



ELSEVIER

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Data in brief

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/dib

Data Article

Data on the diet composition of *Hippocampus guttulatus* cuvier, 1829: Different prey preferences among habitats

Francesca Ape^a, Giuseppe Corriero^b, Simone Mirto^a,
Cataldo Pierri^b, Tamara Lazic^{b,*}, Michele Gristina^b

^a Institute of Anthropic Impacts and Sustainability in Marine Environment, National Research Council (IAS-CNR), via G. da Verrazzano, 17, Castellammare del Golfo, 91014 TP, Italy

^b Dipartimento di Biologia, Università degli Studi di Bari, via Orabona 4, 70125 Bari, Italy



ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 19 April 2019

Received in revised form 13 May 2019

Accepted 21 May 2019

Available online 27 May 2019

Keywords:

Hippocampus guttulatus

Gut content

Prey availability

Habitat type

ABSTRACT

The data presented here support research article entitled "Trophic flexibility and prey selection of the wild long-snouted seahorse *Hippocampus guttulatus* Cuvier, 1829 in three coastal habitats" Ape et al., 2019. Determinations of the dietary composition, differences in prey selection and potential prey abundance and availability among three habitats at Taranto Mar Piccolo were based on the analysis of gut contents of seahorses and sediment samples. Both highly (*Corallina elongata* and *Cladophora prolifera*) and low complex (sandy bottom) habitats were investigated. Prey items were divided into two size classes: <1 mm and >1mm. Data about the total abundance of each prey size class in gut contents and sediments in three different habitats and PERMANOVA comparisons are given.

© 2019 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

1. Data

Data presented describe investigated habitats (*Corallina elongata*, sandy bottom and *Cladophora prolifera*; Table 1), total abundance of prey items found in seahorse gut contents and in sediments of each habitat (Table 2). In Tables 3 and 4, the results of PERMANOVA analyses, performed to establish

DOI of original article: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2019.04.034>.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: tamaralazic90@yahoo.com (T. Lazic).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2019.104068>

2352-3409/© 2019 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Inc. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Specifications table

| | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Subject area | Ecology |
| More specific subject area | Dietary and foraging ecology |
| Type of data | Tables |
| How data was acquired | Gut contents of seahorses were obtained by flushing method, while sediments used for the study of benthic fauna were manually sampled by three replicate cores. Organisms were counted and classified at the major taxa level of taxonomic discrimination using a stereomicroscope (after extraction from sediments and algal fragments in case of benthic organisms). Statistical analyses were performed using PRIMER v6 + software. |
| Data format | Raw and analyzed |
| Experimental factors | Gut contents of 83 individuals of <i>Hippocampus guttulatus</i> and samples of benthic fauna from three different habitats at Taranto Mar Piccolo were analyzed. |
| Experimental features | Taxonomical identification of the ingested prey from gut contents and potential prey from benthic faunal samples to determine diet of <i>H. guttulatus</i> and investigate the differences in the diet composition respect to the prey availability in different habitats. |
| Data source location | Taranto Mar Piccolo, Southern Italy |
| Data accessibility | Data are included in this article |
| Related research article | F. Ape, G. Corriero, S. Mirto, C. Pierri, T. Lazic, M. Gristina. Trophic flexibility and prey selection of the wild long-snouted seahorse <i>Hippocampus guttulatus</i> Cuvier, 1829 in three coastal habitats. <i>Estuar. Coast. Shelf Sci.</i> , 224, 2019, 1–10. |

Value of the data

- The presented data show that gut content analysis is a valuable tool to determine the dietary composition of seahorses. Obtained dietary information can be used by other researchers.
- Data enabled the determination of the dietary composition of long-snouted seahorses as well as differences in the prey preferences among investigated habitats.
- Flushing method, adopted by this work and used to sample gut contents, allowed to appreciate the importance of prey without calcareous/chitinous exoskeleton, such as nematodes.
- Overall, collected data could help to understand the variability and consistency of ecological requests of this species and could help to comprehend better the patchy distribution of seahorses.

differences in the diet among three habitats in terms of total abundance, abundance of the different size classes (<1mm, > 1mm), taxa richness and composition of prey, are reported. Finally, PERMANOVA analyses, carried out to determine the differences in total abundance of benthic fauna, abundance of different size classes (<1mm, > 1mm), taxa richness and community composition among investigated habitats, are presented in [Tables 5 and 6](#).

