

Dirección Nacional de Parques, facilitated our work in the Dominican Republic. R. E. Glor made helpful comments on an early draft of this manuscript. Permits were issued by G. Santana, Departamento de Vida Silvestre, and K. Grasela, Dirección Nacional de Parques. Field work was supported by Grant No. DBI-9732257 awarded by the National Science Foundation to Robert Powell.

Caribbean Journal of Science, Vol. 36, No. 3-4, 323-326, 2000
Copyright 2000 College of Arts and Sciences
University of Puerto Rico, Mayagüez

Relationship of Diet and Prey Availability in *Aristelliger cochranae*, a Gecko from Navassa Island, West Indies

MATTHEW E. GIFFORD¹, ROBERT POWELL^{2,3} AND WARREN E. STEINER, JR.⁴ ¹*Department of Biology, Avila College, Kansas City, Missouri 64145-1698; gif3@hotmail.com.* ²*Department of Biology, Avila College, Kansas City, Missouri 64145-1698; powelr@mail.avila.edu.* ³*Corresponding author.* ⁴*Department of Entomology, NHB-187, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC 20560; steiner.warren@nunn.si.edu.*

Aristelliger cochranae Grant is a relatively small gecko with maximum snout-vent lengths (SVL) of 63 mm for males and 53 mm for females. It is endemic to Navassa Island, West Indies (Powell, 1999), and is typically arboreal, with individuals frequently found within the twisted branches of *Ficus* trees or under bark. Thomas (1966) also noted their association with fan palms (*Thrinax morrisii*). In 1998, we collected this predator and its potential prey in fan palms on Navassa. This tiny island, with an area of approximately 5.2 km², is located about 60 km west of the southwestern tip of the Haitian Tiburon Peninsula (Thomas, 1966).

Although *A. cochranae* was described by Grant (1931) nearly 70 years ago, very little is known about its natural history (Lynxwiler and Parmelee, 1993). Because energy acquisition is a fundamental aspect of any species' niche, we examined food habits in relation to potential prey present in the lizards' habitat. Previous studies of the West Indian geckos *Hemidactylus haitianus* (Powell et al., 1990), *Aristelliger lar* (Burns et al., 1992), and *Sphaerodactylus difficilis*, *S. altavelensis*, *S. clenchi*, and *S. asterulus* (Cunningham et al., 1993) indicated that all of these lizards consume a wide range of prey. However, none of these studies compared prey items taken by geckos with available prey.

Twenty-two (9 males and 13 females) geckos and associated arthropods were collected on 29 July and 2 August 1998 from fan palms in a savanna just south of the lighthouse on Navassa. Predators and presumed prey were acquired by shaking dead fronds over an insect net. Arthropods were placed in a killing jar and preserved in 80 % ethyl alcohol. Lizards were killed by lethal injection of T-61 (a veterinary drug no longer available), preserved in 10 % formalin, and transferred to 75 % ethyl alcohol upon return to the laboratory. Stomachs were removed and contents identified to the lowest possible taxonomic level. Insect collections made during the biological inventory of Navassa facilitated identification of the often fragmented prey. Prey items were counted and volumes determined using the formula for the volume of a prolate spheroid (Vitt and Zani, 1996). The intact size of lizard ova, fragments of which were found in some stomachs,

