Ichthyoplankton dynamics in the Guadiana estuary and adjacent coastal area, South-East Portugal
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Abstract

The species composition, abundance and distribution of the ichthyoplankton of the Guadiana estuary and adjacent coastal area were studied in relation to several environmental parameters. Sampling occurred during new moon Spring tides, at the ebb and flood, at nine stations, from March 2002 to February 2003. Temperature, salinity, dissolved inorganic macronutrients, seston and organic matter and chlorophyll \(a\) were determined at each station. A total of 22 and 34 fish eggs and larvae taxa were identified, respectively. The highest abundances were registered in the lower and middle part of the estuary, probably due to the presence of species that use the estuary as a preferential spawning ground, mainly *Pomatoschistus* spp. and *Engraulis encrasicolus* sensu lato. Temporal patterns of occurrence of ichthyoplankton allowed each species’ spawning season to be determined. Two taxa dominated the ichthyoplanktonic community during spring and summer (*Pomatoschistus* spp. and *E. encrasicolus*), whereas *Sardina pilchardus* was particularly abundant during autumn and winter. The forcing variables responsible for community structure were chlorophyll \(a\) and seston for eggs, while temperature, salinity and nitrite explained the larval component. Comparisons of the results with previous ichthyoplankton studies of the Guadiana estuary conducted before the Alqueva dam was built also indicate that river flow has an important impact on the distribution and abundance of ichthyoplankton in the estuary.
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1. Introduction

Estuaries are unstable systems, generally having a limited number of species present. However, they may support high abundances of organisms due to their high productivity, providing important nursery areas where ichthyoplankton encounter suitable conditions for enhanced development (Moyle and Cech, 1996). Community level studies supply information on several aspects of species biology, allowing for the determination of spatial and temporal evolution of ichthyoplankton distribution (Stratoudakis et al., 2003), thus establishing preferred spawning grounds and seasons (Ishikawa et al., 2001). Moreover, it is also possible to identify factors that influence recruitment variability (Borja et al., 1998, 2002). Predation, food availability (Blaxter and Hunter, 1982; Leggett and Deblois, 1994) and environmental parameters have been pointed out as the main factors influencing ichthyoplankton dynamics. Among environmental parameters, temperature (e.g. Miranda et al., 1990; Blaxter, 1992), salinity (e.g. Loneragan et al., 1987; Whitfield, 1999) and river flow (e.g. Loneragan and Bunn, 1999; Whitfield and Harrison, 2003) are considered the most important variables affecting ichthyoplankton communities in estuarine systems.

Several ichthyoplankton studies of limited temporal and/or spatial coverage have been carried out in the Guadiana estuary (SE Portugal) (Chicharo and Teodósio, 1991; Esteves et al., 2000; Chicharo et al., 2000). Chicharo and Teodósio (1991) and Chicharo et al. (2000) studied ichthyoplankton community composition, whereas Esteves et al. (2000) investigated factors influencing larval abundance and nutritional condition.

The Guadiana river basin has been strongly modified over the last decades, with numerous dams constructed that have...
considerably reduced river flow to the estuary. In February 2002, one month before the beginning of this study, the floodgates of the Alqueva dam were closed. This was the largest and most recent dam built in the Guadiana basin. The present study of the Guadiana estuary ichthyoplankton was based on sampling over an annual period and constitutes the first study conducted after the closure of Alqueva dam floodgates. This study is also the most comprehensive conducted in the Guadiana to date. It aims to provide a detailed characterization of the ichthyoplankton community and its spatio-temporal dynamics in the Guadiana estuary and adjacent coastal zone, an area that is poorly characterized. The main objectives are the following: (a) to identify and quantify the abundance of the ichthyoplankton in the estuary and adjacent coastal area; (b) to study the spatial and temporal distribution of ichthyoplankton in the estuary and adjacent coastal area; (c) to analyse the effects of the tides on the distribution of the ichthyoplankton in the estuary; (d) to identify the most important spawning grounds and seasons for locally abundant fish species; and (e) to evaluate the influence of environmental parameters on ichthyoplankton spatio-temporal dynamics.