2. Experimental design, materials and methods

Data were gathered from 83 specimens of *Hippocampus guttulatus* collected at Taranto Mar Piccolo in Southern Italy from habitats of different complexity: two highly (*Corallina elongata* and *Cladophora*

Table 1

Descriptions, extensions (m²) and depth ranges (m) of the sampled habitat types (*Corallina elongata*, sandy bottom and *Cladophora prolifera*).

| Habitat | Description | Surface (m ²) | Depth range (m) |
|-----------------------------|---|---------------------------|-----------------|
| Corallina elongata | <i>Corallina elongata</i> forms a dense turf on the vertical side of the concrete wall. The algal turf, interrupted by brown algae (<i>Cystoseira</i> sp., <i>Dictyota dichotoma</i>) and filter feeders (large sabellids, both colonial and solitary ascidians, demosponges, bryozoans and hydrozoans), provides substratum and refuges for diverse epifaunal organisms. | 5.504 | 0.4–0.7 |
| Soft bottoms | Near the coastline, soft bottoms are mixed with a large amount of organogenous concretions (bivalve and gastropods shells), small stones and artificial hard substrates that are mainly colonized by sabellids and solitary ascidians. | 4.419 | 1.6–2.2 |
| Cladophora prolifera | Large beds interspersed with soft bottom. Sabellid polychaetes, solitary and colonial ascidians are scattered on the substrate. Ceriantharia <i>Pachycerianthus solitarius</i> may be locally abundant. | 7.471 | 3.3–3.9 |

Table 2

Abundance (N = mean \pm standard deviation) of each size class of organisms found in the guts of *H. guttulatus* and in the sediments in three different habitats (*Corallina elongata*, sandy bottom and *Cladophora prolifera*). Data on the total abundance (sum of organisms < 1mm and > 1mm) of organisms found in the guts and sediments in three habitats are published in Tables 1 and 3, respectively, of the article: Trophic flexibility and prey selection of the wild long-snouted seahorse *Hippocampus guttulatus* Cuvier, 1829 in three coastal habitats [1].

