Field and laboratory metabolism and thermoregulation in rhinoceros auklets (#52974)

Second revision

Guidance from your Editor

Please submit by **18 Mar 2021** for the benefit of the authors .

Structure and Criteria
Please read the 'Structure and Criteria' page for general guidance.

Custom checks
Make sure you include the custom checks shown below, in your review.

Raw data check
Review the raw data.

Image check
Check that figures and images have not been inappropriately manipulated.

Privacy reminder: If uploading an annotated PDF, remove identifiable information to remain anonymous.

Files

Download and review all files from the materials page.

1 Tracked changes manuscript(s)
1 Rebuttal letter(s)
1 Figure file(s)
3 Raw data file(s)

Custom checks

Vertebrate animal usage checks

- Have you checked the authors ethical approval statement?
- Were the experiments necessary and ethical?
- Have you checked our animal research policies?

Field study

- Have you checked the authors field study permits?
- Are the field study permits appropriate?

Structure and Criteria

Structure your review

The review form is divided into 5 sections. Please consider these when composing your review:

1. **BASIC REPORTING**
2. **EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN**
3. **VALIDITY OF THE FINDINGS**
4. General comments
5. Confidential notes to the editor

You can also annotate this PDF and upload it as part of your review

When ready submit online.

Editorial Criteria

Use these criteria points to structure your review. The full detailed editorial criteria is on your guidance page.

BASIC REPORTING

- Clear, unambiguous, professional English language used throughout.
- Intro & background to show context. Literature well referenced & relevant.
- Structure conforms to PeerJ standards, discipline norm, or improved for clarity.
- Figures are relevant, high quality, well labelled & described.
- Raw data supplied (see PeerJ policy).

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

- Original primary research within Scope of the journal.
- Research question well defined, relevant & meaningful. It is stated how the research fills an identified knowledge gap.
- Rigorous investigation performed to a high technical & ethical standard.
- Methods described with sufficient detail & information to replicate.

VALIDITY OF THE FINDINGS

- Impact and novelty not assessed. Negative/inconclusive results accepted. *Meaningful* replication encouraged where rationale & benefit to literature is clearly stated.
- All underlying data have been provided; they are robust, statistically sound, & controlled.
- Speculation is welcome, but should be identified as such.
- Conclusions are well stated, linked to original research question & limited to supporting results.

Standout reviewing tips

The best reviewers use these techniques

Tip	*Example*
Support criticisms with evidence from the text or from other sources	*Smith et al (J of Methodology, 2005, V3, pp 123) have shown that the analysis you use in Lines 241-250 is not the most appropriate for this situation. Please explain why you used this method.*
Give specific suggestions on how to improve the manuscript	*Your introduction needs more detail. I suggest that you improve the description at lines 57- 86 to provide more justification for your study (specifically, you should expand upon the knowledge gap being filled).*
Comment on language and grammar issues	*The English language should be improved to ensure that an international audience can clearly understand your text. Some examples where the language could be improved include lines 23, 77, 121, 128 – the current phrasing makes comprehension difficult.*
Organize by importance of the issues, and number your points	*1. Your most important issue* *2. The next most important item* *3. …* *4. The least important points*
Please provide constructive criticism, and avoid personal opinions	*I thank you for providing the raw data, however your supplemental files need more descriptive metadata identifiers to be useful to future readers. Although your results are compelling, the data analysis should be improved in the following ways: AA, BB, CC*
Comment on strengths (as well as weaknesses) of the manuscript	*I commend the authors for their extensive data set, compiled over many years of detailed fieldwork. In addition, the manuscript is clearly written in professional, unambiguous language. If there is a weakness, it is in the statistical analysis (as I have noted above) which should be improved upon before Acceptance.*

Field and laboratory metabolism and thermoregulation in rhinoceros auklets

Aika Umeyama [1], **Yasuaki Niizuma** [Corresp., 1], **Masaki Shirai** [2]

[1] Laboratory of Environmental Zoology, Faculty of Agriculture, Meijo University, Nagoya, Aichi, Japan

[2] Environmental Science Research Laboratory, Central Research Institute of Electric Power Industry, Abiko, Chiba, Japan

Corresponding Author: Yasuaki Niizuma
Email address: niizuma@meijo-u.ac.jp

Seabirds spend most of their lives at sea, except when visiting their breeding sites. Since the thermal conductivity of water is 25 times higher than that of air, seabirds resting on water lose heat and expend a considerable amount of energy for thermoregulation. Rhinoceros auklet (*Cerorhinca monocerata*), a medium-sized (480–620 g) alcid, spends most of its time floating on the sea. In order to estimate the cost of this behavior in terms of their daily energy expenditure (DEE), we studied rhinoceros auklets breeding on Teuri Island, Hokkaido Japan where we measured their resting metabolic rate (RMR) in air and on water by respirometry, and used the doubly labeled water method to measure DEE. RMR on water increased with decreasing water temperature, whereas there was no effect of air temperature (5.0–20.3°C) on RMR. The DEE of free-ranging auklets averaged 1005.5 $kJday^{-1}$ (± 130.2, n = 3). Since rhinoceros auklets breeding on Teuri Island rest on the sea at temperatures within their thermoneutral zone during chick-rearing period, their energy cost of resting on water would be dependent on the time on water per day.

