2.68$ $63$ $0.01$ $28-32$ 15 $1.83$ $63$ $0.10$ $28-32$ 30 $1.56$ $63$ $0.10$ $28-32$ 30 $1.56$ $63$ $0.10$ $28-32$ 30 $1.56$ $63$ $0.10$ $28-40$ 0 $1.29$ $62$ $0.26$ $28-40$ 30 $0.48$ $62$ $0.76$ $32-40$ 0 $0.19$ $63$ $0.90$ $32-40$ 30 $0.48$ $62$ $0.76$ $32-40$ 30 $0.38$ $63$ $0.76$ $32-40$ 30 $0.38$ $63$ $0.76$ $32-40$ 30 $7.68$ $62$ $0.00$ $28-32$ 15 $9.45$ $62$ $0.00$ $28-40$ 15 $10.86$ $63$ $0.00$ $28-40$ 30 $11.48$ $63$ $0.00$ $28-40$ 30 $11.48$ $63$ $0.00$ <td>32-40</td> <td>30</td> <td>4.69</td> <td>62</td> <td>0.001</td>  | 32-40           | 30         | 4.69  | 62        | 0.001      |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | Rana temporaria |            |       |           |            |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | 28-32           | 0          | 2.68  | 63        | 0.01       |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | 28-32           | 15         | 1.83  | 63        | 0.10       |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | 28-32           | 30         | 1.56  | 63        | 0.10       |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | 28-40           | 0          | 1.29  | 62        | 0.20       |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | 28-40           | 15         | 0.28  | 62        | 0.80       |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | 28-40           | 30         | 0.48  | 62        | 0.70       |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | 32-40           | 0          | 0.19  | 63        | 0.90       |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | 32-40           | 15         | 1.44  | 63        | 0.10       |
| Bufo bufo           28-32         0         7.68         62         0.00           28-32         15         9.45         62         0.00           28-32         30         9.69         62         0.00           28-40         0         8.76         63         0.00           28-40         15         10.86         63         0.00           28-40         30         11.48         63         0.00           32-40         0         0.50         63         0.76           32-40         15         1.03         63         0.30   | 32-40           | 30         | 0.38  | 63        | 0.70       |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | Bufo bufo       |            |       |           |            |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | 28-32           | 0          | 7.68  | 62        | 0.001      |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | 28-32           | 15         | 9.45  | 62        | 0.001      |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | 28-32           | 30         | 9.69  | 62        | 0.001      |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | 28-40           | 0          | 8.76  | 63        | 0.001      |
| 28-40         30         11.48         63         0.00           32-40         0         0.50         63         0.70           32-40         15         1.03         63         0.30           32-40         30         0.49         63         0.70  | 28-40           | 15         | 10.86 | 63        | 0.001      |
| $\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$   | 28-40           | 30         | 11.48 | 63        | 0.001      |
| 32-40 15 1.03 63 0.30<br>32-40 30 0.49 63 0.70   | 32-40           | 0          | 0.50  | 63        | 0.70       |
| 32-40 30 0.49 63 0.76  | 32-40           | 15         | 1.03  | 63        | 0.30       |
|  | 32-40           | 30         | 0.49  | 63        | 0.70       |

To summarize, X. laevis larvae had the highest suspension feeding efficiency, followed by B. calamita larvae. The efficiency of B. bufo larvae was

Table 3. Buccal pump strokes. Comparison of stages; t-test values.

clearly lower. *R. temporaria* larvae were intermediate between *B. calamita* and *B. bufo* larvae.

A comparison of the ingestion of different particle sizes showed a characteristic 'RE' picture (Figs 7a,b,c,d, Table 2). The only species-specific reaction to particle size was suggested by small differences between *B. bufo* and *B. calamita* at Stage 40, with PS1 and PS3. For all the species examined, however, there was only a small 'RE' difference between PS1 and PS2. The earlier the stage, the greater was the PS1-PS3 and PS2-PS3 difference (with the exception of *X. laevis*  $C_i = 100$ , PS1-PS3 and *B. calamita* Stage 28, PS2-PS3). The difference in 'RE' tended to be smaller when the  $C_i$  was high.

