

1 **Seasonal and habitat variations in diet of the invasive driftwood catfish**  
2 ***Trachelyopterus galeatus* in a Neotropical river basin, Brazil**

3

4 **Running title: Diet of the invasive *Trachelyopterus galeatus***

5

6 Diego A. Z. Garcia<sup>1</sup>; Lívia H. Tonella<sup>2</sup>; Gustavo H. Z. Alves<sup>2,3</sup>; Ana Paula Vidotto-  
7 Magnoni<sup>1</sup>; Evanilde Benedito<sup>2,4</sup>; John R. Britton<sup>5</sup>; Mário L. Orsi<sup>1</sup>

8

9 <sup>1</sup>Programa de Pós-Graduação em Ciências Biológicas, Laboratório de Ecologia de  
10 Peixes e Invasões Biológicas, Universidade Estadual de Londrina, Rodovia Celso  
11 Garcia Cid, Londrina, PR CEP 86057-970, Brazil

12 <sup>2</sup>Programa de Pós-Graduação em Ecologia de Ambientes Aquáticos Continentais,  
13 Universidade Estadual de Maringá, Av. Colombo 5790, Maringá, PR CEP 87020-900,  
14 Brazil

15 <sup>3</sup>Departamento de Botânica, Universidade Federal do Paraná, Av. Coronel Francisco H.  
16 dos Santos, 100, Curitiba, PR, Brazil

17 <sup>4</sup>Núcleo de Pesquisas em Limnologia, Ictiologia e Aquicultura (Nupelia), Universidade  
18 Estadual de Maringá, Av. Colombo 5790, Maringá, PR CEP 87020-900, Brazil

19 <sup>5</sup>Department of Life and Environmental Sciences, Faculty of Science and Technology,  
20 Bournemouth University, Poole, Dorset BH12 5BB, UK

21

22 **Correspondence**

23 Diego A. Z. Garcia, Programa de Pós-Graduação em Ciências Biológicas, Laboratório  
24 de Ecologia de Peixes e Invasões Biológicas, Universidade Estadual de Londrina,  
25 Rodovia Celso Garcia Cid, Londrina, PR CEP 86057-970, Brazil

26 Email: diegoazgarcia@hotmail.com

27

### 28 **Funding information**

29 This study was supported by Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e  
30 Tecnológico (CNPq) (n. 455580/2014-6), Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal  
31 de Nível Superior (CAPES) fellowship to Diego A. Z. Garcia and CNPq research  
32 fellowship to Evanilde Benedito (303556/2017-0).

33

### 34 **Acknowledgements**

35

36 We thank A. Casimiro, A. Costa, A. Souza, E. Santana, and M. Yabu for assistance  
37 during the field samplings; and R. Fugi for providing valuable suggestions.

38

### 39 **Conflict of interest**

40 The authors declare no conflict of interest.

41

42

## 43 **Summary**

44

45 The characteristics of successful invaders often include generalist traits that enable  
46 adaptation to new environments through plastic responses, including their diet. The use  
47 of trophic resources of invasive driftwood catfish *Trachelyopterus galeatus* of the  
48 Upper Paraná River basin, Brazil, were studied with diet analysis and stable isotopic  
49 niche metrics based on  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  and  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  to test differences between populations in  
50 impounded and free-flowing river sections, and between wet and dry season. Stomach  
51 content analyses revealed significant differences between the populations. The diet of  
52 the free-flowing river population was macroinvertebrate dominated, with Coleoptera  
53 and Lepidoptera prominent. In the impounded population, diet was largely plant based,  
54 although Coleoptera was also prominent. Trophic niche breadth comparisons revealed a  
55 larger niche in the free-flowing river population versus the impounded population that  
56 was independent of season. Populations in both sites had dietary differences between  
57 the wet and dry season according to stomach contents analyses, although these were less  
58 less prominent according to stable isotope metrics. Therefore, the diet of this invader is  
59 relatively general and plastic, enabling their exploitation of the varying availability of  
60 food resources between free-flowing and impounded river sections, and between wet  
61 and dry season.

62

63 Key words: food resource, niche breadth, non-native species, stable isotopes, spatial  
64 variability.

65

66

## 67 **Introduction**

68

69 Non-native species are a major factor driving biodiversity loss, and altering ecosystem  
70 functioning and services (Dudgeon et al., 2006; Gozlan et al., 2010; Pelicice et al.,  
71 2014). Following establishment, invasive populations can become abundant, competing  
72 with and preying upon native species, and potentially leading to food web instability  
73 (Latini & Petreere, 2004; Li et al., 2015; Sagouis et al., 2015), especially in aquatic  
74 ecosystems (Gallardo et al., 2016). The establishment of populations in new habitats is  
75 facilitated when the introduced species has generalist traits that are highly plastic, as  
76 these enable rapid adaptation to the new biotic and abiotic conditions (Gozlan et al.,  
77 2010). These generalist traits include diet composition, with successful invaders often  
78 being those able to exploit a wide range of prey items in these novel environments  
79 (Gozlan et al., 2010). This ability to alter diet composition is especially important when  
80 the species is invading heavily modified waterbodies, including rivers impounded by  
81 dams. Food resources in impounded sections are usually more strongly associated with  
82 macrophytes and flooded vegetation than in the free-flowing, riverine sections,  
83 especially during the wet season (Mérona et al., 2003; Delariva et al., 2013). Indeed,  
84 seasonal hydrology is a strong driver of riverine food web structure (Douglas et al.,  
85 2005), with fish diet in dry seasons tending to be simpler with narrow diet niche. During  
86 the wet season, flooding increases feeding opportunities (Balcombe et al., 2005;  
87 Douglas et al., 2005), facilitating the establishment process.

88         The construction of hydropower dams produces large reservoirs that can then be  
89 utilized for aquaculture (Forneck et al., 2016; Lima Junior et al., 2018), with public  
90 policies often encouraging this, including the subsequent culture of non-native fish  
91 (Alves et al., 2018; Brito et al., 2018). A number of non-native fishes farmed in

92 aquaculture and sport angling activities are now present within the fish faunas of the  
93 numerous hydroelectric dams in the Upper Paraná basin (Britton & Orsi, 2012). This is  
94 allied to another major introduction pathway for non-native fishes, river engineering  
95 schemes (such as hydroelectric plants and canals), that connect previously disconnected  
96 biogeographic regions, enabling the movement of species between them (Júlio Júnior et  
97 al., 2009; Panov et al., 2009; Vitule et al., 2012; Casimiro et al., 2017). An example is  
98 in the Paraná River, where the construction of the Itaipu Reservoir in 1982 flooded the  
99 natural barrier of the Sete Quedas Falls, connecting the upper and lower river basins for  
100 the first time (Abell et al., 2008; Vitule et al., 2012). This has subsequently resulted in a  
101 mass biological invasion involving over 30 fish species from the lower to the upper  
102 basin (Júlio Júnior et al., 2009).

