

Inferring physiological energetics of loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*) from existing data using a general metabolic theory

Nina Marn^{a,*}, S.A.L.M. Kooijman^b, Marko Jusup^{c,**}, Tarzan Legović^a, Tin Klanjšček^a

^a*Rudjer Bošković Institute*

Bijenička cesta 54, HR-10002 Zagreb, Croatia

^b*Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam*

De Boelelaan 1105, 1081 HV Amsterdam, Netherlands

^c*Center of Mathematics for Social Creativity, Hokkaido University
12-7 Kita Ward, Sapporo 060-0812, Japan*

Abstract

Loggerhead turtle is an endangered sea turtle species with a migratory lifestyle and worldwide distribution, experiencing markedly different habitats throughout its lifetime. Environmental conditions, especially food availability and temperature, constrain the acquisition and the use of available energy, thus affecting physiological processes such as growth, maturation, and reproduction. These physiological processes at the population level determine survival, fecundity, and ultimately the population growth rate—a key indicator of the success of conservation efforts. As a first step towards the comprehensive understanding of how environment shapes the physiology and the life cycle of a loggerhead turtle, we constructed a full life cycle model based on the principles of energy acquisition and utilization embedded in the Dynamic Energy Budget (DEB) theory. We adapted the standard DEB model using data from published and unpublished sources to obtain parameter estimates and model predictions that could be compared with data. The outcome was a successful mathematical description of ontogeny and life history traits of the loggerhead turtle. Some deviations between the model and the data existed (such as an earlier age at sexual maturity and faster growth of the

*nina.marn@gmail.com

**mjusup@gmail.com

post-hatchlings), yet probable causes for these deviations were found informative and discussed in great detail. Physiological traits such as the capacity to withstand starvation, trade-offs between reproduction and growth, and changes in the energy budget throughout the ontogeny were inferred from the model. The results offer new insights into physiology and ecology of loggerhead turtle with the potential to lead to novel approaches in conservation of this endangered species.

Keywords: life cycle model, DEB theory, loggerhead turtle, Dynamic Energy Budget

1. Introduction

Seven known species of sea turtles currently inhabit the world's oceans. All seven are listed in the IUCN list of endangered species [1] and face various threats despite conservation measures [2]. The conservation of sea turtles is complicated by a lack of understanding of their physiology and ecology, and by a long and complex life cycle, spanning multiple habitats over a wide geographical range [3]. Metabolic processes such as growth, maturation, and reproduction are key physiological and ecological determinants, the understanding of which is also crucial for conservation efforts. These processes are influenced by genetics [4], but also by environmental conditions, such as food availability and temperature [5, 6], that constrain the acquisition and use of energy. A way to better understand the physiology and ecology of a species is to reconstruct its energy budget using the principles of a general metabolic theory (e.g. [7, 8, 9]). Indeed, the need for an energy budget approach in the research of sea turtles was identified almost a decade ago [10].

Focusing on the loggerhead turtle and one of its largest nesting aggregations, the North Atlantic population [11], we aim to reconstruct the energy budget of this species from existing data. We begin with a brief overview of loggerhead turtle physiology and ecology. Next we explain the methodology used to develop the full life cycle model, and list the data sets used in parameter estimation. By estimating the parameter values, we establish a mapping between existing data and the loggerhead turtle energy budget. We analyze the validity of the mapping, and discuss physiological and ecological implications of the reconstructed energy budget.

25 1.1. *The loggerhead turtle*

26 Three aspects of the loggerhead turtle’s physiology and ecology impede
27 conservation efforts. These three impeding aspects are (i) a geographically
28 wide species distribution, (ii) long and complex ontogenetic development,
29 and (iii) late and variable reproductive output.

30 Loggerhead sea turtle is a migratory species with global distribution
31 throughout the temperate zone [1]. Individuals of this species occupy habi-
32 tats ranging from cold and nutrient-sparse oceanic zones to warm and food-
33 rich neritic zones, where some of the habitat variability is related to an
34 ontogenetic shift [12, 13] with important implications for the energy budget.
35 Furthermore, the wide distribution of loggerhead turtles means that popula-
36 tions such as the North Atlantic one span multiple jurisdictions and legislative
37 systems with different conservation targets, methods, and ultimately success
38 [3].

39 The ontogenetic development of loggerhead turtles exhibits numerous fas-
40 cinating characteristics. The sex of embryos is determined by nest tempera-
41 ture in the second third of the embryonic development [14, 15]. Throughout
42 its ontogeny, from hatching to ultimate size, an average loggerhead turtle
43 increases almost 25-fold in length, and 6500-fold in body mass. Straight
44 carapace length at hatching is 4-5 cm, while body mass is around 20 g [14].
45 By contrast, adults range between 90-130 cm straight carapace length and
46 between 100-130 kg body mass [14, 16].

47 The average female needs 10-30 years to reach puberty [17, 18]. Repro-
48 ducing every 2-3 years, females lay 4-5 clutches of over a hundred eggs each
49 [19, 20]. The reproduction rate was found to correlate with the average sea
50 surface temperature [21, 22], as well as the large scale environmental oscilla-
51 tions [23].

52 2. **Methods**

53 2.1. *Full life cycle model of the loggerhead turtle*

54 We use the Dynamic Energy Budget (DEB) theory [24, 25, 26] to model
55 the full life cycle of loggerhead turtles. By relying on DEB theory, we ensure
56 that our model is thermodynamically consistent, meaning that the conser-
57 vation laws of mass and energy are strictly observed. Modeled loggerhead
58 turtles also obey several homeostasis rules as a way of coping with sud-
59 den, unfavorable changes in the environment, especially in food availability.
60 Metabolic rates (e.g., food assimilation, somatic maintenance, etc.) follow

61 from scaling assumptions (concise statements of these assumptions are found
62 below) appended with the kappa rule for allocation to soma [24, 27]. The
63 essence of the kappa rule is that energy is divided at a fixed fraction between
64 soma and the reproductive cells. DEB model furthermore accounts for em-
65 bryonic development, where turtle eggs start as blobs of energy received from
66 mothers. This initial energy reserve is used by the embryo to start building
67 structure and to mature enough in order to begin feeding on an outside en-
68 ergy source. The basic model prescribes the rate at which mothers commit
69 energy to reproduction. We make a step forward and convert this energy
70 into the number of eggs as if they were produced in a continuous manner.
71 Modeling the timing and the duration of reproductive seasons is also possible
72 by means of species- or population-specific rules for handling the storage of
73 energy between reproductive seasons and the conversion of stored energy into
74 eggs during one such season.

75 Free ranging animals owe their mobility in large part to a better homeo-
76 static regulation [28, 29], which in turn simplifies their energy budgets. Ac-
77 cordingly, in describing the full life-cycle of loggerhead turtles, we used the
78 least complex DEB formulation called the standard DEB model [24, 25, 26].
79 In this model, the state of a turtle is captured by three state variables:
80 reserve, E (energy in joules, J), structure, L (length in centimeters, cm),
81 and maturity, E_H (J). Reserve is a maintenance-free energy buffer between
82 the environment and the turtle that quantifies metabolic memory. Energy
83 in reserve is readily mobilized to power metabolic processes. Structure, by
84 contrast, is built and maintained using energy mobilized from reserve. Fi-
85 nally, maturity is a maintenance requiring quantity that does not contribute
86 to body mass. It is quantified as energy that was cumulatively invested in
87 maturation (preparation for the adult stage). Maturity controls metabolic
88 switching (e.g., the onset of first feeding or the onset of reproduction) and,
89 analogous to structure, is maintained with energy mobilized from reserve.

90 If sufficient food is available in the environment, all three state variables
91 are increasing functions of age, yet maturity is assumed to remain constant
92 upon reaching the adult stage. In this stage, energy previously used for
93 maturation is redirected to reproduction. Some organisms reproduce inter-
94 mittently, implying that energy is stored in a reproduction buffer. The state
95 of the reproduction buffer is tracked using an auxiliary variable denoted E_R .

96 Dynamics of the state variables are determined by energy flows denoted




Figure 1: **A schematic representation of the standard DEB model describing a sea turtle:** Three state variables are reserve (E), structure (L), and maturity (E_H). An auxiliary variable is needed to track the state of the reproductive buffer. Metabolic energy flows are: \dot{p}_A –assimilation, \dot{p}_C –mobilization, \dot{p}_M –somatic maintenance, \dot{p}_G –growth, \dot{p}_R –maturation/reproduction, and \dot{p}_J –maturity maintenance. The circles indicate metabolic switches that occur when a certain level of maturity is reached: the onset of feeding when $E_H = E_H^b$ (red circle), and the onset of reproduction when $E_H = E_H^p$ (yellow circle). Detailed definitions of these concepts are given in the main text.

97 universally \dot{p}_* (unit J d^{-1} ; Figure 1):

$$\frac{dE}{dt} = \dot{p}_A - \dot{p}_C, \quad (1a)$$

$$\frac{dL}{dt} = \frac{1}{3L^2} \frac{\dot{p}_G}{[E_G]}, \quad (1b)$$

$$\frac{dE_H}{dt} = \begin{cases} \dot{p}_R, & \text{if } E_H < E_H^p, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (1c)$$

100 where $[E_G]$ (unit J cm^{-3}) is the volume-specific cost of structure, and E_H^p is
 101 maturity at puberty marking the beginning of the adult stage. In this stage,
 102 we replace Eq. (1c) with $\frac{dE_R}{dt} = \dot{p}_R$.