| Taxa | <i>Corallina elongata</i> | | | | Sandy bottom | | | | <i>Cladophora prolifera</i> | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------|----------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|---------------|------------------|----------------|
| | Gut content | | Sediment content | | Gut content | | Sediment content | | Gut content | | Sediment content | |
| | <1mm | >1mm | <1mm | >1mm | <1mm | >1mm | <1mm | >1mm | <1mm | >1mm | <1mm | >1mm |
| Nematoda | 12.4 \pm 8.9 | 0.0 | 790.0 \pm 388.0 | 0.0 | 5.0 \pm 8.0 | 0.0 | 122.0 \pm 13.5 | 0.0 | 4.0 \pm 3.5 | 0.0 | 92.3 \pm 11.0 | 0.0 |
| Copepoda | 14.5 \pm 10.0 | 0.0 | 398.5 \pm 78.5 | 0.0 | 4.1 \pm 3.3 | 0.0 | 403.0 \pm 136.8 | 0.0 | 8.7 \pm 5.8 | 0.0 | 262.0 \pm 73.0 | 0.0 |
| Harpacticoida | 12.2 \pm 8.4 | 0.0 | 322.0 \pm 52.0 | 0.0 | 2.4 \pm 2.3 | 0.0 | 244.0 \pm 72.3 | 0.0 | 7.2 \pm 5.9 | 0.0 | 226.0 \pm 58.9 | 0.0 |
| Calanoida | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 \pm 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 \pm 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Cyclopoida | 0.2 \pm 0.5 | 0.0 | 8.0 \pm 4.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 \pm 0.3 | 0.0 | 2.3 \pm 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.8 \pm 2.0 | 0.0 | 4.3 \pm 1.5 | 0.0 |
| Nauplia | 2.1 \pm 3.0 | 0.0 | 68.5 \pm 29.5 | 0.0 | 1.4 \pm 1.7 | 0.0 | 176.7 \pm 65.6 | 0.0 | 0.7 \pm 1.3 | 0.0 | 31.7 \pm 14.5 | 0.0 |
| Polychaeta | 0.6 \pm 0.8 | 0.0 | 378.0 \pm 13.0 | 1.5 \pm 0.5 | 0.0 \pm 0.2 | 0.0 | 61.7 \pm 20.1 | 4.7 \pm 1.5 | 0.2 \pm 0.4 | 0.0 | 45.3 \pm 15.0 | 3.7 \pm 2.9 |
| Ostracoda | 0.5 \pm 0.8 | 0.0 | 22.0 \pm 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 \pm 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 7.0 \pm 4.0 | 0.0 |
| Amphipoda | 5.7 \pm 4.7 | 10.0 \pm 7.8 | 67.5 \pm 1.5 | 5.5 \pm 0.5 | 0.1 \pm 0.2 | 0.7 \pm 1.1 | 11.7 \pm 2.5 | 2.0 \pm 1.0 | 0.8 \pm 1.2 | 9.3 \pm 9.2 | 19.3 \pm 4.7 | 14.3 \pm 9.3 |
| Unidentified | 5.7 \pm 4.7 | 9.6 \pm 7.9 | 67.5 \pm 1.5 | 5.5 \pm 0.5 | 0.1 \pm 0.2 | 0.4 \pm 0.8 | 11.7 \pm 2.5 | 2.0 \pm 1.0 | 0.8 \pm 1.2 | 8.8 \pm 9.2 | 19.3 \pm 4.7 | 14.3 \pm 9.3 |
| Caprellidae | 0.0 | 0.4 \pm 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 \pm 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 \pm 0.9 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Isopoda | 2.6 \pm 2.3 | 7.4 \pm 5.1 | 29.0 \pm 12.0 | 1.5 \pm 1.5 | 0.3 \pm 0.7 | 1.3 \pm 2.0 | 0.7 \pm 1.2 | 0.0 | 1.0 \pm 2.6 | 1.3 \pm 1.9 | 2.3 \pm 1.5 | 1.3 \pm 0.6 |
| Unidentified | 1.1 \pm 1.9 | 7.4 \pm 5.1 | 4.0 \pm 3.0 | 1.5 \pm 1.5 | 0.3 \pm 0.7 | 1.3 \pm 2.0 | 0.7 \pm 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 \pm 0.5 | 1.3 \pm 1.9 | 0.7 \pm 0.6 | 1.3 \pm 0.6 |
| Asellota | 1.5 \pm 2.0 | 0.0 | 25.0 \pm 9.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 \pm 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 \pm 2.2 | 0.0 | 1.7 \pm 1.2 | 0.0 |
| Tanaidacea | 0.1 \pm 0.3 | 0.0 | 4.5 \pm 3.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Galatheoidea | 0.0 | 1.0 \pm 2.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.3 \pm 4.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.8 \pm 3.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Paguroidea | 0.0 | 0.0 \pm 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 \pm 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Mysidacea | 0.0 | 0.6 \pm 2.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 \pm 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 \pm 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Bivalvia | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 \pm 0.0 | 0.0 \pm 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 \pm 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 \pm 1.7 | 0.0 |
| Gastropoda | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 3.5 \pm 1.5 | 0.1 \pm 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.3 \pm 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Acarina | 0.1 \pm 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.5 \pm 0.5 | 0.0 | 0.1 \pm 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Pycnogonida | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 \pm 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 \pm 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Turbellaria | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 \pm 1.5 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 \pm 1.2 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 \pm 1.2 | 0.0 |
| Ophiuroidea | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.3 \pm 0.6 | 0.0 |

Table 3

Results of PERMANOVA analysis carried out to ascertain the differences in gut contents of *H. guttulatus* among three habitats (*Corallina elongata*, sandy bottom and *Cladophora prolifera*) in terms of total abundance of prey items, preys < 1mm, preys > 1mm, number of higher taxa and community composition of prey items (df = degree of freedom, MS = mean square, Pseudo-F = F statistic, P(perm) = probability level; *** = P < 0.001; ** = P < 0.01; * = P < 0.05, n.s. = not significant).

| PERMANOVA Main test | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------|----|--------|----------|---------|
| Variable | Source | df | MS | Pseudo-F | P(perm) |
| Total abundance | Habitat | 2 | 1703.4 | 40.8 | *** |
| | Residual | 80 | 41.7 | | |
| | Total | 82 | | | |
| Prey < 1mm | Habitat | 2 | 1965.5 | 25.5 | *** |
| | Residual | 80 | 76.9 | | |
| | Total | 82 | | | |
| Prey > 1mm | Habitat | 2 | 2235.6 | 6.5 | *** |
| | Residual | 80 | 345.6 | | |
| | Total | 82 | | | |
| Taxa | Habitat | 2 | 1153.5 | 7.2 | ** |
| | Residual | 80 | 160.5 | | |
| | Total | 82 | | | |
| Community | Habitat | 2 | 9061.1 | 14.0 | *** |
| | Residual | 80 | 645.3 | | |
| | Total | 82 | | | |

prolifera) and one low complex (sandy bottom) habitat. To investigate a spectrum of prey items present in the habitat so as to determine seahorse's prey preferences, benthic faunal samples were also collected.

