

## Reproductive failure in common seals feeding on fish from polluted coastal waters

Peter J. H. Reijnders

Research Institute for Nature Management, Department of Estuarine Ecology, Postbus 59, 1790 AB Den Burg, Texel, The Netherlands

The population of common seal *Phoca vitulina* in the westernmost part of the Wadden Sea, The Netherlands, has collapsed during the past few decades<sup>1,2</sup>. Between 1950 and 1975 the population dropped from more than 3,000 to less than 500 animals. Comparative studies of common seal populations from different parts of the Wadden Sea reveal that pup production has declined sharply only in the western (Dutch) part<sup>2-4</sup>. A comparative toxicological study<sup>5</sup> on the levels of heavy metals and organochlorines in tissues of seals from the western and northern parts of the Wadden Sea shows that only the polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB) levels differ significantly. This is predominantly a result of PCB pollution from the river Rhine<sup>6-9</sup>, which mainly affects the western (Dutch) part. PCBs are thought to be responsible for the low rate of reproduction in Dutch common seals on the basis of epidemiological and experimental data on the ability of PCBs to interfere with mammalian reproduction<sup>5,10</sup>. Here I report that reproductive failure in common seals from the Dutch Wadden Sea is related to feeding on fish from that polluted area. This is the first demonstration of a causal relationship between naturally occurring levels of pollutants and a physiological response in marine mammals.

An experiment with two groups of 12 female common seals was carried out to test the detrimental effects of PCBs on seal reproduction. Each group, consisting of 7 seals from the east coast of the United Kingdom and 5 seals from the Museum of Natural History at Texel, was fed a diet containing different levels of pollutants. Group 1 received fish (predominantly plaice, flounder and dab, with some eelpout and hooknose) caught in the western part of the Wadden Sea. Group 2 received fish

(mainly mackerel) from the north-east Atlantic. The fish were maintained at  $-28^{\circ}\text{C}$  and thawed before being fed to the seals. The diets are comparable with respect to nutritional quality, except for fat levels; this was compensated for by a high daily intake. Residue analysis for aldrin, dieldrin, endrin, heptachlor, heptachlor epoxide,  $\alpha,\beta,\gamma$ -hexachlorocyclohexane, pentachlorobenzene, hexachlorobenzene, *pp'*-dichlorodiphenyl-dichloroethylene (DDE), *op'*-dichlorodiphenyl-dichloroethane, *pp'*-dichlorodiphenyl-dichloroethane and PCBs showed statistically significant differences between the two diets for PCBs and *pp'*-DDE. The average daily intake (during  $\sim 2$  years) was 1.5 mg PCBs and 0.4 mg *pp'*-DDE for group 1, and 0.22 mg and 0.13 mg for group 2 (J. P. Boon, P.J.H.R., J. Dols, and P. F. Wensvoort, unpublished data). Three males receiving Atlantic fish were alternated between both groups during the mating period. To detect whether hormonal regulation was affected by pollutants, blood samples were taken regularly and serum concentrations of progesterone and oestradiol- $17\beta$  were determined. Because the timing of oestrus differs for individuals, all profiles have been synchronized by taking the day of previous delivery as day zero and adjusting the profiles of non-pregnant animals accordingly. Although there is some published information about the hormonal changes during reproduction in seals<sup>11,13</sup>, none of these studies reported the changes during a complete annual reproductive cycle in a specific group of females. The oestradiol- $17\beta$  and progesterone concentration profile of the control group (Fig. 1e,g) illustrate the normal annual cycle. The number of non-pregnant animals in the control group is too small to consider their reproductive cycle as 'normal' for non-pregnant females.

