If it's real, could it be an eel?

Floe Foxon[1]

[1] Department of Data Management and Statistical Analysis, PinneyAssociates – Pittsburgh, USA

Correspondence: ffoxon@pinneyassociates.com

Abstract

Previous studies have estimated the size, mass, and population of hypothetical unknown animals in a large, oligrotrophic freshwater loch in Scotland based on biomass and other observational considerations. The 'eel hypothesis' proposes that the anthrozoological phenomenon at Loch Ness can be explained in part by observations of large specimens of European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*), as these animals are most compatible with morphological, behavioural, and environmental considerations. The present study expands upon the 'eel hypothesis' and related literature by estimating the probability of observing eels at least as large as have been proposed, using catch data from Loch Ness and other freshwater bodies in Europe. Skew normal distributions were fitted to eel body length distributions in order to estimate cumulative distribution functions from which probabilities were obtained. The chances of finding a large eel in Loch Ness are around 1 in $50,000$ for a 1-meter specimen, which is reasonable given the loch's fish stock and suggests some sightings of smaller 'unknown' animals may be accounted for by large eels. However, the probability of finding a specimen upwards of 6 meters is essentially zero, therefore eels probably do not account for 'sightings' of larger animals. The existence of exceedingly large eels in the loch is not likely based on purely statistical considerations.

Keywords: European eel; *Anguilla anguilla*; Probability; Distribution; Loch Ness

Introduction

Loch Ness is a large, oligotrophic freshwater loch located along the Great Glen Fault in Scotland. Since the 1930s, purported sightings of unknown animals in the loch have featured prominently in popular media, though to date no specimen has been obtained despite numerous efforts, making the probability of such animals unlikely.

The authenticity and interpretations of photographs and films allegedly depicting unknown animals in Loch Ness have been seriously doubted (Campbell, 1986; Martin and Boyd, 1999; Raynor, 2009, 2010; Shine, 2003). In the 20th century, systematic searches with submersibles, sector-scanning sonar surveys, hydrophones, underwater photography, longlining, and trawling undertaken by the Loch Ness Investigation Bureau (LNIB) (Mackal, 1976, Chapters II–V), the Academy of Applied Science (AAS) (Edgerton et al., 1989; Klein et al., 1972; Rines, 1982; Rines and Curtis, 1979; Rines, Edgerton, et al., 1984; Scott and Rines, 1975), and the Loch Ness and Morar Project (LNMP) (Shine, 2006) have returned only ambigious sonar signals, low-quality photographs, and unidentifiable sound recordings.

In the 1970s, a sample of European eels (*Anguilla anguilla*) were collected from Loch Ness with baited traps. The distribution of eel masses was skewed, which led biologist Roy Mackal (1976) to conclude that large eels may exist in the loch. Indeed, Mackal noted that large eels would be consistent with eyewitness reports including an elongated head-neck, a single pair of pectoral fins, extreme flexion, and dark integument (Gibson and Heppell, 1988a,b). This explanation has also been suggested by naturalists Adrian Shine and David Martin of the LNMP, who noted that eels migrate via the River Ness and that most 'sightings' occur near river mouths.

An eDNA sudy conducted at the loch in 2018 detected extraordinary amounts of mtDNA and nuDNA from eels (Shine, 2019), prompting principal investigator Neil Gemmell to further suggest the possibility of large eels in the loch (University of Otago, 2019). A large eel-shaped animal was recently filmed in the River Ness by the Ness Fishery Board (Turner, 2019).

Simon (2007) suggests the physiologically possible maximum length of *A. anguilla* is 0.5-–1.3 meters, which is not particularly monstrous. Using wave mechanics, LeBlond and Collins (1987) estimate the size of the 'monster' depicted in the infamous "Surgeon's Photograph" at Loch Ness at 0.6–2.4 meters.

Much larger estimates have been made. Based on their "flipper" photograph, Scott and Rines (1975) estimated a total body length of 15–20 meters for an unknown Loch Ness animal. These estimates seem inconsistent with Loch Ness biomass calculations. Sheldon and Kerr (1972, 1973) estimate a population of 156 if the individual mass of a hypothetical unknown animal in Loch Ness is 100 kilograms, and suggest just one individual can exist if its mass is $2,000$–$3,000$ kilograms. Scheider and Wallis (1973) estimate the loch may support 157 animals of 100 kilograms each, and 10 animals of 1,500 kilograms each.