103         Among the species that have invaded the Upper Paraná was the driftwood  
104 catfish *Trachelyopterus galeatus* (Linnaeus 1766), which is now relatively abundant in  
105 the Upper Paraná River floodplain (Agostinho et al., 2004; Luiz et al., 2004; Tonella et  
106 al., 2018). Native to river basins in northern South America (Reis et al., 2003) and  
107 Paraguay-Lower Paraná basin (Britski et al., 2007), the species has a lagged internal  
108 fecundation (Agostinho et al., 2007), where females may preserve the sperm received  
109 from a male for up to several months before it is actually used in egg-laying (Meisner et  
110 al., 2000). This strategy allows females to wait for optimal environmental conditions  
111 before spawning (Pusey & Stewart, 1989). The species is also considered a trophic  
112 generalist with a wide food spectrum (Hahn et al., 1997). Invasive populations are now  
113 present in both free-flowing and impounded environments within the Upper Paraná  
114 basin (Júlio Júnior et al., 2009; Tonella et al., 2018; Garcia et al., 2018). In the free-  
115 flowing sections, their floodplain environments are characterized by high levels of  
116 environmental heterogeneity (Agostinho, 1997), whereas their impounded environments

117 are strongly influenced by hydroelectric dams (Garcia et al., 2018). The impact of *T.*  
118 *galeatus* on native species may extend to a larger number of species and therefore have  
119 a greater effect on the food web. In addition, high plants may have a positive effect on  
120 diet in dammed environments (Mérona et al., 2003).

121 The aim of this study was to test whether the diet of the invasive *T. galeatus* in  
122 the Upper Paraná basin exhibited generalist tendencies by comparing their diet  
123 composition and trophic niche size between free-flowing and impounded environments,  
124 and between the wet and dry seasons. Using stomach contents analyses, supported by  
125 stable isotope analysis, it was predicted that *T. galeatus* in the impounded environments  
126 would be more positively associated with high plants than in the lotic habitat, resulting  
127 in a narrower trophic niche, and would be more diverse in the wet season than dry  
128 season, as shown by larger trophic niches.

129

## 130 **Materials and Methods**

131

132 This study was authorised by the Instituto Chico Mendes de Conservação da  
133 Biodiversidade (ICMBio) (survey permit SISBio/16578) and the Animal Ethics  
134 Committee of Universidade Estadual de Londrina (30992.2014.33).

135

## 136 **Study area**

137 The Paraná River basin is one of the most impacted in the world, mainly due to the  
138 large number of hydroelectric plants in the Brazilian stretch (Grill et al., 2015;  
139 Agostinho et al., 2016). The Upper Paraná floodplain is located between the Porto  
140 Primavera Dam and the Itaipu Reservoir, and is the last stretch that is dam-free and so  
141 free-flowing within Brazil. This has preserved its floodplain, which comprises lagoons,

142 rivers and channels of different degrees of connectivity, with this high habitat  
143 heterogeneity supporting 211 fish species (Ota et al., 2018). Five sites were sampled in  
144 these floodplain areas, hereafter referred to as ‘free-from-dam’ (‘FFD’) sites, being two  
145 rivers (Baía River 22°43’23.16”S; 53°17’25.5”W and Ivinhema River 22°47’59.64”S;  
146 53°32’21.3”W), one open lagoon (Garças Lagoon 22°43’27.18”S; 53°13’4.56”W), and  
147 two closed lagoons (Fechada Lagoon 22°42’37.92”S; 53°16’33.06”W and Ventura  
148 Lagoon 22°51’23.7”S; 53°36’1.02”W) (Figure 1). The Baía and Ivinhema rivers have  
149 high fish species richness and habitat heterogeneity, and have low transparency  
150 (approximately 0.7 m and 0.8 m, respectively) (Reynalte-Tataje et al., 2013).

151 One of the largest tributaries of the Upper Paraná River basin is the  
152 Paranapanema River that has 11 hydroelectric reservoirs constructed along its main  
153 channel. Four areas were sampled in this dammed subsystem, two rivers (Pirapozinho  
154 River 22°32’13.40”S; 52°1’52.50”W and Anhumas River 22°38’58.59”S;  
155 51°26’48.62”W) and two open lagoons (Lagoon 1 22°38’3.26”S; 52°9’39.94”W and  
156 Lagoon 2 22°35’37.74”S; 52°9’29.81”W), in an area under the influence of the Rosana  
157 and Taquaruçu reservoirs (Figure 1). These impounded sites are referred to as ‘under the  
158 influence of dams’ (‘DAM’).

159

### 160 **Fish sampling**

161 Fish were sampled quarterly during the dry (from April to September) and wet (from  
162 October to March) seasons, between August 2014 and March 2016. In both FFD and  
163 DAM sites, fish were captured using gillnets (300 m length, mesh sizes ranging from 3  
164 to 7 cm between opposite knots), which were deployed for 24 hours and inspected at  
165 8:00 a.m., 4:00 p.m., and 10:00 p.m.

166           Following lifting of nets, all fish were removed, identified to species, with *T.*  
167 *galeatus* specimens retained. They were euthanized using an overdose of anaesthetic  
168 (clove oil) and frozen for transport to the laboratory for further analysis (Animal Ethics  
169 Committee of Universidade Estadual de Londrina, 30992.2014.33). In the laboratory,  
170 the fish were defrosted, measured (standard length,  $L_S$ , nearest mm), a sample of dorsal  
171 muscle was removed for stable isotope analysis, and then the stomach was removed and  
172 preserved in ethanol (70%). Subsequently, the stomachs were dissected, prey items  
173 removed and, under a stereo-microscope (magnification x5 to x40), the prey items were  
174 identified to lowest taxonomic level possible.

175

#### 176 **Stable isotope analysis**

177 The fish dorsal muscle samples (FFD: n = 121 (69 in the dry and 52 in the wet season)  
178 and DAM: 62 (28 in the dry and 34 in the wet season)) were dried to constant weight at  
179 60 °C before being ground to a fine powder, weighed and stored in tin capsules before  
180 determination of their carbon and nitrogen isotopic ratios. This determination was made  
181 on an Isotope Radio Mass Spectrometer from PDZ Europa ANCA-GSL with a PDZ  
182 Europe 20-20 interface (Sercon Ltd., Cheshire, UK) at the University of California,  
183 Davis Stable Isotope Facility. The values of the carbon and nitrogen isotope ratios were  
184 expressed in delta notation ( $\delta$ ; ‰), relative to the international standard for the carbon  
185 of the Vienna Pee Dee Belemnite (V-PDB) limestone, and the nitrogen standard was  
186 atmospheric nitrogen (*i.e.*,  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  (indicator of energy source) and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  (indicator of  
187 trophic position)) (Grey, 2006).