103 Energy flows appearing in the system of Eqs. (1) are defined as follows:

104 **Assimilation**, $\dot{p}_A = \{\dot{p}_{Am}\}fL^2$, is the fraction of the daily feed ration that
 105 gets fixed into reserve, where $\{\dot{p}_{Am}\}$ (unit $\text{J cm}^{-2} \text{d}^{-1}$) is the surface
 106 area-specific maximum assimilation rate and f is the scaled functional
 107 response equivalent to the ratio of the actual and the maximum feeding
 108 rate of an individual. The scaled functional response quantifies food
 109 availability (i.e., $f = 1$ under unlimited food availability and $f = 0$
 110 when food is unavailable) and in many cases can be written as

$$f = \frac{x}{1 + x}, \quad (2)$$

111 with x being the food density scaled by the half-saturation constant of
 112 the type-II saturating function (see p. 32 of [24] for details).

113 **Mobilization**, $\dot{p}_C = E(\dot{v}/L - \dot{r})$, is the flow of energy mobilized from reserve
 114 to power metabolic processes, where parameter \dot{v} (unit d^{-1}) is the
 115 energy conductance and, for $[E] = E/L^3$, the specific growth rate is

$$\dot{r} = \frac{[E]\dot{v}/L - [\dot{p}_M]/\kappa}{[E] + [E_G]/\kappa}. \quad (3)$$

116 Here, $[\dot{p}_M]$ (unit $\text{J cm}^{-3} \text{d}^{-1}$) is the volume-specific somatic maintenance
 117 rate. Mobilized reserve is partitioned according to the κ -rule: fixed
 118 fraction κ is allocated to satisfy the organism's somatic needs (somatic
 119 maintenance and growth), whereas the rest is allocated to maturity
 120 maintenance and maturation (before puberty) or reproduction (after
 121 puberty).

122 **Somatic maintenance**, $\dot{p}_M = [\dot{p}_M]L^3$ is the flow of mobilized reserve en-
 123 ergy needed to maintain the structure of given size L^3 .

124 **Growth**, $\dot{p}_G = \kappa\dot{p}_C - \dot{p}_M$, is the flow of mobilized reserve energy invested
 125 into the increase of structure after satisfying the somatic maintenance
 126 needs.

127 **Maturation**, $\dot{p}_R = (1 - \kappa)\dot{p}_C - \dot{p}_J$, is the flow of mobilized reserve energy
 128 towards increasing the level of maturity (E_H), after satisfying the ma-
 129 turity maintenance, \dot{p}_J .

130 **Maturity maintenance**, $\dot{p}_J = \dot{k}_J E_H$, $E_H \leq E_H^p$, is a flow (analogous to
 131 somatic maintenance) that quantifies the mobilized reserve energy nec-
 132 essary to maintain the current level of maturity. Parameter \dot{k}_J (unit
 133 d^{-1}) is called the maturity maintenance rate coefficient. At the onset
 134 of the adult stage when the level of maturity reaches E_H^p , the organism
 135 starts to invest energy into reproduction instead of maturation. Hence,
 136 reproduction starts and maturity stops increasing.

137 All model parameters are conveniently summarized in Table 1.

138 Reserve and structure are abstract state variables that can be linked to
 139 commonly measured quantities such as length or body mass. A measurable
 140 length of a turtle, e.g., straight carapace length (SCL, L_{SCL}), is related to the
 141 structural length (L) by the shape factor (δ_M):

$$L_{SCL} = \frac{L}{\delta_M}. \quad (4)$$

142 Body mass includes contributions from both reserve and structure (assumed
 143 here to have the same specific density, $d_V = d_E$). The contribution of reserve,
 144 in particular, is dependent on food availability f . We have:

$$W = L^3(1 + f\omega), \quad (5)$$

145 where $\omega \propto \{\dot{p}_{Am}\}/\dot{v}$ quantifies how much reserve contributes to body mass at
 146 $f = 1$. In an adult (female) loggerhead turtle, the reproduction buffer (E_R)
 147 also plays a role in determining body mass [30]. However, the dynamics of this
 148 buffer were neglected because our interest lies with the overall investment of
 149 energy into reproduction rather than the detailed modeling of a reproductive
 150 season (e.g., timing and duration).

151 For the model to capture the whole life-cycle, we need the number of eggs
 152 produced by an adult individual. In DEB, the reproductive flow is equal to
 153 the surplus energy from flow $(1 - \kappa)\dot{p}_C$ after maturity maintenance of an
 154 adult, $\dot{k}_J E_H^p$, has been met:

$$\dot{p}_R = (1 - \kappa)\dot{p}_C - \dot{k}_J E_H^p. \quad (6)$$

155 Equation (6) quantifies the investment of mother's energy reserve into the
 156 egg production. The instantaneous reproductive output (measured in the
 157 number of eggs per unit of time) is, then, $\dot{R} = \kappa_R \dot{p}_R / E_0$, where E_0 is the
 158 initial energy reserve of an egg and κ_R is the conversion efficiency of mother's

159 reserve into offspring's reserve. Generally sea turtles produce eggs in clutches
 160 rather than continuously, and there is a trade off between clutch mass and
 161 clutch frequency [20, 30, 31]. Evolutionary constraints such as increased
 162 risks related to the nesting habitat [31, 13], mass and resource limitations,
 163 and/or metabolic heating producing excess heat that could be lethal for
 164 embryos [32, 33] all influence the clutch frequency and size. Furthermore,
 165 loggerhead turtles nesting for the first time (generally of smaller body size)
 166 produce on average half the number of clutches than those turtles that had
 167 nested previously [34]. These factors are important when energy allocated
 168 to reproduction is converted into the number of eggs per clutch (a necessity
 169 due to data availability), but do not affect the estimation of the amount of
 170 allocated energy nor the processes defining the energy budget.

171 2.2. Data used

172 Data on the loggerhead turtle is scarce and data sets are disjointed, mean-
 173 ing that studies do not share focus and methodologies can widely differ. The
 174 mechanistic nature of DEB, however, makes the assimilation of a wide vari-
 175 ety of disjointed data types possible. Accordingly, much of the existing
 176 (published and unpublished) data could be used (Table 2). Additional in-
 177 formation required to complete the whole life cycle has been incorporated in
 178 the model through simplifications, calculations, and/or assumptions:

- 179 • Length and body mass at puberty were calculated as the mean values
 180 of the low end of the reported size ranges for nesting females.
- 181 • The ultimate length and the ultimate body mass were calculated as
 182 the mean values of the high end of the reported size ranges for nesting
 183 females.
- 184 • Age at puberty was indirectly assumed to be equivalent to the age at
 185 first nesting and, as the age of wild nesting females is generally not
 186 known, a conservative estimate of 28 years [35, 36, 37] was used.
- 187 • Reproduction rate (R_i) was assumed to be continuous (in eggs per day),
 188 rather than pulsed as in nature. This did not affect the energy balance
 189 because the total energy commitment remained the same.
- 190 • The clutch size as a function of length was calculated by assuming that:
 191 (i) the number of nests per season is the same (four) for sea turtles of all
 192 sizes (and ages); and (ii) there are no constraints on the clutch size, i.e.,
 193 the clutch size is determined solely by how much energy was committed
 194 to reproduction by a nesting turtle between two reproductive seasons
 195 that are two years apart.

- 196 • The initial energy content of the egg (E_0) was assumed to be the same
197 as in green turtle eggs [38].
- 198 • The environmental (sea) temperature was assumed to be 21° C for all
199 data relating to wild individuals, based on the average sea temperature
200 experienced by loggerhead turtles [39]. The adults experience a higher
201 temperature (23° C) during the nesting season [34]
- 202 • Food level was assumed to be constant, with the value approximated
203 from the average observed ultimate size (see Table 2) and the largest
204 observed nesting female (130 cm SCL, [16]), assuming that the ratio of
205 the two lengths corresponds to the scaled functional response, f , in
206 Eq. (2).

207 3. Results

208 3.1. Model parameters and the goodness of fit

209 The estimated parameter values, listed in Table 1, provide a good fit be-
210 tween the data and the model outputs (Table 2; Figs. 2–5). In particular,
211 life history traits such as age and length at birth, and length at maturity,
212 are nicely reproduced by the model (Table 2). Growth curves and the rela-
213 tionship between body mass and length (Figures 3 and 4), as well as the
214 relationship of clutch size to length (Figure 5) and the duration of incubation
215 as a function of temperature (Figure 2) all agree with the data as discussed
216 in more detail below.

