Disrupted flow sensing impairs hydrodynamic performance and increases the metabolic cost of swimming in the yellowtail kingfish, *Seriola lalandi*
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SUMMARY

The yellowtail kingfish, *Seriola lalandi*, shows a distribution of anaerobic and aerobic (red and pink) muscle fibres along the trunk that is characteristic of active pelagic fishes. The athletic capacity of *S. lalandi* is also shown by its relative high standard metabolic rate and optimal (i.e. least cost) swimming speed. To test the hypothesis that lateral line afferent information contributes to efficient locomotion in an active pelagic species, the swimming performance of *S. lalandi* was evaluated after unilateral disruption of trunk superficial neuromasts (SN). Unilaterally disrupting the superficial neuromasts (SN) of the lateral line impaired both swimming performance and energetic efficiency. The critical swimming speed (mean $U_{\text{crit}} \pm \text{S.D.}, N=12$) for unilaterally SN-disrupted fish was $2.11 \pm 0.96 \, L \, s^{-1}$, which was significantly slower than the $3.66 \pm 0.19 \, L \, s^{-1}$ $U_{\text{crit}}$ of sham SN-disrupted fish. The oxygen consumption (in mg O$_2$ kg$^{-1}$ min$^{-1}$) of the unilaterally SN-disrupted fish in a speed range of 1.0–2.2 $L$ s$^{-1}$ was significantly greater than that of the sham SN-disrupted fish. The least cost of transport (mean GCOT$\pm$S.D., $N=6$) for SN-disrupted fish was $0.18 \pm 0.06 \, J \, N^{-1} \, m^{-1}$, which was significantly greater than the $0.11 \pm 0.03 \, J \, N^{-1} \, m^{-1}$ GCOT for sham SN-disrupted fish. The factorial metabolic scope (mean$\pm$S.D., $N=6$) of the unilaterally SN-disrupted fish ($2.87 \pm 0.78$) was significantly less than that of sham controls ($4.14 \pm 0.37$). These data show that an intact lateral line is important to the swimming performance and efficiency of carangiform swimmers, but the functional mechanism of this effect remains to be determined.
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INTRODUCTION

In contrast to animals with aerial or terrestrial locomotion, aquatic locomotion in fishes is to a greater extent affected by the forces, i.e. pressure drag and viscous drag, resulting in severe restrictions on forward speed and energetic performance due to the high density and viscosity of the aquatic medium (Schmidt-Nielsen, 1972; Daniel and Webb 1987; Fish, 1993). These drags increase with increased swimming speed, and also increase as a result of thrust production through the movements of the trunk and the tail fin (Anderson et al., 2001). Given the metabolic benefits of a lowered cost of locomotion for a given swimming speed, and the complex interaction of boundary layers, drag and thrust production, it seems reasonable that active flow sensing by fish could play a part in improving the efficiency of locomotion. Active flow sensing by the lateral line has been shown to be important in allowing fish to seek out flow refuges generated by obstacles in the flow (Montgomery et al., 2003), and in allowing fish to modify their swimming and save energy in structured turbulent flows (Liao et al., 2003). However, a direct contribution of the lateral line to efficient swimming has not yet been shown for fish swimming under normal conditions.

Two potential roles for a contribution of lateral line feedback to swimming efficiency have been proposed. Lighthill (1993) suggested that the lateral-line sensors in the subcerebral canal system of the herring could provide an appropriate feedback signal for controlling yaw by oscillatory neck deflections so as to minimize the effective pressure difference and any associated cross-flow effects over the head of the fish. It was proposed that swimming clupeid fishes may use this as an 'active' mechanism for reduction of hydrodynamic resistance. This theory was supported by analysis of the mechanics of the subcerebral perilymph canal which crosses the head between the lateral lines of clupeid fishes (Denton and Gray, 1993), and an analysis of the head turning movements in herring and other fishes (Rowe et al., 1993). However, direct experimental evidence for a role of lateral line feedback in this behavior was not provided in those studies. A recent study by McHenry et al. (2010) in a different species of fish (golden shiner: Notemigonus crysoleucas) concluded from kinematic analysis that “flow sensing does not facilitate active drag reduction” at least with respect to coordinating the motion of the head relative to detected flow signals. However, the golden shiner is not a particularly active species, and this study does not provide any direct measures of swimming efficiency relative to the manipulation of the lateral line.

The second suggested role for lateral line feedback in the efficient control of swimming came from the detailed measurements of the thin layers of flowing water immediately adjacent to the surface of the swimming fish (i.e., the boundary layers), where
influence of viscosity predominates (Anderson et al., 2001). This study observed inflected boundary layers that appeared to be stabilized during the later phases of the undulatory cycle, and suggested that these boundary layer profiles may provide evidence of a contribution of hydrodynamic sensing to the optimization of swimming performance. But, again, this suggestion remains to be directly tested.

The lateral line of fish is made up of two submodalities, canal neuromasts and superficial neuromasts. The canal neuromasts respond less to steady currents and low frequency flows, and are better suited to encode higher frequency signals (Montgomery et al., 2001). The superficial neuromasts, on the other hand, have anatomically appropriate properties to sense steady currents and low-frequency flows immediately above the surface of the fish body (Coombs and Janssen, 1989, 1990; Kroese and Schellart, 1992; Montgomery et al., 1994). Therefore, superficial neuromasts are the most likely submodality to contribute to motor control for sustained or prolonged level of swimming associated with boundary layer flows. Here we experimentally test the hypothesis that the superficial neuromasts of trunk lateral line contribute to swimming efficiency. The critical swimming speed, $U_{\text{crit}}$, and metabolic cost of locomotion were measured in an active pelagic species, the yellowtail kingfish *Seriola lalandi*. The premise that should be supported in the present study is that kingfish is an active pelagic species where active flow sensing for swimming efficiency is likely to be important. The muscle locomotor system in fishes contains two functionally independent components, designated red and white muscle due to their usual colour (Lindsey, 1978). While the white muscle is faster, more powerful, and capable of burst activity which may be anaerobic, the red muscle is usually slow with low contractile power. The relative development of red and white muscle in different species may be correlated roughly with their mode of life (Videler, 1993; Ellerby and Altringham, 2001). Therefore, we conducted macroscopic examination of locomotor muscle of kingfish, by which the active athletic nature of this species was documented based on the relative mass proportion of the red muscle and cross-sectional profiles of muscle fibre types that were found. Constant rhythmic oscillatory tail motion that is usually found in prolonged swimming activity, such as migration, foraging, etc. is predominantly powered by aerobic metabolism (Hudson, 1973, Webb, 1975). Such aerobically powered mode of swimming demonstrates a linear increase in oscillatory tail-beat frequency with increased swimming speed, resulting in an exponential increase in $O_2$ demand with increased swimming speed (Lowe et al, 1998; Lowe, 2001; Webber et al., 2001; Steihausen et al., 2005). Measuring the rate at which oxygen is consumed during locomotion is therefore a direct and non-invasive way to determine the physiological cost of locomotion.
and is commonly undertaken in accordance with incremental velocity tests, which measure the critical swimming speed, $U_{\text{crit}}$ (Brett, 1964). These measurements were made for control fish, and fish with a unilateral ablation of the trunk superficial neuromasts.