# Discussion

## Comparison with the results of other authors

The tadpoles investigated here, apart from X. laevis, ingest PS3 in similar quantities to the Chlorella pyrenoidosa and Anabaena sphaerica ingested by other anuran species. The smallest maximum  $I_{\nu}$  of PS3 (Fig. 5c, R. temporaria, Stage 40; Fig. 6c, B. bufo, Stage 40) of 0.2-1  $10^9 \,\mu\text{m}^3 \,\text{larva}^{-1}$  $30 \text{ min}^{-1}$  (= 1-2  $10^9 \mu \text{m}^3 \text{g}^{-1}$   $30 \text{ min}^{-1}$ ) is within the same range as that calculated by Seale and Wassersug (1979) for R. sylvatica (maximum  $I_v$  ca 10<sup>9</sup>  $\mu$ m<sup>3</sup> Chlorella pyrenoidosa larva<sup>-1</sup> h<sup>-1</sup> at a  $C_i$  of  $10^8 \,\mu\text{m}^3 \,\text{ml}^{-1}$ ). Seale & Beckvar (1980) measured ingestion rates of an almost identical range during experiments in which Anabaena sphaerica (cell diameter 5.1  $\mu$ m, colony 27.9 cells in average) was fed to H. crucifer (maximum  $I_{\nu} = 2.52 \quad 10^9 \,\mu\text{m}^3 \,\text{g}^{-1} \,\text{h}^{-1}$  at a  $C_i$  of 4.12  $10^7 \,\mu\text{m}^3 \,\text{ml}^{-1}$ ) and to *B. woodhousei fowleri* (maximum  $I_v = 2.3 \ 10^9 \ \mu \text{m}^3 \text{g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$  at a  $C_i$  of 4.7  $10^7 \,\mu \text{m}^3 \,\text{ml}^{-1}$ ). In the same study (Seale & Beckvar, 1980) R. catesbeiana had a much lower maximum  $I_{\nu}$  than the other species (7.76  $10^8 \,\mu\text{m}^3 \,\text{g}^{-1} \,\text{h}^{-1}$  at a  $C_i$  of 1.33  $10^7 \,\mu\text{m}^3 \,\text{ml}^{-1}$ ). This means that particle sizes from ca 5 to 40  $\mu$ m are ingested more or less equally effectively by these species, although differences in effectivity do arise from species to species. These differ-



*Fig. 4a-c. Bufo calamita.* Ingestion- and filtering rates plotted against initial concentration.  $- = PS1, - \triangle - = PS2, \cdots \bigcirc \cdots = PS3.$ 

ences are found in the  $I_{max}$ , and especially in the TC (see below). Adaptation to oligotrophic environmental conditions is therefore actually determined by whether larvae are able to ingest low food concentration.

X. laevis in the present study had an  $I_{\nu}$  of  $10^{10} \,\mu\text{m}^3 \,\text{g}^{-1} \,30 \,\text{min}^{-1}$  with PS3 and therefore was well above the maximum  $I_{\nu}$  of the other species discussed. This shows that PS3 lies within the size range exploited by this microphagous



Fig. 4c

suspension feeder (particle sizes under  $1 \mu m$ , Wassersug, 1972; see also Wassersug & Hoff, 1979; Wassersug & Rosenberg, 1979) and midwater feeder, i.e. that the morphology and feeding mechanism of the pipid filter apparatus are wholly able to ingest these particle sizes. This is hardly surprising, since some algal plankton (several Chrysophyceae, Pyrrophyta, Pennales, Chlorophyta, Conjugatophyceae) belong within this size range (Huber-Pestalozzi, 1938; Viertel, 1978).

#### Threshold concentration

The species investigated here were able to filter particles of the size range PS1–PS3 at a TC of well under 100 particles  $ml^{-1}$ , indeed in most cases with as few as 10 particles  $ml^{-1}$ . As discussed above, this constitutes actual adaptive ability to the nutritive conditions of the environment. This is further explained by the fact that adaptation to shortcomings allows some anuran larvae access to environments which are more favourable to their survival, i.e. avoidance of predators, than would be the case if they had merely adapted to nutrient superabundance (see below 'Suspension feeding and life history').

Larger particles clearly have a greater chance of entrapment by the mucous entrapment, and of being sieved off by the bucco-pharyngeal structures (see below). This explains why particles are ingested at all at such low  $C_i$ . Chlorella fusca, which are only 5.8  $\mu$ m in diameter, were not ingested under a TC of 1  $10^4$ -1.2  $10^4$  cells ml<sup>-1</sup> (X. laevis, B. calamita), 1.2  $10^4$  cells ml<sup>-1</sup> (R. temporaria) and 5  $10^4$  cells ml<sup>-1</sup> (B. bufo) (Viertel, 1990). TC as it is demonstrated by Lehman (1976), Frost (1974, 1975a, b) and Lam & Frost (1976) for Calanus pacificus, by Rigler (1961) for Daphnia magna and by McMahon (1965) suggests these crustaceans use threshold feeding as a means of regulating their energy balance. Here, the filter feeders are understood to actively reduce their filtering rate at low food concentrations to avoid a negative energy balance. Buccal pump strokes are also observed in anuran larvae in water entirely free of particles (see Fig. 2). In the absence of food, energy is invested in ventilation of the bucco-pharynx for respiration purposes (see also Feder et al., 1984, Gradwell, 1970). Seale et al. (1982) and Seale & Wassersug (1979) explain zero ingestion or low ingestion at extreme