217 Nevertheless, some traits in columns two and three of Table 2, especially
218 the age at puberty, show apparent discord with the observations. According
219 to the model outputs, loggerhead turtles become sexually mature at around
220 14 years of age, corresponding to about 76 cm SCL and 62 kg body mass.
221 This may be because (i) the investment into reproduction precedes the first
222 nesting and (ii) observing the exact moment at which the investment into
223 reproduction starts is exceedingly difficult. In other words, the result is an
224 underestimate compared to the observations deduced from size at the first
225 reproductive event (28 years, 80 cm SCL, and 79 kg [17, 37, 40, 36]), yet it *is*
226 consistent with age at puberty deduced from morphology and behavior [18,
227 41, 42, 43]. Other (slightly) underestimated quantities describe the ultimate
228 size—96.4 cm SCL and 122.8 kg compared to observed 105.3 cm SCL and
229 162.6 kg.

230 Two problems arise in the context of comparisons that focus on size.
231 First, the model estimates of body mass omit the mass of the reproduction

buffer (see eq. (5)) because we assumed continuous reproduction, thus ignoring the fact that some energy (and thus mass) is stored in the reproduction buffer between two reproductive seasons. It is interesting that the cumulative (annual) wet mass of clutches produced by a turtle of 100 kg can be as much as 10 kg [30]. Accounting for this mass of the reproduction buffer would considerably decrease the current mismatch in mass between the model output and the observed values. Second, the average *ultimate* size used for parameter estimation was calculated using the high end of the reported size range from several studies. Extreme-sized individuals (that experience the best feeding conditions or that are genetically predisposed to grow large) may be introducing a bias that has a much more pronounced effect than it would have if more adults had been used for calculating the value. It is therefore encouraging that the model outputs are close to the observed average length of nesting females (92.4 cm SCL, calculated from values in [16, 44, 45]) and the average body mass of adults (116.4 kg [44]).

Model prediction of the incubation duration as a function of incubation temperature is quite satisfactory (Figure 2). The overall trend is correct, yet there is a small systematic bias towards the low end of the observed values. This bias suggests that although temperature explains most of the variation in the incubation duration, other factors may play an important role. Beach sand compactness and grain size, humidity, salinity of water around the nest, number of eggs in a clutch, and gas exchange of the eggs affect the incubation of loggerhead turtles as well [46, 47, 48, 49, 50], and may have to be taken into account when deducing the sex of embryos from incubation duration (e.g., [51]). In addition, metabolic heating active during the last third of the embryonic development [15, 32] could be accelerating growth and maturation (“T-acceleration”, see [52]), effectively resulting in earlier hatching and birth, and smaller than estimated size. By contrast, the previously mentioned environmental factors such as decreased respiratory gas exchange, could be prolonging the incubation [50]. The model underestimation, therefore, suggests that factors prolonging the incubation outweigh those that shorten it.

Predicted growth curves—i.e., length and body mass as the functions of age—and the resulting relationship of body mass and length are shown in Figure 3 for post-hatchlings and in Figure 4 for juveniles and adults. The carapace length estimated for *post-hatchlings* up to 65 days after birth fits the data rather well, except for a slight discrepancy for the first 10-20 days after birth. Predicted body mass during the same period fits the data even bet-

ter, showing almost no discernible discrepancies. These two results suggest that the model-generated relationship between body mass and length should underestimate the data somewhat at small carapace lengths (confirmed in lower panel of Figure 3). Both the predicted carapace length and body mass of *juveniles and adults* as functions of age produce satisfactory fits over the entire period for which the data were available (Figure 4). Consequently, the relationship between body mass and length over the whole size range of juvenile and adult body sizes is in excellent agreement with the data.

Predicted reproductive output as a function of length is nearly a straight line, a result compatible with the data in Figure 5, yet the intercept and the slope of this line are respectively too low and too high. Consequently, the model predicts clutch sizes of < 50 eggs for the smallest adults and > 150 eggs for the largest adults, both of which are rarely observed in nature [47]. The predicted clutch size resulted from the conversion of energy allocated to reproduction into the clutch size—a step influenced by our assumptions on the reproductive output (see Section 2.2). However, this conversion step did not affect the prediction for the energy invested into reproduction, which is in excellent agreement with observations. The energy content of a loggerhead turtle egg is between 260 kJ and 165 kJ [38]. The predicted energy value of an egg (≈ 210 kJ) is very close to the value used for parameter estimation (2, see also [38]). Combining this value with the estimated daily energy flow to reproduction (\dot{p}_R) of 171.34 kJ d^{-1} at 21°C [39], we obtain that a fully grown loggerhead turtle is capable of storing on a daily bases the amount of energy needed to build approximately one egg. If we further take the period of two years between two consecutive nesting seasons, the implication is that a fully grown (95 cm SCL) loggerhead turtle produces ≈ 595 eggs per nesting season—an equivalent of 5 clutches with 119 eggs each or 4 clutches with 148 eggs each, thus matching observations [34, 53, 38].

3.2. Determinants of body and energy reserve sizes

Body and energy reserve sizes are among the most important ecological parameters. Species body size, for example, positively correlates with survival [69, 70, 71] that, alongside fecundity, controls the population growth rate. The maximum structural length of loggerhead turtles, L_m , is achieved for $f = 1$ and given by equation

$$L_m = \kappa \{ \dot{p}_{Am} \} / [\dot{p}_M]. \quad (7)$$

Table 1: List of primary and auxiliary parameters for the North Atlantic loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*) estimated using the covariation method [27] (unless specified differently). An additional shape parameter δ_{CL} was used for the data where the type of length measurement had not been specified [54, 55]. (Preliminary) parameter values for two other sea turtles in the add_my_pet library are given for comparison: Kemp's ridley (*Lepidochelys kempii*) [56], and leatherback turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*) [57]. Typical values for a generalized animal with maximum length $L_m = zL_m^{ref}$ (for a dimensionless zoom factor z and $L_m^{ref} = 1$ cm), can be found in [24], Table 8.1, p. 300 and [27]. All rates are given at reference temperature $T_{ref} = 273$ K, and food availability $f = 0.81$. Primary and auxiliary parameters for which the default values were used are listed below the table. Notation: symbols marked with square brackets, $[]$, indicate that the parameter relates to structural volume (volume specific parameter), and symbols marked with curly brackets, $\{ \}$, indicate that the parameter relates to structural surface area (surface area specific parameter). More details are available in Lika et al. [27], and the online DEB notation document www.bio.vu.nl/thb/deb/deblab/.

Parameter	Symbol	<i>C. caretta</i>	<i>L. kempii</i>	<i>D. coriacea</i>	Unit
Maximum specific assimilation rate	$\{\dot{p}_{Am}\}$	906.1 ^a	728.426	1191.41	J d ⁻¹ cm ⁻²
Digestion efficiency (of food to reserve)	κ_X	0.8 ^b	0.8	0.206503	-
Energy conductance	\dot{v}	0.07084	0.0424	0.0865	cm d ⁻¹
Allocation fraction to soma	κ	0.6481	0.6929	0.9166	-
Volume-specific somatic maintenance	$[\dot{p}_M]$	13.25	20.1739	21.178	J d ⁻¹ cm ⁻³
Specific cost for structure	$[E_G]$	7847	7840.77	7843.18	J cm ⁻³
Maturity at birth	E_H^b	3.809e+04	1.324e+04	7.550e+03	J
Maturity at puberty	E_H^p	8.73e+07	3.648e+07	8.251e+07	J
Weibull aging acceleration	\dot{h}_a	1.85e-10	1.421e-09	1.939e-09	d ⁻²
Arrhenius temperature	T_A	7000 ^c	8000	8000	K
Shape coefficient	δ_M	0.3744	0.3629	0.3397	-
Shape coefficient	δ_{CL}	0.3085			-
Density of structure and reserve	$d_V = d_E$	0.28 ^d	0.3	0.3	-

^a Indirectly estimated primary parameter, $\{\dot{p}_{Am}\} = L_m^{ref} z [\dot{p}_M] / \kappa$, using the estimated value of $z = 44.32$ for loggerhead turtles. *L. kempii*: $z = 25.02$, *D. coriacea*: $z = 51.57$. ^b Standard value [24], same value assumed in [58]. ^c Estimated independently by direct fitting to the data on incubation duration vs. incubation temperature published in [59], [60], and [61]. ^d Value from [62].

Other primary and auxiliary parameters: Maximum searching rate, $\{\dot{F}_m\} = 6.51$ d⁻¹ cm⁻²; Defaecation efficiency (of food to faeces), $\kappa_P = 0.1$; Reproduction efficiency, $\kappa_R = 0.95$; Maturity maintenance rate coefficient, $\dot{k}_J = 0.002$ d⁻¹; Gompertz stress coefficient, $\dot{k}_G = 0.0001$

Table 2: Comparison between observations and model predictions, at the temperature that had been used for the corresponding zero-variate data (see the Section 2.2 for details), and the assumed scaled functional response $f = 0.81$. Values used as zero-variate data are listed in the fifth column of the table, with the corresponding relative error ('Rel. err.') of the predictions provided in the seventh column.