The control system for rhythmic animal locomotion, including fish swimming, is formed by sets of neurons in the central nervous system, the so-called central pattern generators (CPGs: Tytell and Cohen, 2008). The CPGs exhibit certain properties of adaptation and robustness to the environmental changes by generating rhythmic neural output, where the feedback is not essential (Iwasaki and Zheng, 2006). The CPGs, however, receive sensory feedback capable of modulating their rhythmic activity in order to achieve adaptation to environmental changes (Iwasaki and Zheng, 2006). The simplest explanation for the mechanism of the CPGs activity may be given by the reciprocal inhibition oscillator (RIO: Brown, 1911) located in spinal cord (Friesen, 1994): the CPG consists of two pools of interneurons mutually coupled with inhibitory synaptic connections (Iwasaki and Zheng, 2006). Based on the motor pattern measured using an electromyographic technique by Jayne and Lauder (1995), the inhibitory connections in the RIO generate out-of-phase oscillations in the activities of the two neurons, which drive a pair of muscle (i.e. anterior and posterior) alternately in sequence down to the tail on an ipsilateral side of the fish body. To ensure stable phase transition in locomotor cycle to the contralateral side of the fish body, the afferent signals from different (at least two) channels of neurons innervating trunk superficial neuromasts on the respective right and left sides of the fish body must appropriately be associated with each other in the central nervous system. Because of such characteristic feature of CPGs-based control described above, we used unilateral ablation of sensory input from trunk superficial neuromasts as experimental manipulation on the rationale that asymmetric disruption of sensory input may be particularly effective in demonstration of a sensory feedback component to central pattern generation for locomotion efficiency.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Animals**

Ninety-six (96) juvenile kingfish were obtained from the Bream Bay Aquaculture Park, National Institute of Water and Atmospheric Research (NIWA), New Zealand. Fish were held in 3000l tanks at the Leigh Marine Laboratory, and were fed three times a week on chopped fish, such as pilchard. The holding tanks were continuously aerated and flushed with high quality filtered seawater. All the experiments were conducted under the approval of the
University of Auckland Animal Ethics Committee (AEC application number: R817).

Anatomical analysis of distribution of muscle fibres

Fish used for the measurements described in this section were not fed for a period of 2 days and then euthanized with overdose of MS222 (100 mg ethyl 4-aminobenzoate per 1 L seawater). Five (5) adult fish were selected in order to scale the mass of different muscle fibres. After the wetted mass of the fish was measured, the specimen was submerged in 40°C water for 20 minutes so that the skin could easily be removed from the muscle. The mass of glycolytic (white) and oxidative (red and pink) muscle fibres were dissected separately from the fish body, and were immediately measured using an analytical balance. The mass of the remaining components including bones, guts, and skin were also measured. The density of the dissected muscle groups containing oxidative (red + pink) and glycolytic (white) muscle was measured using the method of volumetric displacement. Nine (9) adult fish were used to determine the distribution of the muscle fibres of different type. The frozen specimen was first cut immediately behind the pectoral fin base, 30.4% fork length (FL) from the snout on average with a S.D. of 1.8% FL, and then at standardized increments of 10% FL from 35–85% FL. Each transverse section was pictured using a digital camera (EX-F1, Casio, Tokyo, Japan), after which the areas of red, pink, and white muscle were analyzed with ImageJ (v1.43r, NIH, MD, USA) and expressed as a percentage of the total muscle cross-sectional area.

Unilateral ablation of lateral line

Mechanoreceptive patches of trunk superficial neuromasts are aligned above the trunk lateral line canal on the skin (Fig. 1A). The superficial neuromasts were ablated by a probe cooled by liquid nitrogen (Montgomery et al., 2003). This treatment was undertaken under anaesthetic induced with MS222 (50 mg ethyl 4-aminobenzoate per 1 L-seawater). A sham-treatment for lateral-line disruption was also made to evaluate the effects of anesthetic, handling and associated treatments on swimming performance. The sham-treatment was performed in the same manner, but on an area of the body away from the superficial neuromasts. The number of fish that received unilateral treatment on the left or right side of the body was the same within the group. Body morphometrics relevant to swimming performance, such as body length, body-depth and width, were also recorded before fish were transferred to a recovery tank. The fish were allowed another 3-5 days before experimentation and the procedure was deemed successful if fish resumed feeding after a couple of hours. In order to minimise
handling stress ImageJ was used to estimate the body length ($FL$) of control fish according to background grids placed in the working section of the flow chamber before the experimental trial. The body depth and width of the control fish was estimated using linear regressions obtained during preliminary measurements ($N=60$). If the true body length ($FL$), depth and width measured at the end of the experiment differed from the estimated values, the flow velocity for the calculation of the critical swimming speed was corrected in the post experimental analysis.

**Critical swimming speed test ($U_{crit}$) protocol**

The critical swimming speed ($U_{crit}$) test (Brett, 1964) has long been used in order to assess prolonged swimming capacity of various species. The $U_{crit}$ is obtained from fishes subjected to incremental changes in speed over time in an experimental flow chamber. It is generally assumed that maximum oxygen uptake occurs at the $U_{crit}$ (Farrell and Steffensen, 1987; Farrell, 2007) and is thus a convenient way to measure both swimming performance and the maximum aerobic capacity of fish. Several investigators have found $U_{crit}$ to overestimate sustained speed because recruitment of the fast-twitch, glycolytic muscle fibers at higher speeds is evident in a change in gait from a continuous tail beat to intermittent bursts of high-frequency tail beats followed by gliding (i.e. burst-and-glide) in the final stages of the $U_{crit}$-test (Kolok, 1991; Webb, 1998). To avoid this discrepancy, Drucker (1996) proposed the gait transition speed (e.g. the speed at which pectoral fin locomotion is supplemented by body caudal fin locomotion) as an alternative cut-off swimming speed. Dickson et al. (2002) also defined the upper limit of scope for activity as swimming speed at which a continuous tail beat was shifted to a 'burst-and-glide' gait three times within 30 s. However, it is practically difficult to demonstrate the upper limit of scope for activity by counting how many times such gait shifts are conducted by the fish swimming in the swim tunnel within a certain period of time. Therefore, the $U_{crit}$ is considered to be a relatively robust and reliable metric for comparing the relative aerobic swimming capabilities of body-caudal-fin swimmer, kingfish (Williams and Brett, 1987; Hartwell and Otto, 1991; Peake and McKinley, 1998; Hogan et al., 2007).

The experiment commenced in late October, 2010. At that time, the water temperature in the holding tanks was 18°C. Thirty six (36) fish were used for the $U_{crit}$-test divided into 3 groups: the control group (0.275±0.043 m fork length, $FL$, $N=12$); a group that received sham treatment for superficial neuromast disruption (sham SN-ablated fish:}
0.277±0.034 m FL, N=12), and an experimental group that received the treatment for superficial neuromast disruption (SN-disrupted fish: 0.280±0.027 m FL, N=12). Six (6) individuals in each group were used for the respirometric measurement, and the other 6 individuals were used for kinematical measures (reported separately). The $U_{\text{crit}}$-test was carried out in a Brett-type swim tunnel (38.4 L) with a 0.16 (W) × 0.16 (H) × 0.55 (L) m working section, where the flow was rectified by passing the water through a square mesh filter placed upstream in order to ensure a high degree of homogeneous and unidirectional flow. The downstream end of the working section was closed by a metal grid. During the test, fish swimming behaviour was recorded by two video cameras (EX-F1, Casio, Tokyo, Japan) that were set directly and obliquely above of the working section of the respirometry flow chamber. The respirometry flow chamber was submerged in a water bath. The water was pumped from an experimental sump up to the water bath via an in-line water-chiller (HC-1000A, Hailea, Guandong, China). A flushing pump was able to swap the water inside the respirometry flow chamber with water from the temperature controlled water bath. The water flow was generated by a frequency modulated induction motor that was controlled with a frequency inverter (CFW-10, WEG, VIC, Australia). The flow velocity was controlled using customized software that altered the frequency of the power supply to the motor. The experimental flow system was surrounded by black-out plastic sheet to avoid the fish being disturbed. Supplementary fluorescent light was provided in the $U_{\text{crit}}$-tests.