Fig. 5a-c. Rana temporaria. Ingestion- and filtering rates plotted against initial concentration.  $- = PS1, -\Delta = PS2, \cdots \bigcirc \cdots = PS3.$ 

 $C_i$  in terms of the filtering mechanism: X. *laevis* reduces its buccal pumping rate considerably at  $C_i$  under 5  $10^{-2}$  mg yeast  $1^{-1}$  (equals ca 1.5  $10^6$  yeast cells ml<sup>-1</sup>) and over 50 mg yeast  $1^{-1}$  (equals

1.5  $10^9$  yeast cells ml<sup>-1</sup>). *R. sylvatica* larvae reduced their buccal pump rate continually over the whole range of  $C_i$  tested (4  $10^6$  to 1  $10^8 \,\mu\text{m}^3 \,\text{ml}^{-1}$  *Chlorella pyrenoidosa*, equals ca 3.8  $10^5$  to 9.6  $10^6$ 



Fig. 5c

Chlorella pyrenoidosa cells ml<sup>-1</sup>). Mucus production may also be regulatory. Seale & Wassersug (1979) and Feder *et al.* (1984) suppose this to be the case at high  $C_i$ . It is possible that both pumping rate and mucus production have a regulatory function at low  $C_i$ . As mentioned above, threshold feeding of anuran larvae is influenced not only by  $C_i$  but also by particle size. Frost's (1972) assertion that *Calanus pacificus* achieves maximal ingestion at low  $C_i$  with larger particles (3.8– 87  $\mu$ m) would appear to confirm this for crustaceans, as would Doyle's (1979) results with the amphipod *Corophium volutator* and particles from 10–60  $\mu$ m. Seale assumed, cited by Seale *et al.* (1982), that the TC of smaller (younger) anuran larvae is higher than that of larger (older) anuran larvae. This can be entirely confirmed for the developmental stages of *B. calamita*, and partly for *X. laevis* and *R. temporaria*.

#### Suspension feeding and life history

Viertel (1990) explains the high *I* and 'RE' in Stages 28 and 32 in terms of the rapid growth of premetamorphic stages (see Breuer, 1984; Funke, 1989; Kadel, 1975; Mittmann, 1989; Viertel, 1981; Waringer-Löschenkohl, 1988). The dependence of buccal pump stroke frequency on stage makes it probable that pump stroke frequency causes a stage-related change in suspension feeding efficiency. Polls Pelaz & Pourriot's (1988) findings that Stages 30–35 *Rana ridibunda* ingest very little, or possibly nothing at all, cannot be confirmed for the species investigated here.

The different suspension feeding efficiency  $(I_{\text{max}}, F_{\text{max}}, \text{TC and 'RE'})$  of different species at low Chlorella fusca concentrations is explained by Viertel (1990) in terms of the life history of the species. X. laevis and B. calamita larvae develop in ephemeral and sometimes oligotrophic waters. A high ingestion rate also at low initial concentrations, i.e. a low TC, lead to fast growth and early metamorphosis, increasing the probability that tadpoles will survive the drying up of their larval habitat. B. bufo larvae, in contrast, usually inhabit permanent waters with a rich nutrient supply. These tadpoles have not been selected to escape drying ponds, therefore high ingestion rates and efficient exploitation of meagre food supplies have been less vital for them. In addition protective mechanisms enable the B. bufo larvae to outfox their predators: schooling behavior sim-



Fig. 6a-c. Bufo bufo. Ingestion- and filtering rates plotted against initial concentration.  $- - = PS1, - \Delta - = PS2, \cdots \bigcirc \cdots = PS3.$ 

ulates a big animal, bitter substances in their skin make the larvae inedible for most predators (Voris & Bacon, 1966) and the smashed body of an injured conspecific leads to immobility of all the other larvae (Breuer & Viertel, 1990; Eibl-

168

Eibesfeldt, 1949; Kulzer, 1954; Pfeiffer, 1966; Viertel, 1978). This explains the lack of pressure on *B. bufo* larvae to accelerate their development and leave their waters quickly. *R. temporaria* tadpoles lie between *B. calamita* and *B. bufo* in terms of



feeding efficiency and larval habitat. This species spawns both in small ephemeral ponds and in permanent, nutrient-rich water.