188           As there were no stable isotope data available on the putative food resources of  
189 the fish for each site, inter-site comparisons between FFD and DAM are difficult due to  
190 the lack of standardization in the data (*i.e.*, conversion of  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  to trophic position and



191  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  to corrected carbon; Jackson & Britton, 2014). Consequently, the stable isotope  
192 data were primarily used for intra-site comparisons between the wet and dry season  
193 using a suite of stable isotope metrics (Layman et al., 2007; Jackson et al., 2011). The  
194 initial metrics were the isotopic ranges of nitrogen (NR) and carbon (CR) that represent  
195 the distance between the individual fish with the highest and lowest values of  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  and  
196  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  within the sample, thus indicate the total extent of nitrogen and carbon isotopes  
197 being utilised. Mean centroid distance (CD) was then used as a measure of trophic  
198 diversity and was calculated as the mean Euclidean distance of each fish the centroid of  
199  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  or  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ . Finally, standard ellipse areas (SEA) were used as a measure of isotopic  
200 niche size, a metric similar to trophic niche size, and were calculated in two ways.  
201 Firstly, they were determined using a Bayesian inference model to estimate the  
202 covariance matrix of the isotope data that considered data variability (caused both by  
203 natural variations and by analytical errors) more efficiently and provides a distribution  
204 of solutions rather than a single value ( $\text{SEA}_B$ ). Secondly, they were calculated as sample  
205 size corrected ellipse areas ( $\text{SEA}_c$ ), calculated from the variance and covariance of the  
206 values of  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  and  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and where the standard ellipses accommodate 40% of the data.

207

### 208 **Stomach contents analyses**

209 The analyses of stomach contents tested differences in the diet composition between wet  
210 and dry seasons within the two areas (FFD and DAM), and then between the two areas.  
211 To verify the percentage of the populations with individuals with empty stomachs, the  
212 vacuity index ( $\%I_v$ ) was completed as the percentage of empty stomachs to the total  
213 number of stomachs analysed (Hyslop, 1980). Dietary analyses were then based on the  
214 volume of each food item (Hyslop, 1980), obtained by displacing large items in water in  
215 a graduated cylinder (0.1 ml) and small items on a millimeter plate ( $\text{mm}^3$ ). The volume

216 obtained ( $\text{mm}^3$ ) was converted to millilitres when the volume was less than 0.1 ml  
217 (Hellawel & Abel, 1971). Differences in the diet composition of each population in FFD  
218 and DAM areas, and differences between the dry and wet seasons within FFD and  
219 DAM areas, were determined by permutational multivariate analysis of variance  
220 (PERMANOVA; Anderson et al., 2008), applied to a matrix of food items per analysed  
221 stomach versus the volume of the items. The Gower distance was used as a dissimilarity  
222 index, and 9999 permutations were used to test the significance of the pseudo- $F$  statistic  
223 derived from PERMANOVA. Variations in diet composition were synthesized through  
224 Principal Coordinate Analysis (PCoA), on a volume data set of prey (individuals in the  
225 lines and prey in the columns). The Indicator Value Method (IndVal), based on  
226 abundance and relative frequency, was used to detect which food item differed between  
227 FFD and DAM, according to Dufrêne and Legendre (1997). The indicator value of a  
228 food item ranges from 0 to 100, and reaches its maximum value when all items occur on  
229 all sites and hydrological periods within a single group. We tested the significance of  
230 the indicator value for each item with a Monte Carlo randomization procedure with  
231 10,000 permutations (significance level adopted was  $p < 0.05$ ).

232 The trophic niche breadth was estimated for each population using the Levins'  
233 standardized niche breadth, according to  $B_i = [(E_j P_{ij}^2)^{-1} - 1](n-1)^{-1}$ , where  $B_i$  is the Levins'  
234 standardized niche breadth;  $P_{ij}$  is the proportion of prey  $j$  in the diet; and  $n$  is the number  
235 of food items (Krebs, 1998). Breadth values varies from 0 to 1; higher values indicate a  
236 wider range of resource exploitation.

237 All statistical analyses were performed using R Core Team software. We used  
238 the SIAR (Parnnel & Jackson, 2013), SIBER (Jackson et al., 2011) and Vegan packages  
239 (The R Project for Statistical Computing, <http://www.t-project.prg/>: Oksanen et al.,  
240 2017).

241

**242 Results**

243

**244 Stable isotope metrics between wet and dry seasons**

245 Comparisons of metrics between the wet and dry seasons at both sites revealed there  
246 were only minor differences in NR, CR and SEAc, with SEAB indicating that the  
247 probability of the isotopic niches being larger in the wet season than the dry season was  
248 not significant (Table 1). Moreover, the standard ellipse areas (as SEAc) remained in a  
249 similar position in isotopic space between the wet and dry seasons at each site (Figure  
250 2). Whilst the stable isotope metrics indicated that FFD had higher values than DAM for  
251 NR and CR, and larger isotopic niches, these remain uncorrected due to the lack of  
252 isotopic baseline.

253

**254 Stomach contents analyses**

255 The vacuity indices indicated that values were higher in the FFD areas compared with  
256 the DAM areas; even in DAM, the minimum value was 24% (Table 2). Across the sites,  
257 the stomach contents data indicated that *T. galeatus* diet was mainly composed of high  
258 plants, insects, fish and crustaceans. In comparison to DAM, their diet in FFD had  
259 higher contributions of Coleoptera, irrespective of season, but was lower in high plants  
260 and fish. In DAM, the diet of *T. galeatus* mainly consisted of high plants and  
261 Coleoptera, with fish and crustaceans present in diet but being less prominent (Table 2).

262 In general, the diet of *T. galeatus* differed significantly between FFD and DAM  
263 (PERMANOVA:  $F_{72;44} = 5.66$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ). The ordination plot of the dietary data  
264 revealed a separation between the two environments in axis 1, with FFD being more  
265 positioned in the positive scores (Figure 3a). The food items that contributed to this

266 differentiation were Coleoptera and Lepidoptera in FFD and high plants in DAM. In  
267 contrast to the stable isotope metrics, the PCoA indicated that the diet between dry and  
268 wet seasons differed significantly in both FFD ( $F_{33;9} = 2.432$ ;  $p = 0.02$ ) and DAM ( $F_{37;35}$   
269  $= 3.042$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ) (Figure 3b–c). In FFD, important food items in the dry season were  
270 Coleoptera and Lepidoptera, but these were extremely low (5.22%) and absent (0.00)  
271 respectively in the wet season (Table 2). In DAM, Coleoptera was only important in the  
272 wet season, with Crustacea being more important in the dry season (Table 2).

