

Cross-Shelf Differences in the Response of Herbivorous Fish Assemblages to Severe Environmental Disturbances

Eva C. McClure ^{1,2,*}, Laura E. Richardson ^{2,3}, Alexia Graba-Landry ², Zoe Loffler ², Garry R. Russ ^{1,2}, and Andrew S. Hoey ²

¹ College of Science and Engineering, James Cook University, Townsville, QLD 4811, Australia;
garry.russ@jcu.edu.au

² ARC Centre of Excellence for Coral Reef Studies, James Cook University, Townsville, QLD 4811, Australia;
laura.richardson1@my.jcu.edu.au (L.E.R.); alexia.grabalandry@my.jcu.edu.au (A.G.-L.);
zoe.loffler@my.jcu.edu.au (Z.L.); andrew.hoey1@jcu.edu.au (A.S.H.)

³ Biosciences, College of Life and Environmental Sciences, University of Exeter, Exeter EX4 4QD, UK;
l.richardson@exeter.ac.uk

* Correspondence: eva.mcclure@my.jcu.edu.au, Tel.: +61-438-169-547

Supplementary materials

Table S1 Fish traits assigned to surveyed species. Trait classification based on published literature (Green and Bellwood 2009 [1]; Mouillot et al. 2013 [2]; Froese and Pauly 2018 [3]). Schooling trait categories abbreviated as follows: Small groups (SmallG); medium groups (MedG); large groups (LargeG).

Species	Maximum body-size (TL; cm)	Diet	Mobility	Activity	Social grouping	Position
<i>Acanthurus blochii</i>	51-60	Grazer/detritivore	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	SmallG	Benthic
<i>Acanthurus dussumieri</i>	51-60	Grazer/detritivore	Sedentary	Nocturnal	MedG	Benthopelagic
<i>Acanthurus grammoptilus</i>	31-40	Grazer/detritivore	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	SmallG	Benthopelagic
<i>Acanthurus lineatus</i>	31-40	Grazer/detritivore	Territorial	Diurnal	Solitary	Benthopelagic
<i>Acanthurus nigricans</i>	21-30	Grazer/detritivore	Sedentary	Diurnal	SmallG	Benthic
<i>Acanthurus nigricauda</i>	31-40	Grazer/detritivore	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	SmallG	Benthic
<i>Acanthurus nigrofusus</i>	21-30	Grazer/detritivore	Sedentary	Diurnal	SmallG	Benthic
<i>Acanthurus olivaceus</i>	31-40	Grazer/detritivore	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	SmallG	Benthic
<i>Acanthurus triostegus</i>	21-30	Grazer/detritivore	Sedentary	Diurnal	Solitary	Benthopelagic
<i>Acanthurus xanthopterus</i>	61-70	Grazer/detritivore	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	MedG	Benthic
<i>Bolbometopon muricatum</i>	≥100	Excavator	Mobile across reefs	Diurnal	MedG	Benthic
<i>Calotomus carolinus</i>	51-60	Browser	Mobile within reef	Nocturnal	LargeG	Benthopelagic
<i>Cetoscarus ocellatus</i>	71-80	Excavator	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	SmallG	Benthic
<i>Chlorurus japanensis</i>	31-40	Excavator	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	SmallG	Benthic
<i>Chlorurus microrhinos</i>	61-70	Excavator	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	SmallG	Benthic
<i>Chlorurus spilurus</i>	31-40	Excavator	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	SmallG	Benthic
<i>Ctenochaetus binotatus</i>	21-30	Detritivore	Sedentary	Diurnal	Solitary	Benthic
<i>Ctenochaetus striatus</i>	21-30	Detritivore	Sedentary	Diurnal	MedG	Benthic
<i>Hipposcarus longiceps</i>	51-60	Scraper	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	MedG	Benthic
<i>Kyphosus cinerascens</i>	41-50	Browser	Mobile across reefs	Diurnal	MedG	Benthopelagic
<i>Kyphosus vaigiensis</i>	61-70	Browser	Mobile across reefs	Diurnal	MedG	Benthopelagic
<i>Lo vulpinus</i>	21-30	Grazer/detritivore	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	Pairing	Benthic
<i>Naso annulatus</i>	≥100	Grazer/Planktivore	Sedentary	Nocturnal	Pairing	Pelagic
<i>Naso brachycentron</i>	≥100	Browser	Sedentary	Nocturnal	Pairing	Benthopelagic
<i>Naso brevirostris</i>	41-50	Grazer/Planktivore	Mobile across reefs	Diurnal	LargeG	Benthopelagic
<i>Naso lituratus</i>	51-60	Browser	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	SmallG	Benthic
<i>Naso tonganus</i>	61-70	Browser	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	SmallG	Benthic
<i>Naso unicornis</i>	71-80	Browser	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	SmallG	Benthic
<i>Naso vlamingii</i>	51-60	Grazer/Planktivore	Mobile across reefs	Diurnal	SmallG	Benthopelagic
<i>Platax sp</i>	61-70	Browser	Mobile across reefs	Diurnal	MedG	Benthopelagic
<i>Scarus altipinnis</i>	51-60	Scraper	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	LargeG	Benthic
<i>Scarus chameleon</i>	31-40	Scraper	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	Solitary	Benthic
<i>Scarus dimidiatus</i>	31-40	Scraper	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	SmallG	Benthic
<i>Scarus flavipectoralis</i>	31-40	Scraper	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	Solitary	Benthic
<i>Scarus forsteni</i>	51-60	Scraper	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	Solitary	Benthic
<i>Scarus frenatus</i>	41-50	Scraper	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	Solitary	Benthic
<i>Scarus ghobban</i>	71-80	Scraper	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	SmallG	Benthic
<i>Scarus globiceps</i>	41-50	Scraper	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	Solitary	Benthic
<i>Scarus niger</i>	31-40	Scraper	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	Solitary	Benthic
<i>Scarus oviceps</i>	31-40	Scraper	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	Solitary	Benthic
<i>Scarus psittacus</i>	31-40	Scraper	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	MedG	Benthic
<i>Scarus rivulatus</i>	31-40	Scraper	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	MedG	Benthic
<i>Scarus rubroviolaceus</i>	61-70	Scraper	Mobile within reef	Nocturnal	MedG	Benthopelagic