The experimental water temperature was maintained at 18–19°C during the experiment although water temperature in the holding tanks did increase up to 21°C until the experiment finished in early March 2011. The slight discrepancy in the holding and experimental temperatures over the short period was not likely to have influenced our findings. At the start of the experiment, an individual fish was introduced to the swimming section of the swim flume and left to swim overnight (14–16 hours) with respirometric measures in a flow set to 0.7 $L \ \text{s}^{-1}$. Fish were only used once in the experiments to preclude any effect of prior experience in the analysis (Liao, 2006). Once fish were acclimated to the swim flume, the flow velocity was elevated to 1.0 $L \ \text{s}^{-1}$. The flow speed, and thus the swimming speed, was increased by 0.3 $L \ \text{s}^{-1}$ for every 30 min until the fish failed to swim by fatigue, and the $U_{\text{crit}}$ is interpolated from this final level of swimming performance (i.e. incremental velocity test, Brett, 1964; Jones, 1982; Farrell, 2007). In the present study, we assumed the fatigue was reached when the accumulated time that the body or fin of fish touched the downstream grid reached 1 minute.
The absolute value of the $U_{\text{crit}}$ in $m \, s^{-1}$ is dependent upon the length of fish. Therefore, the $U_{\text{crit}}$ was normalized by the fork length ($FL$) of the fish (Beamish, 1978) and was calculated as follows:

$$U_{\text{crit}} = U_{\text{max}} + (t_f/t_i)U_i,$$

where $U_i$ is the velocity increment ($0.3 \, L \, s^{-1}$), $U_{\text{max}}$ is the maximum speed at which the fish was able to complete a 30-min period of swimming, $t_f$ is the elapsed time from the velocity increase to fatigue, and $t_i$ is the time between the velocity increments (Brett, 1964). The presence of the fish in the enclosed chamber results in an increase in water velocity around the fish. Due to this phenomenon, the so-called solid blocking effect, the flow velocity that the fish was exposed to was corrected in accordance with the equation described by Bell and Terhune (1970):

$$U = U_w (1 + A_f / A_c),$$

where $U$ is corrected velocity, $U_w$ is the flow velocity without fish, $A_c$ is the cross sectional area of the flow chamber, and $A_f$ is the cross sectional area of the fish. The cross sectional area of the fish ($A_f$) was approximated by an ellipse with the maximum depth of the body for the major axis ($d$) and the maximum width of the body for the minor axis ($w$), and was described as:

$$A_f = (\pi dw / 4).$$

**Respirometric measurements and analysis**

The mass-specific rate of oxygen consumption ($MO_2$) of 18 fish was resolved during $U_{\text{crit}}$ swimming tests (see above for details on acclimation and flow velocity increments etc.) in order to address the swimming energetics of fish with intact and non-intact lateral lines: control group ($0.304\pm0.022 \, m \, FL, N=6$); sham SN-disrupted fish group ($0.308\pm0.011 \, m \, FL, N=6$), and SN-disrupted fish group ($0.301\pm0.008 \, m \, FL, N=6$). The respirometer ran with a single measurement cycle consisting of 3 periods (i.e. flushing, waiting and measuring) according to the protocol of Steinhausen et al. (2005) and Brown et al. (2011). During the flushing period, the flushing pump was active to mix the water inside the respirometry flow chamber and to ensure proper flow past the oxygen sensor. The flushing period (2–7 min) was changed depending on the fish and swimming speed so that the air saturation level of water would be $\sim 100\%$ at the end of the flushing period. During waiting and measuring periods the flushing pump was turned off and the respirometry flow chamber was closed by a solenoid valve to prevent water entering from an ambient tank. Before starting a new measuring period,
waiting period is necessary to account for a lag in the system response resulting in a non-linear declination change in oxygen saturation of the water inside the respirometry flow chamber over the elapsed time. To avoid any risk of hypoxia developing, the length of the waiting and measuring periods were also modified to ensure air saturation never dipped below 80% saturation by the end of the measuring period. In general, however, measurement cycles were either 10 or 15 min, allowing 2–3 times of MO₂ measurement for an individual fish swimming at each flow velocity.

The change in oxygen saturation over time, hence MO₂, was measured at 1Hz with a needle type oxygen sensor (NTH-PSt1-L5-TS-NS40/1.2-YOP, PreSens Precision GmbH, Regensburg, Germany) connected to a Microx-TX3 oxygen meter (PreSens Precision GmbH, Regensburg, Germany). The entire respirometer was under the control of customized software that not only managed water flow velocity but also initiated the flush, wait and measure cycle and recorded water O₂ saturation. The software then calculated the rate of change in water saturation per second (% sat s⁻¹; slope of the linear regression of oxygen saturation over the elapsed time), and after Steffensen (1989) this value was converted to MO₂ (mg O₂ kg⁻¹ min⁻¹) using the equation:

\[ \text{MO}_2 = \frac{(\Delta \text{sat/100}) \times \text{PO}_2 \times \beta_{\text{WO}_2} \times V_w \times 60}{M} , \]  

(4)

where \( \Delta \text{sat} \) is the recorded change in % of air saturation per second, PO₂ is the measured partial pressure of oxygen at 100% air saturation, \( \beta_{\text{WO}_2} \) is the capacitance coefficient of oxygen in water at a certain salinity (0.369 mg O₂ L⁻¹ kPa at 36ppt for this experiment), \( V_w \) is the volume of the respirometer, 60 is the number of seconds in a minute and \( M \) is the mass of the fish.

Oxygen consumption, MO₂, was described as a power function of swimming speed (Steinhausen et al., 2005), \( U \) (L s⁻¹) and body mass, \( M \) (kg) by:

\[ \text{MO}_2 = aM^{-0.2} + bM^{-0.2}U^c . \]  

(5)

Oxygen consumption data were fitted to the curve (6) by the least square method (Generalized Reduced Gradient nonlinear algorithm, the Microsoft Excel Solver) in order to estimate the model parameters, \( a \), \( b \), and \( c \). To account for variations in MO₂ due to size differences amongst the fish, Clark and Johnston (1999) used the mass-specific exponent of \( M^{(0.8-1)} \), thus \( M^{-0.2} \) describes the allometric relationship between the standard metabolic rate, SMR, and the mass of 69 species of teleost fish. Standard metabolic rate, SMR, represents the energy required to maintain basic biological functions independent of activity, digestion, or the costs of physiological stressors. The SMR was extrapolated as the oxygen consumption at zero
swimming speed \((U=0)\) using equation 5. To compare the cost of swimming as work per metre (WPM; \(J \text{ m}^{-1}\)), \(\text{MO}_2\) was recalculated with the unit \(\text{mgO}_2 \text{ s}^{-1}\) and multiplied with a general oxycaloric value of 14.1 \(J \text{ mgO}_2^{-1}\) (Videler 1993). The gross cost of transport (GCOT) is the value of WPM (\(J \text{ m}^{-1}\)) that is corrected for size effects by dividing with body weight (N) (Videler, 1993). GCOT (\(J \text{ N}^{-1} \text{ m}^{-1}\)) at \(U_{\text{opt}}\) is therefore given by:

\[
\text{GCOT} = \frac{\text{AMR}_{\text{opt}} (MgU_{\text{opt}})}{U_{\text{opt}}}, \quad (6)
\]

where \(\text{AMR}_{\text{opt}} (J \text{ s}^{-1})\) is the active metabolic rate at \(U_{\text{opt}}\), \(g\) the acceleration of gravity in \(\text{m s}^{-2}\) and \(M\) is the body mass of the fish (kg). After Steinhausen et al. (2005), using the relationship between \(U\) and GCOT with equations 5 and 6, the optimum swimming speed, \(U_{\text{opt}}\), where WPM is at its minimum, was obtained as:

\[
U_{\text{opt}} = (a/b(c - 1))^1/c. \quad (7)
\]

The level of metabolism available for locomotion (aerobic metabolic scope for activity) is usually calculated as the difference between the standard metabolic rate, SMR, and maximum metabolic rate, AMR\(_{\text{max}}\). AMR\(_{\text{max}}\) generally occurs at \(U_{\text{crit}}\), and the fractional difference of AMR\(_{\text{max}}\) to SMR rate from this point onwards is referred to as factorial metabolic scope (Fry, 1957):

\[
\text{Factorial metabolic scope} = \frac{\text{AMR}_{\text{max}}}{\text{SMR}}. \quad (8)
\]

### Composition of unsteady swimming

The acceleration and deceleration of fish swimming within the test section of the swim flume is a good indicator of steady (aerobic) vs. unsteady (anaerobic) activity, the latter being more energetically expensive to maintain (Boisclair and Tang, 1993). The oxygen consumption of unsteady swimming was therefore analyzed to address how swimming style might influence the respirometric measures of SN- and non-SN-disrupted fish.

The geometric centre of the fish swimming at all water velocities was tracked for 30 min at 30Hz using open source video-tracking software, SwisTrack ver. 4.1 (Correll et al., 2006), and the change in the rate of longitudinal displacement velocity was calculated, with final transformation to an acceleration unit with respect to fish length (in \(L \text{ s}^{-2}\)). We categorized unsteady swimming activity into three levels: i) 1 body-length or more than 1 body-length acceleration (\(\geq 1 L \text{ s}^{-2}\)), ii) less than 1-body length acceleration (\(< 1 L \text{ s}^{-2}\) and iii) deceleration. However, even if the fish held the station of the body relative to the flow chamber, it is difficult to determine zero acceleration because the geometric centre was somewhat deflected (both longitudinally and laterally) due to body roll, changes in swimming
depth and body tilt etc. We therefore defined swimming as steady if the rate of longitudinal displacement was within 10% FL (i.e. ±0.1 L s⁻²).