2. Material and methods

2.1. Study site

This study took place in the Guadiana estuary, on the southern border of Portugal and Spain and in its adjacent coastal area. This estuary is approximately 70 km in length, with the lower 50 km constituting the southern border of Portugal and Spain (Iberian Peninsula, Europe) (Fig. 1a). It is a mesotidal estuary having an average depth of 6.5 m, occupying an area of 22 km², with tidal amplitudes that range from 1.3 to 3.5 m. The Guadiana river flow presents a marked variability between and within years, due to the influence of Mediterranean climate characteristics. The average annual rainfall fluctuates between 561 and 600 mm in the Portuguese basin, with considerable variation between years. This variability in rainfall is reflected in the Guadiana river flow, with average river flow oscillating between 8 and 63 m³ s⁻¹ during dry years, between 170 and 190 m³ s⁻¹ in typical years, and between 412 and 463 m³ s⁻¹ in wet years (Bettencourt et al., 2003).

2.2. Sampling strategy and field methodology

Eulerian sampling was carried out during new moon Spring tides at low and high tides, from March 2002 to February 2003 at nine stations: seven inside the estuary and two in the coastal area. Of the coastal stations, st. 1 was located in front of Praia de Santo António outside the direct influence of the estuarine outflow, whereas st. 2 was situated in the area where the river plume is formed (Fig. 1b). A boat equipped with an 80 hp engine was used for all sampling, except in February 2003 when a boat equipped with a 30 hp engine was used due to technical problems. Due to these technical problems, high tide sampling in January and February 2003 could not be carried out. Horizontal profiles of temperature and salinity were recorded with a Yellow Springs Instruments (YSI) 6600 probe. Sub-surface zooplankton trawls were carried out with a 250 μm net mesh, equipped with a flow meter (General Oceanics), and the collected samples were immediately preserved with buffered formaldehyde (4% final concentration). At the same depth as the zooplankton trawls, water samples were collected for the analysis of dissolved inorganic macronutrients (ammonium, nitrate, nitrite, orthophosphate and silicate), seston, suspended organic matter and chlorophyll a. Samples were cooled until laboratory processing (Kirkwood, 1996).

2.3. Laboratory analysis

In the laboratory, ichthyoplankton was sorted from the zooplankton samples and identified to lowest possible taxa (Petersen, 1919; D’Ancona, 1931–1956; Fives, 1970, 1976;

In order to determine dissolved inorganic macronutrient levels, water samples were filtered through 0.45 μm pore cellulose acetate filters (MSI) and preserved frozen until being subjected to spectrophotometric analyses (Grasshoff et al., 1983; Kirkwood, 1996). Water samples collected for seston and suspended organic matter analysis were filtered through 0.7 μm pore filters (Whatman GF/F); filters were washed three times with distilled water and dried at 60 °C for seston determination. Subsequently, the sample was burned at 450 °C to allow organic matter determination (Greenberg et al., 1992). Finally, water samples collected for chlorophyll a determination were filtered through 0.7 μm pore filters (Whatman GF/F) without exceeding vacuum pressures of 100 mmHg, and the filters were kept frozen (−20 °C) until being subjected to fluorimetric analysis (Knap et al., 1996).

2.4. Data analysis

The analysis of river flow was based on data recorded at the Pulo do Lobo hydrometric station (code: 27L/01), located 85 km above the Guadiana estuary mouth. River flow data were made available by the “Instituto Nacional da Água” (INAG, 2004). Monthly average values of river flow were calculated for each sampling date from the daily average river flow observed since last sampling.