Field and laboratory metabolism and thermoregulation in rhinoceros auklets

Aika Umeyama[1], Yasuaki Niizuma[1] and Masaki Shirai[2]

[1] Laboratory of Environmental Zoology, Faculty of Agriculture, Meijo University, Shiogamaguchi 1-501, Tenpaku-ku, Nagoya 468-8502, Japan
[2] Environmental Science Research Laboratory, Central Research Institute of Electric Power Industry, 1646 Abiko, Abiko, Chiba 270-1194, Japan

Corresponding Author:
Yasuaki Niizuma
Laboratory of Environmental Zoology, Faculty of Agriculture, Meijo University, Shiogamaguchi 1-501, Tenpaku-ku, Nagoya 468-8502, Japan
Email address: niizuma@meijo-u.ac.jp

Abstract

Seabirds spend most of their lives at sea, except when visiting their breeding sites. Since the thermal conductivity of water is 25 times higher than that of air, seabirds resting on water lose heat and expend a considerable amount of energy for thermoregulation. Rhinoceros auklet (*Cerorhinca monocerata*), a medium-sized (480–620 g) alcid, spends most of its time floating on the sea. In order to estimate the cost of this behavior in terms of their daily energy expenditure (DEE), we studied rhinoceros auklets breeding on Teuri Island, Hokkaido Japan where we measured their resting metabolic rate (RMR) in air and on water by respirometry, and used the doubly labeled water method to measure DEE. RMR on water increased with decreasing water temperature whereas there was no effect of air temperature (5.0–20.3°C) on RMR. The DEE of free-ranging auklets averaged 1005.5 kJday^{-1} (± 130.2, n = 3). Since rhinoceros auklets breeding on Teuri Island rest on the sea at temperatures within their thermoneutral zone during chick-rearing period, their energy cost of resting on water would be dependent on the time on water per day.

Introduction

The ability of endothermic animals to thermoregulate may affect their life history traits, foraging behavior, and their distributions (Jenssen, Ekker & Bech, 1989; Humphreys, Wanless & Bryant, 2006; Lovvorn et al., 2009). Endothermic animals living in the sea expend considerable energy on thermoregulation even while resting on the surface because the thermal conductivity of water is 25 times great than that of air (Kaseloo & Lovvorn, 2005; Niizuma et al., 2007). Bio-logging

techniques have shown that adult seabirds spend significant amounts of time resting on the sea during their chick-rearing period (Wilson, Weimerskirch & Lys, 1995; Garthe, Grémillet & Furness, 1999; Falk et al., 2000; Daunt et al., 2002; Tremblay et al., 2003; Kato, Watanuki & Naito, 2003). In addition to measurements of high cost behavior of flying and diving (Elliott et al., 2013a), it is important to assess their energy expenditure during this behavior in order to understand more fully their energetics.

Seabirds may have physiological adaptations for floating on cold sea water, which include reducing their thermal conductance by means of a thick water-repellent plumage (Kooyman et al., 1976; Jenssen, Ekker & Bech, 1989; Dawson et al., 1999) and reducing heat flow to the periphery via vasoconstriction in the skin and appendages (Johansen & Bech, 1983; Folkow & Blix, 1987; Niizuma et al., 2007). The air trapped in the loose tangle of air pockets formed by the barbs and barbules of their plumulaceous inner vanes is the main component of plumage insulation for seabirds (Dawson et al., 1999). However, this insulation may constrain their rate of heat dissipation while flying between their nesting and foraging areas because birds produce excess heat during energy-intensive flapping flight (Elliott et al., 2013a; Guillemette et al., 2016; Nord & Nilsson, 2019). This may be especially significant in the temperate zone, where seabirds are less able to lose heat in the mild climate, yet endothermic animals must dissipate their metabolic heat to avoid reaching lethal body temperatures (Speakman & Król, 2010; Nilsson, Molokwu & Olsson, 2016).

The Alcidae seabirds, which breed from the temperate zone to the arctic, have relatively dense plumage, high wing loading and continuous fast flapping flight, deliver food to their nestlings during the chick-rearing period, but spend significant amounts of time resting on the sea (Wilson, Weimerskirch & Lys, 1995; Gaston & Jones, 1998; Garthe, Grémillet & Furness, 1999; Falk et al., 2000; Daunt et al., 2002; Tremblay et al., 2003; Kato, Watanuki & Naito, 2003). The rhinoceros auklet (*Cerorhinca monocerata*), a medium sized (480–620 g) member of the Alcidae, breeds on offshore islands in areas of temperate waters in the northern Pacific and migrates southward to wintering areas (Gaston & Jones, 1998). The auklets rearing chicks on Teuri Island, Hokkaido, Japan, spend 18% of their time landing at the colony, 14% flying, 13 % in diving related behavior, but 55 % floating on the sea (Kato, Watanuki & Naito, 2003). During their annual movement, they experience various water temperatures ranging from cold (4 – 6 ℃) in early March, associated with their northward migration and early arrival on the breeding grounds, to mild (11 –1 4 ℃) during the winter from October to late February in the southwestern Sea of Japan Sea (Takahashi et al., 2015). The sea surface temperature around the Teuri Island breeding colony increases during the breeding season from about 5 ℃ in early April to 15 ℃ in early July (Ito et al., 2009). The auklets spending up to 55% of their time resting on the sea can, therefore, be expected to expend considerable energy for thermoregulation. However, little is known about how much energy rhinoceros auklets demand for their thermoregulation on resting water with various water temperature.

In this study, to elucidate the energy cost of the time spent resting on the sea for pelagic seabirds, the resting metabolic rate (RMR) and daily energy expenditure (DEE) of rhinoceros auklet were

estimated quantitatively. RMR both in the air and on water, at various ambient temperatures, was measured using respirometry - the most common technique for measuring energy expenditure (Halsey, 2011). The DEE of rhinoceros auklets rearing chicks was measured using the doubly labeled water (DLW) method - a common technique for measuring energy expenditure of free-living animals (Shaffer, 2010). These data were then used to assess their lower critical temperature (LCT) in air and on water, and the energy cost of resting on water as a proportion of their DEE while rearing chicks.