LITERATURE CITED

- Cast, E. E. et al. 2000. Natural history of an anoline lizard community in the Sierra de Baoruco, Hispaniola. *Carib. J. Sci.* 36:258-266.
- Curio, E. 1976. *The Ethology of Predation*. Springer-Verlag, New York. 250 pp.
- Greene, H. W. 1988. Antipredator mechanisms in reptiles. In C. Gans and R. B. Huey (eds.), *Biology of the Reptilia*. Vol. 16, Ecology B. Defense and Life History, pp. 1-152. Alan R. Liss, Inc., New York.
- Lenart, L. A., R. Powell, J. S. Parmelee, Jr., A. Lathrop, and D. D. Smith. 1997. Anoline diversity in three differentially altered habitats in the Sierra de Baoruco, Republica Dominicana, Hispaniola. *Biotropica* 29:117-123.
- Losos, J. B., and D. J. Irschick. 1996. The effect of perch diameter on escape behavior of *Anolis* lizards: laboratory predictions and field tests. *Anim. Behav.* 51: 593-602.
- Rand, A. S. 1962. Notes on Hispaniolan herpetology 5. The natural history of three sympatric species of *Anolis*. *Breviora* (154):1-15.
- Rand, A. S., and E. E. Williams. 1969. The anoles of La Palma: aspects of their ecological relationships. *Breviora* (327):1-19.
- Regalado, R. 1998. Approach distance and escape behavior of three species of Cuban *Anolis* (Squamata, Polychrotidae). *Carib. J. Sci.* 34:211-217.
- Schwartz, A. 1974. A new species of primitive *Anolis* (Sauria, Iguanidae) from the Sierra de Bahoruco, Hispanolia. *Breviora* (423):1-19.
- SEA/DVS (Secretaría de Estado de Agricultura/ Departamento de Vida Silvestre). 1992. Reconocimiento y evaluación de los recursos naturales en el Bahoruco Oriental. Sec. Estado Agric., Depto. Vida Silvestre. Sto. Domingo, República Dominicana. x + 141 pp.
- Sifers, S. M., M. L. Yeska, Y. M. Ramos, R. Powell, and J. S. Parmelee, Jr. 2001. *Anolis* lizards restricted to altered edge habitats in a Hispaniolan cloud forest. *Carib. J. Sci.* 37: in press.
- Williams, E. E. 1983. Ecomorphs, faunas, island size, and diverse end points in island radiations of *Anolis*. In R. B. Huey et al. (eds.), *Lizard Ecology: Studies of a Model Organism*, pp. 326-370. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Ydenberg, R. C. and L. M. Dill. 1986. The economics of fleeing from predators. In J. S. Rosenblatt et al. (eds.), *Advances in the Study of Behavior*. Vol. 16, pp. 229-251. Academic Press, New York.

was estimated by using the mean size of 11 intact eggs (Powell, 1999). The resultant data were used to calculate dietary importance values (Powell et al., 1990; Birt et al., in press), which consider numbers, volumes, and frequencies of occurrence for each type of prey. Prey types were defined as species for vertebrates and order for arthropods to facilitate comparisons with other dietary studies of West Indian lizards. Importance values then were used to calculate dietary niche breadths standardized on a scale of 0-1 (Levins, 1968; Hurlbert, 1978) and dietary niche overlaps (Pianka, 1973) between males and females and between potential prey found in palm fronds and actual prey consumed by geckos.

Statistical analyses were made using StatView 5.0 (SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, North Carolina). All means are presented \pm one SE; for all tests, $\alpha = 0.05$. Lizards are in the Bobby Witcher Memorial Collection, Avila College, Kansas City, Missouri (BWMC 06199-220). Insect specimens are deposited in the U.S. National Museum of Natural History, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC, and, in addition to locality information, bear the label "Taken by beating dead leaves of *Thrinax* in open rocky savanna and forest edges."

A total of 576 arthropods was collected (Table 1). The most abundant taxa were Psocoptera (32%), Coleoptera (20%), and Araneida (17%). Psocoptera were not found in lizard stomachs, but the combination of small size and soft bodies could have resulted in such rapid digestion that they appeared to be absent from stomach samples. Araneida (20%) and Coleoptera (12%) were well represented in the lizards' diets. The most common prey items were ants (Formicidae; 32%), which were far less commonly represented among potential prey (6%).

Hatchling *A. cochranæ*, egg shell fragments, or both were found in five females, all of which contained an

oviductal egg. Ova and hatchlings had importance values of 0.271 and 0.082, respectively, in a pooled sample of all lizards (Table 2). In females alone, ova had an importance value of 0.318 and were the most important item. Three stomachs were empty and two contained unidentifiable fragments.

Consumed ova and hatchlings presumably represented the greatest energy source available. That they were taken only by females is likely due to the high energy demands of reproduction. At least 37 species of geckos feed on other vertebrates (Bauer, 1990), with other geckos and conspecifics (mostly juveniles) the most frequent victims. Consumption of intact eggs had not been reported previously (A.M. Bauer, pers. comm.), but we could not determine whether intact ova were consumed or hatching triggered a feeding response in the females.