Finally, in an article titled "If there are any, could there be many?", Carl Sagan (1976) used collision physics and suggested that a population of 300 animals each of 10-meter size would be consistent with AAS observations. Thus, if there are any, there may be many. If it's real, could it be an eel? The aim of the present study is to estimate the probability of finding various sizes of eel in Loch Ness based on available catch data.

Material and methods

Data on the mass distribution of *A. anguilla* in Loch Ness were taken from $n = 129$ eels caught between 1970 and 1971 under the supervision of the LNIB and described in Mackal (1976, Appendix G).

Mackal does not provide the length distribution for the sample, nor did Mackal directly regress length on mass. Mackal did regress functions of length on mass and maximum circumference, but provided only non-linear equations unsuitable for solving simultaneously. Thus, to convert the mass distribution into a length distribution, the relationship between mass and length in *A. anguilla* captured in Scottish freshwaters from 1986–2008 was taken from Oliver et al. (2015, Figure 2) as

$$\log_{10}(1000M) = 3.1586 \log_{10}(100L) - 3.0076 \tag{1}$$

for mass M in kilograms and length L in meters. This equation is used over alternatives such as Simon (2007, Figure 2(b)) because Equation 1 is most relevant to Loch Ness (having been derived from Scottish freshwater).

Rearranging Equation 1 gives

$$L \approx 0.797961 M^{0.316596}\,, \tag{2}$$

from which the lengths of eels in Mackal's sample were estimated.

A skew normal distribution was fitted to the Loch Ness eel length distribution, and fit parameters were used to estimate the probability density function (PDF) and cumulative distribution function (CDF).

The probability of finding an eel in Loch Ness at least as long as L was then estimated from the CDF as

$$\mathbb{P}(l > L) = 1 - \text{CDF}(L)\,. \tag{3}$$

For comparison, the above analysis was repeated with publicly-available length data on $n = 420$ European eels captured in Zeeschelde, Belgium presented in Verhelst et al. (2018, Supplemental Information). Zeeschelde was selected because raw data were available, whereas this is not the case for other published analyses.

All analyses were performed in Python 3.8.8 with the packages Numpy 1.20.1, Pandas 1.2.4, Matplotlib 3.3.4, and Scipy 1.6.2. All code and data are available in the online Supplementary Information (Foxon, 2022).

Results

The length distributions for the Loch Ness and Zeeschelde eel samples are shown in the upper plots of Figure 1. The distribution for Loch Ness is evidently skewed toward lower lengths, similar to the length distribution of European eels presented by Melia et al. (2006, Fig. 2) for eels captured in the Camargue lagoons of France. The Zeeschelde distribution has notably less skew. The length distribution in a sample of eels in Vistonis Lake, Greece was skewed toward higher lengths (Macnamara et al., 2014, Fig. 2), suggesting much variability in eel length skew across different environments.

The probabilities of finding an eel at least as big as L in Loch Ness and in Zeeschelde are shown in the lower plots of Figure 1. Loch Ness has a comparatively low probability of finding larger eels 0.6–0.8 meters in length, and the probability of finding an eel in excess of 1 meter length is very low for both environments.

Figure 1. Length distributions for European eels (*A. anguilla*) captured in Loch Ness (left) and in Zeeschelde (right). The lower plots show the probability of finding an eel at least as long as L. The number of bins follows the rule provided in Freedman and Diaconis (1981).



Table 1 contains the estimated probabilities for specific lengths of interest. Results were somewhat similar for both Loch Ness and for Zeeschelde.

While the chance of finding a large eel approximately 1 meter in length in Loch Ness is low (around 1 in $50,000$), this is certainly possible given the eel population of the loch: assuming a standing fish stock of 0.55 kg ha^{-1} for Loch Ness (Sheldon and Kerr, 1972, 1973) and given a surface area of $5,600$ hectares, the total standing fish stock of the loch is approximately $3,080$ kg. Further assuming that half of this stock is eel mass (plausible given the Loch Ness eDNA study (Shine, 2019)), this would imply $1,540$ kg of eel in the loch. The average Loch Ness eel mass is 0.1857 kg (Mackal, 1976, Appendix G), therefore there are over $8,000$ eels in Loch Ness at a given time. Over the course of a few generations, an eel 1 meter in length may be expected.

However, this is not quite the 'monster' postulated. Indeed, the probability of finding a 6-meter eel in Loch Ness is essentially zero; too low for the software used to provide a reliable estimate. Thus, while large eels may account for some eyewitness sightings of large, animate objects rising to the loch surface, they are

unlikely to account for 'sightings' of extraordinarily large animals, which may instead be accounted for by wave phenomena, the occasional stray mammal, or other.

