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Abstract

Life span, growth and cost of reproduction of *Illex coindetii* were examined for the first time in the southern Adriatic Sea, central Mediterranean. Age and growth were investigated through the reading of statoliths. The cost of reproduction was explored by studying the relative investment between somatic and gonad growth. The life span of *I. coindetii* was less than nine months in both sexes. Females (128-234 days) showed a longer life span than males (124-178 days). In both sexes the linear model best described the mantle length-at age data, while the exponential model provided the best fit for the total weight-at-age data. In terms of mantle length, females grew faster than males (the average growth rate was 1.33 mm day⁻¹ in females and 1.00 mm day⁻¹ in males). In terms of total weight, no significant differences were highlighted between the growth curves of males and females. Mantle length, total weight, mantle weight and fin weight increased up to the last maturity stage in both sexes. Immature and maturing individuals showed poorer body condition than mature counterparts in both sexes. Some evidence was found of a reproductive strategy that was more similar to a multiple-spawning than to a single-spawning species.
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Introduction

Squids traditionally accounts for the largest fraction (>70%) of world cephalopod capture production. Since 1996, squids landings have constantly exceeded 3 million tonnes and peaked in 2007 with about 4.3 million tonnes (about 4 million tonnes in 2012, FAO, 2014). Among squids, *Illex coindetii* (Verany 1837, Cephalopoda, Ommastrephidae) has considerable economic importance in specific areas of the Atlantic Ocean and of the Mediterranean Sea. In European Mediterranean countries such as Italy, Spain and Greece, cephalopods are high in local diets, total catch and trade (e.g. Sánchez et al., 1998; Ceriola et al., 2008; Arkhipkin et al., 2015; Jereb et al., 2015a). In the Adriatic Sea, central Mediterranean, *I. coindetii* is exploited by the fishing fleets of four countries, i.e. Albania, Croatia, Italy and Montenegro and its importance for their fisheries increased recently (Ceriola et al., 2008; Arkhipkin et al., 2015a; Jereb et al., 2015a).

Considerable work has been conducted to review current knowledge in cephalopod fisheries science, as well as to recommend future actions for scientists and cephalopod fishery managers (e.g. Pierce et al., 2005; Payne et al., 2006; Arkhipkin et al., 2015; Jereb et al., 2015b). The determination of age and growth is critical to understand the life history and reproductive strategy of harvested species, as well as to model the dynamics of their populations, both of which are essential for assessment and for fisheries management purposes. Accurate assessment and effective management depend on population models that incorporate life history parameters, such as proportion of sexual maturity at size and growth rate. Statolith analysis has proved to be one of the best tools for squid age and growth estimation in wild populations (Jackson, 1994; Arkhipkin, 2005; Villanueva et al., 2007; Ceriola & Milone, 2008). Growth studies based on direct age estimation or studies on relative investment between somatic and gonad growth are poor or still lacking in many oceanic regions and in the Mediterranean Sea (Sánchez, 1995; Arkhipkin et al., 2000; Arkhipkin & Roa-Ureta, 2005; Cavanna et al., 2008).

*I. coindetii* has shown different life history characteristics in association with geographic distribution. Larger individual size, longer life span and a relatively lower growth rate were reported for *I. coindetii* in western Mediterranean and Galician waters with respect to the population in the central Mediterranean Sea, i.e. Sicily Channel (for review see e.g. Sánchez et al., 1998; Jereb et al., 2015a). However, its life history traits have not been described in all the distribution area yet. To date, no information on the life span, growth and reproductive strategy of the Adriatic population of *I. coindetii* and of squids in general has been provided. The aim of this paper is to describe, for the first time, the growth of *I. coindetii* (Cephalopoda, Ommastrephidae) in the south Adriatic Sea on the basis of statolith analysis. The paper also aims to provide the first evidence that, in this area, the species has similar individual growth and life span
with respect to populations in the central Mediterranean Sea, but different compared to the western Mediterranean Sea and Atlantic Ocean. A preliminary description of the reproductive strategy of *I. coindetii* in the southern Adriatic Sea is also provided in this paper.