No statistically significant differences (Spearman,  $p < 0.005$ ) were found in the progesterone and oestradiol- $17\beta$  profiles of pregnant seals from groups 1 and 2. Identical tests for the non-pregnant animals in both groups gave the same result. This is important as it implies that the differences in diet do not influence hormone patterns. The patterns resemble those for eutherian mammals in general<sup>14,15</sup>. Pinnipeds are classified as having an obligate and seasonal embryonic diapause<sup>16,17</sup>. In common seals in this study implantation probably occurred at




Fig. 1 Circulating serum concentrations of progesterone and oestradiol- $17\beta$  during the reproductive season 1983-84, in common seals feeding on fish from the Wadden Sea (group 1) and on Atlantic fish (group 2). a-d, Group 1 (a,b,c,d): (●---●), pregnant seals ( $n=4$ ); (○---○), non-pregnant seals ( $n=8$ ). e-h, Group 2: (●---●), pregnant seals ( $n=10$ ); (x---x) and (○---○) non-pregnant seals. Vertical bars, 1 s.d.; p = period over which previous parturitions occurred; i = implantation period. Blood samples were obtained from veins in the hind flippers after restraining the animals on a V-shaped bench. The blood ( $\sim 8$  ml) was collected in vacutainers, centrifuged and the serum stored frozen at  $-20^{\circ}\text{C}$ . Serum concentrations of progesterone and oestradiol- $17\beta$  were determined by radioimmunoassay. The intra run coefficients of variation for progesterone and oestradiol- $17\beta$  were consistently below 3.0% and 3.05% respectively.

the en-  
terized  
The  
than in  
test). I  
1 show  
proces  
implan  
These  
mink<sup>18</sup>,  
and im  
or reso  
to dire  
caused  
disrupt  
circulat  
somal  
steroids  
circulat  
the four  
1 and 2  
between  
non-pre  
progest  
oestradi  
indicati  
group 1,  
between  
animals  
results a  
1 seals  
Wilcoxo  
group 1  
success.  
tradiol le  
endomet  
will be di  
steroid b  
and an er  
available  
I concl  
the diet  
decrease  
hormone  
rupted in  
tion seen  
about the  
experime  
mink Mu  
reproduct  
PCBs had  
of 'Stand  
cial Mink  
from fish  
Clopen A  
inhibited  
that the el  
contamine  
Irrespec  
from this  
seals from  
from that  
mental dat  
on fish fro  
the main c  
I thank  
Hospital, I  
Schoonhec  
animals an  
experiment

h were  
seals.  
quality,  
h daily  
achlor,  
enzene,  
thylene  
chloro-  
lly sig-  
pp'-  
1.5 mg  
0.13 mg  
svoort,  
h were  
iod. To  
lutants,  
trations  
Because  
es have  
y as day  
animals  
rmation  
eals<sup>11,13</sup>  
omplete  
les. The  
e of the  
cle. The  
p is too  
for non-

< 0.005)  
rofiles of  
for the  
ult. This  
t do not  
hose for  
ssified as  
e<sup>16,17</sup>. In  
curred at

ncentra-  
radiol-  
season  
ding on  
group 1)  
2). a-d,  
- - - ●,  
○), non-  
group 2:  
(n = 10);  
pregnant  
= period  
nutritions  
period.  
ed from  
rs after  
n a V-  
(~8 ml)  
ers, cen-  
ed frozen  
ations of  
adiol-17β  
radioim-  
efficients  
one and  
sistently  
actively.

the end of October or beginning of November, and was characterized by an increase in oestradiol-17β levels (Fig. 1, c, g).