Non-parametric ANOSIM analysis and non-parametric multidimensional scaling (MDS) were used to examine seasonal and spatial patterns of ichthyoplankton distribution and abundance according to five established factors: “Month” (month when sampling occurred); “Season” (spring = April, May and June 2002, summer = July, August and September 2002, autumn = October, November and December 2002, and winter = March 2002, January and February 2003); “Station” (from sampling st. 1 to sampling st. 9); “Studied Area” (coastal area = st. 1 and 2, lower estuary = st. 3 and 4, middle estuary = st. 5, 6 and 7, and upper estuary = st. 8 and 9); “Tide” (low and high). The similarity matrix constructed to perform these analyses was made after log(x + 1) data transformation and setting Euclidean distance as the similarity measure. ANOSIM analysis, which employs R statistics, was used to examine the existence of meaningful differences between the established groups for each considered factor (Clarke and Warwick, 2001). R values similar to 0 indicate small differences in the evolution pattern of the analysed parameters, in contrast to R values close to 1.

BIOENV analysis, which is comparable to a multiple regression analysis where all possible permutations of variables are examined, was performed to test the relationship between community composition and environmental variables. The analysis used the Spearman correlation coefficient, Euclidian distance as the similarity measure, and the base results were square root transformed. The ten variables used in the analysis were temperature (1), salinity (2), chlorophyll a (3), suspended organic matter (4), seston (5), ammonia (6), nitrates (7), nitrites (8), orthophosphates (9) and silicates (10). All multivariate techniques (ANOSIM, MDS and BIOENV) were applied using Primer 5.2.1 software (Primer-E Ltd.). Horizontal profiles of temperature, salinity, seston, suspended organic matter and chlorophyll a were constructed using Surfer 8.01 software (Golden Software Inc.), using kriging (linear variogram model) as the gridding method.

3. Results

3.1. Environmental parameters

River flow peaked from March 28 to April 15, 2002 (105.3 ± 179.8 m³ s⁻¹), decreased abruptly the following month, and remained reduced until late November. Minimum flows of 3.9 ± 3.0 m³ s⁻¹ were observed between June 12 and July 10, 2002 (Fig. 2a and b). The periods of February 27 to March 27, 2002, March 28 to April 15, 2002, December 5
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to January 5, 2003 and January 6 to February 4, 2003 exhibited extreme river flow variability. The highest daily average river flow, 656.3 m³ s⁻¹, was registered a few days before the April 2002 sampling (Fig. 2a and b).

Water temperature generally increased upstream, but in winter this tendency was inverted (Fig. 3a). Maximum water temperature (26.7 °C) was registered in August 2002 and the lowest (11.6 °C) in February 2003, both in the upper estuary.

Salinity increased towards the coastal area, ranging from 0.1 (st. 9) to 36.3 (st.1) (Fig. 3b). A pronounced decrease in salinity was detected in April 2002, coincident with the highest river flow registered (Fig. 2a and b). Saline intrusion was more pronounced from May to September 2002 and again from November to December 2002, periods of low river flow. Salinity decrease in October was coincident with increased rainfall.

Seston, suspended organic matter and chlorophyll a had an homogeneous spatial distribution pattern, increasing towards the upper estuary (Fig. 4a, b and c) during the periods of higher ichthyoplankton abundance, spring and summer. Seston concentration varied between 2.0 mg L⁻¹ (July 2002) and 132.0 mg L⁻¹ (July 2002) (Fig. 4a), whereas suspended organic matter ranged between 0.0 mg L⁻¹ (July 2002) and 20.0 mg L⁻¹ (November 2002) (Fig. 4b). Chlorophyll a concentration was highest in spring and summer, and varied between 0.3 μg L⁻¹ (August, September and November 2002) and 12.3 μg L⁻¹ (July 2002) (Fig. 4c).

According to the BIOENV analysis, chlorophyll a, seston and silicates were the best explanatory variables ($R = 0.452$) for defining the spatial and temporal evolution of the egg component of ichthyoplankton, while larval spatio-temporal dynamics were best explained by temperature, salinity and nitrites ($R = 0.265$).