Seahorses, selected according to their appearance, were hand-picked by SCUBA divers, morphometrically measured and then transferred to the containers containing filtered seawater (30 µm mesh) and clove oil (0.05%), a natural anesthetic [2,3]. To obtain gut contents, the technique of stomach

Table 4

Results of PERMANOVA pairwise analysis carried out to ascertain the differences in gut contents of *H. guttulatus* among three habitats (*Corallina elongata*, sandy bottom and *Cladophora prolifera*) in terms of total abundance of prey items, preys < 1mm, preys > 1mm, number of higher taxa and community composition of prey items (P(perm) = probability level; *** = P < 0.001; ** = P < 0.01; * = P < 0.05, n.s. = not significant).

| PERMANOVA Pairwise | | | |
|--------------------|---|-----|---------|
| Variable | Groups | t | P(perm) |
| Total abundance | <i>Corallina elongata</i> , Sandy bottom | 8.7 | *** |
| | <i>Corallina elongata</i> , <i>Cladophora prolifera</i> | 5.0 | *** |
| | Sandy bottom, <i>Cladophora prolifera</i> | 4.0 | *** |
| Prey < 1mm | <i>Corallina elongata</i> , Sandy bottom | 7.3 | *** |
| | <i>Corallina elongata</i> , <i>Cladophora prolifera</i> | 4.6 | *** |
| | Sandy bottom, <i>Cladophora prolifera</i> | 2.2 | * |
| Prey > 1mm | <i>Corallina elongata</i> , Sandy bottom | 3.8 | *** |
| | <i>Corallina elongata</i> , <i>Cladophora prolifera</i> | 1.6 | n.s. |
| | Sandy bottom, <i>Cladophora prolifera</i> | 1.9 | * |
| Taxa richness | <i>Corallina elongata</i> , Sandy bottom | 3.7 | *** |
| | <i>Corallina elongata</i> , <i>Cladophora prolifera</i> | 3.1 | ** |
| | Sandy bottom, <i>Cladophora prolifera</i> | 0.6 | n.s. |
| Community | <i>Corallina elongata</i> , Sandy bottom | 4.6 | *** |
| | <i>Corallina elongata</i> , <i>Cladophora prolifera</i> | 2.9 | *** |
| | Sandy bottom, <i>Cladophora prolifera</i> | 3.1 | *** |

Table 5

Results of PERMANOVA analysis carried out to ascertain the differences in sediment contents among three habitats (*Corallina elongata*, sandy bottom and *Cladophora prolifera*) in terms of total abundance of benthic fauna, organisms < 1mm, organisms > 1mm, number of higher taxa and community composition (df = degree of freedom, MS = mean square, Pseudo-F = F statistic, P(MC) = probability level; *** = P < 0.001; ** = P < 0.01; * = P < 0.05, n.s. = not significant).

| PERMANOVA Main test | | | | | |
|---------------------|----------|----|-------|----------|-------|
| Variable | Source | df | MS | Pseudo-F | P(MC) |
| Total abundance | Habitat | 2 | 225.2 | 36.5 | *** |
| | Residual | 6 | 6.2 | | |
| | Total | 8 | | | |
| Organisms < 1mm | Habitat | 2 | 235.5 | 33.9 | *** |
| | Residual | 6 | 6.9 | | |
| | Total | 8 | | | |
| Organisms > 1mm | Habitat | 2 | 94.3 | 2.7 | n.s. |
| | Residual | 6 | 34.5 | | |
| | Total | 8 | | | |
| Taxa | Habitat | 2 | 772.1 | 20.6 | ** |
| | Residual | 6 | 37.4 | | |
| | Total | 8 | | | |
| Community | Habitat | 2 | 951.8 | 13.5 | *** |
| | Residual | 6 | 70.5 | | |
| | Total | 8 | | | |

flushing was applied [1,3]. The water inside the container was sieved through 30 μm mesh. The fraction retained on the sieve was preserved in 50 ml tubes and in 4% buffered formalin and Rose Bengal (0.5 g l⁻¹). Benthic faunal samples were collected from the same habitats as seahorses. In each habitat, three replicate cores (with a diameter of 3.7 cm) were considered. Obtained samples were fixed in 4% buffered formaldehyde in filtered (0.3 μm mesh) seawater solution and in the laboratory, organisms were extracted from sediments by different techniques [4,5]. For both types of samples, the benthic faunal composition was assessed by visual identification under the stereomicroscope. Two size classes of organisms were identified: larger (>1mm) and smaller (i.e. meiofauna < 1mm). A detailed explanation of procedures is provided in [1]. Univariate and multivariate distance-based permutational nonparametric analyses of variance (PERMANOVA) [6,7] were performed including habitat (three levels: *Corallina elongata*, sandy bottom and *Cladophora prolifera*) as a fixed factor.