The reproductive success was significantly lower in group 1 than in group 2 (Table 1;  $p < 0.02$ , Fisher's exact probability test). The hormone profiles of the non-pregnant animals in group 1 show that the effect occurs at a stage of the reproductive process around implantation; the follicular, luteal and post-implantation phases until the end of gestation are not affected. These findings corroborate the results from experiments with mink<sup>18,19</sup> where PCBs impaired reproduction: ovulation, mating and implantation occurred but were followed by early abortion or resorption. These results may be due to hormonal disturbance, to direct dominant-lethal action or to an embryo lethal effect caused by toxicants. Hormonal disturbance may be caused by disruption of the steroid synthetic pathway resulting in reduced circulating levels of hormones. PCBs are known to cause microsomal enzyme induction, accelerating hydroxylation of body steroids such as oestrogens<sup>5</sup>. To determine if pollutants suppress circulating levels of hormones during the implantation period, the four subgroups (pregnant and non-pregnant seals in groups 1 and 2) are compared. A statistical test revealed no difference between progesterone levels of pregnant animals in group 2 and non-pregnant animals in group 1. It is concluded that progesterone levels were not reduced in group 1. The rise in oestradiol levels of the non-pregnant seals in group 2—indicating follicular growth—is lacking in non-pregnant seals of group 1, which suggests that the nature of non-pregnancy differs between the groups. Because there were only 2 non-pregnant animals in group 2, this could not be tested statistically. The results also demonstrate that the levels of oestradiol in all group 1 seals are lower than those in group 2 combined, ( $p < 0.05$ , Wilcoxon), although the initial rise in some of the animals of group 1 (Fig. 1c) was apparently sufficient to ensure reproductive success. The mechanisms behind the smaller increase in oestradiol levels and its consequences for the priming effect on the endometrium, as well as the maternal rejection response<sup>20-22</sup>, will be discussed in detail elsewhere. Hypotheses about impaired steroid binding capacity by PCBs<sup>23</sup>, a dominant-lethal action and an embryo lethal effect cannot be tested with the information available.

I conclude that the reproductive success of the seals receiving the diet with the highest level of pollutants was significantly decreased. No circumannual reduction in levels of circulating hormone levels was observed. The reproductive process is disrupted in the post-ovulation phase. The period around implantation seems to be the most sensitive stage, but no conclusions about the mechanism of action can be drawn. A similar experiment was simultaneously carried out with the American mink *Mustela vison*, a fish-eating mammal with a comparable reproductive physiology. It was designed to test whether pure PCBs had the same effect as the PCB-polluted fish. Three groups of 'Standard' type mink were fed either a basic diet of commercial mink cereal, or the same basic diet supplemented with livers from fish caught in the western part of the Wadden Sea or with Clopen A-60 or A-30. The results show that reproduction is inhibited at very low (25 μg per day) levels of PCB intake and that the effects of the pure PCB diet were identical to those of contaminated fish diet<sup>18</sup>.

Irrespective of the precise mechanism involved, the results from this study show that the reproductive failure in common seals from the Dutch Wadden Sea is related to feeding on fish from that polluted area. The available epidemiological experimental data on effects and levels of PCBs in seals and mink fed on fish from this area<sup>5,27</sup> suggest that these organochlorines are the main cause of this failure.

I thank A. Grijzen, H. Jansens and G. van Weert of De Wever Hospital, Heerlen, for carrying out the radioimmunoassays; J. Schoonheden for the illustrations, M. C. Vieugel for care of the animals and J. Zegers for his assistance throughout the whole experiment.