### 3.2. Ichthyoplankton community characterization

Of the 22 classified taxa of fish eggs, only 6 were clearly identified to the genus or species level: *Belone belone* (Belonidae), *Arnoglossus* sp. (Bothidae), *Callionymus* sp. (Callionymidae), *Sardina pilchardus* (Clupeidae), *Engraulis encrasicolus sensu lato* (only *Engraulis encrasicolus* hereafter) (Engraulidae) and *Dicentrarchus* sp. (Moronidae). Two egg taxa were identified to the family level, Soleidae and Sparidae. The planktonic stages of *Belone belone*, *Arnoglossus* sp. and *Dicentrarchus* sp. were only captured during their egg stage.
A total of 34 larval species were identified, distributed in 13 different families. Twenty-eight taxa were identified to species, and 2 were identified to the genus level: Callionymus sp. and Diplodus spp. Six taxa were only identified to family level: Gobiidae (1), Soleidae (1) and Sparidae (4).

Most species were captured during spring and summer, with Atherina spp., Parablennius gattorugine, Callionymus reticulatus, Symphodus melops, Symphodus baillonii, Solea lascaris, Solea senegalensis and some Sparidae being the most abundant (Table 1). These species were preferentially distributed in the coastal area and lower estuary during spring and summer, although Atherina spp., P. gattorugine and Parablennius pilicornis were also collected at middle estuary stations (Table 2).

The species captured in winter were mainly present in the coastal area or in the lower estuary and included Ammodytes.

Fig. 4. Spatial and temporal evolution of surface seston (mg L$^{-1}$) (a), suspended organic matter (mg L$^{-1}$) (b), and surface chlorophyll a (µg L$^{-1}$) (c) in the Guadiana estuary and adjacent coastal area, at low and high tides, from March 2002 until February 2003. Distance is measured in an upstream direction, starting at coastal station 1.
Family  | Species       | Spring | Summer | Autumn | Winter  
-------|---------------|--------|--------|--------|---------
Blenniidae  | Corphoblenius galentera | X      |        |        |         
Callionymidae  | Callionymus sp. | X      |        |        |         
Labridae  | Symphodus melops | X      |        |        |         
Moronidae  | Dicentrarchus sp. | X      |        |        |         
Soleidae  | Solea senegalensis | X      |        |        |         
Syngnathidae  | Nerophis ophidion | X      |        |        |         
Triglidae  | Trigla lyra | X      |        |        |         
Atherinidae  | Atherina sp. | X      | X      |        |         
Blenniidae  | Parablennius gattorugine | X      | X      |        |         
Callionymidae  | Callionymus reticulates | X      | X      |        |         
Clupeidae  | Sardina pilchardus | X      | X      |        |         
Labridae  | Symphodus bailloni | X      | X      |        |         
Soleidae  | Solea lascaris | X      | X      |        |         
Soleidae n.id.  | Solea senegalensis | X      | X      |        |         
Sparidae n.id.  | Buglossidium luteum | X      | X      |        |         
Gobiidae  | Gobius niger | X      | X      |        |         
Engraulidae  | Engraulis encrasicolus | X      |        |        |         
Engraulidae  | Engraulis encrasicolus | X      |        |        |         
Gobiidae  | Monochirus hispidus | X      | X      |        |         
Labridae  | Synaghatus tyffle | X      |        |        |         
Sparidae  | Diplodus sp. | X      | X      |        |         
Syngnathidae  | Synaghatus abaster | X      | X      |        |         
Belonidae  | Belone belone | X      |        |        |         
Mullidae  | Mullus surmuletus | X      |        |        |         
Syngnathidae  | Hippocampus | X      |        |        |         
Clupeidae  | Sardina pilchardus | X      | X      |        |         
Soleidae  | Monochirus hispidus | X      | X      |        |         
Ammodipterygidae  | Ammodyties tobianus | X      |        |        |         
Soleidae  | Buglossidium luteum | X      |        |        |         
Solea lascaris | X      |        |        |         
Soleidae n.id.  | Solea lascaris | X      | X      |        |         
Gobiidae n.id.  | Gobius niger | X      | X      |        |         
Gobiidae n.id.  | Symphodus microsp | X      | X      |        |         
Sparidae n.id.  | Synaghatus abaster | X      | X      |        |         
Belonidae n.id.  | Belone belone | X      | X      |        |         
Engraulidae n.id.  | Engraulis encrasicolus | X      | X      |        |         
Gobiidae n.id.  | Gobius niger | X      | X      |        |         
Gobiidae n.id.  | Symphodus microsp | X      | X      |        |         
Sparidae n.id. n.id.  | Symphodus microsp | X      | X      |        |         

**Table 1**: Seasonal occurrence of ichthyoplankton in the Guadiana estuary and adjacent coastal area from March 2002 to February 2003, with no distinction between low and high tide.