273         Across both seasons, the trophic niche breadth of *T. galeatus* was similar in FFD  
274 and in DAM (0.18 FFD vs. 0.19 DAM) (Table 2). When compared seasonally, the  
275 trophic niche was larger during the wet season in FFD (0.14 Dry vs. 0.34 Wet), with the  
276 opposite in DAM (0.28 Dry vs. 0.13 Wet) (Table 2).

277

## 278 **Discussion**

279

280 The results indicated that there was variability in the diet of *T. galeatus*, with  
281 differences apparent between the populations in the impounded (DAM) and free  
282 flowing (FFD) areas, and between wet and dry season. This variability was consistent  
283 with the hypothesis that this invader has a generalist diet that is sufficiently plastic to  
284 enable the fish to alter their feeding to exploiting different prey items as their food  
285 resource availability alters. It was also hypothesised that their diet would be more varied  
286 in the wet season than dry due to flooding providing greater feeding opportunities due  
287 to the inundation of floodplain areas and the consequent increase in production from  
288 vegetation breakdown (Britton et al., 2009). This larger trophic niche in the wet season  
289 was indeed apparent in the free flowing areas, but not the impounded areas. In the free-  
290 flowing area, the Baía and Ivinhema rivers are generally important in providing

291 permanent water flows that support high biodiversity, with fish foraging habitat  
292 protected by riparian vegetation (Ward et al., 1999; Thomaz et al., 2007). Thus, the  
293 larger niche of *T. galeatus* in the wet season here suggests that the high habitat  
294 heterogeneity was important in supporting fish diet, with the inundation of floodplain  
295 areas being an important process. This was a contrast to the impounded areas, perhaps  
296 due to the habitat suffering from a marked decrease in nutrient input in the wet season  
297 that limited the extent of food resources available to the fish, as is often typical for  
298 impounded rivers (Agostinho et al., 1999).

299 Fish captured in impoundments had more full stomachs (lower vacuity indices)  
300 than those from free-flowing areas. This may be related to the more consistent reservoir  
301 levels that ensured constant presence of high plants that were then as a common food  
302 item. The diet composition data present here for *T. galeatus* revealed it was omnivorous  
303 and highly plastic in its feeding habitat, which is in agreement with other studies on the  
304 species more generally (e.g., Moyle & Light, 1996; Ruesink, 2005). For example,  
305 Andrian and Barbieri (1996) revealed that *T. galeatus* diet was mainly composed of  
306 invertebrates such as Coleoptera and Hymenoptera, with fish and high plants present,  
307 similar to the results in the DAM fish. High plants were an important food item during  
308 both seasons in DAM. In FFD, the species fed mainly on insects derived from the  
309 riparian vegetation, such as Coleoptera, Lepidoptera and Orthoptera. In the Upper  
310 Paraná River floodplain, Santin et al. (2015) revealed strong ontogenetic patterns in the  
311 diet of *T. galeatus*, where larvae fed mainly on microcrustaceans and aquatic insects,  
312 but as the developed and increased in size, their diet switched to being based primarily  
313 on aquatic insects. In other studies that have been conducted in the Upper Paraná River  
314 floodplain, *T. galeatus* fed mainly on microcrustaceans, insect larvae, aquatic insects  
315 and small fish (Peretti & Andrian, 2004; Santin et al., 2015). In Central Amazonia, *T.*

316 *galeatus* diet comprises mainly of fruits, seeds and invertebrates (Claro-Jr et al., 2004),  
317 while in rivers of the Northern Pantanal, Brazil, the fish is considered as insectivorous  
318 (Ximenes et al., 2011). Elsewhere, it is considered omnivorous due to both plant and  
319 animal matter in their diet (Santos, 2005). In other Brazilian regions, the fish has also  
320 been considered as insectivorous (Gurgel et al., 2002; Oliveira et al., 2016) and  
321 carnivorous (Sousa et al., 2017). In entirety, the species is thus highly opportunistic and  
322 generalist (Ricciardi & Rasmussen, 1998), able to adapt its diet according to resource  
323 availability.

324         The use of stomach contents analysis and stable isotope analysis to assess the  
325 diet composition of fishes is routine, including for dietary assessments of invasive fish  
326 populations (e.g., Leunda et al., 2008; Cucherousset et al., 2012; Hamidan et al., 2016).  
327 However, when the two dietary methods are used together, the results are not always  
328 congruent. For example, a study on the diet of pumpkinseed *Lepomis gibbosus*  
329 (Linnaeus 1758) using a combination of methods (data from stomach contents, stable  
330 isotopes and their trophically transmitted parasite fauna) revealed no congruence  
331 between the methods, with each one providing apparently unrelated information that  
332 provided contrasting information on the importance of the different prey items (Locke et  
333 al., 2013). Dietary changes of fish might not be reflected in the stable isotope data of  
334 their tissues for some time, with this time dependent on a range of factors including the  
335 tissue analysed, and fish growth and metabolic rates (Winter et al., 2019). Thus, a diet  
336 change in the transition between wet and dry season might not be detected in stable  
337 isotope values of dorsal muscle for some time (e.g. > 90 days) (Sacramento et al.,  
338 2016). Indeed, differences in the results of dietary assessments are typical in studies that  
339 use both stomach contents and stable isotope analysis, with the differences usually  
340 relating to how each method works. For example, Hamidan et al. (2016) revealed that in

341 the desert fish *Garra ghorensis* Krupp 1982, stomach contents data collected through  
342 the year was successful at detecting temporal shifts in diet, given that the method  
343 indicates the individual, ingested diet of fish over very short time frames (*e.g.*, < 24 h).  
344 Stable isotope analysis, however, in providing a much longer temporal perspective on  
345 assimilated diet, does not necessarily have the power to detect such short-term dietary  
346 changes, unless a tissue has been analysed that has a short isotopic turnover rate, such as  
347 epidermal mucus (Winter et al., 2019). The *T. galeatus* tissue used here, dorsal muscle,  
348 tends to have a slower turnover rate than mucus, although a faster rate than fin tissue  
349 and scales (Winter et al., 2019). Thus, stable isotope data using these tissues tend to be  
350 less sensitive to temporal dietary changes than stomach contents data. Consequently, the  
351 minor differences observed in the stable isotope metrics between the wet and dry here  
352 might relate to the method not being sufficiently sensitive to detect changes over this  
353 timeframe.

354         Field samples of the putative food resources of the fish were also not available to  
355 this study and so it could not be tested whether there were seasonal or spatial  
356 differences in the stable isotope baseline of the populations. This means that it was  
357 difficult to assess temporal and spatial patterns in stable isotope metrics, such as the size  
358 of the standard ellipse areas, as the metrics could not account for any changes in  
359 variability of the stable isotope data of the main food resources of the fish that might  
360 have been apparent (Jackson & Britton, 2014). Consequently, any inferences on dietary  
361 changes from the stable isotope data need to be interpreted cautiously.

362         In summary, the results indicate that *T. galeatus* is a dietary generalist whose  
363 diet composition varies over time and space, and habitat type. The data presented here  
364 suggest that the species is an unrestricted predator, *i.e.*, it consumes easy-to-catch items  
365 in its habitat (albeit resource availability was not measured here), suggesting it is highly

366 opportunistic. There were clear dietary differences between populations in impounded  
367 and free-flowing areas of river, and differences between wet and dry season. These  
368 results indicate that when introduced into new environments, the diet plasticity of *T.*  
369 *galeatus* facilitates their adaptation, with this likely to be an important trait that  
370 enhances their ability establish new invasive populations.

371

## 372 **References**

373

374 Abell, R., Thieme, M. L., Revenga, C., Bryer, M., Kottelat, M., Bogutskaya, N., Coad,  
375 B., Mandrak, N., Balderas, S. C., Bussing, W., Stiassny, M. L. J., Skelton, P., Allen,  
376 G. R., Unmack, P., Naseka, A., Ng, R., Sindorf, N., Robertson, J., Armijo, E.,  
377 Higgins, J. V., Heibel, T. J., Wikramanayake, E., Olson, D., López, H. L., Reis, R.  
378 E., Lundberg, J. G., Pérez, M. H. S., & Petry, P. (2008). Freshwater ecoregions of the  
379 world: a new map of biogeographic units for freshwater biodiversity conservation.  
380 *Bioscience*, 58, 403–414. doi:10.1641/B580507

381 Agostinho, A. A. (1997). Qualidade dos habitats e perspectivas para a conservação. In  
382 Vazzoler, A. E. M. A., Agostinho, A. A., & Hahn, N. S. (Eds.), *A planície de*  
383 *inundação do alto rio Paraná: aspectos físicos, biológicos e socioeconômico* (pp.  
384 455–460). Maringá: Eduem.

385 Agostinho, A. A., Miranda, L. E., Bini, L. M., Gomes, L. C., Thomaz, S. M., & Suzuki,  
386 H. I. (1999). Patterns of colonizattion in neotropical reservoirs, and prognoses on  
387 aging. In Tundisi, J. G., & Straskraba, M. (Eds.), *Theoretical reservoir ecology and*  
388 *its applications* (pp. 227–265). Leiden: Internacional Institute of Ecology; The  
389 Netherlands; Backhuys Publishers; Rio de Janeiro, Brazilian Academy of Sciences,  
390 São Carlos.



- 391 Agostinho, A. A., Pelicice, F. M., Petry, A. C., Gomes, L. C., & Júlio Jr., H. F. (2007).  
392 Fish diversity in the upper Paraná River basin: habitats, fisheries, management and  
393 conservation. *Aquatic Ecosystem Health and Management*, *10*, 174–186.  
394 *doi:10.1080/14634980701341719*
- 395 Agostinho, A. A., Gomes, L. C., Santos, N. C., Ortega, J. C., & Pelicice, F. M. (2016).  
396 Fish assemblages in Neotropical reservoirs: colonization patterns, impacts and  
397 management. *Fisheries Research*, *173*, 26–36. *doi:10.1016/j.fishres.2015.04.006*
- 398 Alves, G. H. Z., Tófoli, R. M., Message, H. J., Lima-Junior, D. P., & Hoeninghaus, D. J.  
399 (2018). New decree promotes fish invasion in Amazon and Pantanal. *Biodiversity*  
400 *and Conservation*, *27*, 2449. *doi:10.1007/s10531-018-1533-y*
- 401 Anderson, M. J., Gorley, R. N., & Clarke, K. R. (2008). *PERMANOVA+ for PRIMER:*  
402 *Guide to Software and Statistical Methods*. Plymouth: PRIMERE.
- 403 Andrian, I. F. G., & Barbieri, G. (1996). Espectro alimentar e variações sazonal e  
404 espacial na composição da dieta de *Parauchenipterus galeatus* Linnaeus, 1766,  
405 (Siluriformes, Auchenipteridae) na região do reservatório de Itaipu, PR. *Revista*  
406 *Brasileira de Biologia*, *56*, 409–422.
- 407 Balcombe, S. R., Bunn, S. E., McKenzie-Smith, F. J., & Davies, P. M. (2005).  
408 Variability of fish diets between dry and flood periods in an arid zone floodplain  
409 river. *Journal of Fish Biology*, *67*, 1552–1567. *doi:10.1111/j.1095-*  
410 *8649.2005.00858.x*
- 411 Brito, M. F. G., Magalhães, A. L. B., Lima-Junior, D. P., Pelicice, F. M., Azevedo-  
412 Santos, V. M., Garcia, D. A. Z., Cunico, A. M., & Vitule, J. R. S. (2018). Brazil  
413 naturalizes non-native species. *Science*, *361*, 139. *doi:10.1126/science.aau3368*
- 414 Britski, H. A., Silimon, K. Z. S., & Lopes, B. S. (2007). *Peixes do Pantanal: manual de*  
415 *identificação*. Brasília: Embrapa Informação Tecnológica.

- 416 Britton, J. R., Jackson, M. C., Muchiri, M., Tarras-Wahlberg, H., Harper, D. M., &  
417 Grey, J. (2009). Status, ecology and conservation of an endemic fish, *Oreochromis*  
418 *niloticus baringoensis*, in Lake Baringo, Kenya. *Aquatic Conservation: Marine and*  
419 *Freshwater Ecosystems*, 19, 487–496. doi:10.1002/aqc.998
- 420 Britton J. R., & Orsi, M. L. (2012). Non-native fish in aquaculture and sport fishing in  
421 Brazil: economic benefits versus risks to fish diversity in the upper River Paraná  
422 Basin. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*, 22, 555–565. doi:10.1007/s11160-  
423 012-9254-x
- 424 Casimiro, A. C. R., Garcia, D. A. Z., Costa, A. D. A., Britton, J. R., & Orsi, M. L.  
425 (2017). Impoundments facilitate a biological invasion: dispersal and establishment of  
426 non-native armoured catfish *Loricariichthys platymetopon* (Isbrückler & Nijssen,  
427 1979) in a neotropical river. *Limnologica – Ecology and Management of Inland*  
428 *Waters*, 62, 34–37. doi:10.1016/j.limno.2016.11.001
- 429 Claro-Jr, L., Ferreira, E., Zuanon, J., & Araújo-Lima, C. (2004). O efeito da floresta  
430 alagada na alimentação de três espécies de peixes onívoros em lagos de várzea da  
431 Amazônia central, Brasil. *Acta Amazônica*, 34, 133–137. doi:10.1590/S0044-  
432 59672004000100018
- 433 Cucherousset, J., Bouletreau, S., Martino, A., Roussel, J. M., & Santoul, F. (2012).  
434 Using stable isotope analyses to determine the ecological effects of non-native fishes.  
435 *Fisheries Management and Ecology*, 19, 111–119. doi:10.1111/j.1365-  
436 2400.2011.00824.x
- 437 Delariva, R. L., Hahn, N. S., & Kashiwaqui, E. A. L. (2013). Diet and trophic structure  
438 of the fish fauna in a subtropical ecosystem: impoundment effects. *Neotropical*  
439 *Ichthyology*, 11, 891–904. doi:10.1590/S1679-62252013000400017