Materials & Methods

Study area and species

This study was carried out at Teuri Island (44°25' N, 141°52' E), in the northern Sea of Japan, off northwest Hokkaido, from May to July 2015–2107. About 300,000 pairs of rhinoceros auklets breed on the island, in the largest single breeding colony in the world (Watanuki & Ito, 2012).

To measure the RMRs in air and on water of adult auklets in air and on water using respirometry, 43 auklets were captured, using landing nets, as they returned to their nests in the colony at night. Individual birds were used for only one measurement of their RMRs in air or on water. Capture and experiments were under license from the Ministry of the Environment, Government of Japan.

During the chick-rearing period in 2017 specifically, 16 rhinoceros auklets were caught by hand or landing net at the nesting colony or in their nest burrows, five for measurements of background and initial isotope enrichment, and 11 for measurements of DEE by means of the DLW method.

The procedures used in this study were approved by the Animal Experimental Committee of Meijo University (2015-A-E-5, 2016-A-E-10, 2017-A-E-2). The fieldwork was permitted by the Ministry of the Environment (21-26-0291 0292, 21-27-0367 0368 0369 0370 0371, 21-28-0344 035 036 037) and the Agency of Cultural Affairs (26-4-2188, 27-4-1928, 29-4-18).

Measurements of resting metabolic rate using respirometry in air and on water

Oxygen consumption rate (Vo_2) was measured using an open-flow respirometry system composed of an acrylic metabolic chamber and an oxygen analyzer (Xentra 4100, Servomex Ltd, UK) as previously described in Shirai et al. (2015). For the measurement of RMR in air, a 20-L metabolic chamber (20 cm long × 25 cm high × 40 cm wide) was submerged in a thermostatic water bath and maintained at 4.7 – 20.7 ℃. For the measurement of RMR on water, a 72-L metabolic chamber (30 cm long × 60 cm high × 40 cm wide) was filled with freshwater (to a depth of 30 cm) maintained at 5.5 –1 7.5 ℃.

The wild-caught auklets were placed in darkened boxes (30 cm × 30 cm × 25 cm), transported from the colony to the field station situated within 10 min of the capture site, then kept for at least one hour to minimize the effects of capture stress on their metabolic rates (Shirai et al., 2013). After one hour, they were weighed, using a Pesola spring balance, to the nearest 5 g. They were then placed in the metabolic chamber to measure their RMR for 12 hours over night. After finishing the measurements, they were weighed again and released on the colony at night. We

assumed a linear decrease in body mass to estimate the body mass value used for calculating the mass-specific metabolic rate.

During measurements, the chamber was kept dark by covering it with a blackout curtain. The chamber temperature (Tc, ± 0.3℃) and atmospheric pressure (Pa, ±1.5 hPa) were recorded (using a TR-73U Thermo Recorder, T&D Corp.), and water temperature was measured every minute (±0.3˚C, using a TR-52i Thermo Recorder, T&D Corp.). The rate of airflow (V_E) through the chamber was controlled at 2.0 $Lmin^{-1}$ in air and 3.0 $Lmin^{-1}$ on water using a mass flow controller (±2%, Type HM1171A, Tokyo Keiso). The effluent air from the chamber was dried and a fraction of the dry outlet air was directed into the oxygen analyzer. Absorption of oxygen into water in the chamber was less than 0.0015% per minute (Allers & Culik, 1997). The oxygen analyzer was calibrated using dry effluent air (20.946% oxygen) and pure stock nitrogen (0.000% oxygen) before beginning each experiment. The oxygen concentration of the effluent air (F_{EO2}) was recorded every minute by computer.

Vo_2 was calculated using formula 3A in Withers (1977) as follows,

$$V_{O2} = \frac{V_E \times (F_{IO2} - F_{EO2})}{1 - (1 - RQ) \times F_{IO2}}$$

RQ was a respiratory quotient. We assumed to be 0.8 based on Koteja (1996). F_{IO2} was an oxygen concentration of influent air of 20.946%. A conversion coefficient was used 20.1 kJL^{-1} in calculating energy expenditure (Schmidt-Nielsen, 1997). All results are given at standard temperature, pressure, and dryness (STPD).

As previously described in Shirai et al. (2013), we estimated RMR to be the minimum value recorded over a 20 min interval during the 12 h measurements (Supplemental Table 1).

Measurements of daily energy expenditure using the doubly labeled water method

We obtained estimates of DEE in rhinoceros auklets using the single-sample approach of the DLW method as previously described in Niizuma & Shirai (20159. The method allowed an estimation of initial isotope enrichment by a single blood sample and was a less invasive technique with lower impact on the behavior of study subjects (Schultner et al., 2010; Niizuma & Shirai, 2015). Recent validation studies have demonstrated that the precision of the DLW technique can be increased by using a longer sampling interval and/or by applying it to a species with a higher metabolic rate (Shirai et al., 2015; Kume et al., 2019). The DLW injectate used in our study contained 21.0 atom percent ^{18}O, 10.5 atom percent ^{2}H, and 0.9% NaCl.

Blood samples from five wild-caught auklets at 21:00 – 22:00 were used to determine mean background and initial levels of the ^{2}H and ^{18}O isotopes. After capturing the birds, 1 mL of blood was collected from the brachial vein as a background sample; then the DLW was injected into the body cavity. After the DLW injection, the auklets were kept individually in plastic boxes for 90 minutes; then further 1 mL blood samples were collected from each individual as initial samples. After sampling, they were weighed with a Pesola spring balance accurate to the nearest 10 g; then released at the nesting site.