Table 6

Results of PERMANOVA pairwise analysis carried out to ascertain the differences in sediment contents among three habitats (*Corallina elongata*, sandy bottom and *Cladophora prolifera*) in terms of total abundance of benthic fauna, organisms < 1mm, number of higher taxa and community composition (P(MC) = probability level; *** = P < 0.001; ** = P < 0.01; * = P < 0.05, n.s. = not significant).

| PERMANOVA Pairwise | | | |
|--------------------|---|-----|-------|
| Variable | Groups | t | P(MC) |
| Total abundance | <i>Corallina elongata</i> , Sandy bottom | 6.0 | ** |
| | <i>Corallina elongata</i> , <i>Cladophora prolifera</i> | 9.0 | *** |
| | Sandy bottom, <i>Cladophora prolifera</i> | 1.7 | n.s. |
| Organisms < 1mm | <i>Corallina elongata</i> , Sandy bottom | 6.0 | ** |
| | <i>Corallina elongata</i> , <i>Cladophora prolifera</i> | 8.4 | ** |
| | Sandy bottom, <i>Cladophora prolifera</i> | 1.8 | n.s. |
| Taxa richness | <i>Corallina elongata</i> , Sandy bottom | 7.0 | ** |
| | <i>Corallina elongata</i> , <i>Cladophora prolifera</i> | 3.6 | * |
| | Sandy bottom, <i>Cladophora prolifera</i> | 2.6 | n.s. |
| Community | <i>Corallina elongata</i> , Sandy bottom | 4.7 | ** |
| | <i>Corallina elongata</i> , <i>Cladophora prolifera</i> | 4.3 | ** |
| | Sandy bottom, <i>Cladophora prolifera</i> | 2.1 | * |

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Carlo Pipitone for helping in identifying feeding items. A special thanks to Dr Fabio Lunetta for assisting in anesthetic and catheter procedures.

The authors received no specific funding for this work.

Transparency document

Transparency document associated with this article can be found in the online version at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dib.2019.104068>.

References

- [1] F. Ape, G. Corriero, S. Mirto, C. Pierrri, T. Lazic, M. Gristina, Trophic flexibility and prey selection of the wild long-snouted seahorse *Hippocampus guttulatus* Cuvier, 1829 in three coastal habitats, Estuar. Coast Shelf Sci. 224 (2019) 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2019.04.034>.
- [2] F.E.A. Cunha, I.L. Rosa, Anaesthetic effects of clove oil on seven species of tropical reef teleosts, J. Fish Biol. 69 (2006) 1504–1512. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1095-8649.2006.01213.x>.
- [3] A.L.C. Castro, A. De Farias Diniz, I.Z. Martins, A.L. Vendel, T.P.R. De Oliveira, I.M. De Lucena Rosa, Assessing diet composition of seahorses in the wild using a non destructive method: *Hippocampus reidi* (Teleostei: syngnathidae) as a study-case, Neotrop. Ichthyol. 6 (2008) 637–644. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1679-62252008000400012>.
- [4] M. Armenteros, J.A. Pérez-García, A. Pérez-Angulo, J.P. Williams, Efficiency of extraction of meiofauna from sandy and muddy marine sediments, Rev. Invesig. Mar. 29 (2008) 113–118. <http://www.vliz.be/imisdocs/publications/143881.pdf>.
- [5] C. Heip, M. Vincx, G. Vranken, The ecology of marine nematodes, Oceanogr. Mar. Biol. 23 (1985) 399–489.
- [6] M.J. Anderson, A new method for non-parametric multivariate analysis of variance, Austral. Ecology 26 (2011) 32–46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1442-9993.2001.01070.pp.x>.
- [7] B.H. McArdle, M.J. Anderson, Fitting multivariate models to community data: a comment on distance-based redundancy analysis, Ecology 82 (2001) 290–297 [0290:FMMTCD]2.0.CO;2, [https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658\(2001\)082](https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658(2001)082).