Table 1. Probabilities associated with finding a European eel (*A. anguilla*) at least as large as length L in Loch Ness and Zeeschelde for various L.

L **(Meters)**	$\mathbb{P}(l > L)$ **Loch Ness**	$\mathbb{P}(l > L)$ **Zeeschelde**	**Note**
0.505	0.238	0.619	Maximum length from sample of $n = 43$ European eels in the river Vjosa/Aoos, Albania/Greece (2018). Source: Meulenbroek et al. (2020, Figure 4).
0.645	0.0399	0.264	Maximum length from sample of $n = 129$ European eels in Loch Ness, Scotland (1970–1971). Source: Mackal (1976, Appendix G).
0.662	0.0307	0.228	Maximum length from sample of $n = 199$ female yellow European eels in the River Havel system, Germany (2001). Source: Simon (2007, Table 3).
0.784	0.00348	0.0592	Maximum length from sample of $n = 20,108$ European eels in the Camargue lagoons, France (1993–2003). Source: Melia et al. (2006, Table II).
0.932	0.000120	0.00537	Maximum length from sample of $n = 420$ European eels in Zeeschelde, Belgium (2015–2017). Source: Verhelst et al. (2018, Supplemental Information).
1.30	8.18×10^{-10}	2.71×10^{-7}	Physiologically possible maximum length of female yellow European eel in the River Havel system, Germany. Source: Simon (2007, Abstract).
6.10	~ 0	~ 0	Size estimate for hypothetical unknown animals in Loch Ness ("up to 20 ft."). Source: Mackal (1976, Chapter XIV).

Discussion

This study used data on the distribution of European eel (*A. anguilla*) masses in an oligotrophic freshwater loch in Scotland to estimate the probability of finding an eel of extraordinary size there. Similar to other eel populations in Europe, the average eel length in Loch Ness is relatively small. Findings suggest that the chance of finding a 1-meter eel in the loch (1 in $50,000$) is reasonable given the standing fish stock, and so some eels may account for purported sightings of somewhat large animals at the loch surface. However, larger eels upwards of 6 meters are highly improbable, therefore 'super' eels are an unlikely explanation for eyewitness reports of the very largest alleged animals.

This analysis is limited by the Loch Ness eel sample used, which was relatively small at $n = 129$. Larger samples across longer time periods may provide more accurate estimates. The assumption of a skew normal distribution would not hold if, for example, a larger sample revealed a bimodal distribution of eel lengths with a small peak at higher lengths. This analysis is based on purely statistical considerations; the biological mechanism behind the physiological possibility of much larger eels is beyond the scope of the present study. Some authors have suggested neoteny as one such mechanism (Mackal, 1976, Chapter XI). Furthermore, environmental conditions such as temperature and available biomass impact eel growth and length, therefore comparisons to other environments such as Zeeschelde may not be appropriate.

In conclusion, while Sagan (1976) found that if there are any, there may be many, the present study shows that if it's real, it could be an eel, but not a very large one...

Fundings

This work was not supported by any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflict of interest disclosure

The author declares that they have no financial conflicts of interest in relation to the content of the article.

Data, script, code, and supplementary information availability

Data and code are available online: https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/ZMGDJ

References

Campbell S (1986). Monster or Boat. *The Photographic Journal* 126, 54–58.

Edgerton HE, CW Wyckoff, RH Rines, R Needleman, and JC Rines (1989). AAS Underwater Elapsed Time Camera Silhouette Photography Experiments at Loch Ness, 1989. *Cryptozoology* 8, 58–63.

Foxon F (2022). Supplemental materials for paper: If it's real, could it be an eel? https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/ZMGDJ.

Freedman D and P Diaconis (1981). On the histogram as a density estimator: L 2 theory. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete* 57, 453–476. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01025868.

Gibson J and D Heppell, eds. (1988a). *International Society of Cryptozoology Society for the History of Natural History. Symposium on The Loch Ness Monster. The Search for Nessie in the 1980s Part One*. Vol. 100. 2. Kilbarchan, Scotland: The Scottish Natural History Library.

— eds. (1988b). *International Society of Cryptozoology Society for the History of Natural History. Symposium on The Loch Ness Monster. The Search for Nessie in the 1980s Part Two*. Vol. 100. 3. Kilbarchan, Scotland: The Scottish Natural History Library.