Our picture of the relationship between life history and suspension feeding efficiency can be refined with the help of the present results. Plank-

ton is normally smaller than sessile organisms (see also Huber-Pestalozzi, 1938). The plankton found in the alimentary tract of anuran larvae (B. bufo, Rana dalmatina, R. ridibunda, Rana perezi, Hyla arborea, Hyla meridionalis, B. calamita, Pelobates fuscus, Pelobates cultripes, Discoglossus pictus) by Diaz-Paniagua (1985, 1989), Löschenkohl (1985) and Viertel (1978) was mostly smaller than PS1. The exceptions were: several Chrysophyceae, Pyrrophyta, Pennales, Ankistrodemus (Chlorophyta), Netrium, Spirotaenia, Penium, Closterium, Micrasterias (Conjugatophyceae). If we assume that X. laevis is more likely to represent derived features from the evolutionary point of view (Inger, 1967; Viertel, 1986), then mid-water feeding (see Wassersug & Hoff, 1979), i.e. feeding on plankton, is a derived feeding strategy within anuran larvae. This enabled the pipid larval type to gain access to new forms of nutrient supply. Observations indicating that X. laevis feeds facultatively on bottom and deposit (Wassersug, personal communication) do not contradict this. For B. calamita, R. temporaria and B. bufo feeding on periphyton and on bottom particles is the consequence of their basical anatomy (horny beaks, oral disc toothlets and filter apparatus) (see Inger, 1967). Bottom feeding seems to be the basical feeding strategy. Therefore it seems probable that the ability to filter large particles (e.g. PS1) is primarily linked to bottom feeding. Seale (1980) and Seale & Beckvar (1980) observed that Rana larvae begin to feed on the periphyton when the  $C_i$  falls below CC.

#### Zusammenfassung

Untersucht wurde der Einfluß von Partikel-Ausgangskonzentration größe, und Larvalstadium auf die Ingestionsrate, die 'Retentionseffizienz' und die Filtrationsrate von Anurenlarven mit unterschiedlich gebautem Filterapparat und unterschiedlicher Lebensweise. Die Praemetamorphosestadien 28 und 32 und das Prometamorphosestadium 40 wurden wegen ihrer unterschiedlichen Wachstumsraten für die Experimente gewählt. Drei unterschiedlich große Klassen von Silicagelpartikel wurden als



*Fig.* 7a-d. 'Retention efficiency'. Comparison of stages and particle sizes (PS); calculated by inserting the computed  $I_{max}$ , K  $\frac{1}{2}$  and TC and the same  $C_i$  in each case into the Michaelis-Menten equation (see Table 2). Hatched columns = Stage 28, dotted columns = Stage 32, black columns = Stage 40.

Nahrungsattrappe angeboten. Die Partikelkonzentration wurde fotometrisch gemessen. Das Michaelis-Menten Modell wurde verwendet, um die Abhängigkeit der Ingestionsrate, der Filtrationsrate und der 'Retentionseffiziens' von der Ausgangskonzentration zu beschreiben und um die maximale Ingestionsrate, die Thresholdkonzentration und die halbe Sättigungskonstante zu ermitteln.

(1) Die größten Ingestionsraten, Filtrationsraten und 'Retentionseffizienzen' wurden von den X. laevis Larven gefolgt von den B. calamita Larven erreicht. Hingegen lagen die B. bufo Larven am entgegengesetzten Ende der Skala. Die R. temporaria Larven lagen zwischen B. calamita und B. bufo. Diese Reihenfolge wird auf die unterschiedlichen Lebensweisen der Larven in Verbindung mit der unterschiedlichen Ökologie der Larvengewässer zurückgeführt. (2) Je größer die Partikelgröße und je älter das Larvenstadium ist, desto größer ist die Tendenz zur Sättigung von Ingestionsraten, Filtrationsraten und der 'Retentionseffizienz'. Diese Parameter der Filtration sind nach der Partikelgröße gestaffelt. Ingestionarate (Partikelzahl), Filtrationsrate, and 'Retentionseffizienz' sind bei PS3 am größten. Das Ingestionsvolumen ist bei PS1 am größten. Der Unterschied zwischen PS3 und PS2 zu PS1 ist in vielen Fällen groß, bei X. laevis Stadium 28 sehr groß. Dies zeigt, daß große Partikel von den Larven am effektivsten aufgenommen werden können und dies in den Stadien 28 und 32 am effektivsten, was mit der Wachstumsfunktion dieser Stadien zusammenhängt. Möglicherweise ist die effektive Ingestion großer Partikel eine phylogenetisch sehr ursprüngliche Fähigkeit. (3) Die Thresholdkonzentration ist bei großen Partikeln am kleinsten. In Anlehnung an andere Autoren wird das Thresholdfeeding auf die Regulation des vom Buccopharynx gepumpten Wasservolumens und der Schleimproduktion zurückgeführt. Dem Thresholdfeeding wird eine große Bedeutung hinsichtlich der Anpassung an oligotrophe Biotope beigemessen.