**Table 2**: Spatial distribution of ichthyoplankton in the Guadiana estuary and adjacent coastal area from March 2002 to February 2003, with no distinction between low and high tide.

---

tobianus and some Soleidae, such as Buglossidium luteum, Monochirus hispidus and Solea vulgaris (Tables 1 and 2). Sardina pilchardus was also collected mainly during autumn and winter and at downstream stations (Tables 1 and 2).

Egg and larval abundance were higher in the coastal area and in the lower estuary during spring and summer, with maximums of 2122 eggs 100 m⁻³ and 285 larvae 100 m⁻³ in June 2002 (Figs. 5 and 6). In upstream stations, highest ichthyoplankton abundance was observed during June and July 2002. Increasing ichthyoplankton abundance coincided with an increase in water temperature (Fig. 3a) and a decrease in river flow (Fig. 2a and b). Ichthyoplankton abundance decreased in autumn and winter, except in November in downstream stations (Fig. 5), coinciding with Sardina pilchardus spawning (Fig. 9).

Engraulis encrasicolus was the dominant species in the egg component, accounting for 50% of all the eggs sampled. In general, more eggs of E. encrasicolus were captured during low tide than in high tide. Although present in the whole estuary and adjacent coastal area, their presence was higher in the lower and middle estuary, mainly in March, May and June 2002, with a maximum abundance of 2106 eggs 100 m⁻³ in June 2002, and a strong evidence of tidal transport was clearly observed. In April 2002, a sharp decrease in abundance (Fig. 7) coincided with the maximum river flow (105.3 ± 179.81 m³ s⁻¹) (Fig. 2).

Engraulis encrasicolus larvae represented 22% of the total captured larvae. From May to September 2002, it was one of the species with the highest contribution to upstream larval assemblages; however, it was most abundant in the middle estuary. The highest abundance (218 larvae 100 m⁻³) was registered during June 2002, when the species comprised more than
90% of total larval abundance, whereas in winter it was very scarce (Fig. 8).

*Sardina pilchardus* eggs represented only 3.4% of all eggs, however they were relatively abundant during winter and spring in downstream stations (Fig. 9). A maximum abundance of 255 eggs 100 m$^{-3}$ was registered in November 2002. Unlike *Engraulis encrasicolus* eggs, the presence of *S. pilchardus* eggs was always higher during the high tide than in the low tide (Fig. 9).

*Sardina pilchardus* was not very abundant, comprising only 1.2% of the total of captured larvae. It was present mainly in the coastal area and lower estuary (Fig. 10). Although collected in autumn and winter, its abundance was highest in June 2002 (16 larvae 100 m$^{-3}$).

Gobiidae dominated the larval abundance, constituting 65% of the captures; the most abundant genus was *Pomatoschistus*. Gobiid species were present during all months, with maximum abundances in summer. Although distributed throughout the estuary and adjacent coastal area, their presence was reduced in the upper estuary (Fig. 11).

The ANOSIM analysis revealed that “Studied Area” and “Season” were the most important factors structuring the ichthyoplankton community. The egg component in the coastal area and lower estuary were similar to one another ($R = 0.058; p = 1.2$), as were the middle and upper estuary ($R = 0.099; p = 23.4$). A seasonal approach revealed that the egg community was most similar during winter and spring ($R = 0.094; p = 3.9$), in contrast with autumn vs. summer ($R = 0.586; p = 0.1$) and autumn vs. spring ($R = 0.412; p = 0.1$). For larvae, the analysis revealed that the most similar study areas were the coastal area and lower estuary ($R = 0.006; p = 32.9$), just as determined for the eggs. Seasonally, the closest groups were spring and summer ($R = 0.04; p = 2.4$), while the most distant were autumn vs. summer ($R = 0.463; p = 0.1$) and autumn vs. spring ($R = 0.436; p = 0.1$) (Table 3). These findings are easily observed in the MDS analysis (Fig. 12).