Data	Predicted	Observed range	Value used	Unit	Rel. err. (%)	Reference
age at birth ^a	52.51	47-60	57.40	d	8.53	[59, 46]
age at puberty	14.17	19-30	28.00	yr	49.39	[35, 36, 37]
life span	66.69	>65	67.00	yr	0.46	[40, 63]
SCL at birth	5.56	3.9-5.06	4.50	cm	23.57	[36, 55, 64]
SCL at puberty	76.75	76.8-84	80.00	cm	4.06	[45, 44, 16, 65, 19]
ultimate SCL	96.35	98-110	105.26	cm	8.46	[45, 44, 16, 65, 19]
wet mass at birth	23.62	14-24	19.41	g	21.71	[66, 59]
wet mass at puberty	62.08	75-89.7	79.00	kg	21.42	[16, 65]
ultimate wet mass	122.82	148.9-180.7	162.62	kg	24.47	[44, 65]
initial energy content of the egg	209.64	165-260	210.00	kJ	00.17	[38]
maximum reproduction rate ^b	0.8556	0.3452-0.8630	0.7671	egg/d	11.53	[47, 34]

^a Birth in DEB theory denotes the moment when an individual stops relying on embryonic energy reserves and starts feeding, so age at birth was calculated by summing the average incubation duration ([59, 46]), days between exiting the egg shell and exiting the nest ([46]), and days between exiting the nest and the onset of feeding (Stokes, pers.comm).

^b Maximum reproduction rate was expressed as eggs per day using the number of eggs per clutch (assumed to be 140 on average), the number of clutches per nesting season, and the number of nesting seasons per year (an inverse of the remigration interval). Note that 4 clutches every 2 years, and 5 clutches every 2.5 years yield the same value of the maximum reproduction rate. The maximum reproduction rate was then calculated as $R_i = 4 \times 140 / (2.5 \times 365) = 0.7671$.




Figure 2: Model predictions for the duration of incubation as a function of incubation temperature. Data source: [59]; number of data points $N = 61$.

L_m is determined by three parameters: allocation fraction to soma $\kappa = 0.6481$, maximum surface-area specific assimilation rate $\{\dot{p}_{Am}\} = 906.1 \text{ J d}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-2}$, and the maximum volume-specific maintenance rate $[\dot{p}_M] = 13.25 \text{ J d}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-3}$. Based on equation 7, we see that assimilation (proportional to $\{\dot{p}_{Am}\}$) is energy input acting to increase size (and likely survival), while maintenance (proportional to $[\dot{p}_M]$) and reproduction (proportional to $(1 - \kappa)$) are unavoidable energy outputs with the opposite effect. These parameter values in conjunction with shape factor $\delta_M = 0.3744$ correspond to the theoretical maximum carapace length of 118 cm.

Our results indicate that, on the one hand, loggerhead turtles reduce the attainable maximum size from $\{\dot{p}_{Am}\}/([\dot{p}_M]\delta_M) \approx 183 \text{ cm}$ (for $\kappa = 1$) by investing $(1 - \kappa) \approx 35\%$ of the mobilization energy flow into reproduction, to already mentioned 118 cm. On the other hand, this same investment permits that an energy equivalent of approximately one whole egg at $f = 0.81$ and almost two eggs at $f = 1$ is set aside on a daily basis. The investment of energy into reproduction controls fecundity and is particularly important as one of the two chief determinants of the population growth rate. Does such an investment result in the optimal reproductive output? It turns out that at estimated $\kappa = 0.6481$, the largest adults achieve only 33% of the optimum of around 6 eggs per day at $f = 1$ (Figure 6). Achieving the optimum requires $\kappa = 0.3522$. We thus find that the reproductive output of loggerhead turtles is suboptimal. A possible reason is that improved reproduction at lower κ fails to offset the negatives (lower food assimilation and lower survival)




Figure 3: Model predictions for post-hatchlings up to 10 weeks old. Carapace length in relation to age (upper left panel), body mass as a function of time (upper right panel), and relationship of body mass and length (lower panel). Model predictions for post-hatchling growth were satisfactory when the predicted length at birth was used as a starting point (full line), but were consistently lower than the data when the observed length at birth was used to run the model (dashed line). Faster metabolism of hatchlings [67] due to their smaller size could be responsible for the underestimate. Data source: unpublished data obtained from L. Stokes. Number of datapoints: three datasets containing 10 datapoints (measurements taken weekly during 10 weeks), and three datasets containing 8 datapoints (measurements taken weekly during 8 weeks). Experimental design described in [59], and modeled as $f = 0.99$ and $T = 27^\circ \text{C}$.




Figure 4: Model predictions for uni-variate data related to juveniles and adults. *Carapace length in relation to age* (upper left panel). Data from: [54], number of datapoints $N = 2$ (triangles), and [55], number of datapoints $N = 3$ (squares). *Body mass in relation to age* (upper right panel). Data from: [54, 64], number of datapoints $N = 5$ (triangles, same individual as in panel a), $N = 20$ (circles, three individuals); and data from [55], number of datapoints $N = 4$ (squares, two individuals). *Relationship of body mass and length* (lower panel). Data from [68], number of datapoints $N = 369$. The exact temperature and food quantities have not been reported for some data, but most realistic results were obtained for temperature of 23° C for the fastest growing individuals (triangles in upper panels), 22° C for three individuals reared together (circles in upper right panel), and 21° C for two sea turtles reported in [55] (squares in upper left panel).




Figure 5: Number of eggs per clutch in relation to straight carapace length (SCL). Data from [19], number of datapoints $N = 48$.

327 associated with smaller carapace length.




Figure 6: Maximum egg production of the largest loggerhead turtles (eq.2.58 in [24]) as a function of allocation to soma (parameter κ), at $f = 1$. Egg production at estimated $\kappa = 0.6481$ is suboptimal and amounts to only 33% percent of the optimum at $\kappa = 0.3522$. By sacrificing body size to increase the investment into reproduction (lower κ), loggerhead turtles have the potential to nearly triple their egg production. A possible reason why production remains suboptimal is that the benefit of higher fecundity (that would lead to higher population growth rate) fails to offset the negatives of smaller carapace length (that decreases the population growth rate via lower survival).

328 Energy in reserve is another ecologically important parameter because it

indicates how well a species can endure low food availability. The ability to maintain structure in starvation is best represented by energy density, $[E]$, the size of reserve relative to structure: $[E] = E/L^3$. Maximum energy density, $[E_m] = \{\dot{p}_{Am}\}/\dot{v}$, for a loggerhead turtle amounts to 12791 J cm^{-3} . At maximum food availability ($f = 1$), reserve comprises 66.5% of body mass, whereas at more realistic $f = 0.81$, the percentage slightly decreases to 61.7%. In either case, the relative contribution of reserve to body mass is very large, suggesting that loggerhead turtles handle starvation rather well.

One indicator of how well an organism fares under starvation is the time to reserve depletion, t_{\dagger} . While there is no single general recipe for how organisms handle starvation within DEB theory (see [24], Section 4.1), the starvation mode starts when the mobilization flow, \dot{p}_C is unable to satisfy somatic maintenance according to the kappa rule, i.e., when $\kappa\dot{p}_C = \dot{p}_M$ and hence $E_* = \dot{p}_M \frac{L}{\kappa\dot{v}}$. Then the special rules for starvation are applied until energy reserve is completely depleted. The time to depletion depends on the size of the individual, as well as on the strategy for handling starvation (Figure 7). While the estimates of t_{\dagger} may not be completely accurate, they serve as a good qualitative measure of starvation ability. First, larger individuals have more time before experiencing problems due to unfavorable feeding conditions (Figure 7). Second, the reserve size of loggerhead turtles is such that it provides a substantial buffer against variable food availability in the environment. Even mid-sized individuals at about 50 cm carapace length have enough energy in reserve that it takes a full year before this energy is depleted. The potential to bridge long gaps in feeding might be a trait shared with other sea turtle species as indicated by the ability of sea turtles to easily sustain prolonged periods of little or no feeding during energetically demanding reproductive seasons [72].

4. Discussion

We successfully reconstructed the energy budget of loggerhead turtles using preexisting—scarce and disjointed—datasets. Such a reconstruction adds value to the data through new insights into physiology and ecology of the studied species, without additional empirical work. Gaining these new insights became possible only after jointly considering all the data within the unifying framework of DEB theory. Our unifying approach thus complements empirical studies that by necessity have a narrower focus.




Figure 7: Time to reserve depletion, t_d , as a function of carapace length. Two possibilities are considered: (I) energy is mobilized only for somatic maintenance, $t_d = \frac{L}{\kappa v}$ (blue squares) or (II) energy is mobilized for both somatic and maturity maintenance: $t_d = \frac{L}{\kappa v} \frac{\dot{p}_S}{\dot{p}_S + \dot{p}_J}$ (red circles). Although larger individuals take more time to deplete their energy reserve, loggerhead turtles of any size should be able to tolerate substantial variability in feeding conditions, including prolonged periods of starvation.

Among the successfully reconstructed aspects of the energy budget, we first look at the embryonic development. The value of parameter E_H^b indicates that embryos on average spend 37 kJ of energy for maturation. How does this value compare with measurements? The total measured energy available at the beginning of the embryonic development (i.e., the energy of an egg) is around 210 kJ [38], whereas the total energy of hatchlings with the yolk sac at birth is around 125 kJ (calculated using measurements in [62]). The difference of 85 kJ between these two empirical values is in reasonable agreement with 62 kJ measured independently by respirometry [60] and represents the energy dissipated by embryos. A comparison between the value of E_H^b (37 kJ) and empirically determined dissipation (62–85 kJ) suggests that embryos roughly use anywhere between 40 to 60% of dissipated energy for maturation, while the rest is distributed between maintenance and growth overheads (see also Figure 8). Important in this context is the fraction of the initial reserve still left at birth because it is one of the main factors determining the resilience of hatchlings during their migration to the feeding grounds. At $f = 0.81$, for example, hatchlings have about 35 days until reserve depletion (Figure 7), assuming that the parameters remain constant throughout the ontogeny.