Standardized niche breadths of 0.612 for males and 0.516 for females are substantially larger than for other West Indian geckos. Males consumed only 3 of 10 prey types (Table 2), but all were taken in large quantities. Females consumed 9 of 10 prey types. Dietary overlap between males and females (0.282) was surprisingly low, but it increased to 0.462 when ova and hatchlings were excluded from the calculation. These low values and a sexual size dimorphism index (M:F) of 1.19:1 (based on maximum male and female SVL; Roughgarden, 1995) suggest resource partitioning. However, the largest food items were taken by the smaller females and mean food item size of males ($26.7 \pm 13.2 \text{ mm}^3$, 1.0-62.2 mm^3 , $N = 5$) and females ($64.2 \pm 19.9 \text{ mm}^3$, 0.8-202.0 mm^3 , $N = 12$) did not differ significantly when ova and hatchlings were included (Mann-Whitney U , $Z = -0.95$, $P = 0.34$) or excluded ($Z = -0.11$, $P = 0.92$). Similarly, SVL and mean food item size were not significantly correlated (Spearman correlation; males: $Z = 0.60$, $P = 0.55$; females: $Z = 1.89$, $P = 0.06$;

TABLE 1. Numbers of potential prey compared to prey consumed by *A. cochranæ* found in dead, pendant palm fronds of *Thrinax morrisii*. Percentages are in parentheses; dashes indicate that a particular type of prey item was not found.

Prey	Number present	Number consumed
Arachnida: Araneida	96 (16.7)	10 (20.0)
Arachnida: Pseudoscorpionida	9 (1.6)	1 (2.0)
Diplopoda: Polyxenida: Polyxenidae	2 (0.3)	—
Insecta: Cleoptera: Carabidae, Elateridae, Lathridiidae, Aderidae, Curculionidae, Anobiidae, Mordellidae, Oedemeridae, Melyidae, Bruchidae, Nitidulidae	116 (20.1)	6 (12.0)
Insecta Diptera: Ceratopogonidae, Cecidomyiidae, Sciaridae	7 (1.2)	1 (2.0)
Insecta: Heteroptera: Reduviidae, Anthocoridae	4 (0.7)	—
Insecta: Homoptera: Achilidae, fulgoroid (immature)	2 (0.3)	—
Insecta: Hymenoptera: Formicidae, Bethyliidae, Halictidae, Agaonidae	37 (6.4)	16 (32.0)
Insecta: Isoptera	—	5 (10.0)
Insecta: Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae, Tineidae, undet. larvae	35 (6.1)	5 (10.0)
Insecta: Orthoptera: Gryllidae, Blattidae	61 (10.6)	1 (2.0)
Insecta: Psocoptera	182 (31.6)	—
Insecta: Thysanura: Lepismatidae	1 (0.2)	—
Reptilia: Squamata: Gekkonidae (hatchling)	4 (0.7)	1 (2.0)
Reptilia: Squamata: Gekkonidae (ova)	20 (3.5)	4 (8.0)

TABLE 2. Dietary importance values (I) (see text) of male and female *A. cochranæ* taken from dead, pendant palm fronds of *Thrinax morrisii* on Navassa Island. Each entry contains four items: in line one the three figures represent relative numbers, relative volume, and relative frequency of occurrence, respectively; the figure in the second line is the importance value of that type of prey item in the diet. Dashes indicate that a particular type of prey item was not found.

Prey item	I (all)	I (males)	I (females)	I (females w/o ova)
Arachnida: Araneida	0.200/0.092/0.300 0.197	0.444/0.556/0.400 0.465	0.146/0.030/0.261 0.145	0.167/0.307/0.462 0.312
Arachnida: Pseudoscorpionida	0.020/0.002/0.033 0.018	0.111/0.003/0.200 0.104	—	—
Insecta: Coleoptera: Anobiidae, Scolytidae, Tenebrionidae	0.120/0.001/0.067 0.063	—	0.146/0.001/0.087 0.078	0.167/0.006/0.154 0.109
Insecta: Diptera	0.020/0.004/0.033 0.019	—	0.024/0.001/0.044 0.023	0.028/0.012/0.077 0.039
Insecta: Hymenoptera: Formicidae	0.320/0.029/0.200 0.183	—	0.390/0.036/0.261 0.229	0.444/0.347/0.462 0.418
Insecta: Isoptera	0.100/0.013/0.033 0.049	—	0.122/0.015/0.044 0.060	0.139/0.157/0.077 0.124
Insecta: Lepidoptera: Gelechiidae and others	0.100/0.055/0.133 0.096	0.444/0.441/0.400 0.427	0.024/0.005/0.044 0.024	0.028/0.032/0.077 0.455
Insecta: Orthoptera: Blatellidae	0.020/0.011/0.033 0.021	—	0.024/0.013/0.044 0.027	0.028/0.138/0.077 0.081
Reptilia: Gekkonidae (hatchling)	0.020/0.193/0.033 0.082	—	0.024/0.215/0.044 0.094	—
Reptilia: Gekkonidae (ova)	0.080/0.599/0.133 0.271	—	0.098/0.683/0.174 0.318	—

females without ova and hatchlings: $Z = 0.73$, $P = 0.46$).