Klein M, RH Rines, T Dinsdale, and LS Foster (1972). Underwater Search at Loch Ness. *Belmont, Mass., Academy of Applied Science*.

LeBlond PH and MJ Collins (1987). The Wilson Nessie Photo: A Size Determination Based on Physical Principles. *Cryptozoology* 6, 55–64.

Mackal RP (1976). *The Monsters of Loch Ness*. Swallow Press.

Macnamara R, E Koutrakis, A Sapounidis, D Lachouvaris, F Arapoglou, D Panora, and K Mccarthy (2014). Reproductive potential of silver European eels (Anguilla anguilla) migrating from Vistonis Lake (northern Aegean Sea, Greece). *Mediterranean Marine Science*, 539–544. https://doi.org/10.12681/mms.614.

Martin DS and A Boyd (1999). *Nessie: The Surgeon's Photograph Exposed*. Twayne Publishers.

Melia P, D Bevacqua, AJ Crivelli, GA De Leo, J Panfili, and M Gatto (2006). Age and growth of *Anguilla anguilla* in the Camargue lagoons. *Journal of Fish Biology* 68, 876–890. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0022-1112.2006.00975.x.

Meulenbroek P, U Hammerschmied, S Schmutz, S Weiss, M Schabuss, H Zornig, S Shumka, and F Schiemer (2020). Conservation requirements of European eel (Anquilla anquilla) in a Balkan catchment. *Sustainability* 12, 8535. https://doi.org/10.3390/su12208535.

Oliver IW, K Macgregor, JD Godfrey, L Harris, and A Duguid (2015). Lipid increases in European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) in Scotland 1986–2008: an assessment of physical parameters and the influence of organic pollutants. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 22, 7519–7528. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-015-4116-4.

Raynor D (2009). Bird Effects. https://web.archive.org/web/20090311010529/http://www.lochnessinvestigation.com/Mergansers.html.

— (2010). Reflections on Tim Dinsdale's 1960 film. https://web.archive.org/web/20220203133626/http://www.lochnessinvestigation.com/Remembered.html.

Rines RH (1982). Summarizing A Decade of Underwater Studies at Loch Ness. *Cryptozoology* 1, 24–32.

Rines RH and HS Curtis (1979). Loch Ness: The Big One That Got Away– Again. *Technology Review* 81.

Rines RH, HE Edgerton, and R Needleman (1984). Activities of the Academy of Applied Science Related to Investigations at Loch Ness, 1984. *Cryptozoology* 3, 71–73.

Sagan C (1976). If there are any, could there be many? *Nature* 264, 497. https://doi.org/10.1038/264497a0.

Scheider W and P Wallis (1973). An alternate method of calculating the population density of monsters in Loch Ness. *Limnology and Oceanography* 18, 343–345. https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.1973.18.2.0343.

Scott P and RH Rines (1975). Naming the Loch Ness monster. *Nature* 258, 466–468. https://doi.org/10.1038/258466a0.

Sheldon RW and SR Kerr (1972). The Population Density of Monsters in Loch Ness. *Limnology and Oceanography* 17, 796–798. https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.1972.17.5.0796.

— (1973). The Loch Ness Monster: reply to comments of CH Mortimer. *Limnology and Oceanography* 18, 345–346. https://doi.org/10.4319/lo.1973.18.2.0345.

Shine AJ (2003). The Dinsdale Loch Ness Film. An Image Analysis. https://web.archive.org/web/20220626205200/http://www.lochnessinvestigation.com/Remembered.html.

— (2006). *Loch Ness*. Loch Ness Project Drumnadrochit.

— (2019). The Loch Ness eDNA Project - Super Natural History. https://tinyurl.com/37c6m76s.

Simon J (2007). Age, growth, and condition of European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*) from six lakes in the River Havel system (Germany). *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 64, 1414–1422. https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsm093.

Turner R (2019). New footage supports theory Loch Ness Monster is actually an eel. https://web.archive.org/web/20211024225218/https://www.countrylife.co.uk/news/new-footage-supports-theory-loch-ness-monster-actually-eel-204099.

University of Otago (2019). First eDNA Study Of Loch Ness Points To Something Fishy. https://web.archive.org/web/20220607165452/https://www.otago.ac.nz/news/news/otago717609.html.

Verhelst P, J De Meyer, J Reubens, J Coeck, P Goethals, T Moens, and A Mouton (2018). Unimodal head-width distribution of the European eel (Anguilla anguilla L.) from the Zeeschelde does not support disruptive selection. *PeerJ* 6, e5773. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.5773.