Eleven individuals were caught in their nest burrows with their chicks to investigate their DEE. DLW was injected into the abdominal cavity of each bird. After being weighed, all individuals were banded with individually numbered metal bands and released back into their nests. Four of the injected individuals were recaptured in their nest burrows at night after they had returned from foraging trips. Immediately after recapture, a final 1 mL blood sample was collected, and each bird was re-weighed. These procedures were conducted at night between 21:00 and 23:00 to avoid investigator disturbance to their breeding (Sun et al., 2020). Due to lower field efforts for recapturing birds, therefore, four auklets recaptured from 11 injected birds were a low recovery rate compared to previous studies attached bird-borne data-loggers (Kuroki et al., 2003; Kato, Watanuki & Naito, 2003; Matsumoto et al., 2008).

Weighing the syringe (to the nearest 0.0001 g) before and after each injection using an electronic balance in the field laboratory (following Speakman 1997), we quantified the injectate. On average, birds were injected with 3.1326 g DLW (± 0.0783 s.d.). We heparinized and centrifuged (5 min, 6200 rpm) all blood samples. After centrifugation, we stored each serum sample at -25℃ in a 0.5 mL screw-topped plastic vial with an O-ring (Asahi Techno Glass Co.) until isotopic analysis.

We diluted the serum and injectate samples were with distilled water measured with an electronic balance (Mettler-Toledo, Columbus, OH, USA) to the nearest 0.01 mg. We analyzed the ^{2}H and ^{18}O isotope concentrations of the serum, DLW injectate, and distilled water using isotope ratio mass spectrometry (IRMS; Hydra 20-20, Sercon, Crewe, UK; (Shirai et al., 2012, 2015). We used the water equilibration method (Horita et al., 1989) to analyze the serum, DLW injectate, and distilled water in duplicate. Water standards (Iso-Analytical, Crewe, UK) were used to establish calibration curves for normalizing the values. Each sample was analyzed in duplicate. All isotope enrichments were measured in δ per mille relative to the working standards and converted to an absolute ratio for ^{2}H by using equation 14.4, and for ^{18}O by using equation 14.9, from Speakman (1997). Absolute ratios were converted to ppm using equations from Speakman (1997): equation 14.8 for ^{2}H, and equation 14.14 for ^{18}O. All subsequent calculations in the DLW method were performed on the mean values of each sample analyzed in duplicate.

Calculation of CO_2 production rates in the field

Ideally, background and initial isotope levels should be determined for each subject (Speakman & Racey, 1987). However, since this increases both the handling time and disturbance of the subject, the background and initial isotope abundances were determined for just five individuals. The background isotope level averaged 2002.04 ppm (range 1999.75–2005.16 ppm) for ^{18}O and 159.64 ppm (range 156.22–165.77 ppm) for ^{2}H. We used these mean background levels to calculate the CO_2 production rate (rCO2, mL day^{-1}).

We also estimated initial isotope enrichment based on the relationship of increments for isotope injection (H_{inc} or O_{inc}, ppm) and body mass (BM, g) and respective DLW injectate established for the birds as previously described in Niizuma & Shirai (2015).

$$H_{inc} = -1915.0 + 3.835 \times BM + 17661.0 \times H_{inj} - 27.141 \times BM \times H_{inj},$$

$H_i = H_{inc} + H_b$,

$O_{inc} = -3875.7 + 8.639 \times BM + 36186.2 \times O_{inj} - 60.213\ BM \times O_{inj}$,

$O_i = O_{inc} + O_b$,

where H_{inj} and O_{inj} represent the respective DLW injectate (^{2}H or ^{18}O, mol), H_i and O_i represent the estimated initial isotope enrichments and H_b and O_b represent the background isotope enrichments (^{2}H or ^{18}O, ppm). The H_{inc} equation has an adjusted R^2 of 0.942, while the O_{inc} equation has an adjusted R^2 of 0.952.

Using the DLW injectates, the background and the estimated initial isotope enrichments, we calculated the isotope dilution spaces for ^{18}O (N_o, mol) using the general equation:

$$N_o = \frac{O_{inj} \times (O_i - O_d)}{O_b - O_i}$$

where O_d represents the isotope concentration (^{2}H or ^{18}O, ppm) in the DLW injectate. To convert the units of the isotope dilution spaces, we used a conversion factor of 18.002 g mol^{-1} (Speakman 1997).

The turnover rates for ^{2}H and ^{18}O (k_d and k_o, respectively, day^{-1}) were determined using the following general equations:

$$k_d = \frac{ln\,(H_i - H_b) - ln(H_f - H_b)}{t}$$

$$k_o = \frac{ln\,(O_i - O_b) - ln(O_f - O_b)}{t}$$

where H_f and O_f represent the respective isotope concentrations (^{2}H or ^{18}O, ppm) of the final samples and t represents the time interval between the injection and final samples (days; Lifson and McClintock 1966; (Speakman, 1997).

As previously described in Shirai et al. (2012a), we used Speakman's (1997) one-pool model for calculating rCO2 in this study as follows:

$$rCO_2 = \frac{N}{2.078}(k_o - k_d) - 0.0062 \times k_d \times N$$

where $N = N_o$. To convert units in mLCO_2 day^{-1} into energy equivalents, it was assumed that 1 mL of CO_2 equals 25.11 J (Gessaman & Nagy, 1988).

Statistical analysis

All statistical analyses were performed in R 3.3.2 (R Development Core Team 2016). Mass-specific metabolic rates of rhinoceros auklets resting in air and on water were tested for mean differences among air and water temperatures using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). When significant differences were observed among temperatures, the Tukey–Kramer multiple-comparison test was applied to determine which means were significantly different.

Results

Measurements of Resting Metabolic Rate in air and on water

The RMR of rhinoceros auklet in air (555.6 g ± 39.6 s.d., n = 27) was not affected by air temperature ($F_{3, 23} = 0.893$, $P = 0.460$; Figure 1a). The RMR in air averaged 0.0258 ± 0.0033 kJ g^{-1} h^{-1} (n = 27).