- 440 Douglas, M. M., Bunn, S. E., & Davies, P. M. (2005). River and wetland food webs in  
441 Australia's wet-dry tropics: general principles and implications for management.  
442 *Marine and Freshwater Research*, *56*, 329–342. doi:10.1071/MF04084
- 443 Dufrière, M., & Legendre, P. (1997). Species assemblages and indicator species: the  
444 need for a flexible asymmetrical approach. *Ecological Monographs*, *67*, 345–366.  
445 doi:10.1890/0012-9615(1997)067[0345:SAAIST]2.0.CO;2
- 446 Forneck, S. C., Dutra, F. M., Zacarkim, C. E., & Cunico, A. M. (2016). Invasion risks  
447 by non-native freshwater fishes due to aquaculture activity in a Neotropical stream.  
448 *Hydrobiologia*, *773*, 193–205. doi:10.1007/s10750-016-2699-5
- 449 Gallardo, B., Clavero, M., Sánchez, M. I., & Vilà, M. (2016). Global ecological impacts  
450 of invasive species in aquatic ecosystems. *Global Change Biology*, *22*, 151–163.  
451 doi:10.1111/gcb.13004
- 452 Garcia, D. A. Z., Britton, J. R., Vidotto-Magnoni, A. P., & Orsi, M. L. (2018).  
453 Introductions of non-native fishes into a heavily modified river: rates, patterns and  
454 management issues in the Paranapanema River (Upper Paraná ecoregion, Brazil).  
455 *Biological Invasions*, *20*, 1229–1241. doi:10.1007/s10530-017-1623-x
- 456 Gozlan, R. E., Britton, J. R., Cowx, I., & Copp, G. H. (2010). Current knowledge on  
457 non-native freshwater fish introductions. *Journal of Fish Biology*, *76*, 751–786.  
458 doi:10.1111/j.1095-8649.2010.02566.x
- 459 Grey, J. (2006). The use of stable isotope analyses in freshwater ecology: current  
460 awareness. *Polish Journal of Ecology*, *54*, 563–584.
- 461 Grill, G., Lehner, B., Lumsdon, A. E., MacDonald, G. K., Zarfl, C., & Liermann, C. R.  
462 (2015). An index-based framework for assessing patterns and trends in river  
463 fragmentation and flow regulation by global dams at multiple scales. *Environmental*  
464 *Research Letters*, *10*, 015001.

- 465 Gurgel, H. C. B., Lucas, F. D., & Souza, L. L. G. (2002). Dieta de sete espécies de  
466 peixes do semi-árido do Rio Grande do Norte, Brasil. *Revista de Ictiologia*, *10*, 7–16.
- 467 Hahn, N. S., Almeida, V. L. L., & Luz, K. D. G. (1997). Alimentação e ciclo alimentar  
468 diário de *Hoplosternum littorale* (Hancock) (Siluriformes, Callichthyidae) nas lagoas  
469 Guaraná e Patos da planície de inundação do alto rio Paraná, Brasil. *Revista*  
470 *Brasileira de Zoologia*, *14*, 57–64.
- 471 Hamidan, N., Jackson, M. C., & Britton, J. R. (2016). Diet and trophic niche of the  
472 endangered fish *Garra ghorensis* in three Jordanian populations. *Ecology of*  
473 *Freshwater Fish*, *25*, 455–464. doi:10.1111/eff.12226
- 474 Hellawell, J. M., & Abel, R. (1971). A rapid volumetric method for the analysis of the  
475 food of fishes. *Journal of Fish Biology*, *3*, 29–37.
- 476 Hyslop, E. J. (1980). Stomach contents analysis: a review of methods and their  
477 application. *Journal of Fish Biology*, *17*, 411–429.
- 478 Jackson, A. L., Inger, R., Parnell, A. C., & Bearhop, S. (2011). Comparing isotopic  
479 niche widths among and within communities: SIBER - Stable isotope Bayesian  
480 ellipses in R. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, *80*, 595–602. doi:10.1111/j.1365-  
481 2656.2011.01806.x
- 482 Jackson, M. C., & Britton, J. R. (2014). Divergence in the trophic niche of sympatric  
483 freshwater invaders. *Biological Invasions*, *16*, 1095–1103. doi:10.1007/s10530-013-  
484 0563-3
- 485 Júlio Júnior, H. F., Tós, C. D., Agostinho, A. A., & Pavanelli, C. S. (2009). A massive  
486 invasion of fish species after eliminating a natural barrier in the upper rio Paraná  
487 basin. *Neotropical Ichthyology*, *7*, 709–718. doi:10.1590/S1679-  
488 62252009000400021
- 489 Krebs, C. J. (1998). *Ecological methodology*. Menlo Park: Benjamin/Cummings.

- 490 Layman, C. G., Arrington, D. A., Montaña, C. G., & Post, D. M. (2007). Can stable  
491 isotope ratios provide for community-wide measures of trophic structure? *Ecology*,  
492 88, 42–48. doi:10.1890/0012-9658(2007)88[42:CSIRPF]2.0.CO;2
- 493 Li, S. P., Cadotte, M. W., Meiners, S. J., Hua, Z. S., Shu, H. Y., Li, J. T., & Shu, W. S.  
494 (2015). The effects of phylogenetic relatedness on invasion success and impact:  
495 deconstructing Darwin's naturalisation conundrum. *Ecology Letters*, 18, 1285–1292.  
496 doi:10.1111/ele.12522
- 497 Lima Junior, D. P., Magalhães, A. L. B., Pelicice, F. M., Vitule, J. R. S., Azevedo-  
498 Santos, V. M., Orsi, M. L., Simberloff, D., & Agostinho, A. A. (2018). Aquaculture  
499 expansion in Brazilian freshwaters against the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. *Ambio*, 47,  
500 427–440. doi:10.1007/s13280-017-1001-z
- 501 Locke, S. A., Bulté, G., Forbes, M. R. & Marcogliese, D. (2013). Estimating diet in  
502 individual *Lepomis gibbosus* using stomach contents, stable isotopes and parasite.  
503 *Journal of Fish Biology*, 82, 522–537. doi:10.1111/j.1095-8649.2012.03497.x
- 504 Luiz, E. A., Gaspar da Luz, K. D., Costa, R. S., Latini, J. D., Júlio-Júnior, H. F., &  
505 Gomes, L. C. (2004). Structure of the fish assemblage in biotopes and subsystems of  
506 the upper Paraná River Floodplain. In Agostinho, A. A., Rodrigues, L., Gomes, L.  
507 C., Thomaz, S. M., & Miranda, L. E. (Eds.) *Structure and functioning of the Paraná*  
508 *River and its floodplain* (pp. 117–123). Maringá: Eduem.
- 509 Meisner, A. D., Burns, J. R., Weitzman, S. H., & Malabarba, L. R. (2000). Morphology  
510 and histology of the male reproductive system in two species of internally  
511 inseminating South American catfishes, *Trachelyopterus lucenai* and *T. galeatus*  
512 (Teleostei: Auchenipteridae). *Journal of Morphology*, 246, 131–141.  
513 doi:10.1002/1097-4687(200011)246:2<131::AID-JMOR7>3.0.CO;2-K