## Acknowledgements

This project was supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft-DFG-. My thanks are due to B. Hemberger and C. Lissner for their kind assistance with the filtering experiments, and to K. Rehbinder for her drawings. I am grateful to W. Habermann (Ludwigshafen, Badische Anilin und Soda-Fabrik, BASF), Prof. E. Hartmann and K. Kritsotakis (both Mainz) for their technical support, and to S. Pätz-Wenzel (Frankfurt), H. Golle (Frankfurt) and P. Breuer for supplying me with tadpoles. I am indepted to Professors A. Seitz (Mainz) and R. Wassersug (Halifax) and to K. Warkentin (Halifax) for their helpful discussion and critical reading of the manuscript.

# References

- Altig, R. & M. McDearman, 1975. Percent assimilation and clearance times of five anuran species. Herpetologica 31: 67–69.
- Ashworth, R. de B. & B. Crozier, 1972. Standard waters Recommendations for the preparation of standard waters used for testing pesticidal and other formulations. In G. R. Raw (ed.), CIPAC Monograph I, Collaborative International Pesticides Analytical Council: 1–64.
- Beebee, T. J. C., 1983. The natterjack toad. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 159 pp.
- Bergman, M. & S. Richman, 1974. The feeding behavior of Daphnia pulex from Lake Winnebago, Wisconsin. Limnol. Oceanogr. 19: 105-109.
- Bregulla, D., 1986. Untersuchungen zur Wasserchemie von Kreuzkrötenlaichgewässern. Salamandra 22: 173–179.
- Bregulla, D., 1988. Temperaturuntersuchungen an Laichgewässern der Kreuzkröte *Bufo calamita* Laurenti, 1768. Salamandra 24: 276–286.
- Breuer, P., 1984. Untersuchungen zur Überlebensrate von Erdkrötenlarven (*Bufo bufo*) und Grasfroschlarven (*Rana temporaria*) unter dem Einfluß von Regenbogenforellen (*Salmo gairdneri*). Thesis, Fachbereich Biologie, Johannes Gutenberg Universität Mainz, 55 pp.
- Breuer, P. & B. Viertel, 1990. Zur Ökologie von Erdkrötenlarven (*Bufo bufo*) und Grasfroschlarven (*Rana temporaria*).
  I. Die Überlebenrate unter dem Einfluß von Regenbogenforellen (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*). Acta Biologica Benrodis 2: 225-244.
- Collins, J. P., 1979. Intrapopulation variation in the body size at metamorphosis and timing of metamorphosis in the bullfrog, *Rana catesbeiana*. Ecology 60: 738–749.
- Cronin, J. T. & J. Travis, 1986. Size-limited predation on larval *Rana areolata* (Anura:Ranidae) by two species of backswimmer (Insecta:Hemiptera:Notonectidae). Herpetologica 42: 171-174.
- Datta Munshi, J. S., K. S. Bilgrami, O. N. Singh & D. K. Singh, 1986. Food and feeding habits of tadpole larva of toad *Bufo melanosticus*. Envir. Ecol. 4: 109-111.
- DeBenedictis, P. A., 1974. Interspecific competition between tadpoles of *Rana pipiens* and *Rana sylvatica*: an experimental field study. Ecol. Mon. 44: 129–151.
- Diaz-Paniagua, C., 1985. Larval diets related to morphological characters of five anuran species on the biological reserve of Donana (Huelva, Spain). Amphibia-Reptilia 6: 307-322.
- Diaz-Paniagua, C., 1989. Larval diets of two anuran species, *Pelodytes punctatus* and *Bufo bufo*, in SW Spain. Amphibia-Reptilia 10: 71–75.
- Dickman, M., 1968. The effect of grazing by tadpoles on the structure of a periphyton community. Ecology 49: 1188–1190.
- Doyle, R. W., 1979. Ingestion rate of a selective deposit feeder in a complex mixture of particles: testing the energyoptimization hypothesis. Limnol. Oceanogr. 24: 867–874.