Materials and Methods

**Sampling and basic measurements**

Samples of *I. coindetii* were collected on monthly basis in 2006 from March to July (main peak of reproduction, Ceriola et al., 2006; Jereb et al., 2015a) in the port of Molfetta, Italy. Samples were taken from commercial fishing vessels which operated on daily basis (one day = one fishing trip) in the southern Adriatic Sea, central Mediterranean Sea. All the specimens were measured and dissected fresh on the day of capture at the Department of Animal Production of the University of Bari (Italy). All the individuals were sexed and assigned to a maturity stage based on Lipinski’s universal maturity scale (Lipinski, 1979). The maturity stages were treated both separately and grouped according to three functional stages, i.e. immature (stages 1 and 2), maturing (stages 3 and 4) and mature (including spent individuals). Total weight (TW), dorsal mantle length (ML), mantle weight (MW), fin weight (FW), stomach weight and digestive gland weight (DGW) were also measured. Gonad weight, as well as weights of other accessory sexual organs, were recorded for each animal. Accessory organs included testis and penis plus the spermatophoric complex (PSC) in males and ovary, oviducts, oviducal glands and nidamental glands in females. The ML and the nidamental gland length were taken at the nearest 0.1 mm. All the weights (wet weights) were taken at the nearest 0.01 g. Gonadosomatic indices (GSI) were calculated for males and females using the following equation: GSI = gonad weight / (total body weight – stomach weight) * 100, where gonad weight included testis or ovary. The relative weight of somatic and reproductive organs with respect to mantle length per specimens was also estimated.

The statoliths were removed from all specimens and stored dry after cleaning with distilled water (Ceriola & Milone, 2008). For each specimen, the presence of food in the stomach was recorded as an indication of feeding; no qualitative or quantitative measures of stomach content were provided in this paper.

**Statolith analysis and growth**

The statoliths were mounted in Crystal Bond™ thermostatic cement on a microscope slide in preparation for ageing. Statoliths were ground dry by hand on the posterior surface or, when necessary, on both the posterior and anterior surfaces along the longitudinal plane according to Ceriola & Milone (2008). To grind and polish statoliths, four lapping films with increasing grit were used in sequence: 30, 12, 3 and 0.05 μm grades. The coarsest lapping films (30 and 12 μm grades) were used for the main grinding. The remaining films (3 and 0.05 μm grades) were used to remove the scratches from the ground surfaces. Increments were counted using a Leica® high-power microscope (200-400 X) with polarized light connected to a computer monitor via a high-resolution video camera. According to previous studies on *I. coindetii*, each growth increment or ring (i.e. the sequence of a dark and light increments outside the natal ring) in the statolith section was assumed to represent one day’s growth (Arkhipkin, 1996; González et al., 1996; Sánchez et al., 1998; Arkhipkin et al., 2000; Arkhipkin & Roa-Ureta, 2005). Each statolith was counted twice. The average of the two counts was taken as the individual age in days. If the variation between the two counts was greater than 10%, a third count was taken and the average of all three counts was the estimated age in days.

The individual hatch date was back-calculated from age data: hatch date = sampling day – age in days. Based on the hatch date, all specimens were grouped into monthly cohorts. Growth curves were generated using size-at-age (TW or ML) data by sex and monthly cohort.

Several functions were fitted to the length- and weight-at-age data, including asymptotic and non-asymptotic models. The four parameters Schnute model re-parameterised according to Arkhipkin & Roa-Ureta (2005), Gompertz, linear, power and exponential models were tested to describe the form of growth of *I. coindetii* in the south Adriatic Sea (Arkhipkin, 1996; González et al., 1996; Sánchez et al., 1998; Arkhipkin et al., 2000; Arkhipkin & Roa-Ureta, 2005).

The parameters of growth curves were estimated by minimising the sum of squares logarithms (SSQ):

$$SSQ = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\ln O_i - \ln E_i)^2$$

where $O_i$ and $E_i$ are respectively the observed and estimated values.

This approach was chosen based on the assumption that variation in age-at-size usually increases along with age, especially when total weight is considered (Quinn & Deriso, 1999).