- 514 Mérona, B., Vigouroux, R., & Horeau, V. (2003). Changes in the food resources and  
515 their utilization by fish assemblages in a large tropical reservoir in South America  
516 (Petit-Saut Dam, French Guiana). *Acta Oecologica*, *24*, 147–156.  
517 *doi:10.1016/S1146-609X(03)00065-1*
- 518 Moyle, P. B., & Light, T. (1996). Biological invasions of fresh water: Empirical rules  
519 and assembly theory. *Biological Conservation*, *78*, 149–161. *doi:10.1016/0006-*  
520 *3207(96)00024-9*
- 521 Oksanen, J., Blanchet, F. G., Friendly, M., Kindt, R., Legendre, P., McGlinn, D., &  
522 Wagner, H. (2017). Vegan: Community Ecology Package. R package version 2.4-2.  
523 Retrieved from: <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan>.
- 524 Oliveira, J. F., Morais-Segundo, A. L. N. M., Novaes, J. L. C., Costa, R. S., França, J.  
525 S., & Peretti, D. (2016). Estrutura trófica da ictiofauna em um reservatório do  
526 semiárido brasileiro. *Iheringia, Série Zoologia*, *106*, 1–9. *doi:10.1590/1678-*  
527 *4766e2016001*
- 528 Ota, R. R., Deprá, G. C., Graça, W. J., & Pavanelli, C. S. (2018). Peixes da planície de  
529 inundação do alto rio Paraná e áreas adjacentes: revised, annotated and updated.  
530 *Neotropical Ichthyology*, *16*, e170094. *doi:10.1590/1982-0224-20170094*
- 531 Parnell, A. C., & Jackson, A. (2013). Siar: Stable Isotope Analysis in R. R package  
532 version 4.2. Retrieved from: <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=siar>.
- 533 Pelicice, F. M., Vitule, J. R. S., Lima-Junior, D. P., Orsi, M. L., & Agostinho, A. A.  
534 (2014). A serious new threat to Brazilian freshwater ecosystems: the naturalization of  
535 nonnative fish by decree. *Conservation Letters*, *7*, 55–60. *doi:10.1111/conl.12029*
- 536 Peretti, D., & Andrian, I. F. (2004). Trophic structure of fish assemblages in five  
537 permanent lagoons of the high Paraná River floodplain, Brazil. *Environmental*  
538 *Biology of Fishes*, *71*, 95–103. *doi:10.1023/B:EBFI.0000043155.76741.a1*

- 539 Pusey, B. J., & Stewart, T. (1989). Internal fertilization in *Lepidogalaxias*  
540 *salamandroides* Mees (Pisces: Lepidogalaxiidae). *Zoological Journal of Linnean*  
541 *Society*, 97, 69–79. doi:10.1111/j.1096-3642.1989.tb00554.x
- 542 Reis, R. E., Kullander, S. O., & Ferraris, C. J. (2003). *Check list of freshwater fishes of*  
543 *South and Central America*. Porto Alegre: Edipucrs.
- 544 Reynalte-Tataje, D. A., Agostinho, A. A., & Bialezki, A. (2013). Temporal and spatial  
545 distribution of the fish larval assemblages of the Ivinheima River sub-basin (Brazil).  
546 *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, 96, 811–822. doi:10.1007/s10641-012-0073-7
- 547 Ricciardi, A., & Rasmussen, J. B. (1998). Predicting the identity and impact of future  
548 biological invaders: a priority for aquatic resource management. *Canadian Journal of*  
549 *Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 55, 1759–1765. doi:10.1139/f98-066
- 550 Ruesink, J. L. (2005). Global analysis of factors affecting the outcome of freshwater  
551 fish introductions. *Conservation Biology*, 19, 1883–1893. doi:10.1111/j.1523-  
552 1739.2005.00267.x-i1
- 553 Sacramento, P. A., Manetta, G. I., & Benedito, E. (2016). Diet-tissue discrimination  
554 factors ( $\Delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\Delta^{15}\text{N}$ ) and turnover rate in somatic tissues of a neotropical  
555 detritivorous fish on C3 and C4 diets. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 89, 213–219.  
556 doi:10.1111/jfb.12859
- 557 Sagouis, A., Cucherousset, J., Villéger, S., Santoul F., & Boulêtreau, S. (2015). Non-  
558 native species modify the isotopic structure of freshwater fish communities across  
559 the globe. *Ecography*, 38, 979–985. doi:10.1111/ecog.01348
- 560 Santin, M., Lopes, T. M., Baggio, M. M., Agostinho, A. A., & Bialezki, A. (2015).  
561 Mudanças ontogenéticas no trato digestório e na dieta de *Trachelyopterus galeatus*.  
562 *Boletim do Instituto de Pesca*, 41, 57–68.