382 Among the basic DEB parameters listed in Table 1, four are expected
 383 to predictably scale with the maximum size of a species ($\{\dot{p}_{Am}\}$, E_H^b , E_H^p ,
 384 \dot{h}_a), while the rest are expected to remain rather constant [24]. This scaling
 385 property can be used to further reaffirm the consistency of estimated param-
 386 eter values, which we exploit by making comparisons with related species.
 387 Preliminary estimates of the standard DEB parameters were available in the
 388 online add_my_pet library [73] for two other species of sea turtles, Kemp's
 389 ridley (*Lepidochelys kempii*) [56] and leatherback turtle (*Dermochelys cori-
 390 acea*) [57]. The value of the maximum surface-area-specific assimilation rate
 391 ($\{\dot{p}_{Am}\}$) falls within the range of values defined by these two species (Ta-
 392 ble 1), which is expected because loggerhead turtles are larger than Kemp's
 393 ridley, but smaller than leatherback turtles [35]. However, both maturities
 394 (E_H^b and E_H^p) are higher and the aging acceleration (\dot{h}_a) is lower for logger-
 395 head turtles than for the other two species. While these mismatches make
 396 us cautious, they are also encouraging in the sense that the orders of mag-
 397 nitudes of the parameter values are similar, suggesting that the preliminary
 398 estimates for Kemp's ridley and leatherback turtle can be greatly improved
 399 with the inclusion of more data.

400 The surface-area-specific maximum assimilation rate, $\{\dot{p}_{Am}\}$, is deter-
 401 mining how much energy will be assimilated into the energy reserve. The
 402 size-dependent energy budget relative to energy assimilation visualized in
 403 Figure 9 provides insight into the changes in allocation throughout the on-
 404 togeny of the loggerhead turtle (at $f = 0.81$), and can be used as a powerful
 405 tool for exploring additional implications of changes in food availability. The
 406 proportion of assimilated energy remaining in energy reserve, as well as the
 407 energy allocated to growth, gradually reduce with size (Figure 9) as a direct
 408 consequence of the fact that most energy flows (e.g., mobilization, somatic
 409 and maturity maintenance) scale with structural volume, L^3 , while the as-
 410 similation scales with structural surface area, L^2 . Furthermore, in an energy
 411 budget of a fully grown individual the processes of (somatic and maturity)
 412 maintenance add up to become over 3/4 of the daily budget, at which point
 413 the difference between the energy assimilated into energy reserves and that
 414 mobilized for other metabolic processes reduces to practically zero. Keeping
 415 in mind that only after the cost of maintenance has been paid can juve-
 416 niles grow and fully grown adults can allocate to reproduction, our results
 417 suggest that a lower amount of assimilated energy (as a result of, e.g., lower
 418 food availability), could have drastic consequences on the growth of juveniles,
 419 and the reproduction of fully grown adults. Reproducing while experienc-

ing lower food availability could also have consequences on the survival of post-hatchlings, as the amount of energy reserves left after embryonic development is dependent on the food availability experienced by the mother (Figure 8), and will determine how long a turtle can survive before it needs to start feeding (Figure 7).




Figure 8: Cumulative energy investment during embryonic development, plotted at two food availabilities ($f = e_b = 1$ and $f = e_b = 0.81$). The lower food availability is experienced by the North Atlantic loggerhead population. If food availability were high ($f = 1$), about half of the initial reserve would have been dissipated into the environment or consumed for the growth of structure before birth, whereas the remaining half would still have been available to hatchlings after birth. In reality, less than half of the initial reserve is left at birth. The exact fraction is important for further development and survival because the size of the remaining reserve (partly visible as the external yolk sac) determines, e.g., the period that hatchlings survive before reaching the feeding grounds.

Having precise energy ingestion rates through feeding would ultimately allow various model applications such as (i) assessing the energy requirements of loggerhead turtle individuals reared in captivity [8] or (ii) investigating the ecological interactions between loggerhead turtle populations and their prey. To study the ingestion rates, we need to look into the surface-area-specific maximum ingestion rate, $\{\dot{p}_{Xm}\}$, determined by the relationship

$$\{\dot{p}_{Xm}\} = \{\dot{p}_{Am}\} / \kappa_X \quad (8)$$

where κ_X is a constant called assimilation efficiency. However, establishing the reliability of estimates of $\{\dot{p}_{Am}\}$ and κ_X is difficult. Looking into the first parameter, $\{\dot{p}_{Am}\}$, in more detail, we see that it determines the ultimate size of an individual (see Eq. (7)). Assuming a constant allocation to soma (κ) the same maximum size can be predicted with different values of $\{\dot{p}_{Am}\}$ and $[\dot{p}_M]$ as long as their ratio is constant. Our estimate of the volume-specific somatic maintenance rate for the loggerhead turtle of $[\dot{p}_M] = 13.25 \text{ J d}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-3}$




Figure 9: Visualization of the energy budget as a function of size. Shown are the contributions of all metabolic processes (i.e., energy flows) relative to assimilation. Special attention is given to three energetically important moments: birth, puberty, and ultimate size. Flows are calculated using the estimated parameter values for North Atlantic population (Table 1) with the scaled food availability of $f = 0.81$ experienced in the wild.

438 (considerably lower than the estimates of around $20 \text{ J d}^{-1} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ for the other
 439 two sea turtle species) should be used with caution: if the estimate of $[\dot{p}_M]$ is
 440 too low, we may also end up underestimating the surface-area-specific maxi-
 441 mum assimilation rate, $\{\dot{p}_{Am}\}$, yet fail to recognize this underestimate as the
 442 predicted maximum size remains the same. An independent and more reli-
 443 able estimate of $\{\dot{p}_{Am}\}$ is possible only if the precise measurements of both
 444 ingestion rates and assimilation overheads are available [74] (see also Section
 445 11.2 of [24]). Independently estimating the value of κ_X —the other parameter
 446 determining the ingestion rate—is particularly difficult because quantifying
 447 ingestion and assimilation overheads requires knowing (i) egestion, (ii) excre-
 448 tion, and (iii) specific dynamic action [24, 74]. Such a comprehensive set of
 449 measurements on loggerhead turtles is unknown to us, leading to the conclu-

sion that reliable estimates of κ_X or $\{\dot{p}_{Am}\}$ are not possible at this moment. Hence, our estimates of the ingestion rate should be used with caution.

The only attempt to estimate a (static) energy budget of loggerhead turtles in absolute terms known to us is by Hatase and Tsukamoto [58]. The authors considered that oceanic adults of 70 kg body mass feed on energy-sparse plankton of genus *Pyrosoma*, while neritic adults of 90 kg body mass feed on energy-dense clams. Due to difficulties in obtaining precise measurements, the authors were forced to make a number of *ad hoc* assumptions to arrive at a daily energy intake of 28 454 kJ (14.4 kg) of neritic food. This intake, however, seems to be too high. First, observations suggest that the feeding rate of loggerhead turtles is probably much lower: measurements of food intake by loggerhead turtles, ranging in size between 2 and 60 kg and fed anchovies in captivity, yielded a regression equation that at 20 °C gives 3.3 kg of food ingested daily when extrapolated to the size of neritic adults [75]—only about 23% of the estimate by Hatase and Tsukamoto [58]. Second, daily energy intake is unlikely to be higher than that of a species known for high energy consumption and even higher food intake. A validated energy budget exists for such a species: Pacific bluefin tuna (*Thunnus orientalis*) [7, 8, 76]. If we compare the daily energy intake of an individual Pacific bluefin tuna with the same structural size as neritic loggerhead turtle adults, it turns out that the tuna consumes about 3 400 kJ or approximately 8 times less than the value from Hatase and Tsukamoto [58]. Third, the huge intake assigned to loggerhead turtles, with a large proportion needed to satisfy the assumed basic metabolic needs, seems even less likely when put in perspective with measured or estimated metabolic rates. The neritic-sized loggerhead turtles routinely dissipate up to 97% less energy (extrapolated from values in Ref. [67]) than the Pacific bluefin tuna, again with the same structural size as neritic loggerhead adults: 0.03 W kg⁻¹ compared to 1.18 W kg⁻¹ at 20 °C. This makes the 800% higher energy need estimated for neritic loggerhead turtles by Hatase and Tsukamoto [58] highly unlikely. It is interesting to mention that our model predicts dissipation of 0.11 W kg⁻¹ for neritic adults at 20 °C with an assumed $\kappa_X = 0.8$. This value drops to 0.08 W kg⁻¹ in fasting individuals, which is in line with measurements of 0.05 W kg⁻¹ by Lutz et al. [77] performed on smaller resting loggerhead turtles at 20 °C.