**Statistics**

Basic statistics and pairwise tests were performed using the Analysis ToolPak of Microsoft Excel 2010. The statistical program R (ver. 2.12.2, R Development Core Team, Vienna, Austria) was used to run ANCOVA and multiple group comparisons with *post-hoc* analysis. The effect of unilateral disruption on $U_{crit}$ and respirometric performance was examined further if ANCOVA resolved any significant difference in the following pairwise comparisons: 1) between control and SN-disrupted groups and 2) between sham SN-disrupted and SN-disrupted groups. Given statistical significance for the above pairwise comparisons, insignificant result was desired for the comparison between control and sham SN-disrupted groups in order to support equivalence of the effect for control and sham SN-disrupted groups. In this scenario the significance limit of an $F$-statistic was adjusted by Bonfferoni correction in order to reduce the risk of Type I errors. If not stated otherwise, values are presented as mean±S.D.

**RESULTS**

**Distribution of muscle fibres**

The mean of the whole lateral muscle was 0.4065±0.0941 kg ($N=5$) and this corresponded to 52.3% of the body mass of the fish. The mean mass±S.D. of oxidative (red+pink) and glycolytic (white) muscle was 0.0291±0.0060 kg ($N=5$), which corresponded to 7.2% of whole muscle mass, and 0.3774±0.0886 kg ($N=5$), which corresponded to 92.8% of whole muscle mass, respectively (Table 1). Red muscle was concentrated along the lateral line but penetrated the white muscle, and even reached the vertebral column along the horizontal septum (Fig. 2A). The change of muscle distribution along the body axis and the proportions of the red and pink muscle to the whole lateral muscle are shown in Fig. 2B. The area of red and white muscle both reached a maximum at 35.0% FL from the snout (red: 80 mm² and white: 2,282 mm²). The area of the pink muscle reached a maximum at 45.0% FL from the snout (48 mm²). The proportion of the oxidative red and pink muscle increased posteriorly, but the pink muscle was indistinguishable in most of the cross-sections from 75% to 85% FL from the snout. Oxidative muscle for 75% and 85% FL sections might possibly contain pink
muscle, but the ratio is so small it was deemed insignificant. A sharp increase in the proportion of the area of red muscle in the area of the whole muscle was found in the cross-sections posterior to 65% FL from the snout. The percentage of oxidative red muscle posterior to 65% FL was significantly greater than that in the anterior part (i.e. 30.4–45.0% FL from the snout) (Kruskal-Wallis test, $H=48.80$ with 6 d.f., $P<0.01$, followed by a post hoc Steel-Dwass test, $P<0.05$). In contrast, the proportion of the white muscle in the area of the whole muscle decreased posteriorly.

**Critical swimming speed**

The mean critical swimming speed ($U_{\text{crit}}$) of unilaterally SN-disrupted fish group was $2.11\pm0.96$ L s$^{-1}$ ($N=12$), and was significantly slower than the $3.66\pm0.19$ L s$^{-1}$ $U_{\text{crit}}$ ($N=12$) of sham SN-disrupted fish group (ANCOVA, $F_{1,21}=31.87$, $P<0.01$) (Fig. 3). The $U_{\text{crit}}$ of control fish group was $3.89\pm0.45$ L s$^{-1}$ ($N=12$) (Fig. 3), which was the fastest $U_{\text{crit}}$ of the three. No significant difference in FL was detected between the 3 groups (ANOVA, $F_{2,33}=0.07$, $P>0.05$). The $U_{\text{crit}}$ in control group was negatively correlated with the FL (Two-tailed Spearman’s Rank Correlation Test, Spearman’s $r=3.48$ with 10 d.f., $P<0.01$). It might be expected that ability of the smaller fish to execute burst-and-coast gait swimming would be less restricted by the size of the flow chamber, resulting in a faster $U_{\text{crit}}$ (Castro-Santos, 2004, 2005; Peake and Farrell, 2006; Tudorache et al., 2007). However, the $U_{\text{crit}}$, from which this extraneous influence depending on the fish length was removed, was not significantly different between control and sham SN-disrupted fish groups (ANCOVA, $F_{1,21}=3.79$, $P>0.05$).

The mean maximum swimming speed ($U_{\text{max}}$) was $3.79\pm0.42$ L s$^{-1}$ ($N=12$) for control fish and $3.60\pm0.21$ L s$^{-1}$ ($N=12$) for sham SN-disrupted fish. There was no significant difference between these two $U_{\text{max}}$ (ANCOVA, $F_{1,21}=2.99$, $P>0.05$). The $U_{\text{max}}$ for SN-disrupted fish was however reduced at $1.99\pm0.97$ L s$^{-1}$ ($N=12$), and this $U_{\text{max}}$ was significantly slower than that for control (ANCOVA, $F_{1,21}=33.25$, $P<0.01$) and sham SN-disrupted fish (ANCOVA, $F_{1,21}=32.20$, $P<0.01$).

**Respirometric measurement**

Basic statistics describing the respirometric measures are given in Table 2. There was no significant difference in the fork length and body mass between control, sham SN-disrupted and SN-disrupted fish groups (ANOVA, fork length: $F_{2,15}=0.19$, mass: $F_{2,15}=0.41$, $P>0.05$), and so any difference reported herein is not due to body size effects. As shown in Fig. 4A,
MO\textsubscript{2} for sham SN-disrupted fish group was almost identical to the control group MO\textsubscript{2} at all swimming speeds. A significant linear correlation between the logarithm of the MO\textsubscript{2} and the swimming speed was found, but there was no significant difference in log MO\textsubscript{2} between control and sham SN-disrupted fish groups (ANCOVA, \(F_{1,138}=0.27, P>0.05\)). The relationship between MO\textsubscript{2} and swimming speed (\(U\)) was expressed by:

\[
MO_2 = 1.75M^{-0.2} + 0.27M^{-0.2}U^{2.3} \quad (R^2=0.77, F_{1,143}=493.00, P<0.01)\]

for the control group and

\[
MO_2 = 1.91M^{-0.2} + 0.16M^{-0.2}U^{2.7} \quad (R^2=0.77, F_{1,148}=500.81, P<0.01)\]

for the sham SN-disrupted fish. The intercept of the model curve with the vertical axis (Fig. 4A) was determined as the standard metabolic rate, SMR. The estimated SMR for control and sham SN-disrupted fish groups were 2.16 and 2.32 mg O\textsubscript{2} kg\textsuperscript{-1} min\textsuperscript{-1}, respectively. Due to the SN-disrupted fish having a high rise in MO\textsubscript{2} between 0.7 and 1.3 L s\textsuperscript{-1} (Fig. 4B), their extrapolated SMR was unreasonably underestimated. Since SN-ablation should not affect SMR, it was assumed that the SMR of the SN-disrupted fish was the same as the sham SN-disrupted fish group for the model fitting process (Fig. 4B). This assumption allowed the MO\textsubscript{2} of SN-disrupted fish group to be reasonably described by

\[
MO_2 = 1.88M^{-0.2} + 0.97M^{-0.2}U^{1.4} \quad (R^2=0.53, F_{1,91}=103.33, P<0.01)\]

This correction revealed a significant difference in MO\textsubscript{2} between sham SN-disrupted and SN-disrupted fish groups in the swimming speed range of 1.0–2.2 L s\textsuperscript{-1} (ANCOVA, \(F_{1,65}=10.71, P<0.01\)), where 2.2 L s\textsuperscript{-1} was the closest swimming speed to the mean \(U_{\text{crit}}\) of SN-disrupted fish group. It is important to note that only one SN-disrupted fish could complete 2 cycles of the MO\textsubscript{2} measurement during the 3.4 L s\textsuperscript{-1} velocity swimming, and recorded statistically similar MO\textsubscript{2} values (ANOVA, \(F_{2,20}=0.95, P>0.05\)) to those for the other two groups (Fig. 4B): 8.6±1.3 mg O\textsubscript{2} kg\textsuperscript{-1} min\textsuperscript{-1} (10 measurements) for control fish, 8.3±1.1 mg O\textsubscript{2} kg\textsuperscript{-1} min\textsuperscript{-1} (11 measurements) for sham SN-disrupted fish, and 9.5±0.2 mg O\textsubscript{2} kg\textsuperscript{-1} min\textsuperscript{-1} (2 measurements) for SN-disrupted fish.