The RMR of the auklets on water (565.6 ± 48.7 g, n = 16) was affected significantly by water temperature ($F_{2, 13} = 8.32$, $P = 0.0047$; Figure 1b). While RMR on water did not vary significantly between 10°C (0.0366 ± 0.0045 kJ g^{-1} h^{-1}, n = 5) and 15°C (0.0347 ± 0.0036 kJ g^{-1} h^{-1}, n = 6) ($t_{14} = 0.686$, $P = 0.780$), it was significantly higher at 5°C (0.0460 ± 0.0060 kJ kg^{-1} h^{-1}, n = 5) (5 - 15°C: $t_{14} = 3.894$, $P = 0.0049$; 5 - 10°C: $t_{14} = 3.071$, $P = 0.0226$). Auklet RMR on water at combined temperatures of 10 °C and 15 °C was 0.0356 ± 0.0040 kJ g^{-1} h^{-1}, n = 11).

Daily Energy Expenditure of chick-rearing Rhinoceros Auklets

Four birds were recaptured after foraging trips following DLW injection. Three were recaptured after one-day trips (24.1 ± 0.3 hours), but one was recaptured after a three-day (72.5 hours) trip and was found to have almost equal the final isotopic enrichment to the background abundance. Therefore, calculations of DEE were only possible for three individuals. The DEE of free-ranging auklets, which initially weighed 556.3 g (± 42.0, n = 3), averaged 1005.5 $kJday^{-1}$ (± 130.2, n = 3). The DEE/RMR ratio (based on RMR in air) was 2.9.

Discussion

The adult rhinoceros auklets did not increase their RMR in air but did their RMR on water as air or water temperature decreased (Figure 1). Our measurements of RMR in air is similar to the 0.0248 kJ g^{-1} h^{-1} for basal metabolic rate (BMR; Shirai et al., 2013) and the value estimated from the allometric equation for the Charadriiformes (BMR = 2.149 $m^{0.804}$ kJ/day, where m is body mass (0.556 kg); Ellis & Gabrielsen, 2002). The single sample method can minimize potential adverse effects due to avoid additional handling and bleeding (Schultner et al., 2010; Niizuma & Shirai, 2015). Although our DEE of rhinoceros auklets was measured from three birds due to less field efforts for recapturing them, the DEE was equal to 112% and within the confidence interval (577-1276 $kJday^{-1}$) of the predicted DEE that was calculated (using latitude=44°, body mass=556 g, and breeding phase=Brood) from an allometric equation for seabirds (Dunn, White & Green, 2018). This suggests that the measured DEE of rhinoceros auklets is reasonable in comparison with previous studies among seabirds.

Resting metabolic rate in air and on water

We were unable to demonstrate the existence of a lower critical temperature (LCT) in air for rhinoceros auklets in this study, but suspect that it would be at least lower than 5˚C. The LCT in air of seabirds decreases with body mass and latitude. Although the LCT for adult rhinoceros auklets on Teuri Island was estimated to be 13.6˚C from equation 11.9 in Ellis & Gabrielsen (2002), our results suggest that it is lower than the estimation. The LCT of rhinoceros auklets in air is similar to that of other seabird species such as common murre, thick-billed murre, dovekie (*Alle alle*), black guillemot (*Cepphus grylle*) and black-legged kittiwake (*Rissa tridactyla*) that

breed in arctic regions (Johnson & West, 1975; Gabrielsen, Mehlum & Karlsen, 1988; Gabrielsen et al., 1991), but not northern fulmar (*Fulmarus glacialis*) which has an LCT in air of 9.0˚C (Gabrielsen, Mehlum & Karlsen, 1988). Cassin's auklet breeding on Triangle Island, British Columbia, Canada (N 50), has an LCT in air of 16˚C (Richman & Lovvorn, 2011) which is higher than that of the rhinoceros auklet. Despite breeding in the temperate zone, the rhinoceros auklets in this study had similar thermal properties at LCT in air to those breeding in the Arctic region. Their insulation properties would constrain their heat dissipation rate while they fly with flapping flight between their nesting and foraging areas, especially in the temperate zone (Guillemette et al., 2016; Nord & Nilsson, 2019). Alcidae are especially known to have an energy expenditure that is 31 times greater than BMR during flight, which is the highest known for any vertebrate (Elliott et al., 2013a). Since Teuri Island is at the southern limit of this species' breeding area in the west Pacific, rhinoceros auklets with a lower LCT in air would have difficulty in dissipating heat while flying with food from their foraging area to their nesting site due to their high level of insulation in air (Schraft, Whelan & Elliott, 2019).

In contrast to their RMR in air, we estimated the LCT on water of rhinoceros auklets between 5°C and 10˚C. Their LCT on water is lower than that for common murre, thick-billed murre and Cassin's auklet (Croll & McLaren, 1993; Richman & Lovvorn, 2011). This result could have important implications for their ecology. The sea surface temperature around Teuri Island increases from about 5℃ in early April to 15℃ in early July during the auklet breeding season (Ito et al., 2009). After breeding the auklets migrate to more southerly areas so from October to late February, they experience water temperature of between 11℃ and 14℃, but for a short period from early March to April associated with their northward migration they experience 4 – 6℃ sea surface temperatures (Takahashi et al., 2015). Therefore, they could rest on the sea at minimum energetic cost during most seasons due to their LCT on water being lower than the usual sea surface temperature. In field situation, however, the feeding behavior of auklets could make them to stay longer time to digest food following diving bouts (Elliott et al., 2014) and then to increase their metabolic rate for the obligatory component of the heat increment of feeding (Hawkins et al., 1997). The duration for the processes of food digestion and assimilation may be additional cost for resting on water.