4. Discussion

4.1. Ichthyoplankton and its temporal and spatial abundance and distribution

In the present study 38 species were identified, whereas 24 and 11 taxa were identified in the Guadiana estuary by Chicharo and Teodósio (1991) and Chicharo et al. (2000), respectively. This can be attributed to the longer sampling period and larger studied area of the present study. *Ammodytes tobianus, Callionymus reticulatus, Coryphoblennius galerita, Gobius niger, Monochirus hispidus, Mullus surmuletus, Nerophis ophidion, Parablennius plicicornis, Pomatoschistus microps, Pomatoschistus minutus, Pomatoschistus puctus, Solea vulgaris, Symphodus bailloni, Symphodus melops and Trigla lyra* were registered in the present work but were absent in the
study of Chicharo and Teodoso (1991); however, these authors caught other species that were not collected in this study (Blennius ocellaris, Dicentrarchus labrax, Diplodus sargus, Echiichthys vipera, Hyperoplus sp., Labrus bergylta, Lipophrys pholis and Sparus aurata).

The majority of taxa displayed substantial seasonal variations in abundance, being essentially captured during late spring and early summer, periods of high zooplanktonic productivity along the Portuguese coast (Cunha, 1993) and in its estuaries (Cabezas et al., 1999). Although June and July 2002 had the highest ichthyoplankton abundances, a significant decrease from one month to the other was observed which may be explained by increased jellyfish abundance in July. Jellyfish are known to be important fish larvae predators and are considered important zooplankton community regulators in several ecosystems (Frank and Leggett, 1985; Schneider and Behrends, 1994). The summertime decrease in ichthyoplankton might also be linked with the end of species’ spawning periods and not just to predation impact.

Ichthyoplankton abundance in the lower and middle estuary was generally greater than in the coastal area, once the majority of species use the estuary as a preferential spawning ground, namely Pomatoschistus spp. and Engraulis encrasicolus (Reé, 1991). Furthermore, larval retention mechanisms in these estuarine areas may allow the larvae to continue to benefit from the favourable conditions that it provides.

One of the more pronounced differences between the present study and Chicharo and Teodoso (1991) was the relative abundance of Engraulis encrasicolus. We captured almost 4 and 3 times fewer eggs and larvae of E. encrasicolus, respectively. This may be due to the fact that 6 days prior to April 2002 sampling, an exceptional increase in river flow was registered, from 26 m$^3$/s to 656 m$^3$/s. River flow of only 14 m$^3$/s was registered in April 1988 (Chicharo and Teodoso, 1991), so it is reasonable to hypothesize that the high river flow registered in April 2002 may have been responsible reduced larval abundance, by promoting the advection of the larval stages away from the estuary and into the coastal area. Riverflow quantity and timing are critical components of the ecological integrity of river systems. However, current management approaches often fail to recognize that the integrity of flowing water systems depends largely on their natural dynamic character (Poff et al., 1997).

The decrease in abundance of Engraulis encrasicolus coincided with an increase in that of Pomatoschistus spp. Chicharo and Teodoso (1991) reported approximately 1.5 times more Gobidiae larvae than Engraulidiae, whereas in the present study this proportion doubled. A decrease in estuarine productivity might explain the reduced abundance of E. encrasicolus in comparison with Pomatoschistus spp., given that the latter species possesses benthonic eggs and larvae that are more highly developed and less dependent on the available food upon hatching, unlike E. encrasicolus larvae that emerge from
pelagic eggs and are planktrophic. Alterations in the amount of river flow into the estuary and adjacent coastal areas affect the concentration of nutrients, with consequences for the primary productivity and associated trophic chains (Wolanski et al., 2004). The Aswan High dam (Nile river, Egypt) is a classic example; after its construction the load of nutrients exported to the coastal area decreased more than 90%, leading to the collapse of fishing activity in the coastal area (Nixon, 2003, 2004).