The mean AMR at \(U_{\text{max}}\) (\(\overline{\text{AMR}}_{\text{max}}\)) was 8.76±1.60 mg O\textsubscript{2} kg\textsuperscript{-1} min\textsuperscript{-1} for control fish (\(N=6\)) and 9.23±1.19 mg O\textsubscript{2} kg\textsuperscript{-1} min\textsuperscript{-1} for sham SN-disrupted fish (\(N=6\)). The \(\overline{\text{AMR}}_{\text{max}}\) for SN-disrupted fish was 7.47±3.29 mg O\textsubscript{2} kg\textsuperscript{-1} min\textsuperscript{-1} (\(N=6\)). This was the least \(\overline{\text{AMR}}_{\text{max}}\) of the three groups, but there was no significant difference between the three \(\overline{\text{AMR}}_{\text{max}}\) (one-way ANOVA, \(F_{2,15}=1.01, P>0.05\)). The mean factorial metabolic scope for the SN-disrupted fish (2.87±0.78, \(N=6\)) was significantly less than that of control fish (4.04±0.75, \(N=6\)) and sham SN-disrupted fish (4.14±0.37, \(N=6\)) (one-way ANOVA, \(F_{2,15}=6.80, P<0.05\), followed by a Tukey’s post hoc HSD multiple comparison test, \(P<0.05\)). There was no significant difference in the factorial metabolic scope between control and sham SN-disrupted fish (one-way
ANOVA, $F_{2,15}=6.80, P<0.01$, followed by a Tukey’s post hoc HSD multiple comparison test, $P>0.05$).

The mean GCOT of control and sham SN-disrupted fish group was also almost identical at each swimming speed (Fig. 5A) and reflects similarity in the MO$_2$-swim speed relationship (above). The mean GCOT of SN-disrupted fish, however, was significantly greater than that of sham SN-disrupted fish at swimming speeds $1.0–2.2 \text{ L s}^{-1}$ (ANCOVA, $F_{1,65}=14.43, P<0.01$) (Fig. 5B). The $U_{\text{opt}}$ that was extrapolated using the power model (i.e. equations 5 and 7) was $2.0 \text{ L s}^{-1}$ for both control and sham SN-disrupted fish. Using the same approach, a $2.7 \text{ L s}^{-1}$ $U_{\text{opt}}$ value was obtained for SN-disrupted fish. The corresponding value of $GCOT_{\text{min}}$ at $U_{\text{opt}}$ (calculated from equation 6 using the mean mass of each group) was similar between control fish ($0.15 \text{ J N}^{-1} \text{ m}^{-1}$) and sham-disrupted fish ($0.14 \text{ J N}^{-1} \text{ m}^{-1}$) but approximately 1.5x greater for SN-disrupted fish ($0.22 \text{ J N}^{-1} \text{ m}^{-1}$).

In addition to the overall power model estimations (above), the mean optimal swimming speed ($\bar{U}_{\text{opt}}$) obtained from individual fish was estimated to be $2.25\pm0.50 \text{ L s}^{-1}$ ($N=6$) for control, $2.00\pm0.70 \text{ L s}^{-1}$ ($N=6$) for sham SN-disrupted fish, and $1.70\pm0.81 \text{ L s}^{-1}$ ($N=6$) for SN-disrupted fish. Although the overall difference in $\bar{U}_{\text{opt}}$ between the three groups was not significant (one-way ANOVA, $F_{2,15}=0.96, P>0.05$), the mean GCOT at $U_{\text{opt}}$ ($\bar{GCOT}_{\text{min}}$) of SN-disrupted fish ($0.18\pm0.06 \text{ J N}^{-1} \text{ m}^{-1}, N=6$) was significantly greater than that of the other two groups (one-way ANOVA, $F_{2,15}=4.28, P<0.05$, followed by a Tukey’s post hoc HSD multiple comparison test, $P<0.05$). The $\bar{GCOT}_{\text{min}}$ was comparable between control ($0.10\pm0.03 \text{ J N}^{-1} \text{ m}^{-1}, N=6$) and sham SN-disrupted fish ($0.11\pm0.03 \text{ J N}^{-1} \text{ m}^{-1}, N=6$), (one-way ANOVA, $F_{2,15}=4.28, P<0.05$, followed by a post hoc Tukey’s HSD multiple comparison test, $P>0.05$). Contrary to the overall power model estimate of $U_{\text{opt}}$ (i.e. $2.7 \text{ L s}^{-1}$), the $\bar{U}_{\text{opt}}$ for SN-disrupted fish was significantly slower than the $\bar{U}_{\text{crit}}$ of this group (Friedman test, $\chi^2=7.00$ with 2 d.f., $P<0.05$, followed by a post hoc Scheffe’s method for pairwise comparison, $P<0.05$), but it was not significantly different from the $\bar{U}_{\text{max}}$ of this group (Friedman test, $\chi^2=7.00$ with 2 d.f., $P<0.05$, followed by a post hoc Scheffe’s method for pairwise comparison, $P>0.05$).

**Composition of unsteady swimming**

For both control and sham SN-disrupted fish, the percent frequency of quasi-steady swimming (i.e. steady swimming or accelerations $<1.0 \text{ L s}^{-2}$) was nearly 2-fold greater than
the percent frequency of unsteady swimming (i.e. accelerations ≥ 1.0 \( L \text{s}^{-2} \)) (Figs. 6A and 6B) (two-way ANOVA. \( F_{1,50}=48.07, P<0.01 \) for control fish and \( F_{1,48}=36.33, P<0.01 \) for sham SN-disrupted fish). For SN-disrupted fish, however, quasi-steady and unsteady measures shared approximately equal frequencies (Fig. 6C) (two-way ANOVA. \( F_{1,34}=1.79, P>0.05 \)). The percentage frequency of all acceleration measures was generally independent of flow speed in all three groups (Regression analysis for control fish: \( F_{1,28}=0.81, P>0.05 \); for sham SN-disrupted fish: \( F_{1,27}=0.45, P>0.05 \); for SN-disrupted fish: \( F_{1,20}=0.34, P>0.05 \)). Most importantly, the average percentage frequency of unsteady activity (≥ 1.0 \( L \text{s}^{-2} \)) for the SN-disrupted fish was significantly greater than that for the control and sham SN-disrupted fish (Fig. 6D) (two-way ANOVA. \( F_{2,66}=4.88, P<0.05 \)). There were differences between the 3 groups in terms of quasi-steady swimming (Fig. 6E) (two-way ANOVA. \( F_{2,66}=3.86, P<0.05 \)); the percentage frequency of quasi-steady swimming by SN-disrupted fish was less than that of controls (a post hoc Tukey’s HSD multiple comparison test, \( P<0.05 \)) but indifferent to sham SN-disrupted fish (a post hoc Tukey’s HSD multiple comparison test, \( P>0.05 \)). There was, however, no significant difference in the average percentage frequency of deceleration activity (≤ −0.1 \( L \text{s}^{-2} \)) between the three groups (Fig. 6F) (two-way ANOVA. \( F_{2,66}=1.37, P>0.05 \)).