The Energetic cost of resting on the sea surface

The DEE/RMR ratio provides an estimate of how much birds must increase its baseline costs to forage and thermoregulate in a particular environment and may be intrinsically set by physiological constrains (with in four times RMR in air) (Drent & Daan, 1980). The value in this study is below the proposed 'energetic ceiling' level and within the range among Alcidae (2.7-3.8 reviewed in Ellis & Gabrielsen, 2002).

Since the sea surface temperature around Teuri Island during the chick-rearing period was 8-13 ˚C (Ito et al., 2009), which would be within their thermoneutral zone on water, rhinoceros auklets would not expend extra cost for thermoregulation for resting on water. The energy cost of resting on water in rhinoceros auklets would be dependent on the time on water per day (%). Rhinoceros

auklets spend longer on water up to 55% of their time(Kato, Watanuki & Naito, 2003) because they only deliver food to their chick once a day at most (Watanuki, 1987; Takahashi et al., 1999). Common murres at Witless Bay, Newfoundland have longer time resting on water (57.5%) (Cairns et al., 1990) than those at Hornøya (24.9%) (Tremblay et al., 2003). When capelin is present, common murres at Witless Bay have access to abundant food and can forage close to the colony within 10 km (Regular, Hedd & Montevecchi, 2013). Therefore, time on water per day (%) in rhinoceros auklets would vary with food abundance. Although we did not measure time on water per day (%) of the auklets measured their DEE, their energy expenditure while resting on the sea is estimated to be 261.4 $kJday^{-1}$, or 26.0% of the DEE if they spend the same time resting on sea for previous study (Kato, Watanuki & Naito, 2003) and on sea within their LCT on water.

Conclusions

Many studies of seabird energetics have concentrated on quantifying the energetics of flying and diving because such locomotion is considered costly (Elliott et al., 2013b). Nevertheless, both during chick-rearing and wintering seasons seabirds rest floating on the sea. In this study this energetic cost would be increased with the time on water per day when they are in waters within their LCT.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to M. Aotsuka, Y. Watanuki, M. Yamamoto, S. Hashimoto, A. Takahashi, N. Sato and U. Shimabukuro M. We would also like to thank M. Brazil, Scientific Editing Services, for help with the preparation of the final manuscript. Part of the work was supported by the Co-operation Research Program of the Wildlife Research Centre, Kyoto University.

References

Allers D, Culik BM. 1997. Energy requirements of beavers (Castor canadensis) swimming underwater. *Physiological Zoology* 70:456–463. DOI: 10.1086/515852.

Cairns DK, Montevecchi WA, Birt-Friesen VL, Macko SA. 1990. Energy expenditures, activity budgets, and prey harvest of breding common murres. *Studies in Avian Biology* 14:84–92.

Croll DA, McLaren E. 1993. Diving metabolism and thermoregulation in common and thick-billed murres. *Journal of Comparative Physiology B* 163:160–166. DOI: 10.1007/BF00263602.

Daunt F, Benvenuti S, Harris M, Dall'Antonia L, Elston D, Wanless S. 2002. Foraging strategies of the black-legged kittiwake Rissa tridactyla at a North Sea colony: evidence for a maximum foraging range. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 245:239–247. DOI: 10.3354/meps245239.

Dawson C, Vincent JF., Jeronimidis G, Rice G, Forshaw P. 1999. Heat Transfer through Penguin Feathers. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 199:291–295. DOI: 10.1006/JTBI.1999.0959.

Drent S, Daan RH. 1980. The prudent parent: energetic adjustments in avian breeding. *Ardea* 68:225–252.

Dunn RE, White CR, Green JA. 2018. A model to estimate seabird field metabolic rates. *Biology Letters* 14:20180190. DOI: 10.1098/rsbl.2018.0190.

352 Elliott KH, Ricklefs RE, Gaston AJ, Hatch SA, Speakman JR, Davoren GK. 2013a. High flight
353 costs, but low dive costs, in auks support the biomechanical hypothesis for flightlessness in
354 penguins. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*
355 110:9380–9384. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1304838110.
356 Elliott KH, Le Vaillant M, Kato A, Gaston AJ, Ropert-Coudert Y, Hare JF, Speakman JR, Croll
357 D. 2014. Age-related variation in energy expenditure in a long-lived bird within the
358 envelope of an energy ceiling. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 83:136–146. DOI: 10.1111/1365-
359 2656.12126.
360 Elliott KH, Le Vaillant M, Kato A, Speakman JR, Ropert-Coudert Y. 2013b. Accelerometry
361 predicts daily energy expenditure in a bird with high activity levels. . *Biology letters*
362 9:20120919.
363 Ellis HI, Gabrielsen GW. 2002. Energetics of free-ranging seabirds. In: Schreiber EA, Burger J
364 eds. *Biology of marine birds*. Boca Raton.: CRC Press, 359–07.
365 Falk K, Benvenuti S, Dall'Antonia L, Kampp K, Ribolini A. 2000. Time allocation and foraging
366 behaviour of chick-rearing Brunnich's Gullemots Uria lomvia in high-arctic Greenland. *Ibis*
367 142:82–92.
368 Folkow L. P, Blix AS. 1987. Nasal heat and water exchanges in gray seals. *Am. J. Physiol.*
369 253:R883–R889.
370 Gabrielsen GW, Mehlum F, Karlsen HE. 1988. Thermoregulation in four species of arctic
371 seabirds. *Journal of Comparative Physiology B* 157:703–708. DOI: 10.1007/BF00691000.
372 Gabrielsen GW, Taylor JRE, Konarzawski M, Mehlum F. 1991. Field and laboratory metabolism
373 and thermoregulation in dovekies (Alle alle). *Auk* 108:71–78.
374 Garthe S, Grémillet D, Furness R. 1999. At-sea-activity and foraging efficiency in chick-rearing
375 northern gannets Sula bassana:a case study in Shetland. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*
376 185:93–99. DOI: 10.3354/meps185093.
377 Gaston AJ (Anthony J., Jones IL. 1998. *The auks : Alcidae*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
378 Gessaman JA, Nagy KA. 1988. Energy Metabolism: Errors in Gas-Exchange Conversion
379 Factors. *Physiological Zoology* 61:507–513. DOI: 10.1086/physzool.61.6.30156159.
380 Guillemette M, Woakes AJ, Larochelle J, Polymeropoulos ET, Granbois JM, Butler PJ, Pelletier
381 D, Frappell PB, Portugal SJ. 2016. Does hyperthermia constrain flight duration in a short-
382 distance migrant? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*
383 371. DOI: 10.1098/rstb.2015.0386.
384 Halsey LG. 2011. The challenge of measuring energy expenditure: Current field and laboratory
385 methods. . *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology, Part A* 158:247–251.
386 Hawkins P, Butler P, Woakes A, Gabrielsen G. 1997. Heat increment of feeding in Brunnich's
387 guillemot. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 200.
388 Horita J, Ueda A, Mizukami K, Takatori I. 1989. Automatic δD and δ18O analyses of multi-
389 water samples using H2- and CO2-water equilibration methods with a common
390 equilibration set-up. *International Journal of Radiation Applications and Instrumentation.*
391 *Part* 40:801–805. DOI: 10.1016/0883-2889(89)90100-7.
392 Humphreys EM, Wanless S, Bryant DM. 2006. Elevated metabolic costs while resting on water
393 in a surface feeder: the Black-legged Kittiwake Rissa tridactyla. *Ibis* 149:106–111. DOI:
394 10.1111/j.1474-919X.2006.00618.x.
395 Ito M, Minami H, Tanaka Y, Watanuki Y. 2009. Seasonal and inter-annual oceanographic
396 changes induce diet switching in a piscivorous seabird. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*
397 393:273–284. DOI: 10.3354/meps08192.