Overlap between potential prey available and actual prey taken (0.182) was much lower than anticipated, although the overlap is greater (0.475) when ova and hatchlings are excluded. However, overlap was zero when prey were identified to species. In addition, the species actually consumed by geckos are known to be associated with dead standing wood and were not found in the palm frond assemblage. These data suggest that lizards forage away from the palm fronds, a conclusion that raises the question of why geckos would forage elsewhere when the palms offer so much potential prey and shelter from predators.

Acknowledgments.—Jil Swearingen helped collect specimens. Aaron M. Bauer commented on an earlier draft of this manuscript. Field work by RP and WES took place during an expedition organized by the Center for Marine Conservation, with major support of the Luce Foundation, the U.S. Department of the Interior's Office of Insular Affairs, and the U.S. Coast Guard. The captain and crew of the U.S.C.G. Legare arranged access to the island, and the captain and crew of the U.S.C.G. Valiant facilitated our return to civilization. Chief Sharon Patterson provided logistical support and exceedingly gracious hospitality during our stay at the U.S. Naval Base at Guantanamo, Cuba. S. Blair Hedges (Pennsylvania State University) and the Milwaukee Public Museum provided funds to offset personal expenses incurred by RP.

LITERATURE CITED

- Bauer, A. M. 1990. Gekkonid lizards as prey of invertebrates and predators of vertebrates. *Herpetol. Rev.* 21:83-87.
- Birt, R. A., R. Powell, and B. D. Greene. In press. Natural history of *Anolis barkeri*, a semi-aquatic lizard from southern México. *J. Herpetol.* 35: in press.
- Burns, J. K. et al. 1992. Lizards of the Cayos Siete Hermanos, Dominican Republic, Hispaniola. *Bull. Chicago Herpetol. Soc.* 27:225-232.
- Cunningham, C. A., J. S. Tulloch, and R. Powell. 1993. Food habits of four Hispaniolan species of *Sphaerodactylus* (Lacertilia: Gekkonidae). *Herpetol. Nat. Hist.* 1(2):91-93.
- Grant, C. 1931. A new species of *Aristelliger* from Navassa. *J. Dept. Agric. Porto Rico* 4:399-400.
- Hurlbert, S. H. 1978. The measurement of niche overlap and some relatives. *Ecology* 59:67-77.
- Levins, R. 1968. *Evolution in Changing Environments: Some Theoretical Explorations*. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, New Jersey. ix + 120 pp.
- Lynxwiler, J. R. and J. S. Parmelee, Jr. 1993. *Aristelliger cochranæ*. *Cat. Amer. Amphib. Rept.* (567):1-3.
- Pianka, E. R. 1973. The structure of lizard communities. *Ann. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* 4:53-74.
- Powell, R. 1999. Herpetology of Navassa Island, West Indies. *Carib. J. Sci.* 35:1-13.
- Powell, R., J. S. Parmelee, Jr., M. A. Rice, and D. D. Smith. 1990. Ecological observations of *Hemidactylus*

- lus brooki haitianus* Meerwarth (Sauria: Gekkonidae) from Hispaniola. *Carib. J. Sci.* 26:67-70.
- Roughgarden, J. 1995. *Anolis Lizards of the Caribbean: Ecology, Evolution, and Plate Tectonics*. Oxford Univ. Press, New York and Oxford.
- Thomas, R. 1966. A reassessment of the herpetofauna of Navassa Island. *J. Ohio Herpetol. Soc.* 5:73-89.
- Vitt, L. J. and P. A. Zani. 1996. Ecology of the elusive tropical lizard *Tropidurus [=Uracentron] flaviceps* (Tropiduridae) in lowland rain forest of Ecuador. *Herpetologica* 52:121-132.