**DISCUSSION**

**Kingfish muscle and its relation to aerobic swimming performance**

Myotomal muscle is the primary means of propulsion in fishes and, with slow oxidative (red) and fast glycolytic (white) muscle fibres being both anatomically and functionally separated, the proportional mix of muscle-type is generally believed to reflect the swimming ecology of different species (Videler, 1993). Fishes power steady undulatory swimming with both red and pink muscle but recruit white glycolytic fibres when fast unsteady movements, such as sprint and burst swimming, are required (Rome et al., 1992; Coughlin and Rome, 1996; Ellerby and Altringham, 2001). Examining the relative proportion of the different muscle fibres thus provides a valuable insight into the routine swimming performance of different species. For instance, constant swimming pelagic species generally have more slow muscle than benthic species (Videler, 1993; Ellerby and Altringham, 2001) and our analysis of muscle fibre allocations certainly provide support for *S. lalandi* also being a fast-swimming cruiser. The percentage cross-sectional area of aerobic (red and pink) muscle in *S. lalandi* increased
posteriorly, and the percentage for the posterior 65% of the body was significantly greater than the anterior half, suggesting that the red and pink muscle plays a very important role in carangiform swimming where large lateral undulations are restricted to the posterior part of the body. It is probable that the pink muscle of *S. lalandi* is a fast twitch muscle with contraction speeds lying somewhere between the performance of red and white fibres (Coughlin et al., 1996).

The total mass ratio of the oxidative red and pink muscle fibres was found to range from 6.5 to 8.0% in the whole muscle of *S. lalandi* which, although less than common active pelagic species (e.g. sardine *Sardinops melanostica*, 20.7%; chub mackerel *Scomber japonicus*, 12.0%; Obatake and Heya, 1985), is considerably greater than that of common demersal species (e.g. yellow sea bream *Taivs tumifrons*, 2.2%, sillago *Sillago japonica*, 1.6%; Obatake and Heya, 1985). *S. lalandi* shows a similar red muscle mass ratio to the jack mackerel (*Trachurus japonica*); the latter having a red muscle fraction range of 7.7–8.6% (Obatake and Heya, 1985, Xu et al. 1993). The fact that both carangids have red muscle ratios in the vicinity of 6.5–8.6% is presumably sufficient to support rapid long-term schooling which is a characteristic of both species. Examining the shift in muscle type along the length of carangiform and sub-carangiform modes of swimming lends further support to this argument. For example, in *S. lalandi*, the posterior bias for oxidative red and pink muscle fibres is clearly seen in Fig. 2A. The gadoid, *Merlangius merlangus*, a sub-carangiform swimmer that has more body bending and does not solely create thrust from posterior sections, was found to have 2% of red muscle at 35% of the body length and 14.3% at 79% of the body length (Greer-Walker and Pull, 1975). *S. lalandi* at similar positions in the current study (Fig. 2B) was found to have 5.1% of oxidative fibres at 35% FL and 22.9% at 80% FL (if a linear correlation was assumed between the proportions at 75 and 85% FL). *S. lalandi* therefore shows features of a cruising specialist with a carangiform mode of swimming.

The use of fast carangid swimming by kingfish is also supported by our respirometry data. Active epipelagic species are generally seen to have high *SMR* to maintain swimming machinery supporting peak performance at high active maximum metabolic rate (Benetti et al. 1995). Clark and Seymour (2006) measured the *SMR* of 2.1 kg *S. lalandi* at 20°C and 25°C and derived values of 1.55 mg O₂ kg⁻¹ min⁻¹ and 3.31 mg O₂ kg⁻¹ min⁻¹ respectively. Their 1.55 mgO₂ kg⁻¹ min⁻¹ *SMR* at 20°C corresponds to 2.22 mg O₂ kg⁻¹ min⁻¹ for a 0.347 kg fish if a mass-specific exponent of −0.2 is used (Clark and Johnston, 1992). The 2.16 mg O₂ kg⁻¹ min⁻¹ *SMR* of our 0.347 kg control fish at 18°C is therefore close to the measures of Clark and
Seymour (2006). When looking at other pelagic carangids, the chub mackerel *Scomber japonicus* provides a good comparison of SMR since it is an epipelagic predator specialized for rapid and efficient swimming (Dickson et al., 2002). Dickson et al. (2002) reported an SMR of 2.11 mg O\(_2\) kg\(^{-1}\) min\(^{-1}\) for 0.095 kg *S. japonicus* at 18°C. This measure of SMR is close to that of our control fish but obviously applies to a smaller fish and is therefore less than our kingfish if a mass exponent of –0.2 is applied. The optimal swimming speed, \(U_{opt}\), of control and sham treated fish within the current line of work was 2.0 L s\(^{-1}\) at 18°C which is directly comparable to 2.2 L s\(^{-1}\) \(U_{opt}\) of *S. lalandi* at 22°C within the study of Brown et al. (2011) using the same swim flume and similarly sized fish. However, other more sluggish species such as saithe and whiting are seen to have much lower \(U_{opt}\) values in the vicinity of 1.4 L s\(^{-1}\) and 1.0 L s\(^{-1}\) respectively (Steinhausen et al., 2005). The specialized musculature and relatively high \(U_{opt}\) and SMR of *S. lalandi* therefore suggests that kingfish use relatively faster swimming speed during routine moving and foraging, and it is within these more energy demanding speeds that the lateral line is likely to play a more substantive role.

**Effect of lateral line disruption on aerobic metabolic capacity and mode of swimming**

SN-disrupted fish had a lower swimming performance and swam less efficiently. They were not only unable to attain high critical swimming speeds (Fig. 3), but across a comparable range of swimming up to the \(U_{crit}\) level of 2.11 L s\(^{-1}\), their rate of O\(_2\) consumption per unit swimming speed was greater (Fig. 4B). Although MO\(_2\) was higher for SN-disrupted fish, the drop in \(U_{crit}\) swimming performance translated into a reduced aerobic scope, implying that fish were possibly forced to recruit anaerobic fibres earlier in the \(U_{crit}\)-test. As illustrated in Fig. 5B, some SN-disrupted individuals would have had to swim beyond their \(U_{crit}\) limit to capitalize on the benefits of \(U_{opt}\), their least cost swimming speed at 2.74 L s\(^{-1}\), which emphasizes the mismatch in swimming efficiency and performance in this group. Only one SN-disrupted fish could complete 2 cycles of the MO\(_2\) measurement at 3.4 L s\(^{-1}\), and showed similar MO\(_2\) measures to those for the fish with intact lateral line input (Fig. 4B). This may result from the stabilized swimming performance by multisensory substitution involving canal neuromasts that has higher threshold for hydrodynamic stimuli (high-frequency flow).

The estimated \(U_{opt}\) for control fish suggests that kingfish use swimming speeds as fast as 2 L s\(^{-1}\) for routine swimming, such as migration and foraging. These considerations taken together suggest the upper limit of the swimming speed range where trunk superficial neuromasts are
responsible for motor control for swimming efficiency may fall between 2.0 and 3.4 L s\(^{-1}\). The fish with intact lateral line were able to sustain swimming across an extended range of speed and were able to capitalize on the benefit of least cost swimming at \(U_{\text{opt}}\). The results of the present study therefore suggest that the majority of SN-disrupted fish were subject to increased swimming costs and showed poor swimming efficiency and performance across a range of swimming speeds. In relation to the MO\(_2\) measures, no significant difference in GCOT was detected between fish with and without intact lateral line when swimming at \(U_{\text{opt}}\). This suggests that SN-disrupted fish are required to take the same period of time to reach the same distance if swimming at \(U_{\text{opt}}\). This is the least cost swimming activity. However, SN-disrupted fish will subsequently consume 1.5 times greater amount of aerobic energy compared with control and sham SN-disrupted fish. The higher GCOT at \(U_{\text{opt}}\) for SN-disrupted fish and shallower U-shaped relationship of GCOT with swimming speed (Fig. 5B) suggest that the cost of swimming for this group of fish was considerably high up to \(U_{\text{crit}}\). That is because the difference between the GCOT at \(U_{\text{opt}}\) and \(U_{\text{crit}}\) was negligibly small despite that the GCOT at swimming speeds around \(U_{\text{crit}}\) should arguably be high due to the exponentially increased hydrodynamic resistance that the fish had to overcome. It is essential that like kingfish fish species leading a pelagic life use energetically most cost effective swimming speed (i.e. \(U_{\text{opt}}\)) for longer and more directional movement. Therefore, relatively inefficient swimming at \(U_{\text{opt}}\) must have substantial impact on their fitness components, such as survival, growth, reproduction and other relevant responses.