Jenssen BM, Ekker M, Bech C. 1989. Thermoregulation in winter-acclimatized common eiders (*Somateria mollissima*) in air and water. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 67:669–673. DOI: 10.1139/z89-096.

Johansen K, Bech C. 1983. Heat conservation during cold exposure in birds (vasomotor ans respiratory implications). *Polar Research* 1:259–268.

Johnson SR, West GC. 1975. Growth and Development of Heat Regulation in Nestlings, and Metabolism of Adult Common and Thick-Billed Murres. *Ornis Scandinavica* 6:109–115. DOI: 10.2307/3676282.

Kaseloo PA, Lovvorn JR. 2005. Effects of surface activity patterns and dive depth on thermal substitution in fasted and fed lesser scaup (Aythya affinis) ducks. *Can. J. Zool.* 83:301–311.

Kato A, Watanuki Y, Naito Y. 2003. Foraging behaviour of chick-rearing rhinoceros auklets Cerorhinca monocerata at Teuri Island, Japan, determined by acceleration-depth recording micro data loggers. *Journal of Avian Biology* 34:282–287. DOI: 10.1034/j.1600-048X.2003.03134.x.

Kooyman GL, Gentry RL, Bergman WP, Hammel HT. 1976. Heat loss in penguins during immersion and compression. *Comp. Biochem. Physiol.* 54A:75–80.

Koteja P. 1996. Measuring Energy Metabolism with Open-Flow Respirometric Systems: Which Design to Choose? *Functional Ecology* 10:675. DOI: 10.2307/2390179.

Kume Y, Shirai M, Mizutani Y, Niizuma Y. 2019. Parental birds incubating larger clutches regulate their field metabolic rates in response to environmental changes. *Ornithological Science* 18:161–167. DOI: 10.2326/OSJ.18.161.

Kuroki M, Kato A, Watanuki Y, Niizuma Y, Takahashi A, Naito Y. 2003. Diving behavior of an epipelagically feeding alcid, the Rhinoceros Auklet (Cerorhinca monocerata). *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 81:1249–1256. DOI: 10.1139/z03-112.

Lovvorn JR, Grebmeier JM, Cooper LW, Bump JK, Richman SE. 2009. Modeling Marine Protected Areas for Threatened Eiders in a Climatically Changing Bering Sea. *Ecological Applications* 19:1596–1613. DOI: 10.2307/40346272.

Matsumoto K, Deguchi T, Wada A, Kato A, Saitoh S, Watanuki Y. 2008. Estimating foraging area of Rhinoceros Auklets by simultaneous sampling of water temperature profiles using bird-borne data-loggers. *Ornithological Science* 7:37–46. DOI: 10.2326/1347-0558(2008)7[37:efaora]2.0.co;2.

Niizuma Y, Gabrielsen GW, Sato K, Watanuki Y, Naito Y. 2007. Brünnich's guillemots (Uria lomvia) maintain high temperature in the body core during dives. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part A: Molecular & Integrative Physiology* 147:438–444. DOI: 10.1016/J.CBPA.2007.01.014.

Niizuma Y, Shirai M. 2015. Applicability of a Single-Sample Approach for the Doubly Labelled Water Method to the Streaked Shearwater *Calonectris leucomelas*. *Ornithological Science* 14:21–28. DOI: 10.2326/osj.14.21.

Nilsson J-Å, Molokwu MN, Olsson O. 2016. Body Temperature Regulation in Hot Environments. *PLOS ONE* 11:e0161481. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0161481.

Nord A, Nilsson J. 2019. Heat dissipation rate constrains reproductive investment in a wild bird. *Functional Ecology* 33:250–259. DOI: 10.1111/1365-2435.13243.