Estimates of energy investment into reproduction (\dot{p}_J and \dot{p}_R in DEB, see Figure 1) also show a mismatch when comparing our model outputs with calculations reported by Hatase and Tsukamoto. Integrating energy invested into the reproductive branch (maturity maintenance + egg production) over

two years gives an estimate of approximately 300 MJ (127 MJ for maintenance, and 147 MJ for egg production) at the temperature of 23°C (the average temperature experienced by adult loggerhead turtles [39, 58]). This is markedly smaller than 1003 MJ calculated for the smaller oceanic adults nesting every second year [58], and approximately 30% less than the reproduction costs calculated for neritic Pacific loggerhead turtles nesting *every* year (435 MJ, [58]). We did not separately model the neritic and oceanic adults, nor explicitly include the different expenses of migration that these two groups of adults have. However, the realistic number of eggs predicted by our model (see section 3.1) suggest that our estimate of the energy investment into reproduction is realistic.

Not all aspects of the energy budget of loggerhead turtles were captured perfectly by the model, yet even deviations of model outputs from the commonly accepted knowledge are informative. For example, we estimate that in an environment with relatively constant food and temperature, loggerhead turtles start allocating to reproduction several years before reaching the currently accepted age-at-puberty based on nesting observations. The transition to adulthood might thus be happening much earlier than currently suspected, and first nesting observed might be an inadequate proxy for puberty. The definition of “puberty”, whether it is the initial allocation to reproduction or morphological changes (e.g., tail prolongation in males) or the first nesting, therefore has to be agreed upon prior to making comparisons across studies.

Furthermore, the underestimated growth of posthatchlings during the first 15-30 days after birth (Figure 3) suggests that the description in terms of fixed parameter values throughout the whole life cycle may be somewhat inadequate. One way to speed up growth in DEB theory is exemplified by the “waste to hurry” strategy [78], whereby the increase in the values of parameters directly related to the acquisition of energy ($\{\dot{p}_{Am}\}$) and metabolism (\dot{v} and $[\dot{p}_M]$) results in faster growth, but smaller ultimate size due to a higher energetic cost. The strategy in which some energy is wasted to achieve faster growth and reduce time spent in early stages which are particularly vulnerable to predation [79] may be beneficial to post-hatchlings.

5. Conclusion

The standard DEB model aided the characterization of the whole life cycle of the loggerhead turtle using relatively few types of disjointed data on life-history traits and growth curves, some of which date from 1926. The

estimated DEB parameter values now characterize the energy utilization patterns in the loggerhead turtle, enabling the standard DEB model to predict growth, maturation, and reproduction as a function of temperature and food (or energy reserve provided by the mother, in case of an embryo).

In addition, the parameter values enabled quantitative predictions of many energy budget features that were not (or could not be) measured directly. Examples are the plotted energy budgets at birth, puberty, and when fully grown (Figures 8 and 9). The model made it possible to study ontogeny and physiological traits such as coping with prolonged periods of starvation and the trade-offs between growth and reproduction.

Additional details could be included into the model to increase its predictive capabilities and accuracy, but whether additional predictions and accuracy warrant the increased complexity of the model highly depends on particular questions of interest. For example, precision in modeling embryonic development could be augmented by including effects of the sand (compactness, humidity, and grain size) on incubation duration and time needed from hatching to emergence. Also, metabolic heating could be incorporated into the model by increasing the temperature in simulations. Including constraints on the size and frequency of clutches, as well as explicit modeling of the reproduction buffer (as opposed to continuous reproduction), offers an opportunity to improve the conversion from allocation to reproduction (joules per day) to the reproductive output (eggs or clutches per nesting season).

The realism and precision of the model predictions could be further improved by (i) loosening the assumption that the parameters are constant throughout ontogeny, and (ii) simulating a more variable environment, reproducing some of the food and temperature variability experienced by the loggerhead turtles in the wild [12]. By allowing the parameters to vary throughout ontogeny, physiology of small loggerhead post-hatchlings can change such that temporarily increased parameter values improve growth performance, thereby reducing the risk of being eaten by predators. Simulating an environment in which food availability and/or temperature drastically change might be a good approximation of the ontogenetic habitat shift when juvenile loggerhead turtles change their oceanic (colder and food poorer) environment for a neritic (warmer and food richer) one [13]. Consequently, growth curve might differ (see e.g. [5, 80, 81]) from the most commonly assumed monotonic one. Such a different environment would result also in different predictions for age at puberty. The range of observed maturation age estimates are

562 seemingly contradictory (15-39 years, [37, 17, 40, 41, 42]).

563 The lower end of the range is obtained by direct observations in captivity,
564 or deduced from morphology and behavior, while the upper end of the range
565 is estimated using the carapace length at reproductive events. Could such
566 a large range be explained by the time necessary to accumulate energy for
567 reproduction after the actual maturation, or by environmental variability
568 experienced by some loggerhead turtles in the wild?

569 Even without the mentioned additions and alterations, the model pro-
570 vides insight into physiology and ecology of the loggerhead turtle, and makes
571 a powerful tool for conservation biology and management of sea turtles. Ob-
572 taining a set of DEB parameters for a different loggerhead turtle population
573 (e.g., the Mediterranean population) might provide further insight into the
574 observed [4, 19] differences in growth, maturation, and reproduction between
575 these two populations. Information on relevant processes and life history
576 traits (duration of life cycle phases, reproduction output, etc.) can be fur-
577 ther studied for a range of temperature and/or food abundances to gain
578 additional insight into physiology and ecology of the loggerhead turtle. The
579 model is one of a full life cycle, and can be used to study the environmental
580 effects on the physiological processes such as growth, maintenance, matu-
581 ration, and reproduction. It enables exploring future scenarios, e.g., those
582 resulting from the global climate change. In particular, the information can
583 be used to create population models that include environmental information
584 into the population dynamics, as it is possible to investigate how changes in
585 temperature and food availability might affect individual physiological pro-
586 cesses (thus affecting survival and fecundity). This is the first step toward
587 determining the effects of environmental changes on growth and viability of
588 a population, and the chances of success of conservation efforts.

589 **6. Acknowledgements**

590 The authors would like to thank L. Stokes for generously sharing her data.
591 N.M and T.K. have been in part supported by Croatian Science Foundation
592 under the project 2202-ACCTA. M.J. was supported by the Japan Science
593 and Technology Agency (JST) Program to Disseminate Tenure Tracking Sys-
594 tem.

References

- [1] Turtle Taxonomy Working Group (TTWG), Turtles of the world, 2012 update: Annotated checklist of taxonomy, synonymy, distribution, and conservation status, in: A. Rhodin, P. Pritchard, P.C.H. and van Dijk, R. Saumure, K. Buhlmann, J. Iverson, R. Mittermeier (Eds.), Conservation biology of freshwater turtles and tortoises: A compilation project of the IUCN/SSC tortoise and freshwater turtle specialist group. Chelonian Research Monographs No. 5, volume 5, Chelonian Research Foundation, 2012, pp. 000.243–000.328. TTWG: Turtle Taxonomy Working Group [van Dijk, Peter P. and Iverson, John B. and Shaffer, Bradley H. and Bour, Roger and Rhodin, A.G.J.].
- [2] A. B. Bolten, L. B. Crowder, M. G. Dodd, S. L. MacPherson, J. A. Musick, B. A. Schroeder, B. E. Witherington, K. J. Long, M. L. Snover, Quantifying multiple threats to endangered species: an example from loggerhead sea turtles, *Front Ecol Environ* 9 (2011) 295–301.
- [3] M. Hamann, M. Godfrey, J. Seminoff, K. Arthur, P. Barata, K. Bjornndal, A. Bolten, A. Broderick, L. Campbell, C. Carreras, P. Casale, M. Chaloupka, S. Chan, M. Coyne, L. Crowder, C. Diez, P. Dutton, S. Epperly, N. FitzSimmons, A. Formia, M. Girondot, G. Hays, I. Cheng, Y. Kaska, R. Lewison, J. Mortimer, W. Nichols, R. Reina, K. Shanker, J. Spotila, J. Tomás, B. Wallace, T. Work, J. Zbinden, B. Godley, Global research priorities for sea turtles: informing management and conservation in the 21st century, *Endang Species Res* 11 (2010) 245–269.
- [4] S. Piovano, M. Clusa, C. Carreras, C. Giacoma, M. Pascual, L. Cardona, Different growth rates between loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) of Mediterranean and Atlantic origin in the Mediterranean Sea, *Mar. Biol.* 158 (2011) 2577–2587.
- [5] K. A. Bjorndal, A. B. Bolten, T. Dellinger, C. Delgado, H. R. Martins, Compensatory growth in oceanic loggerhead sea turtles: response to a stochastic environment, *Ecology* 84 (2003) 1237–1249.
- [6] K. A. Bjorndal, B. A. Schroeder, A. M. Foley, B. E. Witherington, M. Bresette, D. Clark, R. M. Herren, M. D. Arendt, J. R. Schmid, A. B. Meylan, et al., Temporal, spatial, and body size effects on growth rates