Behavioural aspects of swimming (i.e. steady versus unsteady maneuvers of swimming, Fig. 6) in the \(U_{\text{crit}}\)-test obviously has important implications for the bioenergetics of swimming kingfish. It would appear that the greater \(\overline{G\text{COT}}\) of SN-disrupted fish was attributed to their frequent use of unsteady swimming gait (i.e. \(\geq 1.0\text{ L s}^{-2}\), Fig. 6D) and other spontaneous activities, such as turns, breaks, and fin movements for stability control that were observed in SN-disrupted fish during intermediate swimming between 1.0 and 1.9 L s\(^{-1}\). However, the percentage frequency of quasi-steady swimming (steady swimming or accelerations < 1.0 L s\(^{-2}\)) for SN-disrupted fish swimming at 2.2 L s\(^{-1}\) was almost exactly the same as that for control and sham SN-disrupted fish swimming at 2.2 L s\(^{-1}\). Nevertheless, the mean \(\overline{G\text{COT}}\) of SN-disrupted fish (0.23 J N\(^{-1}\) m\(^{-1}\)) swimming at 2.2 L s\(^{-1}\) was significantly greater than that of control (0.14 J N\(^{-1}\) m\(^{-1}\)) and sham SN-disrupted fish (0.13 J N\(^{-1}\) m\(^{-1}\)) swimming at 2.2 L s\(^{-1}\). We therefore believe that the relatively high level of inefficient/high-cost swimming seen in the SN-disrupted fish may have contributed to the
elevated level of GCOT of this group.

Disrupting the lateral line of *S. lalandi* is seen to affect the mode of swimming in a way that increases the metabolic costs of travel. This potentially provides evidence for a role of flow sensing feedback from trunk superficial neuromasts on both sides of the fish body in swimming efficiency but the mechanism by which this effect occurs is not yet resolved. One possibility is that SN-disrupted fish experienced an asymmetric disruption of sensory feedback from trunk superficial neuromasts or asymmetric integration of mechanosensory input within the central nervous system that resulted in unsteady swimming and reduced swimming efficiency (Boisclair and Tang 1993). We believe this may have occurred and at least partially explains why *U*<sub>crit</sub> swimming performance was reduced and *O*<sub>2</sub> consumption at standardized rates of swimming was higher in the SN-disrupted fish. The use of unsteady swimming undoubtedly produced a high cost relationship between *O*<sub>2</sub> consumption and swimming speed in the SN-disrupted fish. Previous investigators have proposed a role for sensory feedback in promoting efficient kinematics (Lighthill, 1993) and boundary layer control (Anderson et al., 2001). But more detailed studies of kinematics and boundary layer control after sensory manipulation are required to directly test these possibilities. Further work is also required to clarify if there are other factors, such as changes in swimming behavior, that contribute to the observed efficiency deficits created by SN ablation.

Previous studies have shown that central pattern generators (CPGs) are involved in generation of rhythmic neural output for diverse rhythmic activities in various animals, including swimming in fishes (Tytell and Cohen, 2008). It is also known that although CPGs produce a rhythmic motor pattern in the absence of any external cues (i.e. CPG-based control), deafferentated animals were not able to sustain the rhythmic pattern of CPGs for long periods without sensory input, and that in a natural situation, a great number of afferent sensory inputs are involved in the sustained production of the rhythmic motor patterns (Belanger and Orchard, 1992; da Silva and Lange, 2011). Assuming that this is also the case in our kingfish, even if lateral-line input from trunk superficial neuromasts was completely blocked by bilateral SN-ablation, the alternative sensory feedback system could compensate for the perturbation that would otherwise be caused by the bilateral SN-ablation, by performing a similar function. Therefore, we chose unilateral superficial neuromast ablation as the experimental manipulation rather than bilateral ablation on the rationale that central pattern generation may be more sensitive to asymmetric disruption of sensory input. It is interesting to note that the observed change in metabolic and cost-of-transport measures is particularly evident at intermediate swimming speeds. One interpretation of these findings is that sensory
feedback to modify CPGs for locomotion efficiency is more important over an intermediate swimming range. It is possible that the CPGs are tuned to operate efficiently at higher swimming speeds without sensory feedback from trunk superficial neuromasts and that it is at intermediate swimming speeds that active sensory feedback will be more evident.

**LIST OF SYMBOLS AND ABBREVIATIONS**

\[ a \quad \text{parameter in a power function of swimming speed and body mass for oxygen consumption} \]

\[ A_c \quad \text{cross sectional area of the flow chamber} \]

\[ A_f \quad \text{cross sectional area of the fish} \]

\[ \text{AMR} \quad \text{active metabolic rate} \]

\[ \text{AMR}_{\text{max}} \quad \text{maximum active metabolic rate} \]

\[ \bar{\text{AMR}}_{\text{max}} \quad \text{mean maximum active metabolic rate} \]

\[ \text{AMR}_{\text{opt}} \quad \text{active metabolic rate at optimal swimming speed} \]

\[ b \quad \text{parameter in a power function of swimming speed and body mass for oxygen consumption} \]

\[ c \quad \text{parameter in a power function of swimming speed and body mass for oxygen consumption} \]

\[ \text{CPGs} \quad \text{central pattern generators} \]

\[ d \quad \text{maximum depth of the fish body} \]

\[ FL \quad \text{fork length of the fish} \]

\[ \text{GCOT} \quad \text{gross cost of transport} \]

\[ \text{GCOT}_{\text{min}} \quad \text{minimum gross aerobic cost of transport based on a power model of mass specific oxygen consumption} \]

\[ \bar{\text{GCOT}}_{\text{min}} \quad \text{mean minimum gross cost of transport} \]

\[ g \quad \text{gravitational acceleration} \]

\[ M \quad \text{mass of the fish} \]

\[ \text{MO}_2 \quad \text{mass specific oxygen consumption rate} \]

\[ \text{PO}_2 \quad \text{partial pressure of oxygen at 100% air saturation} \]

\[ \text{RIO} \quad \text{reciprocal inhibition oscillator} \]

\[ \text{SMR} \quad \text{standard metabolic rate} \]

\[ \text{SN} \quad \text{superficial neuromasts} \]

\[ t_f \quad \text{elapsed time from the velocity increase to fatigue of the fish in the critical} \]
swimming speed test

t_i time between the velocity increments in the critical swimming speed test

U flow velocity or swimming speed when the fish held its station relative to the flume

U_{crit} critical swimming speed

\bar{U}_{crit} mean critical swimming speed

U_i velocity increment in the critical swimming speed test

U_{max} maximum swimming speed at which the fish was able to complete 30-min period of swimming in the critical swimming speed test

\bar{U}_{max} mean maximum swimming speed

U_{opt} optimal swimming speed based on a power model of mass specific oxygen consumption rate

\bar{U}_{opt} mean optimal swimming speed

U_w the flow velocity without fish

V_w volume of the respirometer

w maximum width of the fish body

WPM cost of swimming as work per metre

\alpha rate of velocity change in terms of body length of the fish

\beta_{wo2} capacitance coefficient of oxygen in water at a certain salinity

\Delta_{sat} change in % of air saturation per second

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was financially supported by the New Zealand Foundation of Research Science and Technology (FRST) under the Fellowship Program jointly administrated by the Japan Society for Promotion of Science (JSPS).
REFERENCES


Clark, T. D. and Seymour, R. S. (2006). Cardiorespiratory physiology and swimming energetics of a high-energy-demand teleost, the yellowtail kingfish (*Seriola...