Oswald SA, Bearhop S, Furness RW, Huntley B, Hamer KC. 2008. Heat stress in a high-latitude seabird: Effects of temperature and food supply on bathing and nest attendance of great skuas Catharacta skua. *Journal of Avian Biology* 39:163–169. DOI: 10.1111/j.2008.0908-8857.04187.x.

444 Regular PM, Hedd A, Montevecchi WA. 2013. Must marine predators always follow scaling
445 laws? Memory guides the foraging decisions of a pursuit-diving seabird. *Animal Behaviour*
446 86:545–552. DOI: 10.1016/j.anbehav.2013.06.008.
447 Richman SE, Lovvorn JR. 2011. Effects of air and water temperatures on resting metabolism of
448 auklets and other diving birds. *Physiological and biochemical zoology* 84:316–332. DOI:
449 10.1086/660008.
450 Schmidt-Nielsen K. 1997. *Animal physiology: adaptation and environment.* Cambridge:
451 Cambridge University Press.
452 Schraft HA, Whelan S, Elliott KH. 2019. Huffin' and puffin: Seabirds use large bills to dissipate
453 heat from energetically demanding flight. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 222. DOI:
454 10.1242/jeb.212563.
455 Schultner J, Welcker J, Speakman JR, Nordoy ES, Gabrielsen GW. 2010. Application of the
456 two-sample doubly labelled water method alters behaviour and affects estimates of energy
457 expenditure in black-legged kittiwakes. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 213:2958–2966.
458 DOI: 10.1242/jeb.043414.
459 Shaffer SA. 2010. A reviw of seabird energetics using the doubly labeled water method. *Comp.*
460 *Biochem. Physiol. A*.
461 Shirai M, Ito M, Yoda K, Niizuma Y. 2013. Basal metabolic rate of the Rhinoceros Auklet
462 Cerorhinca monocerata, as measured using respirometry. *Marine Ornithology* 41:151–153.
463 Shirai M, Niizuma Y, Yamamoto M, Oda E, Ebine N, Oka N, Yoda K. 2015. High levels of
464 isotope elimination improve precision and allow individual-based measurements of
465 metabolic rates in animals using the doubly labeled water method. *Physiological Reports*
466 3:1–15. DOI: 10.14814/phy2.12552.
467 Shirai M, Yamamoto M, Ebine N, Yamamoto T, Trathan PN, Yoda K, Oka N, Niizuma Y. 2012.
468 Basal and Field Metabolic Rates of Streaked Shearwater During the Chick-Rearing Period.
469 *Ornithological Science* 11:47–55. DOI: 10.2326/osj.11.47.
470 Speakman JR. 1997. *Doubly labelled water: theory and practice.* London: Chapman & Hall Ltd.
471 Speakman JR, Król E. 2010. Maximal heat dissipation capacity and hyperthermia risk: neglected
472 key factors in the ecology of endotherms. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 79:no-no. DOI:
473 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2010.01689.x.
474 Speakman JR, Racey PA. 1987. The equilibrium concentration of oxygen-18 in body water:
475 Implications for the accuracy of the doubly-labelled water technique and a potential new
476 method of measuring RQ in free-living animals. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* 127:79–95.
477 DOI: 10.1016/S0022-5193(87)80162-5.
478 Sun A, Whelan S, Hatch S, Elliott K. 2020. Tags below three percent of body mass increase nest
479 abandonment by rhinoceros auklets, but handling impacts decline as breeding progresses.
480 *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 643:173–181. DOI: 10.3354/meps13341.
481 Takahashi A, Ito M, Suzuki Y, Watanuki Y, Thiebot JB, Yamamoto T, Iida T, Trathan P,
482 Niizuma Y, Kuwae T. 2015. Migratory movements of rhinoceros auklets in the
483 northwestern Pacific: Connecting seasonal productivities. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*
484 525:229–243. DOI: 10.3354/meps11179.
485 Takahashi A, Kuroki M, Niizuma Y, Watanuki Y. 1999. Parental Food Provisioning Is Unrelated
486 to Manipulated Offspring Food Demand in a Nocturnal Single-Provisioning Alcid, the
487 Rhinoceros Auklet. *Journal of Avian Biology* 30:486. DOI: 10.2307/3677021.
488 Tremblay Y, Cherel Y, Oremus M, Tveraa T, Chastel O. 2003. Unconventional ventral
489 attachment of time-depth recorders as a new method for investigating time budget and

490 diving behaviour of seabirds. *The Journal of Experimental Biology* 206:1929–1940. DOI:
491 10.1242/jeb.00363.
492 Watanuki Y. 1987. Breeding biology and foods of Rhinoceros Auklets on Teuri Island, Japan.
493 *Proceedings of the NIPR Symposium on Polar Biology*:175–183.
494 Watanuki Y, Ito M. 2012. Climatic effects on breeding seabirds of the northern Japan Sea.
495 *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 454:183–196. DOI: 10.3354/meps09627.
496 Welcker J, Harding AMA, Kitaysky AS, Speakman JR, Gabrielsen GW. 2009. Daily energy
497 expenditure increases in response to low nutritional stress in an Arctic-breeding seabird
498 with no effect on mortality. *Funct. Ecol.* 23:1081–1090.
499 Wilson RP, Weimerskirch H, Lys P. 1995. A Device for Measuring Seabird Activity at Sea.
500 *Journal of Avian Biology* 26:172. DOI: 10.2307/3677067.
501 Withers PC. 1977. Measurement of Vo, Vco, and evaporative water loss with a flow-through
502 mask. *J. Appl. Physiol. Respirant. Environ. Exercise Physiol.* 42:120–123.
503

Figure 1

Figure 1. Resting metabolic rate (a) in air and (b) on water in rhinoceros auklets.

Figure 1. Resting metabolic rate (a) in air and (b) on wate rhinoceros auklets.