- 628 of loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in the Northwest Atlantic,
629 Mar. Biol. 160 (2013) 2711–2721.
- 630 [7] M. Jusup, T. Klanjscek, H. Matsuda, S. Kooijman, A full lifecycle
631 bioenergetic model for bluefin tuna, PLoS One 6 (2011) e21903.
- 632 [8] M. Jusup, T. Klanjsček, H. Matsuda, Simple measurements reveal the
633 feeding history, the onset of reproduction, and energy conversion effi-
634 ciencies in captive bluefin tuna, J. Sea Res. 94 (2014) 144–155.
- 635 [9] C. M. Teixeira, T. Sousa, G. M. Marques, T. Domingos, S. A. Kooijman,
636 A new perspective on the growth pattern of the Wandering Albatross
637 (*Diomedea exulans*) through DEB theory, J. Sea Res. 94 (2014) 117–127.
- 638 [10] G. C. Hays, Sea turtles: a review of some key recent discoveries and
639 remaining questions, J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol. 356 (2008) 1–7.
- 640 [11] N. Thompson, A. Bolten, M. Dodd, S. Epperly, A. Foley, et al., An
641 assessment of the loggerhead turtle population in the western North At-
642 lantic Ocean, in: NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC (Turtle
643 Expert Working Group), volume 575, 2009, p. 131.
- 644 [12] C. M. McClellan, A. J. Read, Complexity and variation in loggerhead
645 sea turtle life history, Biol. Lett. 3 (2007) 592–594.
- 646 [13] S. H. Peckham, D. Maldonado-Diaz, Y. Tremblay, R. Ochoa, J. Polovina,
647 G. Balazs, P. H. Dutton, W. J. Nichols, Demographic implications
648 of alternative foraging strategies in juvenile loggerhead turtles *caretta*
649 *caretta* of the north pacific ocean, Mar Ecol Prog Ser 425 (2011) 269–
650 280.
- 651 [14] A. B. Bolten, B. E. Witherington, Loggerhead sea turtles, Smithsonian
652 Books Washington, DC, 2003.
- 653 [15] A. M. LeBlanc, K. K. Drake, K. L. Williams, M. G. Frick, T. Wibbels,
654 D. C. Rostal, Nest temperatures and hatchling sex ratios from logger-
655 head turtle nests incubated under natural field conditions in Georgia,
656 United States, Chelonian Conserv. Biol. 11 (2012) 108–116.
- 657 [16] D. Stoneburner, Body depth: an indicator of morphological variation
658 among nesting groups of adult loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*),
659 J. Herpetol. 14 (1980) 205–206.

- 660 [17] R. Scott, R. Marsh, G. C. Hays, Life in the really slow lane: loggerhead
661 sea turtles mature late relative to other reptiles, *Funct. Ecol.* 26 (2012)
662 227–235.
- 663 [18] G. R. Zug, A. H. Wynn, C. Ruckdeschel, Age determination of logger-
664 head sea turtles, *Caretta caretta*, by incremental growth marks in the
665 skeleton, *Citeseer*, 1986.
- 666 [19] M. Tiwari, K. A. Bjorndal, Variation in morphology and reproduction
667 in loggerheads, *Caretta caretta*, nesting in the United States, Brazil, and
668 Greece, *Herpetologica* (2000) 343–356.
- 669 [20] A. C. Broderick, F. Glen, B. J. Godley, G. C. Hays, Variation in repro-
670 ductive output of marine turtles, *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.* 288 (2003)
671 95–109.
- 672 [21] A. R. Solow, K. A. Bjorndal, A. B. Bolten, Annual variation in nesting
673 numbers of marine turtles: the effect of sea surface temperature on re-
674 migration intervals, *Ecology Letters* 5 (2002) 742–746.
- 675 [22] G. Hays, A. Broderick, F. Glen, B. Godley, J. Houghton, J. Metcalfe,
676 Water temperature and internesting intervals for loggerhead (*Caretta*
677 *caretta*) and green (*Chelonia mydas*) sea turtles, *Journal of Thermal*
678 *Biology* 27 (2002) 429 – 432.
- 679 [23] K. S. Van Houtan, J. M. Halle, Long-term climate forcing in loggerhead
680 sea turtle nesting, *PLoS ONE* 6 (2011) e19043.
- 681 [24] S. A. L. M. Kooijman, *Dynamic Energy Budget theory for metabolic*
682 *organisation*, Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- 683 [25] T. Sousa, T. Domingos, S. A. L. M. Kooijman, From empirical patterns
684 to theory: A formal metabolic theory of life, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* 363
685 (2008) 2453–2464.
- 686 [26] T. Sousa, T. Domingos, J.-C. Poggiale, S. A. L. M. Kooijman, *Dynamic*
687 *Energy Budget theory restores coherence in biology*, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc.*
688 *B* 365 (2010) 3413–3428.
- 689 [27] K. Lika, M. R. Kearney, V. Freitas, H. W. van der Veer, J. van der
690 Meer, J. W. Wijsman, L. Pecquerie, S. A. Kooijman, The “covariation

- method” for estimating the parameters of the standard Dynamic Energy Budget model I: philosophy and approach, *J. Sea Res.* 66 (2011) 270–277.
- [28] S. Kooijman, T. Troost, Quantitative steps in the evolution of metabolic organisation as specified by the Dynamic Energy Budget theory, *Biol. Rev.* 82 (2007) 113–142.
- [29] K. Lika, S. Augustine, L. Pecquerie, S. A. Kooijman, The bijection from data to parameter space with the standard DEB model quantifies the supply–demand spectrum, *J. Theor. Biol.* 354 (2014) 35–47.
- [30] J. B. Iverson, Correlates of reproductive output in turtles (order *Tes- tudines*), *Herpetol. Monogr.* (1992) 25–42.
- [31] B. P. Wallace, P. R. Sotherland, P. S. Tomillo, R. D. Reina, J. R. Spotila, F. V. Paladino, Maternal investment in reproduction and its consequences in leatherback turtles, *Oecologia* 152 (2007) 37–47.
- [32] J. A. Zbinden, D. Margaritoulis, R. Arlettaz, Metabolic heating in mediterranean loggerhead sea turtle clutches, *J Exp Mar Biol Ecol* 334 (2006) 151–157.
- [33] Y. Matsuzawa, K. Sato, W. Sakamoto, K. Bjorndal, Seasonal fluctuations in sand temperature: effects on the incubation period and mortality of loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*) pre-emergent hatchlings in minabe, japan, *Mar Biol* 140 (2002) 639–646.
- [34] L. A. Hawkes, A. C. Broderick, M. H. Godfrey, B. J. Godley, Status of nesting loggerhead turtles *Caretta caretta* at Bald Head Island (North Carolina, USA) after 24 years of intensive monitoring and conservation, *Oryx* 39 (2005) 65–72.
- [35] J. R. Spotila, Sea turtles: A complete guide to their biology, behavior, and conservation, JHU Press, 2004.
- [36] J. Braun-McNeill, S. P. Epperly, L. Avens, M. L. Snover, J. C. Taylor, Growth rates of loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) from the western north atlantic, *Herpetol. Conserv. Biol.* 3 (2008) 273–281.

- 721 [37] J. F. Parham, G. R. Zug, Age and growth of loggerhead sea turtles
722 (*Caretta caretta*) of coastal Georgia: an assessment of skeletochronologi-
723 cal age-estimates, *Bull. Mar. Sci.* 61 (1997) 287–304.
- 724 [38] G. C. Hays, J. R. Speakman, Reproductive investment and optimum
725 clutch size of loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*), *J. Anim. Ecol.*
726 (1991) 455–462.
- 727 [39] L. A. Hawkes, M. J. Witt, A. C. Broderick, J. W. Coker, M. S. Coyne,
728 M. Dodd, M. G. Frick, M. H. Godfrey, D. B. Griffin, S. R. Murphy,
729 et al., Home on the range: spatial ecology of loggerhead turtles in
730 Atlantic waters of the USA, *Divers. Distrib.* 17 (2011) 624–640.
- 731 [40] M. L. Snover, Growth and ontogeny of sea turtles using skeletochronol-
732 ogy: methods, validation and application to conservation, Ph.D. thesis,
733 Duke University, 2002.
- 734 [41] F. J. Schwartz, Growth, maturity, and reproduction of a long-term
735 captive male loggerhead sea turtle, *Caretta caretta* (*Chelonia*, *Reptilia*),
736 in North Carolina, *Journal of the Elisha Mitchell Scientific Society* 1
737 (1997) 3.
- 738 [42] A. Reséndiz S. H., B. A. Jimenez de Reséndiz, Loggerhead turtles re-
739 leased after ten years in captivity, *Marine Turtle Newsletter* 57 (1992)
740 7–9.
- 741 [43] A. de Padua Almeida, C. Baptistotte, A. S. dos Santos, T. Z. Serafini,
742 Captive-raised loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*) found nesting eight
743 years after release, *Marine Turtle Newsletter* 115 (2007) 11–13.
- 744 [44] L. Ehrhart, R. Yoder, Marine turtles of Merritt Island National Wildlife
745 Refuge, Kennedy Space Center, Florida, Fla. *Mar. Res. Publ.* 33 (1978)
746 25–30.
- 747 [45] J. Byrd, S. Murphy, A. Von Harten, Morphometric analysis of the north-
748 ern subpopulation of *Caretta caretta* in South Carolina, USA, *Marine*
749 *Turtle Newsletter* 107 (2005) 1–4.
- 750 [46] M. Godfrey, N. Mrosovsky, Estimating the time between hatching of
751 sea turtles and their emergence from the nest, *Chelonian Conserv. Biol.*
752 2 (1997) 581–584.