Of the total fish larvae captured in the present study, 70% were from benthonic eggs; in the Mondego estuary (West Portugal) they represented up to 90% of the larvae (Ribeiro and Gonçalves, 1993), thus reflecting the success of this spawning strategy in estuaries. Nevertheless, in the Rio de la Plata estuary (North Argentina) most larvae hatch from pelagic eggs, accounting for 75% and 94% of total species number and abundance, respectively (Berasategui et al., 2004). Thus, the concept that pelagic eggs and their larvae have reduced contributions to estuarine ichthyoplanktonic communities should not be generalized (Haedrich, 1983). Truly, it is fundamental to consider that the physiography of the two estuaries is completely different. The Rio de la Plata is funnel shaped and 230 km wide at the mouth (Guerrero et al., 1997), unlike the Guadiana which has a channel shape and a maximum width of 0.55 km (Rodrigues da Costa, 1980). The Guadiana estuary should be compared with estuaries of similar size and shape, since these characteristics are highly variable and can have a decisive influence on the biological dynamics (Barnes, 1974).

4.2. Identification of the most important spawning grounds and seasons

Generally, the collected species represented two distinct groups: estuarine and coastal spawners, whose larval stages remain preferentially inside the estuary or in the coastal zone/low estuary, respectively. Most taxa were marine species, rather than true estuarine species (e.g. Pomatoschistus spp.). On the one hand, this is due to the high physiological stress that these organisms are submitted to and to the fact that estuaries are relatively recent systems from an evolutionary perspective; not enough time has elapsed for the emergence of more species adapted to the unique conditions of these ecosystems (McLusky, 1989).

Although marine ichthyoplankton constituted most of the taxa observed in the present study, the greatest fraction was represented by relatively few individuals and their presence can be explained by tidal passive transport. Usually, more species were caught in the low estuary during the high tide presumably due to the advection of marine species into the system, thus increasing the species diversity of this area.

Differences in the relative densities of Sardina pilchardus and Engraulis encrasicolus eggs allowed us to conclude that the spawning grounds of these species are different. Sardina
The larval and egg concentrations of some species were captured during all seasons (Pomatoschistus spp.) or most of the year (Engraulis encrasicolus), while others appeared during a restricted period. Thus, two main spawning periods, spring/summer and autumn/winter, were identified according to species presence and abundance. The spring/summer spawners were Arnoglossus sp., Athetina spp., Belone belone, Callionymus reticulatus, Callionymus sp., Coryphoblennius gaster, Dicentarchus sp., Diplodus spp., E. encrasicolus, Gobius niger, Hippocampus hippocampus, Mullus surmuletus, Nerophis ophidion, Parablennius gattorugine, Parablennius pilicornis, Pomatoschistus microps, Pomatoschistus minutus, Pomatoschistus pictus, Solea senegalensis, Sparidae, Syaphodus bailloni, Symphodus melops, Syngnathus abaster, Syngnathus acus Syngnathus typhle and Trigla lyra, while Ammodytes tobianus, Buglossidium luteum, Monochirus hispidus, Sardina pilchardus, Solea lasca and Solea vulgaris were classified as autumn/winter spawners.

In addition to temperature and salinity (Blaxter, 1992; Morton et al., 1996), several other parameters such as seston (Cyrus and Blaber, 1992; North and Houde, 2003), suspended organic matter, chlorophyll a and river flow (Loneragan and Bunn, 1999; Whitfield and Harrison, 2003) decisively affect spatial organization of estuarine communities (Jaureguizar et al., 2004). The start of most species’ reproduction periods coincide with periods of greater food availability, thereby ensuring greater larval development success and explaining the link between spawning dynamics and chlorophyll a and seston concentrations.