172

- Eibl-Eibesfeldt, I., 1949. Über das Vorkommen von Schreckstoffen bei Erdkrötenkaulquappen. Experientia 5: 236.
- Etkin, W., 1968. Hormonal control of amphibian metamorphosis. In Etkin, W. & L. I. Gilbert (eds), Metamorphosis a problem in developmental biology. North Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam: 313-348.
- Feder, M., D. B. Seale, M. E. Boraas, R. J. Wassersug & A. G. Gibbs, 1984. Functional conflicts between feeding and gas exchange in suspension-feeding tadpoles, *Xenopus laevis*. J. exp. Biol. 110: 91–98.
- Formanowicz jr., D. R., 1986. Anuran tadpole/aquatic insect predator-prey interactions: tadpole size and predator capture success. Herpetologica 42: 367–373.
- Frost, B. W., 1972. Effects of size and concentration of food particles on the feeding behavior of the marine planktonic copepod *Calanus pacificus*. Limnol. Oceanogr. 17: 805-815.
- Frost, B. W., 1974. Feeding processes at lower trophic levels in pelagic communities. In C. B. Miller (ed), The biology of the oceanic Pacific. Oregon State University: 59–77.
- Frost, B. W., 1975a. Ingestion by phytoplanktonic grazers as a function of concentration of food. Limnol. Oceanogr. 20: 259–262.
- Frost, B. W., 1975b. A threshold feeding behavior in *Calanus pacificus*. Limnol. Oceanogr. 20: 263–266.
- Funke, A., 1989. Untersuchungen zur Populationsökologie der Erdkröte (*Bufo bufo* L.) im Stadtgebiet Frankfurt am Main. Thesis, Fachbereich Biologie, J. W. Goethe-Universität Frankfurt, 95 pp.
- Gosner, K. L., 1960. A simplified table for staging anuran embryos and larvae with notes on identification. Herpetologica 16: 160-183.
- Gradwell, N., 1970. The function of the ventral velum during gill irrigation in *Rana catesbeiana*. Can. J. Zool. 48: 1179–1186.
- Harrison, J. D., 1987. Food and feeding relations of Common Frog and Common Toad tadpoles (*Rana temporaria* and *Bufo bufo*) at a pond in Mid-Wales. Herp. J. 1: 141– 143.
- Harvey, H. W., 1937. Note on selective feeding by *Calanus*. J. mar. Biol. Assoc. 22: 97-100.
- Hendricks, F. S., 1973. Intestinal contents of *Rana pipiens* Schreber (Ranidae) larvae. Southw. Natural. 18: 99-101.
- Heusser, H., 1958. Über die Beziehungen der Erdkröte (Bufo bufo L.) zu ihrem Laichplatz I. Behaviour 12: 208–232.
- Heusser, H., 1960. Über die Beziehungen der Erdkröte (Bufo bufo L.) zu ihrem Laichplatz II. Behaviour 16: 93-109.
- Hota, A. K. & M. C. Dash, 1986. Growth and metamorphosis of anuran larvae: effect of diet and temperature. Alytes 5: 165-172.
- Höll, K., 1979. Wasser. De Gruyter, Berlin, 515 pp.
- Huber-Pestalozzi, G., 1938. Das Phytoplankton das Süßwassers, Systematik und Biolgie. In A. Thienemann (ed.), Die Binnengewässer vol 16, part 1. Schweizerbart'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Stuttgart: 1-342.
- Inger, R. F., 1967. The development of a phylogeny of frogs. Evolution 21: 369-384.