- 753 [47] J. D. Miller, C. J. Limpus, M. H. Godfrey, Nest site selection, oviposi-
754 tion, eggs, development, hatching, and emergence of loggerhead turtles,
755 *Loggerhead Sea Turtles* 12 (2003).
- 756 [48] J. Patino-Martinez, A. Marco, L. Quiñones, L. A. Hawkes, The potential
757 future influence of sea level rise on leatherback turtle nests, *J Exp Mar*
758 *Biol Ecol* 461 (2014) 116–123.
- 759 [49] D. W. Wood, K. A. Bjorndal, S. Ross, Relation of temperature, mois-
760 ture, salinity, and slope to nest site selection in loggerhead sea turtles,
761 *Copeia* 2000 (2000) 119–119.
- 762 [50] R. A. Ackerman, Growth and gas exchange of embryonic sea turtles
763 (*chelonina*, *caretta*), *Copeia* (1981) 757–765.
- 764 [51] N. Mrosovsky, S. J. Kamel, C. Diez, R. Van Dam, et al., Methods of
765 estimating natural sex ratios of sea turtles from incubation temperatures
766 and laboratory data, *Endanger Species Res* 8 (2009) 147–155.
- 767 [52] S. A. L. M. Kooijman, Metabolic acceleration in animal ontogeny: an
768 evolutionary perspective, *J. Sea Res.* 94 (2014) 128–137.
- 769 [53] A. D. Tucker, Nest site fidelity and clutch frequency of loggerhead turtles
770 are better elucidated by satellite telemetry than by nocturnal tagging
771 efforts: implications for stock estimation, *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.* 383
772 (2010) 48–55.
- 773 [54] G. H. Parker, The growth of turtles, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 12
774 (1926) 422–424.
- 775 [55] S. F. Hildebrand, C. Hatsel, On the growth, care and behavior of log-
776 gerhead turtles in captivity, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 13 (1927)
777 374–377.
- 778 [56] J. Pierro, Add_my_pet, *Lepidochelys kempii*, in: B. Kooji-
779 man, D. Lika, G. Marques, S. Augustine, L. Pecquerie (Eds.),
780 Add_my_pet data library [WWW Document], 2015. Last mod-
781 ified 2015/11/06 by Jocylin Pierro, accessed 2015/11/18,
782 [http://www.bio.vu.nl/thb/deb/deblab/add_my_pet/entries_web/](http://www.bio.vu.nl/thb/deb/deblab/add_my_pet/entries_web/i_results_Lepidochelys_kempii.html)
783 [i_results_Lepidochelys_kempii.html](http://www.bio.vu.nl/thb/deb/deblab/add_my_pet/entries_web/i_results_Lepidochelys_kempii.html).

- 784 [57] B. Kooijman, Add_my_pet, *Dermochelys coriacea*, in: B. Koo-
785 jiman, D. Lika, G. Marques, S. Augustine, L. Pecquerie (Eds.),
786 Add_my_pet data library [WWW Document], 2015. Last mod-
787 ified 2015/09/21 by Bas Kooijman, accessed 2015/11/18,
788 [http://www.bio.vu.nl/thb/deb/deblab/add_my_pet/entries_web/](http://www.bio.vu.nl/thb/deb/deblab/add_my_pet/entries_web/i_results_Dermochelys_coriacea.html)
789 [i_results_Dermochelys_coriacea.html](http://www.bio.vu.nl/thb/deb/deblab/add_my_pet/entries_web/i_results_Dermochelys_coriacea.html).
- 790 [58] H. Hatase, K. Tsukamoto, Smaller longer, larger shorter: energy budget
791 calculations explain intrapopulation variation in remigration intervals
792 for loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*), Can. J. Zool. 86 (2008)
793 595–600.
- 794 [59] L. Stokes, J. Wyneken, L. B. Crowder, J. Marsh, The influence of
795 temporal and spatial origin on size and early growth rates in captive
796 loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in the United States, Herpetol.
797 Conserv. Biol. 1 (2006) 71–80.
- 798 [60] K. A. Reid, D. Margaritoulis, J. R. Speakman, Incubation temperature
799 and energy expenditure during development in loggerhead sea turtle
800 embryos, J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol. 378 (2009) 62–68.
- 801 [61] L. Woolgar, S. Trocini, N. Mitchell, Key parameters describing
802 temperature-dependent sex determination in the southernmost popu-
803 lation of loggerhead sea turtles, J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol. 449 (2013)
804 77–84.
- 805 [62] J. E. Kraemer, S. H. Bennett, Utilization of posthatching yolk in log-
806 gerhead sea turtles, *Caretta caretta*, Copeia (1981) 406–411.
- 807 [63] Georgia Sea Turtle Center (GSTC), Frequently asked ques-
808 tions [WWW Document], 2015. Accessed on 2015/11/18,
809 <http://gstc.jekyllisland.com/>.
- 810 [64] G. Parker, The growth of the loggerhead turtle, Am. Nat. (1929) 367–
811 373.
- 812 [65] T. M. Norton, Sea turtle conservation in Georgia and an overview of
813 the Georgia sea turtle center on Jekyll Island, Georgia, Ga. J. Sci. 63
814 (2005) 208.

- 815 [66] K. J. Reich, K. A. Bjorndal, M. G. Frick, B. E. Witherington, C. John-
816 son, A. B. Bolten, Polymodal foraging in adult female loggerheads
817 (*Caretta caretta*), Mar. Biol. 157 (2010) 113–121.
- 818 [67] B. P. Wallace, T. T. Jones, What makes marine turtles go: a review of
819 metabolic rates and their consequences, J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 356 (2008)
820 8–24.
- 821 [68] C. Wabnitz, D. Pauly, Length-weight relationships and additional
822 growth parameters for sea turtles, Fish Cent Res Rep 16 (2008) 92–
823 101.
- 824 [69] D. Pauly, On the interrelationships between natural mortality, growth
825 parameters, and mean environmental temperature in 175 fish stocks, J.
826 Cons. Int. Explor. Mer. 39 (1980) 175–192.
- 827 [70] B.-E. Sæther, Survival rates in relation to body weight in European
828 birds, Ornis Scand. (1989) 13–21.
- 829 [71] M. D. Jennions, A. P. Moller, M. Petrie, Sexually selected traits and
830 adult survival: a meta-analysis, Q. Rev. Biol. (2001) 3–36.
- 831 [72] G. C. Hays, A. C. Broderick, F. Glen, B. J. Godley, Change in body
832 mass associated with long-term fasting in a marine reptile: the case of
833 green turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) at Ascension Island, Can. J. Zool. 80
834 (2002) 1299–1302.
- 835 [73] S. A. L. M. Kooijman, D. Lika, G. Marques, S. Augus-
836 tine, L. Pecquerie, Add_my_pet [WWW Document], 2014.
837 http://www.bio.vu.nl/thb/deb/deblab/add_my_pet/index.html.
- 838 [74] R. M. Nisbet, M. Jusup, T. Klanjscek, L. Pecquerie, Integrating dynamic
839 energy budget (DEB) theory with traditional bioenergetic models, J.
840 Exp. Biol. 215 (2012) 892–902.
- 841 [75] S. Hochscheid, F. Bentivegna, J. R. Speakman, Long-term cold accli-
842 mation leads to high Q10 effects on oxygen consumption of loggerhead
843 sea turtles *caretta caretta*, Physiol. Biochem. Zool. 77 (2004) 209–222.
- 844 [76] M. Jusup, H. Matsuda, Mathematical modeling of bluefin tuna growth,
845 maturation, and reproduction based on physiological energetics, in:

- 846 T. Kitagawa, S. Kimura (Eds.), Biology and Ecology of Bluefin Tuna,
847 CRC Press, 2015.
- 848 [77] P. L. Lutz, A. Bergey, M. Bergey, Effects of temperature on gas exchange
849 and acid-base balance in the sea turtle *caretta caretta* at rest and during
850 routine activity, J. Exp. Biol. 144 (1989) 155–169.
- 851 [78] S. A. L. M. Kooijman, Waste to hurry: dynamic energy budgets explain
852 the need of wasting to fully exploit blooming resources, Oikos 122 (2013)
853 348–357.
- 854 [79] M. Salmon, J. Scholl, Allometric growth in juvenile marine turtles:
855 possible role as an antipredator adaptation, Zoology 117 (2014) 131–
856 138.
- 857 [80] M. Chaloupka, Polyphasic growth in pelagic loggerhead sea turtles,
858 Copeia 1998 (1998) 516–518.
- 859 [81] P. Casale, A. D. Mazaris, D. Freggi, C. Vallini, R. Argano, Growth rates
860 and age at adult size of loggerhead sea turtles (*caretta caretta*) in the
861 Mediterranean Sea, estimated through capture-mark-recapture records,
862 Sci Mar 73 (2009) 589–595.