

Table 1. Case data on sea turtles that were preyed/scavenged upon by shark predators. Included are the turtles' life-stage class, sex, standard straight carapace length (SCL) and straight carapace width (SCW) in cm, and timing of the wound (ante- or postmortem). Data are also provided on the most likely shark predators, including mean interdermal distance (IDD), bite circumference (BC), and estimated shark size. Footnotes are provided regarding interpretation of the results and possible other shark predator candidates.

Sea Turtles						Sharks				
Case	Year	Location	Life-stage class/sex	SCL (cm)	SCW (cm)	Bite Timing	Mean IDD (mm)	Mean BC (mm)	Likely species	Shark size (m)
1. Cm1	2013	Hutchinson Island, FL	Juvenile/unknown	47.4	37.4	Antemortem	12	310	Bull shark ^b	1.9–2.2 ^b
2. Cm2	2010	Bay County, FL	Juvenile/unknown	49.5	39.5	Antemortem	12	CND	Bull shark ^c	1.9 ^c
3. Cm3	2016	Hutchinson Island, FL	Juvenile/unknown	41.1	NA	Postmortem	16	316	Tiger shark ^d	2.3–2.4 ^d
4. Cm4	2018	Vero Beach, FL	Juvenile/unknown	19.2	17.2 ^a	Antemortem	19	467	White shark ^e	2.3–2.7 ^e
5. Cm5	1019	Brevard County, FL	Juvenile/unknown	45.0 ^a	29.3 ^a	Antemortem	8	238	Dusky shark ^f	1.6–1.7 ^f
6. Cc1	2014	Hutchinson Island, FL	Adult/female	83.2	67.0	Antemortem	20	412	White shark ^g	2.3–2.4 ^g
7. Cc2	2017	Hutchinson Island, FL	Adult/female	83.2	67.5	Antemortem	25	CND	Mako spp. ^h	2.6 ^h
8. Cc3	2017	Hutchinson Island, FL	Adult/unknown	68.8	56.6	Antemortem	52	CND	White shark ⁱ	6.3–6.4 ⁱ
9. Cc4	2019	Hutchinson Island, FL	Adult/unknown	65.3	56.3	Antemortem	19	294	Tiger shark ^j	2.8
10. Lk1	2011	Dauphin Island, AL	Adult/female	60.7	59.7	Postmortem	15	317	White shark ^k	1.8–1.9
									Bull shark ^k	2.3–2.5 ^k
11. Lk2	2015	Bay County, FL	Adult/unknown	63.2	62.8	Postmortem	11	212	Bull shark ^l	1.4–1.7
									Sandbar shark ^l	1.6–2.0 ^l
12. Dc1	2019	Juno Beach, FL	Nesting/female	155.6 ^a	114.0 ^a	Antemortem	29.2	250–280	Tiger shark ^m	4.2 ^m
									Head injury:	
									Longfin mako shark	3.3
									White shark ⁿ	3.8 ⁿ
13. Dc2	2020	Juno Beach, FL	Nesting/female	154.6 ^a	111.4 ^a	Antemortem	Head: 31 Carapace: 28	Head: CND Carapace: CND	Carapace injury:	
									White shark	3.4
									Longfin mako shark	3.0
									Shortfin mako shark ^o	3.0 ^o

Abbreviations: CND, could not determine; NA, not available

Scientific names: bull shark, *Carcharhinus leucas*; dusky shark, *C. obscurus*; longfin mako shark, *Isurus paucus*; mako species, *Isurus* spp.; sandbar shark, *C. plumbeus*; shortfin mako shark, *I. oxyrinchus*; tiger shark, *Galeocerdo cuvier*; white shark, *Carcharodon carcharias*

^aMeasurements are standard (Cm5) and minimum (Dc1–2) curved carapace length (CCL) and curved carapace width (CCW).

^bOther possible predators included a 1.9–2.2 m tiger shark or a 1.4–1.8 m white shark; however, these juvenile sharks would most likely target fish rather than large prey due to their small size. Additionally, the wound had a broad arc and marks suggesting that the teeth were serrated, further indicating a bull shark as the predator.

^cOther potential predators include a 1.9 m tiger shark or a 1.4 m white shark. Tiger sharks typically grab the carapace and attempt to consume the entire turtle (of which there was no evidence, as only the extremities were targeted); therefore, we suggest a bull shark as the most likely predator.

^dWhile both mako sharks and white sharks can excise tissues from the turtle, the small size estimate makes these two candidates unlikely. This leaves a tiger shark as a likely match, as they tend to saw off parts of the carapace.

^eAnother possibility is a tiger shark, although one this large would have likely cut through the carapace.

^fThese bites could have also come from a 1.4–1.6 m sandbar shark, but the pronounced signs of cutting and penetration indicated a predator with broad, capable teeth—characteristic of dusky sharks rather than sandbar sharks.

^gA 2.3–2.4 m tiger shark was also considered as the possible predator. The bite arc was narrow with several overlapping bites, suggesting that the shark bit the turtle several times.

^hOther possible predators include 3.6 m tiger shark or a 3.0 m white shark. The head wounds likely came from a 'hit and run' attempt by the shark, and were made with minimal sawing or cutting. This behavior is more consistent with mako sharks than tiger or white sharks.

ⁱDue to lack of cutting and tearing evidence on the head, the likely predator was a white shark; however, a 7.0 m tiger shark was also considered.

^jThe bite had evidence of sawing, which is consistent with tiger shark behavior. The turtle was likely too large for a shark this size to transect completely.

^kThe shark made clear attempts to saw at the turtle, which is consistent with bull, tiger, and white shark feeding tendencies; however, the scrapes on the right lateral carapace were more consistent with a bull or white shark, since tiger shark teeth tend to penetrate and then tear at the carapace.

^lThis was an unusual bite to analyze, as the image suggests that the turtle's entire head was in the shark's mouth. Only the anterior edge of the shark's jaws contacted the turtle. Because of the narrow arc of the bite, we suggest a bull shark or a sandbar shark as possible predators.

^mOther candidates include a 3.1 m mako shark (longfin or shortfin) or 3.5 m white shark. The tooth spacing indicates a mako shark; however, this size is not large enough to prey on an adult leatherback turtle. Therefore, a nearshore bite from a tiger shark was deemed most likely.

ⁿThe large gap size of the teeth makes longfin mako or white shark as the most likely predators; a 4.4 m tiger shark was also considered, but that size shark is beyond the bounds of the regression generated in Lowry et al. (2009) (i.e., a specimen that large could not be obtained for use in generating the regression).

^oAssuming that the shark's upper jaw contacted the turtle, these three candidates were considered; a 4.1 m tiger shark was also considered but was beyond the bounds of the regression generated in Lowry et al. (2009) (i.e., a specimen that large could not be obtained for use in generating the regression).