**Peake, S. and McKinley, R. S.** (1998). A re-evaluation of swimming performance in


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>Wetted mass (kg)</th>
<th>White muscle (kg) [% relative to (5)]</th>
<th>Oxidative (red + pink) muscle (kg) [% relative to (5)]</th>
<th>Whole muscle: (3)+(4) [% relative to (2)]</th>
<th>Remaining (kg) [% relative to (2)]</th>
<th>Lost mass (kg) after measurement [% relative to (2)]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>0.601</td>
<td>0.247 [92.8]</td>
<td>0.019 [7.2]</td>
<td>0.266 [44.3]</td>
<td>0.325 [54.1]</td>
<td>0.010 [1.6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.871</td>
<td>0.422 [93.5]</td>
<td>0.029 [6.5]</td>
<td>0.452 [51.8]</td>
<td>0.403 [46.2]</td>
<td>0.017 [2.0]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>0.481 [93.3]</td>
<td>0.035 [6.7]</td>
<td>0.516 [56.4]</td>
<td>0.378 [41.3]</td>
<td>0.021 [2.3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.365</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.341 [92.0]</td>
<td>0.030 [8.0]</td>
<td>0.370 [54.1]</td>
<td>0.296 [43.3]</td>
<td>0.018 [2.6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td>0.395 [92.3]</td>
<td>0.033 [7.7]</td>
<td>0.428 [52.6]</td>
<td>0.379 [46.6]</td>
<td>0.007 [0.8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.777 [92.8]</td>
<td>0.029 [7.2]</td>
<td>0.407 [52.3]</td>
<td>0.356 [45.9]</td>
<td>0.014 [1.8]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.089 [0.6]</td>
<td>0.006 [0.6]</td>
<td>0.094 [4.6]</td>
<td>0.044 [4.9%]</td>
<td>0.006 [0.7]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 Basic statistics from the respirometric measurement (mean±S.D., N=6) for the yellowtail kingfish. The values in parentheses represent the estimates based on a power model of mass specific oxygen consumption (MO$_2$), MO$_2 = aM^{-0.2} + bM^{-0.2}U^c$, where parameters $a$, $b$, and $c$ are estimated from data, and $M$ is the mean mass of the fish for each group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control fish</th>
<th>Sham SN-disrupted fish</th>
<th>SN-disrupted fish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fork length, FL±S.D. [m]</td>
<td>0.304±0.022</td>
<td>0.308±0.011</td>
<td>0.301±0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass±S.D. [kg]</td>
<td>0.347±0.070</td>
<td>0.366±0.051</td>
<td>0.340±0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard metabolic rate, SMR [mg O$_2$ kg$^{-1}$ min$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum metabolic rate, AMR$_{max}$ [mg O$_2$ kg$^{-1}$ min$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>8.76±1.60</td>
<td>9.23±1.19</td>
<td>7.47±3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Optimal swimming speed, $U_{\text{opt}}$±S.D. ($U_{\text{opt}}$ at GCOT$_{\text{max}}$) [L s$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>2.25±0.50 (2.00)</td>
<td>2.00±0.70 (2.00)</td>
<td>1.70±0.81 (2.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross cost of transport, $\text{GCOT}$±S.D. at $U_{\text{opt}}$ (GCOT at $U_{\text{opt}}$) [J N$^{-1}$ m$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>0.10±0.03 (0.15)</td>
<td>0.11±0.03 (0.14)</td>
<td>0.17±0.06* (0.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factorial metabolic scope</td>
<td>4.04±0.75</td>
<td>4.14±0.37</td>
<td>2.87±0.78**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum swimming speed, $U_{\text{max}}$ [L s$^{-1}$]</td>
<td>3.79±0.42</td>
<td>3.60±0.21</td>
<td>1.99±0.97**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The standard metabolic rate, SMR, of SN-disrupted fish was assumed to be the same as that of sham SN-disrupted fish group.

* Significant at $P<0.05$.  ** Significant at $P<0.01$. 
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Fig. 1. The lateral line system of the yellowtail kingfish *Seriola lalandi*. (A) Mechanoreceptive patches for superficial neuromasts are clearly visible as dark pigmented dots. Lateral line canal including pores is visible as a dark line running horizontally in the middle of the picture. (B) Scanning electron micrograph of a superficial neuromast from a mature fish (*FL*=0.362 m) showing the exposed cilia of the hair cells. The cupula is removed in the preparation process for electron microscopy.
A) The image shows a fish with marked sections indicating longitudinal position (%FL).

B) The graph illustrates the area of muscle (mm²) against longitudinal position (%FL). The area decreases as the position moves from 0% to 100% FL. The percentage area relative to the total area of the muscle is also shown, with a peak at 0% FL and a decline to 0% at 100% FL.
Fig. 2. Distribution of the mean area of red, pink, and white muscle and the % of the area relative to the whole muscle area. (A) Lateral view of the distribution of the red muscle and transverse sections. (B) The absolute area of the white (black crosses) and whole muscle (blue diamonds), and % areas of different fiber type relative to the whole muscle area for the oxydative red + pink (red crosses), red (red circles), and pink (pink circles) muscle at different longitudinal positions. Allometry effect for all the data were adjusted by ANCOVA with $FL^2$. The curves (fourth order polynomials) are indicated for the illustration purpose.
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Fig. 3. Box-plot of critical swimming speed. Boxes are defined by the 1st and 3rd quartile values, and the total range of values (N=12) is shown as vertical bars. The white crosses represent median $U_{\text{crit}}$. 
Fig. 4. Comparison of mass specific oxygen consumption (MO$_2$) between fish groups with and without a unilateral ablation of trunk superficial neuromasts (SN). The plots compare mass specific oxygen consumption (mean MO$_2$±S.D.) (A) between control (in black) and sham SN-disrupted (in red) fish groups and (B) between sham SN-disrupted (in red) and SN-disrupted (in blue) fish groups. The curves represent the power model MO$_2$ = a$M^{0.2} + bM^{0.2}U^c$ (A) for control (in black) and sham SN-disrupted (in red) and (B) for sham SN-disrupted (in red) and SN-disrupted (in blue) fish groups. The model parameters $a$, $b$, and $c$ are approximated from empirical data obtained from fish with mean body mass of $M$. The ANCOVA regression models of Log(MO$_2$) on the swimming speed ($U$=1.0–2.2 L s$^{-1}$) for sham SN-disrupted (solid black curve) and SN-disrupted (broken black curve) fish groups are compared in panel B. The error bars in each graphic represent S.D. from the mean of $N$=6.
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Fig. 5. Comparison of gross cost of transport (GCOT) between fish groups with and without a unilateral ablation of trunk superficial neuromasts (SN). Plots compare gross cost of transport (mean $\overline{GCOT} \pm \text{S.D.}$) (A) between control (in black) and sham SN-disrupted (in blue) fish groups and (B) between sham SN-disrupted (in blue) and SN-disrupted (in blue) fish groups. The curves represent the model estimated from $\text{MO}_2 = aM^{-0.2} + bM^{-0.2}U^c$ (A) for control (in black) and sham SN-disrupted (in red) and (B) for sham SN-disrupted (in red) and SN-disrupted (in blue) fish groups. The model parameters $a$, $b$, and $c$ are approximated from empirical data obtained from fish with mean body mass of $M$. The optimal swimming speed, $U_{\text{opt}}$, in the graphic was determined based on the approximated GCOT curve where the cost of transport was minimal ($GCOT_{\text{min}}$). The ANCOVA regression models of GCOT on the swimming speed ($U=1.0-2.2 \text{ L s}^{-1}$) for sham SN-disrupted (solid black curve) and SN-disrupted (broken black curve) fish groups are compared in panel B. The error bars in each graphic represent S.D. from the mean of $N=6$. 
Percentage frequency of unsteady or quasi-steady activity
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Fig. 6. Comparison of unsteady (solid bars) and quasi-steady (hollow bars) swimming activities within (A) control, (B) sham SN-disrupted, and (C) SN-disrupted fish groups. The magnitude of acceleration was classified based on the rate of velocity increase per second: \(-0.1 \sim \) less than \(1.0 \text{ L s}^{-2}\) (quasi-steady), \(1.0 \text{ L s}^{-2}\) or greater (unsteady), and less than \(-0.1 \text{ L s}^{-2}\) (decelerating). Percentage frequency equates to the number of acceleration event relative to the total number of movements made across the 30 min observation period. For all graphics, the error bars represent S.D. from the mean of \(N=6\).
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Fig. 7. Comparison of percentage frequency of (A) unsteady swimming activity, (B) quasi-steady swimming activity, and (C) decelerating activity between control (grey bars), sham SN-disrupted (red bars), and SN-disrupted (blue bars) fish groups. The magnitude of acceleration was classified based on the rate of velocity increase per second: $-0.1 \sim$ less than $1.0 \, \text{L s}^{-2}$ (quasi-steady), $1.0 \, \text{L s}^{-2}$ or greater (unsteady), and less than $-0.1 \, \text{L s}^{-2}$ (decelerating). Percentage frequency equates to the number of acceleration event relative to the total number of movements made across the 30 min observation period. For all graphics, the error bars represent S.D. from the mean of $N=6$. 