1. Reijnders, P. J. H. *Neth. J. Sea Res.* 10, 223-235 (1976).
2. Reijnders, P. J. H. *Neth. J. Sea Res.* 12, 164-179 (1978).
3. Reijnders, P. J. H., Drescher, H. E., van Haften, J. L., Bøgebjerg Hansen, E. & Tougaard, S. in *Marine Mammals of the Wadden Sea* (eds Reijnders, P. J. H. & Wolf, W. J.) 19-32 (Balkema, Rotterdam, 1981).
4. Reijnders, P. J. H. *Z. Säugetierk.* 48, 50-54 (1983).
5. Reijnders, P. J. H. *Neth. J. Sea Res.* 14, 30-65 (1980).
6. Duinker, J. C. & Hillebrand, M. T. J. *Neth. J. Sea Res.* 13, 256-281 (1979).
7. Duinker, J. C., Hillebrand, M. T. J., Nolting, R. F. & Wellershaus, S. *Neth. J. Sea Res.* 15, 141-169 (1982).
8. Duinker, J. C., Hillebrand, M. T. J., Nolting, R. F. & Wellershaus, S. *Neth. J. Sea Res.* 15, 170-195 (1982).
9. Duinker, J. C., Boon, J. P. & Hillebrand, M. T. J. *Neth. Inst. Sea Res. Publ. Ser.* 10, 211-228 (1984).
10. Reijnders, P. J. H. in *Marine Mammals of the Wadden Sea* (eds Reijnders, P. J. H. & Wolf, W. J.) 38-47 (Balkema, Rotterdam, 1981).
11. Daniel, J. C., Jr. *J. Fish. Res. Bd Can.* 33, 65-66 (1975).
12. Boyd, I. L. *J. Repr. Fert.* 69, 157-164 (1983).
13. Raeside, J. I. & Ronald, K. *J. Repr. Fert.* 61, 135-139 (1981).
14. Amoroso, E. C., Heap, A. B. & Renfree, M. B. in *Hormones and Evolution* (ed. Barrington, E. J. W.) 925-989 (1979).
15. Flint, A. P. F. *J. Repr. Fert. Suppl.* 29, 215-227 (1981).
16. Renfree, M. B. & Calaby, J. H. *J. Repr. Fert. Suppl.* 29, 1-9 (1981).
17. Boshier, D. P. *J. Repr. Fert. Suppl.* 29, 143-149 (1981).
18. Boer, M. den in *A. Rep. RIN* (ed. Rossum, T. van) 77-86 (Rijksinstituut voor Natuurbeheer, Leersum, 1983).
19. Jensen, S., Kilstrom, J. E., Olsson, M., Lundberg, C. & Orberg, J. *Ambio* 6, 239 (1977).
20. Finn, R., St. Hill, C. A., Govan, A. J., Raifs, I. G. & Gurney, F. J. *Br. Med. J.* 3, 150-152 (1972).
21. Anderson, R. H. & Munroe, C. W. *Am. J. Obstet. Gynec.* 84, 1096-1103 (1962).
22. Grossman, C. J. *Science* 227, 257-261 (1985).
23. Bitman, J. & Cecil, H. C. *J. Agric. Fd Chem.* 18, 1108-1112 (1970).
24. Osborn, D. B., Cooke, A. S. & Freestone, S. *Envir. Pollut.* 25, 305-319 (1981).
25. Ronald, K., Foster, M. E. & Johnson, E. *Can. J. Zool.* 47, 461-468 (1969).
26. Bouckaert, P. X. J. M. thesis (Univ. Nijmegen, Netherlands, 1984).
27. Reijnders, P. J. H. *Mar. Mamm. Sci.* (submitted).

Table 1 of this paper appears on page 418.

## A common mammalian plan of accessory optic system organization revealed in all primates

H. M. Cooper & M. Magnin

Laboratoire de Neuropsychologie Expérimentale, INSERM U-94, 16 Avenue Doyen Lépine, 69500 Bron, France

The accessory optic system (AOS), which was described as early as 1870 by Gudden<sup>1</sup>, constitutes a distinct midbrain visual pathway in all classes of vertebrates<sup>2</sup>. In non-primate mammals, retinal fibres of this system project to a set of three nuclei<sup>3,4</sup>: the dorsal (DTN), the lateral (LTN) and the medial (MTN) terminal nuclei. Whereas all AOS cells respond to the slow motion of large visual stimuli, the neurons are tuned to complementary directions of movement<sup>5</sup>: horizontal temporo-nasal direction for the DTN, vertical up and down for the LTN and vertical down for the MTN. It has thus been suggested that these nuclei establish a system of retinal coordinates for the detection of whole field motion<sup>6</sup>. As the AOS provides direct and indirect pathways to both oculomotor and vestibular structures<sup>7,8</sup>, each of these nuclei is thought to be an essential link in the co-ordination of eye and head movements in relation to movement within the visual field. One problem for the generalization of this theory is that the medial terminal nucleus has never been found in primates. In this report we establish both the existence of this nucleus and its afferent input from the retina in all major groups of primates (prosimians, New and Old World monkeys and apes), indicating a common anatomical plan of organization of the AOS in mammals.