Measures of seston can be used to determine estuarine turbidity maximum (ETM) location (Herman and Heip, 1999). The ETM is commonly located in the middle estuary, near Foz de Odeleite (st. 7) (Chicharo et al., 2001). However, seston maximum values in this study were determined in the upper estuary, near Alcoutim (st. 9). Although the position of ETM varies seasonally and at short time scales due to variations in freshwater input and wind forcing (North and Houde, 2001), this indicates that the ETM was displaced upstream likely due to the reduced flow imposed during filling of the Alqueva reservoir. ETM has been identified as an important nursery area in several estuaries, such as the St. Lawrence (Winkler et al., 2003) and Chesapeake Bay (North and

---

**Table 3**

ANOSIM analysis of the factors Study area (A) and Season (B) determined for the fish eggs and larvae captured in the Guadiana estuary and adjacent coastal area from March 2002 to February 2003.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Eggs R (p)</th>
<th>Eggs Global R</th>
<th>Larvae R (p)</th>
<th>Larvae Global R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal area, low estuary</td>
<td>0.058 (1.2)</td>
<td>0.006 (32.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal area, middle estuary</td>
<td>0.455 (0.1)</td>
<td>0.123 (0.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal area, high estuary</td>
<td>0.492 (0.1)</td>
<td>0.334 (0.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low estuary, middle estuary</td>
<td>0.225 (0.1)</td>
<td>0.109 (0.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low estuary, high estuary</td>
<td>0.365 (0.4)</td>
<td>0.419 (0.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle estuary, high estuary</td>
<td>0.099 (23.4)</td>
<td>0.282 (0.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (B)                         |            |               |              |                 |
| Winter, Spring              | 0.094 (3.9)| 3.9          |              |                 |
| Winter, Summer              | 0.209 (0.1)| 0.1          |              |                 |
| Winter, Autumn              | 0.251 (0.1)| 0.1          |              |                 |
| Spring, Summer              | 0.234 (0.1)| 0.1          |              |                 |
| Spring, Autumn              | 0.412 (0.1)| 0.1          |              |                 |
| Summer, Autumn              | 0.586 (0.1)| 0.1          |              |                 |
Houde, 2003), either by providing protection from predators (Cyrus and Blaber, 1987) or due to high productivity levels (Roman et al., 2001). However, in this study, ichthyoplankton diversity and abundance was low in the ETM. Several hypothesis may explain the low observed diversity: (a) the high turbidity might constitute a feeding impediment for some species since larvae are visual predators (Houde, 1982); (b) larvae collected in this region were larger and many might have avoided the net, and (c) larvae in the ETM might have occupied deeper depths during the day than elsewhere, due to their more advanced development, which enabled them to regulate their position in the water column. The reduced abundance of eggs collected for some species characteristic of the ETM can in part be explained because they are benthonic spawners. Besides these hypotheses, annual differences in freshwater flow alter the physical and biological characteristics of the ETM region, thus affecting retention and productivity (North and Houde, 2001). This way we cannot put aside the hypothesis that the ETM zone does not constitute an important nursery area in the Guadiana estuary, as observed elsewhere.

5. Conclusions

It seems clear that river inflow played a major role in structuring the ichthyoplankton community in the Guadiana estuary and adjacent coastal area from March 2002 to February 2003. Persistent reduced inflow conditions can lead to degraded estuarine environments and loss of important nursery habitats. Moreover, sudden increase in river flow may cause the advective of fish eggs out of the system, compromising future recruitment, mainly of those species with reduced reproduction periods. Thus, it seems reasonable that the most effective way to maintain ecosystem integrity would be to follow a water management regime that mimics the natural inflow regime, reducing by as much as possible the time elapsed between the peak in precipitation and river flow.

Based on our findings new dilemmas arose that urge to be resolved. There is a clear constraint on current methodological sampling devices and strategies. Introducing different methodologies, such as light traps, will permit the collection of broader size range of larvae and facilitate the study of larval
retention strategies. Deeper insight into the importance of creeks as nursery areas is needed. But above all, it is crucial to establish a permanent monitoring program in the Guadiana estuary to assess the influence of long term river inflow variations on the ecosystem.
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