- 563 Santos, A. C. A. (2005). Ecologia alimentar do molé, *Trachelyopterus galeatus*  
564 Linnaeus, 1766 (Siluriformes, Auchenipteridae), em trechos inferiores dos rios Santo  
565 Antônio e São José (Chapada Diamantina, Bahia). *Sitientibus, Série Ciências*  
566 *Biológicas*, 5, 93–98.
- 567 Sousa, J. I. M., Oliveira, J. C. D., Oliveira, J. F., Rebouças, L. G. F., Novaes, J. L. C.,  
568 Costa, R. S., & Peretti, D. (2017). Variação temporal e espacial na dieta de  
569 *Trachelyopterus galeatus* (Siluriformes, Auchenipteridae) em dois reservatórios no  
570 semiárido Neotropical. *Iheringia, Série Zoologia*, 107, e2017040. doi:1678-  
571 4766e2017040
- 572 Tonella, L. H., Fugì, R., Vitorino, O. B., Suzuki, H. I., Gomes, L. C., & Agostinho, A.  
573 A. (2018). Importance of feeding strategies on the long-term success of fish  
574 invasions. *Hydrobiologia*, 817, 239–252. doi:10.1007/s10750-017-3404-z
- 575 Thomaz, S. M., Bini, L. M., & Bozelli, R. L. (2007). Floods increase similarity among  
576 aquatic habitats in river-floodplain systems. *Hydrobiologia*, 579, 1–13.  
577 doi:10.1007/s10750-006-0285-y
- 578 Vitule, J. R. S., Skóra F., & Abilhoa, V. (2012). Homogenization of freshwater fish  
579 faunas after the elimination of a natural barrier by a dam in Neotropics. *Diversity and*  
580 *Distributions*, 18, 111–120. doi:10.1111/j.1472-4642.2011.00821.x
- 581 Ximenes, L. Q. L., Mateus L. A. D. F., & Penha, J. M. F. (2011). Variação temporal e  
582 espacial na composição de guildas alimentares da ictiofauna em lagoas marginais do  
583 Rio Cuiabá, Pantanal Norte. *Biota Neotropica*, 11, 205–215. doi:10.1590/S1676-  
584 06032011000100022
- 585 Ward, J. V., Tockner K., & Schiemer, F. (1999). Biodiversity of floodplain river  
586 ecosystems: ecotones and connectivity. *River Research and Applications*, 15, 125–



587 139. [doi:10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1646\(199901/06\)15:1/3<125::AID-RRR523>3.0.CO;2-E](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1646(199901/06)15:1/3<125::AID-RRR523>3.0.CO;2-E)

589 Winter, E. R., Nolan, E. T., Busst, G. M., & Britton, J. R. (2019). Estimating stable  
590 isotope turnover rates of epidermal mucus and dorsal muscle for an omnivorous fish  
591 using a diet-switch experiment. *Hydrobiologia*, 828, 245–258. [doi:10.1007/s10750-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10750-018-3816-4)  
592 018-3816-4

593

594

595

596

597

598

599

600 TABLE 1 Isotopic niche metrics of *Trachelyopterus galeatus* in free-from-dam (FFD)  
601 and damming (DAM) environments according to all data and wet and dry season,  
602 where NR = nitrogen isotopic range; CR = carbon isotopic range; CD = mean centroid  
603 distance; Prob. Wet > Dry = probability that the SEA<sub>B</sub> obtained in wet season is greater  
604 than the SEA<sub>B</sub> obtained in the dry season

Environment/Season		NR	CR	CD	SEAc	Prob. Wet < Dry
All		7.96	12.51	2.61	9.64	0.29
FFD	Dry	7.65	11.92	2.46	9.00	
	Wet	6.99	10.53	2.66	10.19	
DAM	All	5.41	11.64	2.18	7.08	0.25
	Dry	4.10	11.12	1.94	6.33	

Wet 5.41 8.96 2.30 7.54

605

606

607

608

609

610

611

612

613

614

615

616

617

618 TABLE 2 Volumetric percentage of food items in the diet of *Trachelyopterus galeatus*,  
 619 trophic niche breadth ( $B_i$ ), and mean standard length ( $\pm$  standard deviation) in free-  
 620 from-dam (FFD) and damming (DAM) environments. Values in parentheses show the  
 621 number of stomach contents analysed

Items	FFD			DAM		
	Dry	Wet	Total	Dry	Wet	Total
	(112)	(26)	(138)	(50)	(46)	(96)
High plants	6.58	28.26	34.84	30.45	47.79	78.24
Fish	0.77	21.87	22.64	17.81	7.41	25.22
Coleoptera	52.04	5.22	57.26	2.57	28.79	31.36

Lepidoptera	19.89	0.00	19.89	0.35	0.00	0.35
Orthoptera	8.00	2.75	10.75	3.23	1.28	4.51
Odonata	4.03	0.82	4.85	5.17	1.69	6.86
Ephemeroptera	0.00	10.93	10.93	0.00	0.00	0
Hymenoptera	0.02	0.01	0.03	3.00	0.84	3.84
Isoptera	2.32	0.00	2.32	0.00	0.00	0
Hemiptera	2.17	0.54	2.71	0.19	0.00	0.19
Homoptera	0.18	0.00	0.18	0.55	1.28	1.83
Crustacea	2.63	0.00	2.63	22.46	0.00	22.46
Gastropoda	0.38	0.00	0.38	1.89	2.37	4.26
Aranae	0.12	3.55	3.67	1.11	0.04	1.15
Algae	0.00	0.86	0.86	0.184	0.07	0.25
<hr/> <i>%I<sub>v</sub></i>	<hr/> 67.9	<hr/> 57.7	<hr/> 65.9	<hr/> 26.0	<hr/> 24.4	<hr/> 25.0
<hr/> <i>Bi</i>	<hr/> 0.14	<hr/> 0.34	<hr/> 0.18	<hr/> 0.28	<hr/> 0.13	<hr/> 0.19
<hr/> Mean <i>L<sub>S</sub></i> (cm) ±	<hr/> 13.7 ±	<hr/> 12.7 ±	<hr/> 13.5±2.3	<hr/> 14.0 ±	<hr/> 14.1 ±	<hr/> 14.1 ±
<hr/> S.D.	<hr/> 2.1	<hr/> 2.9		<hr/> 1.1	<hr/> 1.4	<hr/> 1.3

622

623

624

625

626

627

628

629

630

631

632

633

634

635

636

637

638

639

640

641

642

643

644

**645 List of figure captions**

646

647 FIGURE 1 Study area and sampling sites in the Upper Paraná River floodplain (free  
648 from dam, FFD): 1 – Ventura Lagoon; 2 – Ivinhema River; 3 – Fechada Lagoon; 4 –  
649 Baía River; 5 – Garças Lagoon; and Lower Parapanema (under the influence of dams,  
650 DAM): 6 – Lagoon 1; 7 – Lagoon 2; 8 – Pirapozinho River; 9 – Anhumas River; A –  
651 Porto Primavera Dam; B – Rosana Dam; C – Taquaruçu Dam; D – Capivara Dam

652

653 FIGURE 2 Stable isotope biplot of  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  and  $\delta^{15}\text{N}$  data (expressed in parts per thousand)  
654 for each sampling area with the ellipses that represents the isotopic niche area (SEAc  
655  $\%o^2$ ) occupied by *Trachelyopterus galeatus*. (a) all seasons and all areas together; (b)

656 free-from-dam habitat (FFD), each ellipse represent a different season; (c) damming  
657 habitat (DAM), each ellipse represent a different season. Each point is an individual fish  
658

659 FIGURE 3 (a) Diet data ordination of *Trachelyopterus galeatus* based on food items  
660 volume consumed in free-from-dam (white circles, FFD) and damming (black squares,  
661 DAM) environments during dry and wet season, (b) by dry (white circles) and wet  
662 (black squares) season in FFD area, and (c) DAM area. Each point represents the  
663 stomach of one fish in each environment