Caribbean Journal of Science, Vol. 36, No. 3-4, 326-328, 2000
Copyright 2000 College of Arts and Sciences
University of Puerto Rico, Mayagüez

Cuban Treefrogs (*Osteopilus septentrionalis*) in Anguilla, Lesser Antilles

JOSIAH H. TOWNSEND, *Department of Biology, Miami-Dade Community College, Kendall Campus, Miami, Florida 33157 (current address: Department of Wildlife Ecology and Conservation, University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida 32611, joetownsend@earthlink.net)*; JAMES M. EATON, *Department of Biology, St. Louis University, St. Louis, Missouri 63103 (eatonjm@slu.edu)*; ROBERT POWELL, *Department of Biology, Avila College, Kansas City, MO 64145 (powellr@mail.avila.edu)*; JOHN S. PARMERLEE, JR., *Department of Biology, Avila College, Kansas City, Missouri 64145 and Department of Biology, Johnson County Community College, Overland Park, Kansas 66210 (caarmapman@earthlink.net)*; AND ROBERT W. HENDERSON, *Section of Vertebrate Zoology, Milwaukee Public Museum, Milwaukee, WI 53233 (rh@mpm.edu)*.

Since late 1999, the Cuban Treefrog, *Osteopilus septentrionalis*, has become firmly established in Anguilla (Fig. 1). Anguilla is a xeric island (~900 mm annual rainfall) and its primary habitat is dry thorn forest, most of it degraded by feral goats. Twenty-three salt ponds and marshes constitute the only natural surface water. Sites where treefrogs have been recorded include water storage tanks, old wells, private cisterns, and areas in resorts and gardens that are watered regularly.

Most Anguillians believe that these frogs were introduced in 1999 via container shipments of decorative plants from Miami, Florida (USA) that were bound for a resort hotel in the final stages of construction. Workers at several resorts and nurseries reported that they had opened shipping containers from Miami and found frogs inside. However, several of these same workers, in addition to officials with the Health Care and Water departments, reported seeing occasional frogs as early as the late 1980s. Although the earlier arrivals were not documented with voucher specimens, photographs of Cuban Treefrogs were taken in 1997 (K. V. D. Hodge, pers. comm.) and Daltrey (1998) included *O. septentrionalis* in a list of Anguil-

lian amphibians and reptiles. Apparently, small localized populations had been established prior to the documented arrival of container-borne frogs in 1999.

The resident populations, supplemented by recent arrivals, took advantage of conditions during an unusually wet year (1999) that culminated with the landfall of two major hurricanes—José in October and Lenny in November. Population sizes increased explosively due to the benefits of inundation and corresponding large-scale increases in reproductive activity (Meshaka, 1993; in press). During such events, breeding activity is not limited to larger, more fecund females. Instead, the more plentiful small-to-medium sized females are incorporated into the breeding population, dramatically enhancing recruitment (Meshaka, in press).

In addition, frogs moved or were transported throughout much of the western half of the island. With the resumption of drier conditions, frogs retreated into available refuges (Schwartz and Henderson, 1991; Meshaka, 1996). By February 2000, the Health Department had received many calls about frogs and tadpoles in cisterns. A program was instituted to screen cistern openings where frogs had been reported. Between February and June, 33 complaints were investigated and 144 frogs were collected (J. Parr, pers. comm.). An additional 81 cisterns were screened as a precautionary measure.

In June 2000, we searched 20 sites (water tanks, freshwater springs, gardens, and resorts) across the island (Fig. 1). Voucher specimens were collected at ten sites, and frogs, tadpoles, or eggs were observed but not collected at two additional sites. No evidence of frogs was found at the remaining sites. Eighteen metamorphosed frogs and three tadpoles were collected and are deposited in the Bobby Witcher Memorial Collection (BWMC) at Avila College. The Health Department reported an additional 24 sites (J. Parr, pers. comm.; Fig. 1). All sites with frogs, except one, were near areas of human activity. The exception was an abandoned well near Katouche Bay, in which frogs were observed calling and in amplexus at the water's surface approximately 3 m below ground level.

Osteopilus septentrionalis is well known for its ability to successfully colonize areas by exploiting man-made structures and water supplies (Meshaka, in press). The populations on Anguilla certainly have followed this pattern, but methods of dispersal are unknown. Aside from active dispersal during the rainy season, frogs might be dispersed passively via plants transported from one site to another. In addition, we heard numerous anecdotal accounts of dispersal by cars or by the trucks that distribute water to cisterns during the dry season. Assuming that dispersal and subsequent colonization of new areas are facilitated by wet conditions, we predict that, when hurricanes strike Anguilla again, frogs are likely to occupy almost every suitable habitat on the island.

Meshaka (in press) listed 10 factors that allow *Osteopilus septentrionalis* to be successful in a situation that seems less than ideal for supporting a widespread anuran population (i.e., an extremely xeric island). Although the Anguillian population exhibits most of these factors, four appear to be particularly important: