

**Trophic specialization on unique resources despite limited niche divergence in
a celebrated example of sympatric speciation**

Jacquelyn R. Galvez^{1,2}, Michelle E. St. John^{1,2}, Keara McLean³, Cyrille Dening Touokong⁴,
Legrand Nono Gonwouo⁵, Christopher H. Martin^{1,2}

¹Department of Integrative Biology, University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA

²Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA

³Department of Biology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA

⁴Gulf Aquatics, Inc., P.O. Box: 8647, Douala-Cameroon

⁵Laboratory of Zoology, Faculty of Science, University of Yaoundé I, P.O. Box 812, Yaoundé,
Cameroon

Key words: trophic niche partitioning, dietary niche partitioning, dietary specialization,
specialization, adaptive radiation, ecological divergence, sympatric speciation, Liem's paradox

Correspondence: chmartin@berkeley.edu

ABSTRACT

Trophic niche partitioning is observed in many adaptive radiations and is hypothesized to be a central process underlying species divergence. However, patterns of dietary niche partitioning are inconsistent across radiations and there are few studies of niche partitioning in putative examples of sympatric speciation. Here, we conducted the first quantitative study of dietary niche partitioning using stomach contents and stable isotope analyses in one of the most celebrated examples of sympatric speciation: the cichlid radiation from crater lake Barombi Mbo, Cameroon. We found little evidence for trophic niche partitioning among cichlids, including the nine species coexisting in the narrow littoral zone. Stable isotope analyses supported these conclusions of substantial dietary overlap. Our data, however, did reveal that five of eleven species consume rare dietary items, including freshwater sponge, terrestrial ants, and nocturnal foraging on shrimp. Stomach contents of the spongivore (*Pungu maclareni*) were 20% freshwater sponge, notable considering that only 0.04% of all fishes consume sponges. Overall, we conclude that cichlid species in lake Barombi Mbo overlap considerably in broad dietary niches—in part due to the large proportion of detritus in the stomach contents of all species—but there is evidence for divergence among species in their diet specializations on unique resources. We speculate that these species may utilize these additional specialized resources during periods of low resource abundance in support of Liem's paradox.

47

48 INTRODUCTION

49 Adaptive radiations are a hallmark of evolutionary biology, being among the most celebrated,
50 studied, and charismatic examples of ecological diversity. Much research on these systems centers
51 on uncovering the mechanisms driving diversification (Schluter 2000; Martin & Richards 2019;
52 Stroud & Losos 2020), and there are several hypotheses suggesting that specific temporal, spatial,
53 environmental, and/or genomic factors are necessary for a radiation to proceed (Schluter 2000;
54 Gavrillets & Losos 2009; Richards et al. 2021). Many of these theories highlight the importance of
55 divergence in trophic niche, as dietary niche partitioning can allow for the coexistence of similar
56 species by reducing interspecific competition for limited food resources (Ross 1986; Winemiller
57 & Pianka 1990; Reinthal 1990; Correa & Winemiller 2014; Varghese *et al.* 2014). For example,
58 the stages hypothesis suggests that adaptation occurs in distinct, ordered stages, and that
59 divergence in habit is followed by divergence in trophic morphology and diet, and finally
60 divergence in traits related to communication (Danley and Streelman 2003). Other hypotheses
61 suggest that divergence in dietary niche may occur early in diversification (Ackerly *et al.* 2006),
62 and still others suggest that shifts in dietary niche can occur without much phenotypic change
63 (Gavrillets & Losos 2009). Even though multiple hypotheses assume that divergence in trophic
64 niche—as well as divergence in relevant phenotypic traits—are ubiquitous and integral to adaptive
65 radiations, evidence from empirical studies remains conflicting (Gillespie *et al.* 2020). To fully
66 understand how divergence in dietary niche contributes to diversification in adaptive radiations,
67 we need more empirical evidence documenting the patterns and frequency of trophic niche
68 partitioning in examples in nature.

African cichlids are widely regarded as a model system for studying adaptive radiation and have been especially useful for investigating patterns of dietary niche partitioning. There is great diversity in trophic divergence patterns among closely related cichlid species, with no single solution to how diet relates to diversification. For example, the species flocks of lakes Malawi, Victoria, and Tanganyika contain dietary specialists and closely related species that exhibit varying levels of trophic niche partitioning (Kocher 2004; Martin & Genner 2009; Wagner *et al.* 2009), providing evidence that divergence in dietary niche is important for adaptive radiations. Yet divergence in these lakes cannot solely be attributed to dietary differences. Habitat partitioning (Albertson 2008; Conith *et al.* 2020) and sexual selection (McKaye *et al.* 1993; Taylor *et al.* 1998; Seehausen 2000; Stauffer *et al.* 2002; Streelman & Danley 2003; Martin & Genner 2009; Poelstra *et al.* 2018) are also hypothesized to play an important role in the observed ecological diversity of these lineages. Additionally, many sympatric rock-dwelling Malawi cichlids exhibit differences in trophic morphology, but still show extreme dietary overlap (Ribbink *et al.* 1983; Reinthal 1990; Genner *et al.* 1999a; Genner *et al.* 1999b; Martin & Genner 2009), suggesting that many closely related species can diversify and coexist without strong trophic niche divergence (see also Stauffer & McKaye 2002; McKaye *et al.* 2002 for an example of dietary overlap among co-occurring cichlids in Nicaraguan crater lake Xiloá). This phenomenon—where trophic specialists act as “jacks-of-all-trades” able to consume both their narrow food source as well as a more generalist diet despite substantial differences in trophic morphology—is known as “Liem’s paradox” (Liem 1980). Contrastingly, there are African cichlid systems in which diet may be the primary driver of ecological divergence, such as the *Alcolapia* species flock of the alkaline Lake Natron (Seegers & Tichy 1999). These three herbivorous species exhibit fine-scale trophic and ecomorphological differences despite limited genomic differentiation, suggesting the importance of trophic niche

partitioning in the diversification of this clade (Ford *et al.* 2016). Continuing to investigate these diverse, unique patterns of dietary divergence will aid in understanding how trophic niche partitioning contributes to ecological diversity in adaptive radiations, especially in systems where diet is hypothesized to play an integral role in divergence.

One such system is the African cichlid radiation in crater lake Barombi Mbo, Cameroon. This adaptive radiation contains 11 endemic cichlid species, including a monophyletic *Stomatepia* clade (*Stomatepia mongo*, *Stomatepia mariae*, and *Stomatepia pindu*), a polyphyletic *Sarotherodon* group (*Sarotherodon linnellii*, *Sarotherodon caroli*, *Sarotherodon steinbachi*, and *Sarotherodon lohbergeri*), the shallow/deep-water sister species pair of *Konia* (*Konia eisentrauti* and *Konia dikume*), and monotypic genera *Pungu maclareni* and *Myaka myaka* (see Martin *et al.* 2015 for phylogenetic relationships). The cichlids of Barombi Mbo are an excellent system to investigate patterns of dietary niche partitioning for several reasons. First, the radiation is celebrated as a putative example of sympatric speciation in nature and is responsible for renewing interest in the empirical and theoretical study of this process (Schliewen *et al.* 1994; Turelli *et al.* 2001; Schliewen and Klee 2004; Coyne *et al.* 2004; Bolnick & Fitzpatrick 2007; Martin 2012; Richards *et al.* 2019). Second, dietary partitioning appears to be the primary axis of divergence in this system (Martin 2012). In a second radiation of *Coptodon* cichlid species endemic to Lake Ejagham, Cameroon—another recognized example of sympatric speciation in nature—olfactory preferences and sexual selection are hypothesized to play a primary role in divergence (Martin 2013; Poelstra *et al.* 2018), making it difficult to isolate the effects of diet. The cichlid radiation of Barombi Mbo, on the other hand, displays striking differences among sympatric species in trophic morphology and there is no evidence of sexual dimorphism in 10 out of the 11 species in the lake, suggesting that differences in diet may be the primary driver of ecological divergence

(Martin 2012). Finally, despite the renewed interest in this system, few studies have documented the dietary niches of each species, nor have they quantitatively identified species that may partake in dietary specialization. Trewavas *et al.* (1972) provided qualitative descriptions of dietary profiles among species and identified potential specialist species that feed heavily on plants (*K. eisenbrauti*) and freshwater sponges (*P. maclareni*). More recently, Martin (2012) investigated trophic position divergence within endemic *Stomatepia spp.* using stable isotope data, finding minimal divergence within the genus but some difference between *Stomatepia spp.* and *P. maclareni*. Still, divergence in dietary components (i.e. stomach contents) and relative trophic position (i.e. stable isotopes) has not been recently assessed for all species. Furthermore, the dietary niche partitioning patterns, especially among generalists and putative specialists, are still unknown.

Here we measured the dietary profiles of all cichlid species from Barombi Mbo. We used stomach content analyses to quantify differences in dietary item proportions, niche width and overlap, and overall dietary composition (9 out of 11 species). We also used stable isotope analyses to investigate relative trophic position and carbon source differences among species over a longer timeframe than the “snapshot” provided by stomach content data (11 out of 11 species). These data allowed us to specifically investigate 1) the extent of dietary niche partitioning and overlap occurring in the system, 2) the existence of any unique or specialized food items, and 3) the extent of trophic specialization—all necessary for furthering our understanding of how dietary divergence contributed to diversification in this system.

METHODS

Study site and sample collection

Barombi Mbo is a 1 Mya volcanic crater lake (Cornen *et al.* 1992) in southwestern Cameroon. It is roughly circular in shape with a diameter of 2.5 km and a maximum depth of 110 m, but the oxic zone only reaches to 30 m (Trewavas *et al.* 1972; Cornen *et al.* 1992; Musilova *et al.* 2019). We collected samples in December 2009 through January 2010, and in July through December, 2016 from several localities in the lake using a 6 x 2 m seine net with 0.5 cm² mesh. *Sarotherodon linnellii* and *K. dikume* were caught by artisanal fishers using gill nets. We collected all 11 cichlid species that are endemic to Barombi Mbo. We euthanized captured fish with an overdose of MS-222 and immediately took a 5 mg muscle tissue sample from the caudal peduncle for stable isotope analysis. Muscle samples were desiccated individually with magnesium perchlorate in airtight vials following Martin (2012; 2013). Specimens were then individually labeled and fixed in 95-100% ethanol. Field procedures followed approved protocols by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees of the University of California, Davis and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Stomach content analyses

In total, we selected 241 individuals for stomach content analysis, including at least 3 individuals from each species. Nine out of the lake's 11 endemic species of cichlid were analyzed in this study, all except *S. caroli* and *S. lohbergeri*, which are morphologically and ecologically similar to *S. linnellii* and *S. steinbachi*, respectively (Trewavas *et al.* 1972). We removed the entire stomach and intestine from each individual and placed stomach contents or a subset of the intestine on a Sedgwick-Rafter cell containing 1 x 1 mm squares for visualization and quantification under a stereomicroscope (following Martin and Wainwright 2013). Dietary proportions were based upon a visual volume estimation method (Hyslop 1980; Manko 2016). We compressed stomach contents

to a uniform thickness (approx. 0.5 mm) and estimated the surface area of each prey item by counting the number of 1 mm² squares covered by the item (Hyslop 1980; Gelwich & McIntyre 2017). Smaller items were assigned fractions of a square to the nearest 0.1 mm². This number was then divided by the total number of squares covered by all diet items for that individual to calculate individual dietary proportions for each item. Proportions were rounded to the nearest 0.001 and are reported as percentages. Individuals with empty stomachs were excluded from all subsequent calculations and statistical analyses ($n = 38$).

We identified all diet items based on partially digested remnants, including exoskeletal remains, plant matter, and sponge spicules; unidentified organic matter was classified as detritus, and inorganic matter—such as particles of sand—was classified as silt. All prey items were grouped into taxa, usually to the level of class or family. Diet categories were comparable to previously identified prey items of the cichlid species described in Trewavas *et al.* (1972). We used 13 diet categories in total: ants, *Corvospongilla* spp. sponge, Dipteran larvae, Ephemeropteran larvae, Trichopteran larvae, fish, gastropod shell, nematode, plant tissue, shrimp, detritus, silt, and unidentified. Ants were identified by distinct head capsules of species within Formicidae, which likely originated from terrestrial debris that fell into the lake. The sponge category consisted of two members of the genus *Corvospongilla*: *C. thysi*, endemic to Barombi Mbo, and closely related *C. bohmi* (Trewavas *et al.* 1972). Both species are found in the lake's shallow waters (up to 3-4 m depth), with *C. thysi* typically covering the outer surfaces of rocks and *C. bohmi* found in crevices (Trewavas *et al.* 1972). Dipteran larvae included larval forms of the midge families Chaoboridae and Chironomidae. Ephemeropteran larvae included larval forms of various mayfly families Baetidae and Caenidae. This category also included larvae of the common burrowing mayfly species *Povilla adusta*, previously identified by Trewavas *et al.* (1972) to be

present on both stones and fallen logs in Barombi Mbo. Trichopteran larvae consisted of caddisflies in their larval form, likely from the genus *Trienodes*, which has many species endemic to West Africa (Andersen & Holzenthal 2002). The fish category was assigned to portions of fish fins and tissue, as well as to whole fry found in individuals' stomachs (not identifiable to species level at this size). The gastropod shell category consisted of shell remains from various snails, including freshwater limpets from the genus *Ferrissia* (Trewavas *et al.* 1972). The nematode category contained all roundworms, likely including both terrestrial and aquatic species. The plant tissue category was assigned to all plant material found in individuals' stomachs. This included aquatic species such as *Najas pectinate* and *Potamogeton octandrus* previously documented in Barombi Mbo (Trewavas *et al.* 1972) and any terrestrial plant leaves. The shrimp category consisted of *Caridina spp.* and *Macrobrachium spp.*, freshwater shrimp genera found in Barombi Mbo and throughout Cameroon (Trewavas *et al.* 1972). Detritus was used as a catch-all term to describe organic matter that was digested beyond the point of identification. Silt was used as a catch-all to describe inorganic materials, including rocks and sand. Animal remains that could not be clearly identified (e.g. egg-like structures) were grouped into the unidentified category.

We estimated dietary niche breadth of each species by calculating Levins' standardized index (Levins 1968) and Pianka's measure of dietary niche overlap (Pianka 1973) using the *spaa* package (Zhang 2016) in R (version 4.0.2). Both indices have values ranging from 0-1, with increasing values corresponding to increased niche breadth (Levins) and increased niche overlap (Pianka), respectively. Values were set at the following levels for both metrics: high (>0.6), moderate (0.4-0.6), and low (>0.4) following guidelines outlined in other dietary studies on fishes (Grossman 1986; Novakowski *et al.* 2008; da Silva *et al.* 2012; Sá-Oliveira *et al.* 2014; de Oliveira *et al.* 2021). An assumption adopted for both indices is that all dietary resources are equally

available to all species (Grossman 1986, Reinthal 1990, Sá-Oliveira *et al.* 2014). While we did not collect specific data on dietary resource abundance and variation within Barombi Mbo, this assumption seems reasonable for our system due to the shared lake environment and most species (all except *K. dikume*, *Myaka myaka* and *S. caroli*) coexist in the littoral zone (Trewavas *et al.* 1972). Previous studies lacking these data have used these matrices and followed this assumption for aquatic systems (Grossman 1986; Novakowski *et al.* 2008; Sá-Oliveira *et al.* 2014).

Stable isotope analyses

To assess relative trophic positions of cichlid species in Barombi Mbo, we performed stable isotope analyses for all 11 species (including *S. caroli* and *S. lohbergi*). In limnetic systems, $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ isotope ratios offer insight into the ultimate carbon source of prey consumed (Post 2002). Higher $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values indicate a more littoral carbon source, while lower values indicate a more pelagic source (Post 2002). Ratios of $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ indicate the relative trophic position of individual consumers (Post 2002). In total, we selected 180 individuals for stable isotope analysis, including at least 6 individuals from each species. Field samples desiccated with magnesium perchlorate in individual vials were subsequently dehydrated at 60° C for at least 24 hours, then 1 mg samples were weighed to the nearest 0.0001 g, packaged into tinfoil capsules, and sent to the UC Davis Stable Isotope Facility. Isotopes of ^{13}C and ^{15}N were measured on a PDZ Europa ANCA-GSL elemental analyzer interfaced to a PDZ Europa 20–20 isotope ratio mass spectrometer (Sercon Ltd., Cheshire, U.K.).

Statistical analyses

We performed all statistical analyses in R version 4.0.2 (R Core Team 2020). Our sample size for stomach content analysis was $n = 203$; the sample sizes for each species are reported in Table 1.

To visualize overall dietary similarity among species, we estimated a non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) plot from a Bray-Curtis dissimilarity matrix of dietary proportions for each individual. To test for differences in diet among species, we used analysis of similarities (ANOSIM) with species designated as the grouping variable (“anosim” function in R *vegan* package version 2.5.6). To determine which dietary components significantly contributed to the stomach contents of each species, we performed an indicator species analysis (“multipatt” function in R *indicspecies* package version 1.7.9) (Defrêne & Legendre 1997; Cáceres & Legendre 2009). This analysis has traditionally been used to identify one or more species characterizing various habitats or sites in ecological studies (Defrêne & Legendre 1997). More recently, it has been used in dietary studies to identify diet items significantly contributing to differences in stomach contents between groups (Hertz *et al.* 2017; Lee *et al.* 2018; Thalmann *et al.* 2020). These visualizations and analyses were performed in R using the *vegan* (Oksanen *et al.* 2019) and *indicspecies* (Cáceres & Legendre 2009) packages.

To determine whether individual dietary proportions varied by species, we used linear models (LMs). All LMs were fitted using the *stats* package in R (R Core Team 2020). Dietary proportions were first transformed using the arcsine (also known as arcsine square root) transformation typical for proportional data. We fit a separate model for each dietary item after arcsine-transformation of the proportions. The independent variable was species with log-transformed standard length (SL) as a covariate. A normal distribution was used for all models. To test the significance of each model, we performed an ANOVA with Type II sum of squares using the *car* package (Fox & Weisberg 2019) in R. For significant models, we used Tukey’s HSD post hoc analysis for pairwise comparisons between species. Post-hoc analyses were conducted using the *stats* package in R.

Since volume-based dietary proportions are highly variable depending on prey condition (Buckland *et al.* 2017), we decided to additionally analyze our stomach content data using a frequency of occurrence approach. To determine whether presence/absence of dietary components varied by species, we fit generalized linear models (GLMs) using a binomial distribution. We converted all proportions into binomial success (proportion > 0) and failure (proportion = 0) data, and then fit all models as described above.

Both our proportional and binomial models indicated that standard length (SL) significantly impacted the proportion of *Corvospongilla* sponge, detritus, fish, and plant tissue in an individual's diet (Tables 5 & 6). We therefore investigated if this relationship was species specific or a more general pattern using LMs. We fitted these models using the *lme4* package (Bates *et al.* 2015) in R. We ran individual models for each species and food item (when sample size allowed), used the arcsine-transformed proportion of a dietary item consumed (i.e., arcsine-transformed proportion of *Corvospongilla* sponge, detritus, fish, and plant tissue) as the response variable, and log-transformed SL as the predictor variable. A normal distribution was used for all models. We tested the significance of predictor variables using an ANOVA with Type II sum of squares.

To determine whether stable isotope content varied by species, we fit LMs for both $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\delta^{13}\text{C}$. We fit models including all 11 cichlid species, and models including only the three *Stomatepia* species. The response variable for each was $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ and $\delta^{13}\text{C}$, respectively, and the independent variable was species. A normal distribution was used for all models. To test the significance of each model, we performed an ANOVA with Type II sum of squares. We used Tukey's HSD post hoc analysis for pairwise comparisons between species.

RESULTS

Dietary composition, niche breadth, and niche overlap

We found a majority of individuals consumed detritus, plant tissue, and aquatic insects (Fig. 1). Detritus was the majority (>50%) dietary component in all species except for *S. mongo* (Table 1; Fig. 1). Notably, *M. myaka* was the only species with stomach contents consisting of 100% detritus (Table 1; Fig. 1). *Konia eisentrauti* consumed the largest percentage of plant tissue (22.8%) across all species (Table 1; Fig. 1). While *P. maclareni* and all three *Stomatepia* species consumed shrimp (Fig. 2A), *Stomatepia mongo* consumed the greatest proportion of shrimp (62.9%) among all species (Table 1; Fig. 1). Most species also had unidentified material in their stomach contents, although this percentage was typically under 15% on average (Table 1; Fig. 1). *Sarotherodon steinbachi* contained the highest percentage (38.3%) of unidentified material (Table 1; Fig. 1), specifically egg-like structures that could not be identified.

Several dietary components were much rarer and found in only one or two cichlid species. *Sarotherodon linnellii*, the largest species in the radiation, and *Stomatepia mariae* were the only two species to consume fish (Table 1; Fig. 2F). The only species to consume gastropod shells and *Corvospongilla* sponge spicules was *P. maclareni* (Fig. 2D), and sponge spicules comprised about 20% of this species' diet on average (Table 1; Fig. 1). *Stomatepia mariae* was the only species to consume ants (Fig. 2B), comprising about 10% of this species' diet on average (Table 1; Fig. 1). While insect larvae from the orders Ephemeroptera and Diptera were found in the stomach contents of several species (Table 1; Fig. 1), only *Stomatepia pindu* consumed Trichopteran larvae (Fig. 2C), comprising about 14% of this species' diet on average (Table 1; Fig. 1).

All cichlids displayed limited niche breadth, with Levins values below 0.2 for all species (Table 1). *Stomatepia mariae* had the widest niche breadth among all species ($B_A = 0.173$),

whereas *M. myaka* had the smallest ($B_A = 0.000$) (Table 1). Many species displayed considerable dietary niche overlap, with Pianka index values typically ranging from 0.8-1 (Table 2). Notably, *S. mongo* showed the lowest niche overlap with other species, with Pianka index values from 0.2-0.4 (Table 2).

Clustering, analysis of similarities, and indicator analyses of overall diet

The NMDS ordination (stress = 0.103) displayed little clustering of species by dietary components, with considerable overlap among species (Fig. 3). There was, however, a statistically significant difference in overall diet among species (ANOSIM: $R = 0.06275$, $P = 0.0238$).

We identified several dietary items that were significant indicators of species or species groups (Fig. 1). For *K. dikume*, *M. myaka*, and *S. linnellii*, detritus was a significant indicator (Table 3; indicpecies: Dufrêne-Legendre indicator value = 0.454, $P = 0.0077$). For *K. eisentrauti*, plant tissue was a significant indicator (Table 3; Dufrêne-Legendre Indicator = 0.438, $P = 0.0184$); for *S. mongo*, shrimp was a significant indicator (Table 3; Dufrêne-Legendre Indicator = 0.744, $P = 0.0002$); *Corvospongilla* sponge was a significant indicator of *P. maclareni* (Table 3; indicpecies: Dufrêne-Legendre indicator value = 0.49, $P = 0.013$); ants were a significant indicator of *S. mariae* (Table 3; indicpecies: Dufrêne-Legendre indicator value = 0.405, $P = 0.0458$); and Trichopteran larvae were a significant indicator of *S. pindu* (Table 3; indicpecies: Dufrêne-Legendre indicator value = 0.457, $P = 0.0295$).

Individual dietary components

We found individual diet proportions to vary by species for several items (Fig. 2). All comparisons of relative diet item consumption between species is based on mean surface area proportion.

Detritus consumption was significantly different among species (Table 4; ANOVA: $\chi^2 = 36.242$, $df = 8$, $P = 1.585 \times 10^{-5}$). In particular, *M. myaka* consumed about 2 times more detritus than *S. mariae* (Table 1; Tukey HSD: $P = 0.044$), and *S. linnellii* consumed about 1.5 times more detritus than *S. mariae* (Table 1; Tukey HSD: $P = 0.021$). Plant tissue consumption varied across species (Table 4; Fig. 2E; ANOVA: $\chi^2 = 49.347$, $df = 8$, $P = 5.455 \times 10^{-8}$), with *K. eistentrauti* consuming at least 5 times more plant tissue than *S. linnellii*, *S. steinbachii*, *P. maclareni*, *S. mariae*, and *S. pindu* (Table 1; Tukey HSD: $P < 0.05$). Shrimp consumption also varied among species (Table 4; Fig. 2A; ANOVA: $\chi^2 = 116.674$, $df = 8$, $P < 2 \times 10^{-16}$), with *S. mongo* consuming at least 7 times more shrimp than all other species (Table 1; Tukey HSD: $P < 0.001$). Consumption of unidentified diet items varied among species (Table 4; ANOVA: $\chi^2 = 55.175$, $df = 8$, $P = 4.082 \times 10^{-9}$), with *S. steinbachii* consuming at least 2 times more than all other species (Table 1; Tukey HSD: $P < 0.05$). *Pungu maclareni* was the only species to consume *Corvospongilla* sponge (Table 4; Fig. 2D; ANOVA: $\chi^2 = 55.461$, $df = 8$, $P = 3.591 \times 10^{-9}$). *Corvospongilla* spicules made up 21.2% of *P. maclareni*'s diet (Table 1; Fig. 1). Similarly, *S. mariae* was the only species to consume ants (Table 4; Fig. 2B; ANOVA: $\chi^2 = 51.806$, $df = 8$, $P = 1.835 \times 10^{-8}$). Ants made up 9.8% of *S. mariae*'s diet (Table 1; Fig. 1). *Stomatepia pindu* was the only species to consume Trichopteran larvae (Table 4; Fig. 2C; ANOVA: $\chi^2 = 58.100$, $df = 8$, $P = 1.098 \times 10^{-9}$). Trichopteran larvae made up 14.1% of *S. pindu*'s diet (Table 1; Fig. 1).

Collapsing these proportional data to presence/absence data of individual dietary components (as described above) yielded similar results. Detritus (Table 6; ANOVA: $\chi^2 = 24.440$, $df = 8$, $P = 0.002$); plant tissue (Table 6; ANOVA: $\chi^2 = 36.158$, $df = 8$, $P = 1.643 \times 10^{-5}$); shrimp (Table 6; ANOVA: $\chi^2 = 19.1124$, $df = 8$, $P = 0.014$); unidentified items (Table 6; ANOVA: $\chi^2 = 45.748$, $df = 8$, $P = 2.654 \times 10^{-7}$); *Corvospongilla* sponge (Table 6; ANOVA: $\chi^2 = 55.628$, $df = 8$, P

= 3.333×10^{-9}); ants (Table 6; ANOVA: $\chi^2 = 51.997$, $df = 8$, $P = 1.685 \times 10^{-8}$); and Trichopteran larvae (Table 6; ANOVA: $\chi^2 = 17.6528$, $df = 8$, $P = 0.024$) all varied significantly among species by presence/absence with similar specialists as described above.

Finally, we found a significant relationship between log-transformed SL and arcsine-transformed proportion of certain dietary items for *S. mariae*, *K. eisenrauti*, and *P. maclareni*. For *S. mariae*, we found that larger individuals consumed significantly more fish than smaller individuals (ANOVA: $F = 5.716$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.022$). For *K. eisenrauti*, we found that smaller individuals consumed more detritus (Fig. 4A; ANOVA: $F = 5.986$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.02$), while larger individuals consumed more plant tissue (Fig. 4B; ANOVA: $F = 7.24$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.011$). Similarly, smaller *P. maclareni* consumed more detritus than larger individuals (Fig. 4C; ANOVA: $F = 24.755$, $df = 1$, $P = 5.621 \times 10^{-6}$), and larger individuals consumed more *Corvospongilla* sponge material than smaller individuals (Fig. 4D; ANOVA: $F = 9.583$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.003$).

Carbon and nitrogen stable isotopes

We found $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values to be significantly different among species when comparing all 11 cichlid species (Table 6; ANOVA: $\chi^2 = 123.36$, $df = 11$, $P = 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$). *Sarotherodon lohbergeri* had the highest $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ value, significantly more than all other species except *P. maclareni*, *S. caroli*, and *S. steinbachi* (Tukey HSD: $P < 0.01$). Contrastingly, *M. myaka* had the lowest $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ value, significantly lower than all other species except *K. dikume*, *K. eisenrauti*, *S. linnellii*, and *S. pindu* (Tukey HSD: $P < 0.05$). *Stomatepia mongo* exhibited significantly higher $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ than *S. pindu* in both the model containing all cichlid species (Tukey HSD: $P = 0.041$) and the model containing only *Stomatepia* species (Tukey HSD: $P = 0.005$).

Values of $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ were also significantly different among species in the model containing all cichlid species (Table 6; ANOVA: $\chi^2 = 67.967$, $\text{df} = 11$, $P = 2.969 \times 10^{-10}$). *Konia dikume* had the highest $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ value of any species, significantly more than *M. myaka*, *S. caroli*, *S. lohbergeri*, and *S. pindu* (Tukey HSD: $P < 0.05$). *Sarotherodon lohbergeri* had the lowest $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ value, significantly lower than all other species except *M. myaka*, *S. caroli*, and *S. steinbachi* (Tukey HSD: $P < 0.05$). There were no significant differences in $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values among *Stomatepia* species (Table 6). Despite these significant differences in both $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values among species, there was minimal clustering by species when visualizing stable isotope values (Fig. 5).

DISCUSSION

We measured dietary profiles and relative trophic positions in a celebrated potential of cichlid sympatric speciation and adaptive radiation in crater lake Barombi Mbo using stomach content analyses stable isotope data. We found minimal evidence of trophic niche partitioning among species but documented several specialized dietary items that were consumed by a single or few species within the radiation. In general, our findings align with the major trophic strategies outlined by Trewavas *et al.* (1972), providing quantitative data for differences in dietary components among species.

Minimal trophic niche partitioning among cichlid species in lake Barombi Mbo in overall dietary niche

Our measurements of niche overlap (Pianka index) and relative trophic position ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ stable isotope measurements) suggest there is not strong evidence for dietary niche partitioning among cichlid species. We observed Pianka index values of 0.84 (84% similarity) and higher for

most species (Table 2), and while we did find significant differences in $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values among species (Table 6), there was little evidence of clustering by species (Fig. 5). Detritus was the majority (>50%) dietary component in 8 out of 9 species studied (Table 1), which may explain the high niche overlap values observed in this system. For instance, Levins' and Pianka's indices for *M. myaka* are estimated to be 0 and 0.85, respectively, (Tables 1 & 2) suggesting that this species simultaneously exhibits the narrowest niche breadth and 85% similarity in niche with all other species. In contrast, *S. mongo* was both the only species to display relatively low values of niche overlap—26% similarity in niche on average (Table 2)—and to have a majority diet component other than detritus (Fig. 1), perhaps reflecting its nocturnal foraging habits which previously limited successful captures of this species (Musilova et al. 2014).

Limited dietary divergence is not uncommon because short-term coexistence among ecologically similar species can occur even without fine-scale niche partitioning, particularly within speciose African cichlid communities in the great lakes (Liem 1980; Ribbink & Lewis 1982; Martin and Genner 2009). Previous work has also shown that cichlid species may partition the same resources based on functional access, allowing for similarity in dietary profiles but different modes of access. For example, Stauffer & Posner (2006) found that the rock-dwelling cichlid species of Lake Malawi utilized the same dietary items but exhibited habitat partitioning based on the unique feeding kinematics (feeding angles) of each species to reduce competition between groups. This may also be the case for some generalist diet items (detritus, aquatic insects, microalgae) in Barombi Mbo, and further research is needed on the kinematics and functional mechanisms by which these cichlids consume their food to investigate this possibility.

Another explanation for the minimal trophic niche partitioning we observed could lie in undetected seasonal differences. Our data combined specimens collected during both the wet (July-

September) and dry (December-January) seasons in Cameroon across multiple years (2009-10, 2016). Prey availability often differs greatly between seasons, especially in tropical systems (Winemiller 1990; Correa & Winemiller 2014); however, dietary profiles of the trophic specialists in Barombi Mbo were generally consistent between seasons and years collected.

Alternatively, dietary niche partitioning may have been obscured by variability in prey condition. Stomach content analyses are highly dependent on prey condition (Baker *et al.* 2014; Buckland *et al.* 2017). Soft-bodied organisms are likely to digest more quickly than those with chitinous exoskeletons or other similarly tough external features, potentially leading to an overrepresentation of hard-bodied, less digestible organisms (Randall 1967). Furthermore, there may be finer-scale niche partitioning at lower taxonomic prey levels (i.e. genus, species) than what can be detected by microscopic visual analysis of stomach contents. DNA metabarcoding approaches may aid in identifying these finer-scale patterns (Berry *et al.* 2015; Harms-Tuohy *et al.* 2016; Jakubavičiūtė *et al.* 2017) and can also account for highly digested prey (Carreon-Martinez *et al.* 2011), though such techniques come with their own suite of challenges and may overestimate the relative importance of certain dietary items (Sakaguchi *et al.* 2017).

Evidence of trophic niche partitioning via dietary specialization

Although the above summary statistics failed to detect differences in overall dietary niche between species, distinctions are apparent when we examined the proportions of individual dietary items between species. Our indicator species analysis, LMs, and GLMs all suggest that different specialized dietary items are consumed primarily by single species (Tables 4, 5, 6; Fig. 2). Specifically, *K. eisentrauti* consumes the most plant tissue, *P. maclareni* is the only species that consumes sponge tissue, *S. mariae* is the only species to consume ants, *S. mongo*'s diet is primarily

shrimp, and *S. pindu* is the only species to consume Trichopteran larvae (Fig. 1 & 2). Herbivory is common among African cichlids (Ribbink & Lewis 1982; Genner & Turner 2005), and *K. eisenbrauti* was previously qualitatively described as a plant specialist (Trewavas *et al.* 1972). Additionally, shrimp (Kohda & Hori 1993; Yuma *et al.* 1998) and Trichopteran larvae (Kohda & Hori 1993; Kohda & Tanida 1996; Kohda *et al.* 2008) have been documented in the stomach contents of cichlids from African rift lake Tanganyika, but the remaining dietary items (sponge and ants) are rare among African cichlids.

One of our most exciting findings is evidence of spongivory in *P. maclareni*. A significant proportion (20%) of this species' diet is freshwater sponges (*Corvospongilla spp.*) and it is the only cichlid species from Barombi Mbo to consume this diet item. Spongivory is extremely rare among fishes, with only about 0.04% of all fishes (FishBase) consuming sponges (2 out of a total of 14 of these species are cichlids from Cameroon crater lakes). In fact, the only freshwater fishes partaking in sponge-eating are cichlids found in African Great Lakes Tanganyika (Kohda & Hori 1993; Awata & Kohda 2004) and Victoria (Bouton *et al.* 1997), and Cameroon crater lakes Barombi Mbo (Trewavas *et al.* 1972) and Bermin (Stiassny *et al.* 1992; Schlieuwen 2005). Sponges are a rare diet item among fishes and other vertebrates because they are incredibly hard to consume. Most documented spongivores have evolved morphological adaptations to aid in sponge consumption, including beak-shaped mouths (Witzel 1983; Pritchard & Mortimer 1999; Blumenthal *et al.* 2009) and multiple rows of tricuspid teeth (Hourigan *et al.* 1989) used to shear and scrape sponge off its substrate. *P. maclareni* also appears to have adaptations that may aid in sponge-eating, including short robust oral jaws, large epaxial musculature (particularly when compared to other cichlids in Barombi Mbo), and fleshy lips with protruding tricuspid teeth (Trewavas *et al.* 1972).

Another notable finding of this study was evidence of ant consumption in *S. mariae*. We found that about 10% of this species' diet is ants, and it is the only cichlid species in Barombi Mbo to consume this item. While *S. mariae* has previously been noted to feed on adult terrestrial insects (Trewavas *et al.* 1972), this is the first study documenting terrestrial ants as a major component of this species' diet. It is interesting that *S. mariae* was the only species to consume ants, as *S. mariae* and *S. pindu* are closely related species, ecologically similar, hybridize in the lab, and represent the extreme tails of a unimodal distribution for all trophic traits measured (Martin 2012, Martin *et al.* 2015). This divergence in dietary items may be due to the potential sensory adaptations that *S. mariae* uses to detect ants and its shoaling mid-water habitat, whereas *S. pindu* is a solitary benthic species that forages within the leaf-litter (Trewavas *et al.* 1972). Alternatively, it may be that *S. mariae* is consuming ants incidentally. Terrestrial insects are not uncommon components of fish diets, as they enter lakes and rivers through fallen vegetation. Fish that opportunistically feed near the surface or middle of the water column will take up these insects while foraging, which is likely why terrestrial insects are a major food source of known drift foragers (Resh *et al.* 1999; Nakano *et al.* 1999). This species had the highest Levins' index, indicating that it had the widest niche breadth of all cichlids studied and suggests dietary flexibility within the species (Pedreschi *et al.* 2015; Spencer *et al.* 2017; Jesmer *et al.* 2020). Future studies should investigate if *S. mariae* is preferentially seeking out ants or if they are an incidental part of the diet.

Finally, we also document that *S. mongo* consumed the most shrimp out of all cichlid species in lake Barombi Mbo (at least 7 times more than all other species). We only observed and captured this species after twilight hours (beginning around 19:00 hours), yet many individuals had full stomachs. This could suggest that *S. mongo* exhibits a rare hunting strategy for nocturnal shrimp prey, which is notable as nocturnality is extremely rare among African cichlids and has

only been documented once in Lake Malawi out of thousands of species (Lloyd *et al.* 2021). It is also interesting that *S. mongo* is the only cichlid species to have a dietary component other than detritus as its majority component (Fig. 1). Trewavas *et al.* (1972) were unable to qualitatively describe the stomach contents of *S. mongo* (due to limited catches, small sample size, and empty stomachs), but here we provide quantitative evidence that this species should indeed be considered a dietary specialist of shrimp.

The term ‘specialist’ has a wide range of definitions that often differ among researchers, which can lead to confusion when identifying empirical examples of specialization in nature (see Bolnick *et al.* 2003 for further discussion on this topic). When discussing dietary niche, the term specialist has been historically used to describe organisms that exploit a relatively narrow breadth of dietary resources compared to other members of their ecological community (Futuyma & Moreno 1988; Sargeant 2007). Recent work, however, suggests that we must broaden the term to include temporal, spatial, environmental, and organizational level (i.e., individual level, species level, community level, etc.) effects on dietary patterns (Bolnick *et al.* 2003; Shipley *et al.* 2009; Devictor *et al.* 2010; Poisot *et al.* 2011; Pagani-Núñez *et al.* 2016). Our current data suggests that the above ‘specialist’ species most closely align with the definition of ‘*facultative generalist*’ from Pagani-Núñez *et al.* (2016) (also noted as ‘*functional specialist*’ from Bolnick *et al.* 2003), where a given group primarily feeds on generalist diet items but can exploit novel resources when necessary. The remaining species in our study (*K. dikume*, *M. myaka*, *S. steinbachi*, and *S. linnellii*), neatly align with the definition of ‘*obligate generalist*’ (Pagani-Núñez *et al.* 2016; also noted as ‘*pure generalist*’ from Bolnick *et al.* 2003), where individuals within a group completely overlap in diet, exploit dietary items that are common in the environment (such as detritus), and exhibit limited foraging innovations.

Our data also suggests that the cichlid radiation of Barombi Mbo may be another example of Liem's paradox, in which trophic specialists act as "jacks-of-all-trades" able to consume both their specialized resources and more generalist diet items (Liem 1980). One potential explanation for this phenomenon is that trophic specialists will act as opportunistic feeders during periods of high resource availability—closely related species may show minimal or undetectable ecological differentiation during this time—but will consume a specialized diet when resources are scarce (Robinson & Wilson 1998). All specialists appear to be predominantly feeding on common, shared resources (microinvertebrates, microalgae, detritus) while also supplementing their diet with unique resources, but our current data do not allow us to determine if the time periods measured encompass high or low resource availability. Future studies should explicitly measure dietary profiles of species in this system during high and low resource periods, as Liem's paradox may simultaneously provide explanations for when ecological niche divergence is necessary (e.g., low resources periods) and for why some radiations do not display trophic niche partitioning.

Other modes of trophic niche partitioning

Dietary niche partitioning may be occurring in this system on organizational levels other than between species, such as between individuals of the same species, across developmental time periods, or across different behavioral strategies; our current data supports some of these possibilities. First, many studies incorporate variation in dietary profiles among conspecifics into their definitions of specialization, often termed 'individual specialization' (Bolnick *et al.* 2003; Sargeant 2007; Poisot *et al.* 2011; Pagani-Núñez *et al.* 2016). Organisms displaying individual specialization are expected to have minimal overlap in dietary niche with conspecifics and—at the population and species levels—specialist groups are expected to show more variation between

individuals (i.e. more individual variation in niche breadth and overlap) than generalist groups (Bolnick *et al.* 2003). There is some evidence to suggest that this pattern is occurring in the cichlid radiation of Barombi Mbo. Figure 6 depicts density plots of individuals from generalist and specialist species, comparing proportional consumption of detritus and an additional diet item. For specialist species, we display the specialized food items highlighted by our analyses. Since generalist species do not have an obvious specialized diet item for comparison, we display the second most-prevalent item in their dietary profile. While generalist display narrow, unimodal distributions for both detritus and their secondary diet items, specialists display wide, and potentially bimodal, distributions across dietary components (Fig. 6). These bimodal distributions could indicate that niche partitioning is occurring at the individual level or may even suggest that these groups are undergoing further ecological diversification (Schluter 2000; Bolnick *et al.* 2003; Kusche *et al.* 2014).

Trophic niche partitioning may also occur across developmental time periods. Previous studies have documented variation in dietary niche partitioning across life history stages in sympatric populations of snappers (Takahashi *et al.* 2020), drums (Deary *et al.* 2017), and whitefish (Chouinard & Bernatchez 1998). Differences in diet early in life have also been associated with plastic variation in trophic morphology in species of cichlids (Stauffer & Gray 2004) and could explain why we observe divergent feeding morphology between species despite dietary overlap. While our study does not specifically investigate differences in dietary profiles across age, we do observe some dietary divergence between large and small fish. In general, fish growth is isometric, meaning that standard length or size can be a good proxy for age. For *S. mariae*, *K. eisenrauti*, and *P. maclareni* we observed that larger individuals were more likely to consume the specialized dietary items of fish, plant tissue, and sponge respectively (Fig. 4B, 4D).

Furthermore, smaller *K. eisenbrauti* and *P. maclareni* were also more likely to consume detritus (Fig. 4A, 4C). This may indicate that that juvenile or small individuals are more easily able to consume a generalist diet—perhaps due to morphological constraints or competition from larger fish. This finding agrees with previous work that suggests niche partitioning at early life stages may not be as important as later in life (Chouinard & Bernatchez 1998), but other studies suggest there can also be fine-scale trophic niche partitioning among larval life stages in fishes (Mcaskill *et al.* 2021). Future work on this system should explicitly document dietary profiles across the various life stages of cichlids (juvenile, adult, breeding adult) to understand if and how dietary competition differs through ontogeny.

Dietary divergence and speciation

The cichlid radiation in Barombi Mbo is an excellent candidate system for investigating the role of dietary divergence in speciation, due to both the lack of sexual dimorphism and substantial differences in trophic morphology among species (Trewavas *et al.* 1972; Schliewen *et al.* 1994; Coyne *et al.* 2004; Martin 2012; Richards *et al.* 2018). The current study provides empirical evidence of dietary specialization in 5 out of the 11 cichlid species and ultimately strengthens the above argument by providing potential focal species for future studies to investigate. We still lack many key pieces of information, however, that would provide a clear link between these two processes. For instance, we still lack information on how different trophic morphologies aid, hinder, or play no role in feeding on specialized and generalist diet items, nor do we understand the connection between these morphologies and assortative mating. Understanding temporal and spatial differences in feeding and reproduction is also potentially important. In general, future studies should investigate whether dietary specialization coincides with phenotypic traits under

disruptive selection and assortative mating, both of which contribute to ecological speciation in sympatry (Dieckmann & Doebeli 1999; Gavrillets 2004; Gavrillets & Losos 2009; Martin 2013). Examples of this phenomenon include experimental evolution studies (Blount *et al.* 2008), divergence of insect host races (Nosil 2009), and ecological speciation in classic adaptive radiations (Grant & Grant 2002; Kocher *et al.* 2004; Lamichhaney *et al.* 2015; Gillespie *et al.* 2020). Further study of how dietary specialization in this system contributes to ecological divergence and assortative mating can offer further insight into the mechanisms driving sympatric speciation.

Conclusion

In conclusion, we documented a high level of dietary niche overlap among cichlid species in lake Barombi Mbo, but suggest that this pattern is primarily due to the presences of detritus in the diet of all cichlid species. We also find evidence of dietary specialization in 5 out of the 11 cichlid species and suggest that these species be viewed as functional specialists that utilize specialized dietary items to supplement their otherwise generalist diet, possibly at certain times of the year when resources are scarce. Future work should investigate if specialist species' dietary profiles shift across spatial or temporal scales and investigate how variation in morphology connects to diet and reproductive isolation in the system.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was funded by a National Geographic Society Young Explorer's Grant, a Lewis and Clark Field Research grant from the American Philosophical Society, the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, and the University of California, Berkeley to CHM. We gratefully

acknowledge the Cameroonian government and the local chiefs of Barombi Mbo village and surrounding communities for permission to conduct this research. We also thank Jackson Waite-Himmelwright and Patrick Enyang for logistical support and generous assistance with fieldwork.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

All data analyzed for this study will be provided upon request.

REFERENCES

- Ackerly, D. D., Schilck, D. W. & Webb, C. O. Niche Evolution and Adaptive Radiation: Testing the Order of Trait Divergence. *Ecology* **87**, S50–S61 (2006).
- Albertson, R. C. Morphological Divergence Predicts Habitat Partitioning in a Lake Malawi Cichlid Species Complex. *Copeia* **2008**: 689–698 (2008).
- Andersen, T. & Holzenthal, R. W. West African Triaenodes McLachlan (Trichoptera: Leptoceridae). 2. Subgenus Triaenodess sensu stricto. *Tijdschrift voor Entomologie* **145**: 61–88 (2002).
- Awata, S. & Kohda, M. Parental Roles and the Amount of Care in a Bi-Parental Substrate Brooding Cichlid: The Effect of Size Differences within Pairs. *Behaviour* **141**, 1135–1149 (2004).
- Baker, R., Buckland, A. & Sheaves, M. Fish gut content analysis: robust measures of diet composition. *Fish and Fisheries* **15**: 170–177 (2014).
- Berry, O. *et al.* Comparison of morphological and DNA metabarcoding analyses of diets in exploited marine fishes. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* **540**: 167–181 (2015).
- Blount, Z. D., Borland, C. Z. & Lenski, R. E. Historical contingency and the evolution of a key innovation in an experimental population of *Escherichia coli*. *PNAS* **105**: 7899–7906 (2008).

620 Blumenthal, J. M. *et al.* Ecology of Hawksbill Turtles, *Eretmochelys imbricata*, on a Western
621 Caribbean Foraging Ground. *Chelonian Conservation and Biology* **8**: 1–10 (2009).

622 Bolnick, D. I. & Fitzpatrick, B. M. Sympatric Speciation: Models and Empirical Evidence. *Annual*
623 *Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* **38**: 459–487 (2007).

624 Bolnick, D. I. *et al.* The Ecology of Individuals: Incidence and Implications of Individual
625 Specialization. *The American Naturalist* **161**, 1–28 (2003).

626 Bolnick, D. I. Sympatric Speciation in Threespine Stickleback: Why Not? *International Journal*
627 *of Ecology* **2011**: e942847 (2011).

628 Bouton, N., Seehausen, O. & van Alphen, J. J. M. Resource partitioning among rock-dwelling
629 haplochromines (Pisces: Cichlidae) from Lake Victoria. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish* **6**, 225–240
630 (1997).

631 Buckland, A., Baker, R., Loneragan, N. & Sheaves, M. Standardising fish stomach content
632 analysis: The importance of prey condition. *Fisheries Research* **196**: 126–140 (2017).

633 Carreon-Martinez, L., Johnson, T. B., Ludsin, S. A. & Heath, D. D. Utilization of stomach content
634 DNA to determine diet diversity in piscivorous fishes. *Journal of Fish Biology* **78**: 1170–1182
635 (2011).

636 Chouinard, A. & Bernatchez, L. A study of trophic niche partitioning between larval populations
637 of reproductively isolated whitefish (*Coregonus* sp.) ecotypes. *Journal of Fish Biology* **53**, 1231–
638 1242 (1998).

639 Conith, A. J., Kidd, M. R., Kocher, T. D. & Albertson, R. C. Ecomorphological divergence and
640 habitat lability in the context of robust patterns of modularity in the cichlid feeding apparatus.
641 *BMC Evolutionary Biology* **20**: 95 (2020).

642 Cornen, G., Bande, Y., Giresse, P. & Maley, J. The nature and chronostratigraphy of Quaternary
643 pyroclastic accumulations from lake Barombi Mbo (West-Cameroon). *Journal of Volcanology and*
644 *Geothermal Research* **51**: 357–374 (1992).

645 Correa, S. B. & Winemiller, K. O. Niche partitioning among frugivorous fishes in response to
646 fluctuating resources in the Amazonian floodplain forest. *Ecology* **95**: 210–224 (2014)..

647 Coyne, J. A., Coyne, H. A. & Orr, H. A. *Speciation*. (Oxford University Press, Incorporated, 2004).

648 da Silva, J. C. da, Delariva, R. L. & Bonato, K. O. Food-resource partitioning among fish species
649 from a first-order stream in northwestern Paraná, Brazil. *Neotrop. ichthyol.* **10**, 389–399 (2012).

650 De Cáceres, M. D. & Legendre, P. Associations between species and groups of sites: indices and
651 statistical inference. *Ecology* **90**: 3566–3574 (2009).

652 de Oliveira, J. C. D. *et al.* Trophic ecology of detritivorous fish along a reservoir cascade in a
653 tropical semi-arid region. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish* **30**, 234–243 (2021).

654 Deary, A. L., Latour, R. J. & Hilton, E. J. Niche Partitioning in Early Life History Stage, Estuarine-
655 Dependent Fishes (Sciaenidae). *Estuaries and Coasts* **40**, 1757–1770 (2017).

656 Devictor, V. *et al.* Defining and measuring ecological specialization. *Journal of Applied Ecology*
657 **47**, 15–25 (2010).

658 Dieckmann, U. & Doebeli, M. On the origin of species by sympatric speciation. *Nature* **400**: 354–
659 357 (1999).

660 Douglas Bates, Martin Maechler, Ben Bolker, Steve Walker (2015). Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects
661 Models Using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67(1), 1-48. doi:10.18637/jss.v067.i01.

662 Dufrêne, M. & Legendre, P. Species Assemblages and Indicator Species: the Need for a Flexible
663 Asymmetrical Approach. *Ecological Monographs* **67**: 345–366 (1997).

664 Ford, A. G. P. *et al.* Niche divergence facilitated by fine-scale ecological partitioning in a recent
665 cichlid fish adaptive radiation. *Evolution* **70**: 2718–2735 (2016).

666 Futuyma, D. J. & Moreno, G. The Evolution of Ecological Specialization. *Annual Review of*
667 *Ecology and Systematics* **19**, 207–233 (1988).

668 Gavrillets, S. & Losos, J. B. Adaptive Radiation: Contrasting Theory with Data. *Science* **323**: 732–
669 737 (2009).

670 Gavrillets, S. *Fitness Landscapes and the Origin of Species (MPB-41)*. (Princeton University Press,
671 2004).

672 Gelwick, F. P. & McIntyre, P. B. Chapter 22 - Trophic Relations of Stream Fishes. in *Methods in*
673 *Stream Ecology, Volume 1 (Third Edition)* (eds. Hauer, F. R. & Lamberti, G. A.) 457–479
674 (Academic Press, 2017). doi:[10.1016/B978-0-12-416558-8.00022-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-416558-8.00022-6).

675 Genner, M. J. & Turner, G. F. The mbuna cichlids of Lake Malawi: a model for rapid speciation
676 and adaptive radiation. *Fish and Fisheries* **6**: 1–34 (2005).

677 Genner, M. J., Hawkins, S. J. & Turner, G. F. Foraging of rocky habitat cichlid fishes in Lake
678 Malawi: coexistence through niche partitioning? *Oecologia* **121**: 283–292 (1999).

679 Genner, M. J., Turner, G. F., Barker, S. & Hawkins, S. J. Niche segregation among Lake Malawi
680 cichlid fishes? Evidence from stable isotope signatures. *Ecology Letters* **2**: 185–190 (1999).

681 Gillespie, R. G. *et al.* Comparing Adaptive Radiations Across Space, Time, and Taxa. *Journal of*
682 *Heredity* **111**: 1–20 (2020).

683 Grant, P. R. & Grant, B. R. Unpredictable Evolution in a 30-Year Study of Darwin’s Finches.
684 *Science* **296**: 707–711 (2002).

685 Grossman, G. D. Food resource partitioning in a rocky intertidal fish assemblage. *Journal of*
686 *Zoology* **1**, 317–355 (1986).

687 Harms-Tuohy, C. A., Schizas, N. V. & Appeldoorn, R. S. Use of DNA metabarcoding for stomach
688 content analysis in the invasive lionfish *Pterois volitans* in Puerto Rico. *Marine Ecology Progress*
689 *Series* **558**: 181–191 (2016).

690 Hertz, E., Trudel, M., Tucker, S., Beacham, T. D. & Mazumder, A. Overwinter shifts in the feeding
691 ecology of juvenile Chinook salmon. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* **74**: 226–233 (2017).

692 Hourigan, T. F., Stanton, F. G., Motta, P. J., Kelley', C. D. & Carlson', B. The feeding ecology of
693 three species of Caribbean angelfishes (family Pomacanthidae). **24**: 105-116 (1989).

694 Hyslop, E. J. Stomach contents analysis—a review of methods and their application. *Journal of*
695 *Fish Biology* **17**: 411–429 (1980).

696 Jakubavičiūtė, E., Bergström, U., Eklöf, J. S., Haenel, Q. & Bourlat, S. J. DNA metabarcoding
697 reveals diverse diet of the three-spined stickleback in a coastal ecosystem. *PLOS ONE* **12**:
698 e0186929 (2017).

699 Jari Oksanen, F. Guillaume Blanchet, Michael Friendly, Roeland Kindt, Pierre Legendre, Dan
700 McGlinn, Peter R. Minchin, R. B. O'Hara, Gavin L. Simpson, Peter Solymos, M. Henry H.
701 Stevens, Eduard Szoecs and Helene Wagner (2019). vegan: Community Ecology Package. R
702 package version 2.5-6. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=vegan>

703 Jesmer, B. R., Kauffman, M. J., Murphy, M. A. & Goheen, J. R. A test of the Niche Variation
704 Hypothesis in a ruminant herbivore. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **89**, 2825–2839 (2020).

705 Jinlong Zhang (2016). spaa: SPecies Association Analysis. R package version 0.2.2.
706 <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=spaa>

707 John Fox and Sanford Weisberg (2019). An {R} Companion to Applied Regression, Third Edition.
708 Thousand Oaks CA: Sage. URL: <https://socialsciences.mcmaster.ca/jfox/Books/Companion/>

709 Kingsolver, J. G. *et al.* The Strength of Phenotypic Selection in Natural Populations. *The American*
710 *Naturalist* **157**: 245–261 (2001).

711 Kocher, T. D. Adaptive evolution and explosive speciation: the cichlid fish model. *Nat Rev Genet*
712 **5**: 288–298 (2004).

713 Kohda, M. & Hori, M. Dichromatism in relation to the trophic biology of predatory cichlid fishes
714 in Lake Tanganyika, East Africa. *Journal of Zoology* **229**, 447–455 (1993).

715 Kohda, M. & Tanida, K. Overlapping territory of the benthophagous cichlid fish, *Lobochilotes*
716 *labiatus*, in Lake Tanganyika. *Environ Biol Fish* **45**, 13–20 (1996).

717 Kohda, M. *et al.* Niche differentiation depends on body size in a cichlid fish: a model system of a
718 community structured according to size regularities. *Journal of Animal Ecology* **77**, 859–868
719 (2008).

720 Kusche, H., Recknagel, H., Elmer, K. R. & Meyer, A. Crater lake cichlids individually specialize
721 along the benthic–limnetic axis. *Ecology and Evolution* **4**, 1127–1139 (2014).

722 Lamichhaney, S. *et al.* Evolution of Darwin’s finches and their beaks revealed by genome
723 sequencing. *Nature* **518**: 371–375 (2015).

724 Lee, F., Simon, K. S. & Perry, G. L. W. Prey selectivity and ontogenetic diet shift of the globally
725 invasive western mosquitofish (*Gambusia affinis*) in agriculturally impacted streams. *Ecology of*
726 *Freshwater Fish* **27**: 822–833 (2018).

727 Levins, R. *Evolution in Changing Environments: Some Theoretical Explorations*. (Princeton
728 University Press, 1968).

729 Liem, K. F. Adaptive Significance of Intra- and Interspecific Differences in the Feeding
730 Repertoires of Cichlid Fishes. *American Zoologist* **20**: 295–314 (1980).

731 Lloyd, E., Chhouk, B., Conith, A. J., Keene, A. C. & Albertson, R. C. Diversity in rest–activity
732 patterns among Lake Malawi cichlid fishes suggests a novel axis of habitat partitioning. *Journal*
733 *of Experimental Biology* **224**: (2021).

734 Manko, P. Stomach content analysis in freshwater fish feeding ecology. 117 (2016).

735 Martin, C. H. & Genner, M. J. High niche overlap between two successfully coexisting pairs of
736 Lake Malawi cichlid fishes. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* **66**: 579–588
737 (2009).

738 Martin, C. H. & Richards, E. J. The Paradox Behind the Pattern of Rapid Adaptive Radiation: How
739 Can the Speciation Process Sustain Itself Through an Early Burst? *Annual Review of Ecology,*
740 *Evolution, and Systematics* **50**: 569–593 (2019).

741 Martin, C. H. *et al.* Complex histories of repeated gene flow in Cameroon crater lake cichlids cast
742 doubt on one of the clearest examples of sympatric speciation. *Evolution* **69**: 1406–1422 (2015).

743 Martin, C. H. Strong assortative mating by diet, color, size, and morphology but limited progress
744 toward sympatric speciation in a classic example: Cameroon crater lake cichlids. *Evolution* **67**:
745 2114–2123 (2013).

746 Martin, C. H. Weak Disruptive Selection and Incomplete Phenotypic Divergence in Two Classic
747 Examples of Sympatric Speciation: Cameroon Crater Lake Cichlids. *The American Naturalist* **180**:
748 E90–E109 (2012).

749 Mcaskill, S., Paxton, S. & Geist, S. J. Trophic niche partitioning of three larval Sciaenidae species
750 in the north-western Gulf of Mexico. *Journal of Plankton Research* fbab081 (2021)
751 doi:[10.1093/plankt/fbab081](https://doi.org/10.1093/plankt/fbab081).

752 McKaye, K. R., Howard, J. H., Stauffer, J. R., Morgan, R. P., & Shonhiwa, F. Sexual selection
753 and genetic relationships of a sibling species complex of bower building cichlids in Lake
754 Malawi, Africa. *Japanese Journal of Ichthyology* **40** (1), 15-21 (1993).

755 McKaye, K. R., Stauffer, J. R., van den Berghe, E. P., Vivas, R., Perez, L. L., McCrary, J. K., ...
756 & Kocher, T. D. Behavioral, morphological and genetic evidence of divergence of the Midas
757 cichlid species complex in two Nicaraguan crater lakes. *Cuadernos de Investigación de la UCA*
758 **12**, 19-47 (2002).

759 Musilova, Z. *et al.* Evolution of the visual sensory system in cichlid fishes from crater lake
760 Barombi Mbo in Cameroon. *Molecular Ecology* **28**: 5010–5031 (2019).

761 Nakano, S. *et al.* Selective foraging on terrestrial invertebrates by rainbow trout in a forested
762 headwater stream in northern Japan: Terrestrial invertebrate feeding by fish. *Ecological Research*
763 **14**: 351–360 (1999).

764 Novakowski, G. C., Hahn, N. S. & Fugl, R. Diet seasonality and food overlap of the fish
765 assemblage in a pantanal pond. *Neotrop. ichthyol.* **6**, 567–576 (2008).

766 Otto, S. P., Servedio, M. R. & Nuismer, S. L. Frequency-Dependent Selection and the Evolution
767 of Assortative Mating. *Genetics* **179**: 2091–2112 (2008).

768 Pagani-Núñez, E., Barnett, C. A., Gu, H. & Goodale, E. The need for new categorizations of
769 dietary specialism incorporating spatio-temporal variability of individual diet specialization.
770 *Journal of Zoology* **300**, 1–7 (2016).

771 Pedreschi, D. *et al.* Trophic flexibility and opportunism in pike *Esox lucius*. *Journal of Fish*
772 *Biology* **87**, 876–894 (2015).

773 Pianka, E. R. The Structure of Lizard Communities. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics* **4**:
774 53–74 (1973).

775 Poelstra, J. W., Richards, E. J. & Martin, C. H. Speciation in sympatry with ongoing secondary
776 gene flow and a potential olfactory trigger in a radiation of Cameroon cichlids. *Molecular Ecology*
777 **27**: 4270–4288 (2018).

778 Poisot, T., Bever, J. D., Nemri, A., Thrall, P. H. & Hochberg, M. E. A conceptual framework for
779 the evolution of ecological specialisation. *Ecology Letters* **14**, 841–851 (2011).

780 Post, D. M. Using Stable Isotopes to Estimate Trophic Position: Models, Methods, and
781 Assumptions. *Ecology* **83**: 703–718 (2002).

782 Pritchard, P. C. H. and J. A. Mortimer. 1999. Taxonomy, External Morphology, and Species
783 Identification, p.21- 38. In: Karen L. Eckert, Karen A. Bjorndal, F. Alberto Abreu G. and Marydele
784 Donnelly (eds.), Research and Management Techniques for the Conservation of Sea Turtles.
785 IUCN/SSC Marine Turtle Specialist Group Publ. No. 4. Washington, D.C.

786 R Core Team (2020). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
787 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.

788 Randall, J. E. Food Habits of Reef Fishes of the West Indies. **5**: 94 (1967).

789 Reinthal, P. N. The feeding habits of a group of herbivorous rock-dwelling cichlid fishes
790 (Cichlidae: Perciformes) from Lake Malawi, Africa. *Environ Biol Fish* **27**, 215–233 (1990).

791 Resh, V. H., Moser, M. & Poole, M. Feeding habits of some freshwater fishes in streams of
792 Moorea, French Polynesia. *Annales de Limnologie - International Journal of Limnology* **35**: 205–
793 210 (1999).

794 Ribbink, A. & Lewis, D. *Melanochromis crabro* sp. nov. : a cichlid fish from lake Malawi which
795 feeds on ectoparasites and catfish eggs. (1982).

796 Ribbink, A. J., Marsh, B. A., Marsh, A. C., Ribbink, A. C. & Sharp. A preliminary survey of the
797 cichlid fishes of rocky habitats in Lake Malawi: results - The Mbuna - *Pseudotropheus*. *African*
798 *Zoology* **18**, 157–200 (1983).

799 Richards, E. J., Poelstra, J. W. & Martin, C. H. Don't throw out the sympatric speciation with the
800 crater lake water: fine-scale investigation of introgression provides equivocal support for causal
801 role of secondary gene flow in one of the clearest examples of sympatric speciation. *Evolution*
802 *Letters* **2**: 524–540 (2018).

803 Richards, E. J., Servedio, M. R. & Martin, C. H. Searching for Sympatric Speciation in the
804 Genomic Era. *BioEssays* **41**: 1900047 (2019).

805 Robinson, B. W. & Wilson, D. S. Optimal Foraging, Specialization, and a Solution to Liem's
806 Paradox. *The American Naturalist* **151**, 223–235 (1998).

807 Ross, S. T. Resource Partitioning in Fish Assemblages: A Review of Field Studies. *Copeia* **1986**:
808 352–388 (1986).

809 Sakaguchi, S. O. *et al.* Comparison of morphological and DNA-based techniques for stomach
810 content analyses in juvenile chum salmon *Oncorhynchus keta*: a case study on diet richness of
811 juvenile fishes. *Fisheries Science* **83**: 47–56 (2017).

812 Sá-Oliveira, J. C., Angelini, R. & Isaac-Nahum, V. J. Diet and niche breadth and overlap in fish
813 communities within the area affected by an Amazonian reservoir (Amapá, Brazil). *An. Acad. Bras.*
814 *Ciênc.* **86**, 383–406 (2014).

815 Sargeant, B. L. Individual Foraging Specialization: Niche Width versus Niche Overlap. *Oikos* **116**,
816 1431–1437 (2007).

817 Schliewen, U. K. & Klee, B. Reticulate sympatric speciation in Cameroonian crater lake cichlids.
818 *Frontiers in Zoology* **1**: 5 (2004).

819 Schliewen, U. K. Cichlid species flocks in small Cameroonian lakes. *Freshwater ecoregions of*
820 *Africa and Madagascar: a conservation assessment* 58-60 (2005).

821 Schliewen, U. K., Tautz, D. & Pääbo, S. Sympatric speciation suggested by monophyly of crater
822 lake cichlids. *Nature* **368**: 629–632 (1994).

823 Schluter, D. *The Ecology of Adaptive Radiation*. (OUP Oxford, 2000).

824 Seegers, L., and H. Tichy. The *Oreochromis alcalicus* flock (Teleostei: Cichlidae) from Lake
825 Natron and Magadi, Tanzania and Kenya, with description of two new species. *Ichthyological*
826 *Exploration of Freshwaters* **10**:97–146 (1999).

827 Seehausen, O. Explosive speciation rates and unusual species richness in haplochromine cichlid
828 fishes: Effects of sexual selection. in *Advances in Ecological Research* vol. 31 237–274 (Academic
829 Press, 2000).

830 Shipley, L. A., Forbey, J. S. & Moore, B. D. Revisiting the dietary niche: When is a mammalian
831 herbivore a specialist? *Integrative and Comparative Biology* **49**, 274–290 (2009).

832 Spencer, E. E., Newsome, T. M. & Dickman, C. R. Prey selection and dietary flexibility of three
833 species of mammalian predator during an irruption of non-cyclic prey. *R. Soc. open sci.* **4**, 170317
834 (2017).

835 Stauffer, J. R. & McKaye, K. R. Descriptions of Three New Species of Cichlid Fishes (Teleostei:
836 Cichlidae) from Lake Xiloá, Nicaragua. *Cuadernos de Investigación* 1–18 (2002).

837 Stauffer, J. R., Jr. & Gray, E. Phenotypic plasticity: Its role in trophic radiation and explosive
838 speciation in cichlids (Teleostei: Cichlidae). *Animal Biology* **54**, 137–158 (2004).

839 Stauffer, J. R., Jr. & Posner, I. An Investigation of the Utility of Feeding Angles Among Lake
840 Malawi Rock-dwelling Cichlids (Teleostei: Cichlidae). *cope* **2006**, 289–292 (2006).

841 Stauffer, J. R., McKaye, K. R. & Konings, A. F. Behaviour: an important diagnostic tool for
842 Lake Malawi cichlids. *Fish and Fisheries* **3**, 213–224 (2002).

843 Stiassny, M. L. J., Schliewen, U. K., & Dominey, W. J. A new species flock of cichlid fishes from
844 Lake Bermin, Cameroon with a description of eight new species of Tilapia (Labroidei:
845 Cichlidae). *Ichthyological Exploration of Freshwaters* **3**(4): 311–346 (1992).

846 Streelman, J. T. & Danley, P. D. The stages of vertebrate evolutionary radiation. *Trends in Ecology*
847 *& Evolution* **18**, 126–131 (2003).

848 Stroud, J. T. & Losos, J. B. Bridging the Process-Pattern Divide to Understand the Origins and
849 Early Stages of Adaptive Radiation: A Review of Approaches With Insights From Studies of
850 Anolis Lizards. *Journal of Heredity* **111**: 33–42 (2020).

851 Takahashi, M. *et al.* Partitioning of diet between species and life history stages of sympatric and
852 cryptic snappers (Lutjanidae) based on DNA metabarcoding. *Sci Rep* **10**, 4319 (2020).

853 Taylor, M. I., Turner, G. F., Robinson, R. L. & Stauffer, J. R. Sexual selection, parasites and
854 bower height skew in a bower-building cichlid fish. *Animal Behaviour* **56**, 379–384 (1998).

855 Thalmann, H. L., Daly, E. A. & Brodeur, R. D. Two Anomalously Warm Years in the Northern
856 California Current: Impacts on Early Marine Steelhead Diet Composition, Morphology, and
857 Potential Survival. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society* **149**: 369–382 (2020).

858 Trewavas, E., Green, J. & Corbet, S. A. Ecological studies on crater lakes in West Cameroon
859 Fishes of Barombi Mbo. *Journal of Zoology* **167**: 41–95 (1972).

860 Turelli, M., N. H. Barton, and J. A. Coyne. Theory and speciation. *Trends in Ecology and*
861 *Evolution* **16**:330–343 (2001).

862 Varghese, S. P., Somvanshi, V. S. & Dalvi, R. S. Diet composition, feeding niche partitioning and
863 trophic organisation of large pelagic predatory fishes in the eastern Arabian Sea. *Hydrobiologia*
864 **736**: 99–114 (2014).

865 Wagner, C. E., McIntyre, P. B., Buels, K. S., Gilbert, D. M. & Michel, E. Diet predicts intestine
866 length in Lake Tanganyika's cichlid fishes. *Functional Ecology* **23**: 1122–1131 (2009).

867 Winemiller, K. O. & Pianka, E. R. Organization in Natural Assemblages of Desert Lizards and
868 Tropical Fishes. *Ecological Monographs* **60**: 27–55 (1990).

869 Winemiller, K. O. Spatial and Temporal Variation in Tropical Fish Trophic Networks. *Ecological*
870 *Monographs* **60**: 331–367 (1990).

871 Witzell, W. N. *Synopsis of Biological Data on the Hawksbill Turtle, Eretmochelys Imbricata*
872 *(Linnaeus, 1766)*. (Food & Agriculture Org., 1983).

873 Yuma, M., Narita, T., Hori, M. & Kondo, T. Food resources of shrimp-eating cichlid fishes in
874 Lake Tanganyika. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* **52**, 371–378 (1998).

875

876 **AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTION STATEMENT**

877 Conceived and designed the investigation: CHM

878 Performed field and/or laboratory work: CHM, CDT, LNG, KM

879 Analyzed the data: JRG, MES

880 Contributed materials, reagents, and/or analysis tools: CHM

881 Wrote the paper: JRG, MES, CHM

882

883 **TABLES**

884 Table 1: Mean proportion of each dietary component and sample sizes by species. BA is Levins’
 885 standardized index of niche breadth (Levins 1968).

Dietary component	<i>Konia dikume</i>	<i>Konia eisentrauti</i>	<i>Myaka myaka</i>	<i>Sarotherodon linnellii</i>	<i>Sarotherodon steinbachi</i>	<i>Pungu maclareni</i>	<i>Stomatepia mongo</i>	<i>Stomatepia mariae</i>	<i>Stomatepia pindu</i>
Ant	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.098	0.000
<i>Corvospongilla</i> Sponge	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.212	0.000	0.000	0.000
Detritus	0.889	0.628	1.000	0.865	0.608	0.609	0.143	0.526	0.651
Dipteran Larvae	0.111	0.027	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.003	0.000	0.023	0.000
Ephemeropteran Larvae	0.000	0.101	0.000	0.025	0.009	0.088	0.000	0.120	0.000
Fish	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.060	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.074	0.000
Gastropod Shell	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000
Nematode	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.015	0.000
Plant Tissue	0.000	0.228	0.000	0.045	0.000	0.016	0.019	0.006	0.000
Shrimp	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.008	0.629	0.001	0.091
Silt	0.000	0.012	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.000	0.000	0.000
Trichopteran Larvae	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.141
Unidentified	0.000	0.005	0.000	0.006	0.383	0.059	0.209	0.137	0.117
n	3	37	6	17	15	63	7	44	11
BA	0.021	0.099	0.000	0.027	0.078	0.112	0.098	0.173	0.095

886

887 Table 2: Pianka’s measure of niche overlap (Pianka 1973) among cichlid species from Barombi
 888 Mbo. Values range from 0-1, with 0 being no niche overlap and 1 being complete niche overlap.

	<i>Konia dikume</i>	<i>Konia eisentrauti</i>	<i>Myaka myaka</i>	<i>Sarotherodon linnellii</i>	<i>Sarotherodon steinbachi</i>	<i>Pungu maclareni</i>	<i>Stomatepia mongo</i>	<i>Stomatepia mariae</i>
<i>Konia eisentrauti</i>	0.926							
<i>Myaka myaka</i>	0.992	0.928						
<i>Sarotherodon linnellii</i>	0.988	0.946	0.996					
<i>Sarotherodon steinbachi</i>	0.840	0.791	0.846	0.847				
<i>Pungu maclareni</i>	0.925	0.894	0.932	0.934	0.838			
<i>Stomatepia mongo</i>	0.209	0.207	0.211	0.213	0.342	0.236		
<i>Stomatepia mariae</i>	0.919	0.894	0.921	0.935	0.910	0.909	0.270	
<i>Stomatepia pindu</i>	0.947	0.887	0.954	0.951	0.899	0.906	0.377	0.920

889

890

891 **Table 3:** Results of indicator species analysis (indicspecies). Each dietary component was assigned
 892 a group consisting of either one or multiple species based on its abundance in the data set (Bray-
 893 Curtis dissimilarity matrix). Significant indicators ($P < 0.05$) are bolded and denote dietary items
 894 that contribute to differences in stomach contents among groups.

Dietary component	Species group associated	Dufrène-Legendre indicator value	<i>P</i>
Ant	<i>Stomatepia mariae</i>	0.405	0.0458
Corvospongilla Sponge	<i>Pungu maclareni</i>	0.49	0.013
Detritus	<i>Konia dikume</i>	0.454	0.0077
	<i>Myaka myaka</i>		
	<i>Sarotherodon linnellii</i>		
Dipteran Larvae	<i>Konia dikume</i>	0.34	0.0878
Ephemeropteran Larvae	<i>Konia eisenrauti</i>	0.319	0.141
	<i>Pungu maclareni</i>		
	<i>Stomatepia mariae</i>		
Fish	<i>Sarotherodon linnellii</i>	0.28	0.212
	<i>Stomatepia mariae</i>		
Gastropod Shell	<i>Pungu maclareni</i>	0.166	0.674
Nematode	<i>Stomatepia mariae</i>	0.209	0.3545
Plant Tissue	<i>Konia eisenrauti</i>	0.438	0.0184
Shrimp	<i>Stomatepia mongo</i>	0.744	0.0002
Silt	<i>Konia eisenrauti</i>	0.206	0.4217
Trichopteran larvae	<i>Stomatepia pindu</i>	0.457	0.0295
Unidentified	<i>Sarotherodon steinbachi</i>	0.413	0.0077
	<i>Stomatepia mongo</i>		

895

896 **Table 4:** Results of linear models (LMs) investigating variation in dietary component proportions
 897 among cichlid species. Table displays results of LMs investigating if individual dietary item
 898 proportions vary among species, with log(Standard length) as a covariate. All proportions were
 899 transformed using the arcsine square root transformation and a normal distribution was used for
 900 all models. Significant predictors ($P < 0.05$) are bolded.

Response	Predictor	χ^2	d.f.	<i>P</i>
Ant	Species	51.806	8	1.835*10⁻⁸
	log(Standard length)	0.448	1	0.503

<i>Corvospongilla</i> Sponge	Species	55.461	8	3.591*10⁻⁹
	log(Standard length)	5.374	1	0.02
Detritus	Species	36.242	8	1.585*10⁻⁵
	log(Standard length)	15.282	1	9.26*10⁻⁵
Dipteran Larvae	Species	5.569	8	0.695
	log(Standard length)	0.336	1	0.562
Ephemeropteran Larvae	Species	11.772	8	0.162
	log(Standard length)	0.978	1	0.323
Fish	Species	8.299	8	0.405
	log(Standard length)	7.11	1	0.00766
Gastropod Shell	Species	3.445	8	0.903
	log(Standard length)	1.214	1	0.271
Nematode	Species	9.123	8	0.332
	log(Standard length)	0.002	1	0.964
Plant Tissue	Species	49.347	8	5.455*10⁻⁸
	log(Standard length)	6.317	1	0.012
Shrimp	Species	116.674	8	<2*10⁻¹⁶
	log(Standard length)	0.041	1	0.839
Silt	Species	4.914	8	0.767
	log(Standard length)	0.022	1	0.882
Trichopteran Larvae	Species	58.1	8	1.098*10⁻⁹
	log(Standard length)	0.048	1	0.826
Unidentified	Species	55.175	8	4.082*10⁻⁹
	log(Standard length)	0.341	1	0.559

901

902 Table 5: Results of generalized linear models (GLMs) investigating variation in frequency of
903 occurrence of dietary components among cichlid species. Table displays results of GLMs
904 investigating if individual dietary item presence/absence varies among species, with log(Standard
905 length) as a covariate. All proportions were converted into binomial success (proportion > 0) and
906 failure (proportion = 0) data, and a binomial distribution was used for all models. Significant
907 predictors ($P < 0.05$) are bolded.

Response	Predictor	χ^2	d.f.	P
Ant	Species	51.997	8	1.685*10⁻⁸
	log(Standard length)	0.074	1	0.786
<i>Corvospongilla</i> Sponge	Species	55.628	8	3.333*10⁻⁹
	log(Standard length)	5.715	1	0.0168
Detritus	Species	24.44	8	0.00193
	log(Standard length)	5.537	1	0.0186

Dipteran Larvae	Species	8.216	8	0.413
	log(Standard length)	0.0434	1	0.835
Ephemeropteran Larvae	Species	22.971	8	0.0034
	log(Standard length)	2.067	1	0.151
Fish	Species	14.411	8	0.0717
	log(Standard length)	11.178	1	0.000828
Gastropod Shell	Species	4.783	8	0.781
	log(Standard length)	1.845	1	0.174
Nematode	Species	9.412	8	0.309
	log(Standard length)	0.102	1	0.75
Plant Tissue	Species	36.158	8	1.643*10⁻⁵
	log(Standard length)	13.795	1	0.000204
Shrimp	Species	19.112	8	0.0143
	log(Standard length)	1.384	1	0.239
Silt	Species	4.81	8	0.778
	log(Standard length)	0.604	1	0.473
Trichopteran Larvae	Species	17.653	8	0.024
	log(Standard length)	0.268	1	0.605
Unidentified	Species	45.748	8	2.654*10⁻⁷
	log(Standard length)	0.823	1	0.364

Table 6: Results of linear models (LMs) investigating variation in stable isotope values among 1) all cichlid species and 2) only *Stomatepia spp.* Table displays results of LMs investigating if $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values vary among species. A normal distribution was used for all models. Significant predictors ($P < 0.05$) are bolded.

Model	Response	Predictor	χ^2	d.f.	P
ALL species	$\delta^{13}\text{C}$	Species	123.36	11	$<2.2*10^{-16}$
	$\delta^{15}\text{N}$	Species	67.967	11	$2.969*10^{-10}$
<i>Stomatepia</i> ONLY	$\delta^{13}\text{C}$	Species	15.534	3	0.00141
	$\delta^{15}\text{N}$	Species	5.36	3	0.147

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1: Dietary profiles of cichlid species from Barombi Mbo by prey item proportion. Each color represents a different dietary component. Bar length is based on the average proportion of

each prey item. Representative live photographs of most species reared in a common lab environment are also shown, excluding *K. dikume* which was never successfully recovered alive.

Figure 2: Box and whisker plots displaying the proportions of A) shrimp B) ants, C) Trichopteran larvae, D) *Corvospongilla* sponge, E) plant tissue, and F) fish found in each species' stomachs. Total sample size was 203 individuals collected in 2010 and 2016 from multiple sites around the lake.

Figure 3: Non-metric multidimensional scaling (NMDS) ordination of dietary item proportions for nine out of the eleven cichlid species from Barombi Mbo. Ordination is based on Bray-Curtis similarity index (stress = 0.103).

Figure 4: The diet of large *Konia eisentrauti* and *Pungu maclareni* individuals contains a larger proportion of plant tissue and *Corvospongilla* sponge respectively, while the diets of small *K. eisentrauti* and *P. maclareni* individuals contain a larger proportion of detritus. Graphs display the linear relationship between the log(standard length(mm)) of individual fish and the proportion (arcsine-transformed) of A) detritus and B) plant tissue for *K. eisentrauti*, and C) detritus and D) *Corvospongilla* sponge for *P. maclareni*. Points represent individuals, lines represent the predicted results of a LOESS model with proportion of a diet item as the response variable and log(standard length(mm)) as the predictor variable.

938 Figure 5: Scatterplots of $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ isotopic values for A) all eleven cichlid species from
939 Barombi Mbo and B) only *Stomatepia* species. $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ offers insight into ultimate carbon source
940 (littoral vs pelagic) while $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values describe relative trophic position.

941

942 Figure 6: Individuals that are part of specialist groups exhibit a wider range of detritus in their diets
943 and more individuals consume secondary or specialized diet items. Density plots displaying the
944 number of individuals per species consuming a given proportion (arcsine-transformed) of 1)
945 detritus and 2) the second most-consumed item (generalist species) or their specialized food item
946 (specialist species).