

proximately 0.8 kcal/mol for each segment replaced, as indicated by the parallel line drawn through these points. These two parallel relations show that transmembrane segments 1 to 5 of these receptors each contribute approximately 0.8 kcal/mol to the difference in binding energy between PAC and ISO.

In contrast to the progressive change in binding energy preference observed when segments 1 to 5 are exchanged, substitution of transmembrane segment 7 of the α_2 -receptor for the corresponding segment of the β_2 receptor causes a dramatic change of 3.7 kcal/mol for a single segment (compare \square and \blacksquare in Fig. 1). The size of this change is independent of the source of transmembrane segments 1 to 5 as illustrated by the parallel lines in Fig. 1. Evidently segment 7 has unique determinants of agonist binding specificity, as concluded by Kobilka *et al.* (1).

This quantitative analysis of agonist binding specificity emphasizes the additive con-

tributions of individual transmembrane segments in determining binding energy preference. The use of binding free energy as the measured parameter makes these additive relationships clearer than simple inspection of binding curves and relative K_d values. This approach may prove valuable in similar analyses of chimeras of other members of the family of G-protein-coupled receptors or of other proteins with multiple membrane-spanning segments.

WILLIAM A. CATTERALL
*Department of Pharmacology,
School of Medicine,
University of Washington,
Seattle, WA 98195*

REFERENCES

1. B. K. Kobilka *et al.*, *Science* **240**, 1310 (1988).
22 June 1988; accepted 10 August 1988

Response: We are pleased that Catterall's quantitative analysis of our data strengthens

the conclusions that we drew about the importance of various transmembrane domains in determining the α - versus β -adrenergic binding specificity of these receptors. Combination of the experimental approaches used in our studies with analytic approaches such as that suggested by Catterall should provide a powerful means of analyzing the structural basis of the function of receptors coupled to guanine nucleotide regulatory proteins.

BRIAN K. KOBILKA
TONG SUN KOBILKA
KIEFER W. DANIELS
JOHN W. REGAN
MARC G. CARAN
ROBERT J. LEFKOWITZ
*Howard Hughes Medical Institute,
Cardiovascular Division,
Department of Medicine,
Duke University Medical Center,
Box 3821, Durham, NC 27710*

18 July 1988; accepted 10 August 1988

Predation on Ocean Krill

In developing the hypothesis that "high-density demersal layers" of krill (*Meganyctiphanes norvegica*) at the bottom of submarine canyons are a major prey of fishes on Georges Bank, Greene *et al.* (1) may be missing a major facet of the trophic interactions among these organisms. According to their hypothesis, the fishes make descents into deep water next to the Bank, where, it is suggested, there is advantage in feeding on these vertical migrators when they are in their normal daytime aggregations. But this is not how the interactions proceed in what probably are similar situations elsewhere.

It has been widely reported (2-4) that fishes which inhabit relatively shallow banks or shelves feed heavily by day on organisms that, like *M. norvegica*, make extensive diel vertical migrations in adjacent deep water. The reports have come from the continental shelves of North America (2) and Australia (3), as well as from a central Pacific atoll (4); and in addition to various species of krill, the vertically migrating prey have included copepods and myctophid fishes. In the reported cases, however, the predatory fishes do not descend from the shelf or bank into the adjacent depths to take prey from the concentrations that form there by day. Rather, they feed on individuals that, after having been carried by currents (or swimming) over the shelf-bank while in the surface waters at night, are trapped by the relatively shallow shelf-bank when in the morning

they descend toward their normal daytime depths. Apparently these organisms are especially vulnerable to predators in this setting, which is very different from their normal daytime habitat.

EDMUND S. HOBSON
*Southwest Fisheries Center,
Tiburon Laboratory,
3150 Paradise Drive,
Tiburon, CA 94920*

REFERENCES

1. C. H. Greene, P. H. Weibe, J. Burczynski, M. J. Youngbluth, *Science* **241**, 359 (1988).
2. J. D. Isaacs and R. A. Schwartzlose, *ibid.* **150**, 1810 (1965); W. T. Pereyra, W. G. Percy, F. E. Garvey, *J. Fish. Res. Board. Can.* **26**, 2214 (1969); R. Brodeur and W. G. Percy, *Fish. Bull. U.S.* **28**, 289 (1984); J. R. Chess, S. E. Smith, P. C. Fisher, *Calif. Coop. Oceanic Fish. Invest. Rep.*, in press.
3. T. A. Clarke, *Copeia* **605** (1984).
4. E. S. Hobson and J. R. Chess, *Pacific Sci.* **40**, 24 (1986).

12 August 1988; accepted 16 September 1988

Response: In our paper (1), we hypothesized that squid and demersal fish production attributed to Georges Bank might be subsidized by the exploitation of krill from the submarine canyons and other deep waters surrounding the Bank. At present, the evidence for such a subsidy is circumstantial; krill are an important but variable dietary component of the Bank's commercially important squid and demersal fish stocks, and many of these stocks seasonally move off the

Bank (as defined by the 200-meter isobath) into the surrounding deep waters where the high-density krill demersal layers are found. Unfortunately, little is known about the behavior and diets of these species when they move into deeper water. As we stated, closer examination of the spatial and temporal coupling between predator and prey populations will be essential to determine the validity of our hypothesis.

Hobson (2) raises a valid point with regard to the spatio-temporal coupling between predator and prey populations. If krill are the missing link in the Georges Bank food chain, then they must move onto the Bank either through vertical migration and advection by currents (or active swimming), as Hobson suggests, or the squid and fish stocks must descend into deeper water and feed, as we implied. Initially, we favored the mechanism hypothesized by Hobson, since there is ample evidence for such events occurring on other banks (3) and seamounts (4) around the world. However, extensive zooplankton and micronekton surveys on Georges Bank (5) indicate that krill rarely intrude on the shallower portions of the Bank, and thus the circumstantial evidence for Hobson's hypothesis does not appear to exist. On the other hand, fishery surveys on and around Georges Bank (6) indicate that many squid and demersal fish stocks move off the Bank seasonally into the deeper waters, where high-density krill demersal layers have been observed. Therefore, we chose to emphasize the latter hypothesized mechanism for the trophic linkage rather than the one Hobson suggests. So little is

Science

Predation on ocean krill

ES Hobson

Science **243** (4888), 237-238.
DOI: 10.1126/science.2911738

ARTICLE TOOLS

<http://science.sciencemag.org/content/243/4888/237.2.citation>

PERMISSIONS

<http://www.sciencemag.org/help/reprints-and-permissions>

Use of this article is subject to the [Terms of Service](#)

Science (print ISSN 0036-8075; online ISSN 1095-9203) is published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1200 New York Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20005. 2017 © The Authors, some rights reserved; exclusive licensee American Association for the Advancement of Science. No claim to original U.S. Government Works. The title *Science* is a registered trademark of AAAS.