We used both autoradiographic and histochemical anterograde tracing techniques to study the retinal projection to the AOS in the two primate suborders<sup>9</sup> Strepsirhini (prosimians: lemurs and lorises) and Haplorhini (simians: New and Old World monkeys, apes and man). For the Strepsirhines we studied five mouse lemurs (*Microcebus murinus*) and one bushbaby (*Galago demidovii*). Haplorhine species included two marmosets (*Callithrix jacchus*), three macaques (*Macaca fascicularis*) and two gibbons (*Hylobates concolor*). Most animals were injected with a radioactive amino acid mixture (500-

large samples, where the finer points of statistical inference are relatively unimportant, but biologists often have to argue from quite small samples. It is no accident that the greatest impetus for the refinement of the logic of statistical inference has come from the biological sciences, and especially from human genetics, where the paucity of the data is matched only by the importance of the inferences. Nuclear accidents fall into the same category.

A. W. F. EDWARDS

Department of Community Medicine,  
University of Cambridge,  
Fenner's, Gresham Road,  
Cambridge CB1 2ES, UK

1. Islam, S. & Lindgren, K. *Nature* 322, 691-692 (1986).
2. Edwards, A. W. F. *Likelihood* (Cambridge University Press, 1984).
3. Jeffreys, H. *Theory of Probability* 3rd edn (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1983).

## Stunning whales

SIR—M.A. Taylor's comments on prey echolocation and sonic squid-stunning by whales (*Nature* 323, 298, 1986) contain an incorrect discussion of the relation between the maximum detection distance by the whale ( $D$ ) and the maximum distance at which potential prey can detect the whale's echolocating emissions ( $d$ ). If for simplicity we neglect absorption, refraction, scattering by extraneous bodies, inhomogeneities, anisotropies, near-field and frequency-dependent effects, then the outward power-flux at distance  $r$  is  $W/4\pi r^2$ , and the returning power-flux experienced by the whale is  $W\sigma/16\pi r^4$ , where  $W$  is the emitted power and  $\sigma$  is the backscattering cross-section of the prey. If the minimum flux detectable by the whale is  $S$  and by the prey is  $s$ , we may find  $D$  and  $d$  from the equations  $S = W\sigma/16.235^2 D^4$  and  $s = W/4\pi d^2$ . The ratio  $d/D$  is  $(WS/\sigma s^2)^{1/4}$ . This expression can be made more illuminating by normalizing to prey-length,  $L$ , letting  $\sigma = \alpha\pi L^2$  and  $D = \beta L$ , yielding  $d/D = 2\beta(S/\alpha s)^{1/2}$ . For any useful sonar system, the maximum prey detection range will be several prey-lengths ( $\beta > 1$ ), and typically  $\alpha < 1$ .

Thus, for roughly equal hearing sensitivity,  $d/D$  will be greater than unity, and the prey will be able to take evasive action before detection by the whale. The ratio  $d/D$  is not 2, as indicated by Taylor's Fig. 1. This does not affect his fascinating discussion, but the relation given here permits additional variations of strategy in Taylor's "evolutionary arms race".

DAVID C. JOLLY

Box 931, Brookline,  
Massachusetts 02146, USA

## Body temperature and the specific heat of water

SIR—John Paul attempts to explain why the normal body temperature of homoiotherms is approximately 36 °C by its proximity to the temperature of minimum

specific heat of water'. He states: "An organism functioning at this temperature will find it necessary to generate or dissipate the minimum amount of heat energy in order to maintain its temperature constant". But the rate of heat loss (and therefore rate of heat generation with which it is balanced) is equal to the temperature differential between body and environment times the heat transfer coefficient ("conductance"). This is independent of heat capacity, or heat content (specific heat times mass times temperature change). In fact, temperature would be maintained more easily if the specific heat and heat content were greater—that is, for a given amount of heat loss, the temperature decrease would be less.

Perhaps a better reason for maintaining body temperature considerably higher than the average ambient temperature is that this ensures that excess heat produced by the high metabolism of terrestrial mammals and birds can be dissipated by conductive, convective and radiative means which require no evaporative water loss<sup>2</sup>.


WILLIAM A. CALDER III

Department of Ecology  
and Evolutionary Biology,  
University of Arizona,  
Tucson, Arizona 85721, USA

1. Paul, J. *Nature* 323, 300 (1986).
2. Calder, W.A. & King, J.R. in *Avian Biology* Vol. 4 (eds Farner, D.S. & King, J.R.) 259-413 (Academic, New York, 1974).

SIR—We were intrigued by the proposal that the nearly constant body temperature (around 36 °C) of many homoiothermic animals can be explained by the fact that the specific heat of water passes through a minimum around this temperature. The explanation offered was that "an organism functioning at this temperature will find it necessary to generate or dissipate the minimum amount of heat energy in order to maintain its temperature constant. From the point of view of the organism's energy economy this temperature is clearly the most efficient at which to function".

This explanation is appealing but it cannot be correct. The amount of heat required to maintain a given temperature is, of course, exactly equal to the amount of heat lost to the environment; this depends on many factors, such as the temperature difference, surface area and thermal conductivity of a body, but it is independent of its specific heat. Moreover, the smaller the specific heat, the larger will be the fluctuations in the temperature of the body, so that the problem of maintaining a constant body temperature becomes all the more difficult. Finally, the specific heat minimum at about 36 °C applies to pure water. Aqueous solutions generally shown no minimum in the specific heat, which usually decreases monotonically as the temperature drops and is appreciably lower than that of pure water in the re-



Crosses, solubility; circles, viscosity.

levant temperature region. The specific heat of normal blood plasma is about 6 per cent lower, that of haematopoietic cells about 11 per cent lower<sup>2</sup>.

What then is the explanation? We do not know, but most likely, a temperature of around 36 °C, if it is the product of natural selection at all, is selected because it corresponds to an optimal mix of properties. We consider here only two, viscosity and 'hydrophobic' effects.

The rates of many biological processes are limited by diffusion. As temperature rises, long-range structures in water are disrupted, the viscosity decreases, and the rates of diffusion-limited processes become faster. This factor by itself would appear to favour higher body temperatures. But disruption of the long-range structures in water will also lead to changes in hydrophobic effects, which are important in many vital processes, such as substrate binding, protein folding and bilayer membrane formation.

The accompanying figure shows the viscosity of water and, as a measure of hydrophobic forces, the solubility of benzene in water<sup>3</sup>, both as a function of temperature. By inspection, a temperature of around 36 °C seems to be a reasonable compromise; high enough to give a low viscosity, low enough that hydrophobic molecules do not dissolve too easily.

JACK D. DUNITZ  
STEVEN A. BENNER

Organic Chemistry Laboratory,  
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology,  
ETH-Zentrum, CH-8092 Zurich,  
Switzerland

1. Paul, J. *Nature* 323, 300 (1986).
2. Mendelowitz, M. *Science* 107, 97-98 (1948).
3. Stephen, O.B.E. & Stephen, T. *Solubilities of Inorganic and Organic Compounds* (Pergamon, New York, 1963).

## Reproductive failure in common seals

THE table shown below was omitted from the letter by P.J.H. Reijnders on page 456.

Table 1 Number of participating, ovulating and pregnant seals in both experimental groups, during the season 1983-84

Group	1	2
No. of females	12	12
No. ovulating	12	12
No. pregnant	4	10

WI

Michael

Supersy  
Edited by  
Cambria

PHYSICS  
aim is t  
what ma  
are the  
it start a  
less, are  
theoretic  
So far, i  
cord in a  
impressi  
lier cent  
tion and  
netism,  
what a p  
sal in ap  
and rigo  
terms, i  
which t  
problem

At th  
notions  
of matt  
fields ar  
tual due  
er into  
theories  
more a  
tually a  
ed our  
and tim  
ity is m  
ton's, a  
mathem  
mechan  
volutio  
clear. "

emergit  
increasi  
plain th  
In all  
main p  
What a  
cles"?  
eral rel  
The fir  
mental  
new ge  
second  
mational  
quantu  
ferent s

Qual  
theory  
with qu  
sophist  
particle  
may va  
particle  
mely d