- Jorgensen, C. B., 1966. Biology of suspension feeding. Int. Ser. Monogr. pure appl. Biol. (Zoology) 27: 1–357.
- Jorgensen, C. B., 1983. Fluid mechanical aspects of suspension feeding. Mar. Ecol. Progr. Ser. 11: 89-103.
- Kadel, K., 1975. Freilandstudien zur Überlebensrate von Kreuzkrötenlarven (*Bufo calamita* L.). Revue. suisse Zool. 82: 237–244.
- Krezoski, J. R., S. C. Mozley & J. A. Robbins, 1978. Influence of benthic macroinvertebrates on mixing of profundal sediments in southeastern Lake Huron. Limnol. Oceanogr. 23: 1011–1016.
- Kulzer, E., 1954. Untersuchungen über die Schreckreaktion bei Erdkrötenkaulquappen (*Bufo bufo L.*). Z. Vergl. Physiol. 36: 443–463.
- Lam, R. K. & W. Frost, 1976. Model of copepod filtering response to changes in size and concentration of food. Limnol. Oceanogr. 21: 490-500.
- Lehman, J. T., 1976. The filter-feeders as an optimal forager, and the predicted shapes of feeding curves. Limnol. Oceanogr. 21: 501–516.
- Löschenkohl, A., 1985. Freiland-und Laboruntersuchungen zur Ökologie der aquatischen Phase einheimischer Amphipienarten. Doctoral thesis, Formal-und Naturwissenschaftliche Fakultät. Universität Wien, 165 pp.
- McMahon, J. W., 1965. Some physical factors influencing behaviour of *Daphnia magna* Straus. Can. J. Zool. 43: 603-612.
- Mittmann, R., 1989. Die Larvenbiologie von Grasfrosch (Rana t. temporaria LINNAEUS, 1758) und Erdkröte (Bufo b. bufo LINNAEUS, 1758) in verschiedenen Kleingewässern des Niederrheins. Thesis, Fachbereich Biologie, Universität Köln, 121 pp.
- Muck, P. & W. Lampert, 1980. Feeding of freshwater filterfeeders at very low concentrations: Poor evidence for 'threshold feeding' and 'optimal foraging' in *Daphnia longispina* and *Eudiaptomus gracilis*. J. Plankton Res. 2: 367–379.
- Mullin, M. M., E. F. Steward & F. J. Fuglister, 1975. Ingestion by planktonic grazers as a function of concentration of food. Limnol. Oceanogr. 5: 259–262.
- Murray, D. L., 1990. The effects of food and density on growth and metamorphosis in larval wood frogs (*Rana sylvatica*) from central Labrador. Can. J. Zool. 68: 1221-1226.
- Nieuwkoop, P. D. & J. Faber, 1956. Normal table of *Xenopus laevis* (Daudin) a systematical and chronological survey of the development from the fertilized egg till the end of metamorphosis. North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 243 pp.
- Orton, G. L., 1953. The systematics of vertebrate larvae. Syst. Zool. 2: 63-75.
- Parsons, T. R., R. J. LeBrasseur & J. D. Fulton, 1967. Some observations on the dependence of zooplankton grazing on the cell size and concentration of phytoplankton blooms. J. Oceanogr. Soc. Jap. 23: 10–17.
- Pfeiffer, W., 1966. Die Verbreitung der Schreckreaktion bei Kaulquappen und die Herkunft des Schreckstoffes. Z. Vergl. Physiol. 52: 79–98.

- Polls Pelaz, M. & R. Pourriot, 1988. Une apporoche de la fonction de filtration des tetards de grenouille verte (*Rana ridibunda*). Vie Milieu 38: 293–298.
- Randlov, A. & H. U. Riisgard, 1979. Efficiency of particle retention and filtration rate in four species of ascidians. Mar. Ecol. 1: 55–59.
- Rigler, F. H., 1961. The relation between concentration of food and feeding rate of *Daphnia magna* Straus. Can. J. Zool. 39: 857–868.
- Sabnis, J. H. & Ku. S. M. Kuthe, 1980. Observation on food and growth of *Bufo melanosticus* tadpole. J. Bombay Nat. Hist. Soc. 77: 21–25.
- Sahu, A. K. & M. K. Kahre, 1988. Food and feeding habits of *Rana alticola* Boulenger (Anura:Ranidae) during different stages of metamorphosis. J Adv. Zool. 9: 97-104.
- Savage, R. M., 1961. The ecology and life history of the common frog (*Rana temporaria temporaria*). Pitman, London, 221 pp.
- Scheinberg, H., 1984. Kupfer. In E. Merian (ed), Metalle in der Umwelt. Verlag Chemie, Weinheim, Deerfield Beach, Basel: 451–463.
- Schwörbel, J., 1966. Methoden der Hydrobiolgie. Franckh'sche Verlagshandlung, Stuttgart, 207 pp.
- Seale, D. B., 1980. Influence of amphibian larvae on primary production, nutrient flux, and competition in a pond ecosystem. Ecology 61: 1531–1550.
- Seale, D. B. & H. Beckvar, 1980. The comparative ability of anuran larvae (genera: *Hyla, Bufo*, and *Rana*) to ingest suspended blue-green algae. Copeia 1980: 495–503.
- Seale, D. B. & R. J. Wassersug, 1979. Suspension feeding dynamics of anuran larvae related to their functional morphology. Oecologia 39: 259–272.
- Seale, D. B., K. Hoff & R. Wassersug, 1982. Xenopus laevis larvae (Amphibia, Anura) as model suspension feeders. Hydrobiologia 87: 161–169.
- Semlitsch, R. D., 1990. Effects of body size, sibship, and tail injury on the susceptibility of tadpoles to dragonfly predation. Can. J. Zool. 68: 1027–1030.
- Semlitsch, R. D. & J. W. Gibbons, 1988. Fish predation in size-structured populations of treefrog tadpoles. Oecologia 75: 321–326.
- Siemens, A. G., 1981/82. Siemens Opto-Halbleiter Datenbuch. München, 730 pp.
- Strijbosch, H., 1979. Habitat selection of amphibians during their aquatic phase. Oikos 33: 363–372.
- Tevini, M. & D. P. Häder, 1985. Allgemeine Photobiologie. Georg Thieme Verlag, Stuttgart New York, 348 pp.
- Travis, J., 1983. Variation in growth and survival of *Hyla* gratiosa larvae in experimental enclosures. Copeia 1983: 232-237.
- Utermöhl, H., 1958. Zur Vervollkommnung der quantitativen

Phytoplankton-Methodik. Mitt. Int. Ver. theor. angew. Limnol. 9: 1-38.

- Viertel, B., 1976. Die Amphibien Rheinhessens unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Umgebung von Oppenheim. Mz. Naturwiss. Archiv. 15: 183–221.
- Viertel, B., 1978. Populationsökologische Untersuchungen an Erdkrötenlarven (*Bufo bufo L.*). Doctoral Thesis, Fachbereich Biologie, Johannes Gutenberg Universität Mainz, 68 pp.
- Viertel, B., 1981. Wachstumsraten, Gewichtszustandswert und Ätilität bei Erdkrötenlarven (*Bufo bufo L.*) im Freiland (Amphibia:Salientia:Bufonidae). Salamandra 17: 20-42.
- Viertel, B., 1985. The filter apparatus of *Rana temporaria* and *Bufo bufo* larvae (Amphibia, Anura). Zoomorphology 105: 345-355.
- Viertel, B., 1987. The filter apparatus of *Xenopus laevis*, *Bombina variegata*, and *Bufo calamita* (Amphibia,Anura): a comparison of different larval types. Zool. Jb. Anat. 115: 425-452.
- Viertel, B., 1989. The filter apparatus of anuran larvae. -Aspects of the filtering mechanism. In: Splechtna, H. & H. Hilgers (eds). Trends in vertebrate morphology. Proc. 2<sup>nd</sup> Int. Symp. Vert. Morph. Vienna 526–533 pp.
- Viertel, B., 1990. Suspension feeding of anuran larvae at low concentrations of *Chlorella* algae (Amphibia, Anura). Oecologia 85: 167–177.
- Viertel, B., 1991. The ontogeny of the filter apparatus of anuran larvae (Amphibia, Anura). Zoomorphology 110: 239–266.
- Voris, H. K. & J. P. Bacon jr., 1966. Differential predation on tadpoles. Copeia 1966: 594–598.
- Waringer-Löschenkohl, A., 1988. Sukzession und Wachstum von Amphibienlarven in vier Kleingewässern in Wien und in Niederösterreich. Salamandra 24: 287–301.
- Wassersug, R. J., 1972. The mechanism of ultraplanktonic entrapment in anuran larvae. J. Morphol. 137: 279–288.
- Wassersug, R. J. & K. Hoff, 1979. A comparative study of the buccal pumping mechanism of tadpoles. Biol. J. Linn. Soc. 12: 225–259.
- Wassersug, R. J. & K. Rosenberg, 1979. Surface anatomy of branchial food traps of tadpoles: a comparative study. J. Morphol. 159: 393–425.
- Weigmann, D. B., 1982. Relationships between production and abundance of ranid (*Rana pipiens*, *R. catesbeiana*, and *R. calamitans*) tadpoles and the effects of tadpole grazing on algal productivity and diversity and on phosphorus, nitrogen, and organic carbon. Doctoral Thesis, Michigan State University, pp. 386 (sse also Diss. Abstr. Int. 43 [1983]: 2803-B).
- Wilbur, H. M., 1977. Interactions of food level and population density in *Rana sylvatica*. Ecology 58: 206-209.