The best model selection was based on the Akaike’s information criterion (AIC). The AIC was estimated from sum of square (SSQ) function according to Burnham & Anderson (2002). In particular, the second-order AIC (AIC$_c$) was preferred, taking into account the small ratio between the sample size and the number of parameters to be estimated. The model with the smallest AIC$_c$ value was selected as the best among the models tested (Haddon, 2001). According to Burnham & Anderson (2002), the AIC$_c$ differences ($\Delta c$) were used to further verify if a model could explain the individual growth pattern. The AIC$_c$ differences were computed over all candidate models as follows: $\Delta c = \text{AIC}_c - \text{AIC}_{c_{min}}$, where $\text{AIC}_{c_{min}}$ was the
estimated AICc value for each candidate growth model \(i\) and AICcmin is the lowest AICc estimated. To quantify the plausibility of each model, given the data and the set of models, the Akaike weight \((w_i)\) was estimated according to Burnham & Anderson (2002). The Akaike weight provides an effective way to scale and interpret the \(\Delta i\) values (Katsanevakis, 2006; Grueber et al., 2011); it is considered as the weight of evidence in favour of model \(i\) being the best model currently of the available set of models.

A Student’s \(t\)-test was used to test the significance of the differences between pairs of curves (e.g. Zar, 1984; González et al., 1996; Triantafillos, 2004).

Relative growth rate \((G, \%\) of TW or ML day\(^{-1}\)) and absolute growth rate \((AGR, g\) or mm day\(^{-1}\)) were calculated by 20-day age class as follows:

\[
G = \frac{\ln R_2 - \ln R_1}{t_2 - t_1} \times 100
\]

\[
AGR = \frac{R_2 - R_1}{t_2 - t_1}
\]

where \(R_1\) and \(R_2\) are the body size (mantle length or total weight) respectively at the beginning \((t_1)\) and at the end \((t_2)\) of the time interval considered (20 days) (González et al., 1996; Triantafillos, 2004). \(G\) and AGR for every length interval were compared by \(t\)-test.

**Maturity and condition**

To study the relative investment between somatic and gonad growth, the geometric mean regression (Model II) equations for ML-MW, ML-FW, ML-DGW, ML-gonad weight were calculated separately for males and females. From these equations, the residuals were estimated for each specimen and used as size-independent measure of tissue and somatic condition (Moltschaniwskyj & Semmens, 2000; García-Berthout, 2001; Green, 2001; Pecl, 2001; McGrath Steer & Jackson, 2004; Otero et al., 2007; Ceriola & Jackson, 2010). The ML-gonad weight residuals were correlated with ML-FW residuals, ML-MW residuals, and ML-DGW residuals for each sex separately. This type of analysis can highlight possible trade-offs occurring between somatic and reproductive apparatus growth (Moltschaniwskyj & Semmens, 2000; Pecl, 2001; McGrath & Jackson, 2002; McGrath Steer & Jackson, 2004; Otero et al., 2007; Ceriola & Jackson, 2010).

**Results**

**Age and Growth**

A total of 169 individuals were sampled from March to July 2006 (83 males, 80 females and 6 too small to be sexed) and they were all successfully aged (Table 1). Growth of *I. coindetii* was rapid and the life span was less than one year in both sexes. Females were generally larger (in ML) and lived relatively longer than males. Males were heavier than females at any size. Estimates of age ranged between 124 and 178 days for males and between 128 to 234 days for females. The back calculation of hatching date revealed continuous hatching from August to January, with an increase between November and December (Fig. 1).

Owing to the lack of any growth pattern in monthly cohorts (probably related to the small number of individuals), the age data were pooled together and only the distinction between sexes was considered in the analysis. There was a relatively small scatter in the ML-at-age plot, whilst the scatter was greater in the TW-at-age plot. The linear, power and exponential models described the size-at-age data relatively well (i.e. ML-at-age and TW-at-age) for both males and females. However, in both sexes the linear and exponential models provided the best fit for the ML-at-age and TW-at-age data respectively (Figs. 2 and 3; Tables 2 and 3).

<p>| Table 1. Descriptive statistics for <em>Illex coindetii</em> (March-July 2006). ML = dorsal mantle length; TW = total weight; s.d. = standard deviation |
|---|---|---|---|---|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2006</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Unsexed</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ML (mm)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>108.2</td>
<td>129.6</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>116.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max</td>
<td>170.7</td>
<td>235.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>235.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>max</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average</td>
<td>154.8</td>
<td>166.3</td>
<td>128.3</td>
<td>159.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s.d.</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 1: Hatch date distribution of *Illex coindetii* from the south Adriatic Sea. \( N = \) number of specimens.

Fig. 2: Mantle length-at-age plots for immature (stages 1-2), maturing (stages 3-4) and mature (stages 5-6) female (a) and male (b) individuals of *Illex coindetii* from the south Adriatic Sea (March-June 2006).
Table 2. Parameter estimates and statistical response for the different models applied to the size-at-age data of *Illex coindetii* from the south Adriatic (March-July 2006). ML = dorsal mantle length; TW = total body weight; SE = standard error; CV = coefficient of variation. Bold underlined denotes the best model values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>CV</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>CV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schnute</td>
<td>$m_1$</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>239.8</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>239.8</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$g_1$</td>
<td>-2.1E-03</td>
<td>-2.5E-04</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>-2.1E-03</td>
<td>-3.7E-04</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$g_2$</td>
<td>1.380</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>1122.1</td>
<td>218.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>1122.1</td>
<td>218.8</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gompertz</td>
<td>$g_1$</td>
<td>5.2E-03</td>
<td>7.3E-04</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>5.2E-03</td>
<td>1.1E-03</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$x$</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exponential</td>
<td>$m_1$</td>
<td>19.540</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>0.183</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$g_1$</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>2.2E-03</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>0.3E-02</td>
<td>2.2E-03</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linear</td>
<td>$m_1$</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$g_1$</td>
<td>-102.7</td>
<td>-10.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>-202.0</td>
<td>-42.8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>$m_1$</td>
<td>2.3E-06</td>
<td>2.8E-07</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>2.3E-06</td>
<td>4.3E-07</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$g_1$</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G and AGR were generally greater in females than in males at all the age classes, with the exception of TW in the 160-179 day-old individuals (Fig. 4). In females, $G$ decreased with age, with the greatest values (2.81% day$^{-1}$ in ML and 6.99% day$^{-1}$ in TW) recorded in the 140-159 days age class. In terms of AGR, the greatest values for females were found in 160-179 days age class for ML (2.82 mm day$^{-1}$), and 200-219 days age class for TW (4.96 g day$^{-1}$). In males, $G$ decreased in older individuals and peaked in the 160-179 days age class in both ML (1.96% day$^{-1}$) and TW (7.92% day$^{-1}$). The AGR in ML had the maximum (2.06 mm day$^{-1}$) in 160-179 days old specimens, but in TW it peaked (3.12 g day$^{-1}$) in 180-199 days age class.

Age-at-maturity was smaller in males than in females. The youngest mature male was 158 days old (123 mm ML). The youngest mature female was 187 days old (171 mm LM). The oldest immature male and females were 178 (116 mm ML) and 195 (160.5 mm ML) days old respectively.
Table 3. Parameters for growth model selection for *Illex coindetii* from the south Adriatic (March-July 2006). N. parameters = number of parameters in the model; ML = dorsal mantle length; TW = total body weight; AIC$_c$ = second order Akaike’s information criterion; $\Delta_i$ = AIC$_c$ difference; $w_i$ = Akaike weight.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Model parameters</th>
<th>Schnute</th>
<th>Gompertz</th>
<th>Exponential</th>
<th>Linear</th>
<th>Power</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. parameters</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALES ML</td>
<td>AIC$_c$</td>
<td>-343.44</td>
<td>-340.9</td>
<td>-330.8</td>
<td>-374.7</td>
<td>-344.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\Delta_i$</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$w_i$</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALES TW</td>
<td>AIC$_c$</td>
<td>-181.34</td>
<td>-178.59</td>
<td>-187.71</td>
<td>-171.46</td>
<td>-116.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\Delta_i$</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>9.12</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16.26</td>
<td>71.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$w_i$</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALES ML</td>
<td>AIC$_c$</td>
<td>-340.62</td>
<td>-357.47</td>
<td>-357.85</td>
<td>-360.88</td>
<td>-317.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\Delta_i$</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$w_i$</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALES TW</td>
<td>AIC$_c$</td>
<td>-155.76</td>
<td>-152.76</td>
<td>-161.18</td>
<td>-141.63</td>
<td>-112.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\Delta_i$</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>19.56</td>
<td>48.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$w_i$</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3: Total weight-at-age plots for female (a) and male (b) individuals of *Illex coindetii* from the south Adriatic Sea (March-June 2006).
**Maturity and Condition**

The mantle length, total weight and relative mantle weight and fin weight increased up to stage 6 animals in both sexes, even if in males growth from stages 5 and 6 was relatively low (Figs. 5, 6). The nidamental glands, ovary and oviduct relative weight increased up to stage 5 females but decreased in stage 6. Relative weight of oviducal glands increased up to the latest maturity stage. The relative ovary weight increased from stage 3 to stage 5 (with some ovaries exceeding 20 g absolute weight) and then dropped by 95 % from stage 5 to stage 6 animals.

The absolute weight of the oviduct was relatively low in stages 3 and 4 (<1 g), but increased in stage 5 females (in some cases exceeding 3.5 g). The increase observed was due to the large number of eggs packed into the oviduct in all the stage 5 females. The absolute oviduct weight never exceeded the absolute ovary weight (maximum oviduct weight = 3.5 g, maximum ovary weight = 26.8 g in an animal of 190 mm DML). Digestive gland weight peaked in stage 4 individuals and dropped in stage 6 females.

In males, the relative weight of reproductive organs increased up to stage 5 and decreased in stage 6. The absolute testis weight exceeded 3 g in stage 5 individuals and decreased of 93 % in stage 6. The PSC weight followed the same pattern with a decrease of 98 % from stage 5 to stage 6 individuals. The relative weight of the digestive gland increased up to stage 5 individuals and dropped in stage 6 males.

The GSI increased with maturation in both sexes. The greatest values were found in females, but GSI values never exceeded 15 % (Fig. 7). The mean GSI for mature females was 7.3 % with minimum and maximum values of 1.6 and 12.2 % respectively. In mature males the mean GSI was 4.1 %, with values ranging from 2.4 % to 5.1 %.

There was a significant linear relationship between gonad weight and body size in both sexes for maturing and mature individuals (p < 0.01, significance level tested according to Pearson’s correlation coefficient) (Fig. 8). The geometric-mean (type II) regressions between ML and gonad, mantle, fin and digestive gland weight highlighted strong correlations between variables in both sexes except for the ML-DGW regression that was relatively weaker (Table 4) ($r^2 = 0.66$). There was no relationship between the ML-GW residuals and ML-MW, ML-FW, ML-DGW residuals (graphs not included). Accordingly, no trade-off between somatic organs, or digestive glands with gonad development was found. No evidence was observed that feeding ceased in maturing and mature individuals and food was found in stomachs at all the maturity stages, even if half of spent animals were found with empty stomachs. There was a positive relationship between ML-MW and ML-FW residuals in males ($n = 81, r = 0.55, p < 0.01$) and females ($n = 78, r = 0.72, p < 0.01$).
Fig. 5: Change in mean mantle length (a) and relative weight of selected organs with maturity stage for female individuals of *Illex coindetii* off the south Adriatic Sea: mantle (b); fin (c); nidamental gland (d); oviducal gland (e); oviduct (f); ovary (g); digestive gland (h). ML = dorsal mantle length; MantleW = mantle weight; FinW = NidGl W = nidamental gland weight; OvidGl W = oviducal gland weight; Oviduct W = oviduct weight; OvaryW = ovary weight; DigestGlW = Digestive gland weight.
Fig. 6: Change in mean mantle length (a) and relative weight of selected organs with maturity stage for male individuals of *Illex coindetii* off the south Adriatic Sea: mantle (b); fin (c); testis (d); other sexual apparatus (e); digestive gland (f). ML = mantle length; MantleW = mantle weight; FinW = fin weight; TestisW = testis weight; PenSperCW = penis plus spermatophoric complex weight; DigestGlW = Digestive gland weight.
Fig. 7: Gonadosomatic index (GSI) values for mantle length and maturity stages for female (a) and male (b) individuals of *Illex coindetii* in the south Adriatic Sea.

Fig. 8: Relationship between (a) ovary weight and mantle length, (b) ovary weight and total weight, (c) testis weight and mantle length and (d) testis weight and total weight for immature, maturing and mature individuals of *Illex coindetii*. Linear regression was tested for maturing and mature specimens only. *r* = Pearson’s correlation coefficient (bold underlined *r*, denote significance at 0.01).
Discussion

Age and growth

This study provides the first description of the life history and growth of *Illex coindetii* in the Adriatic Sea contributing to the knowledge on the biology of this species. In a previous study on *I. coindetii*, Ceriola et al. (2006) found individual size and size-at-maturity smaller in the southern Adriatic Sea with respect to the Galician waters and Catalan Sea, but comparable to the Sicily Channel and central Tyrrenian Sea (Jereb & Ragonese, 1995; González et al., 1996; Sánchez et al., 1998; Arkhipkin et al., 2000; Gentiloni et al., 2001). In further work on the south Adriatic *I. coindetii* population, a decrease in the average individual size from 1996 to 2004 was found, suggesting that this species was adapting to local “environmental” conditions by progressively shortening the life span and increasing growth rate (Ceriola et al., 2007). This study confirms that *I. coindetii* in the southern Adriatic Sea has a comparable life span (< 9 months) to the Sicily Channel (Arkhipkin et al., 2000), but lives less and grows faster than in the north western Mediterranean Sea (12-18 months, Sánchez, 1995) and in the Galician waters (13-15 months, González et al., 1996). These findings agree with the positive relationship found between life span and latitude in oegopsin squids reported by Arkhipkin (2004). The recorded differences in life span are reflected in terms of individual size. In spite of the faster growth rate, *I. coindetii* in the Adriatic Sea is considerably smaller and matures earlier than in Galician waters (maximum size 390 mm ML for females and 279 mm ML for males) and in western Mediterranean areas (Sánchez et al., 1998; Relini et al., 1999; Arkhipkin et al., 2000; Gentiloni et al., 2001; Ceriola et al., 2006). The local environmental conditions (including sea water temperature and fishery exploitation) and the high plasticity in growth and maturation are likely to be the main causes of the differences between the populations of *I. coindetii* described. Sea water surface temperature (SST) is generally lower during the spawning/hatching peak of *I. coindetii* (May-July period, for review see Sánchez et al., 1998) in the Catalan Sea (2001-2007, SST range 18.3-19.4°C, average SST = 19.1°C) and Galician waters (2001-2007, SST range 15.1-17.0°C, average SST = 15.9°C) with respect to the south Adriatic Sea (2001-2007, SST range 22.0-24.1°C, average SST = 22.6°C) (monthly data on the sea surface temperature through the POET interactive on-line system, http://podaac.jpl.nasa.gov). Warmer water generally induces a faster growth rate in squids and in *I. coindetii* leads to populations with a shorter life span and smaller adult size (Arkhipkin, 1996; González et al., 1996; Sánchez et al., 1998; Arkhipkin et al., 2000; Ragonese et al., 2002; Forsythe, 2004). Pecl & Jackson (2008) provided some evidences that warm-water squids would have smaller hatchlings with a shorter life span and smaller adult size (Arkhipkin, 1996; González et al., 1996; Sánchez et al., 1998; Arkhipkin et al., 2000; Ragonese et al., 2002; Forsythe, 2004). In terms of growth, the linear model for mantle length-at-age and the exponential model for total weight-at-age provided the best fit to the data. However, in none of the four cases considered (i.e. ML- TW-at age data for males and females) the best model was strongly supported as a ‘clear winner’ (with $w_i > 90\%$). In each case, there was at least one additional model that was also supported by the data. Linear growth for mantle length-at-age data was reported for *I. coindetii* in the Galician waters (González et al., 2000; Ragonese et al., 2002; Forsythe, 2004).
et al., 1996) and in the Tyrrhenian Sea (Cavanna et al., 2008). However, in Galician waters the power model best described the weight-at-age data (González et al., 1996). Asymptotic functions were also used to describe growth in I. coindetii (Ragonese et al., 2002; Arkhipkin & Roa-Ureta, 2005) and the identification of the form of growth in this species and in teuthoids in general is still an actively debated matter (e.g. Guerra et al., 2010).

By comparing the growth between sexes, females I. coindetii generally showed faster growth rate and longer life span than males (González et al., 1996; Sánchez et al., 1998; Arkhipkin et al., 2000). This feature was confirmed also in the southern Adriatic Sea in terms of ML-at-age, but was less evident in terms of TW-at-age. Moreover, weight of females increased faster towards the end of life. The morphometric changes occurring during the gonad maturation induce a positive length-weight relationship allometric in males and isometric in females (Belcari, 1996; Ceriola et al., 2006). These changes are probably reflected in the size-at-age data and affect the growth in weight of old and mature individuals of the two sexes.

The back calculation of the hatch date revealed continuous spawning for I. coindetii in the south Adriatic during autumn and winter, with an increase between November and December. These findings, together with those reported by C. lei (2006) on the spawning of I. coindetii in the same region (i.e. continuous spawning in spring and summer with a considerable peak during spring), indicate year-round spawning with peaks in spring and late autumn. This behaviour confirms for the southern Adriatic Sea, a feature already described in other regions (see e.g. Relini et al., 1999; Sánchez et al., 1998; Arkhipkin et al., 2015; Jereb et al., 2015a). Taking into account the data on age-at-maturity of both sexes, the ‘reproductive’ period of I. coindetii (including maturation and spawning) covers approximately the final third of the entire life span, as already observed in previous works on this species (González & Guerra, 1996; González et al., 1996).

Maturity and Condition

In agreement with the bias arising from the relatively low number of specimens sampled, only preliminary information on the reproductive strategy of I. coindetii in south Adriatic Sea is given. Jackson & Mladenov (1994) suggested that there is likely a continuum of reproductive strategies among cephalopods from single spawning to multiple spawning species. Rocha et al. (2001) described I. coindetii as an intermittent terminal spawning species, with behaviour more similar to a multiple than to a single spawning species. Although preliminary, the results of this study agree with the conclusions of Rocha et al. (2001). Males and females of I. coindetii displayed a regression in testis and ovary-oviduct weight in the latest maturity stage, whilst the growth of other somatic and, in females, reproductive organs continued. In mature females of terminal spawning squids, the oviduct/s exceeds the ovary weight before spawning and GSI values reach 50% (Harman et al., 1989; Ikeda et al., 1993; Moltschaniwskyj, 1995; Pecil, 2001; McGrath & Jackson, 2002; Jackson et al., 2004). In I. coindetii specimens examined in this study, the oviduct weight never exceeded the ovary weight and GSI values were also relatively low in both sexes.

The increase in mantle, fin and gonad weight suggests that in I. coindetii there is no transfer of energy from the mantle or fins to support the maturation process (e.g. Moltschaniwskyj & Semmens, 2000; Semmens, 2002). Furthermore, the lack of correlation between digestive gland weight and gonad weight suggests that lipid reserves are not directly diverted from this organ to fuel the gonad maturation process. These preliminary results agree with the findings of Rosa et al. (2005) that I. coindetii takes energy for egg production directly from food. Overall, the information outlined in this study, although not conclusive, contributes to improving knowledge on the biology of I. coindetii, thus adding a further piece to the information necessary to plan management for multispecies demersal fisheries in the Adriatic Sea.
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