<i>Scarus schlegeli</i>	31-40	Scraper	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	MedG	Benthic
<i>Scarus</i> sp	41-50	Scraper	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	SmallG	Benthic
<i>Scarus spinus</i>	21-30	Scraper	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	Solitary	Benthic
<i>Siganus argenteus</i>	31-40	Grazer/detritivore	Sedentary	Nocturnal	Solitary	Benthopelagic
<i>Siganus canaliculatus</i>	31-40	Browser	Sedentary	Nocturnal	Solitary	Benthopelagic
<i>Siganus coralinus</i>	31-40	Grazer/detritivore	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	Pairing	Benthic
<i>Siganus doliatus</i>	31-40	Grazer/detritivore	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	Pairing	Benthic
<i>Siganus puellus</i>	31-40	Grazer/detritivore	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	Pairing	Benthic
<i>Siganus punctatus</i>	31-40	Grazer/detritivore	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	Pairing	Benthic
<i>Siganus</i> sp	31-40	Grazer/detritivore	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	Pairing	Benthic
<i>Siganus spinus</i>	21-30	Grazer/detritivore	Mobile across reefs	Diurnal	LargeG	Benthic
<i>Zebrasoma scopas</i>	41-50	Grazer/detritivore	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	SmallG	Benthic
<i>Zebrasoma velifer</i>	41-50	Grazer/detritivore	Mobile within reef	Diurnal	Pairing	Benthic

Table S2 Two-way nested PERMANOVA pairwise comparisons with Monte Carlo sampling estimates of taxonomic composition of herbivorous fish among shelf position and between years. Comparisons based on Bray-Curtis similarities of fourth root transformed data (shelf position and year, fixed factors; site random factor nested in shelf position; 9999 iterations). Herbivorous fish species consistently contributing to average similarity within assemblages across the shelf (grey boxes) in each year are listed (one-way SIMPER; sim/SD, dissim/SD > 2). Multivariate dispersion analysis (MVDISP) results shown with an index of multivariate dispersion (IMD).

	Inner	Mid	Outer
Inner	<u>Av. sim:</u> 2008/9: 63% ; 2016: 52% <u>PERMANOVA:</u> P=0.03 (comparison between years) <u>IMD:</u> 2008/9: 0.65 ; 2016: 1.07 <u>SIM/SD ≥2:</u> 2008/9: <i>Scarus rivulatus</i> , <i>Siganus doliatus</i> , <i>Acanthurus blochii</i> , <i>Scarus ghobban</i> 2016: <i>Scarus rivulatus</i>	Av. disssim: 2008/9: 66% ; 2016: 84%	Av. disssim: 2008/9: 81% ; 2016: 97%
Mid	IMD: 2008/9: 0.06 ; 2016: 0.25 2008/9: P: 0.0002 (MC) ; 2016: 0.002 (perm)	<u>Av. sim:</u> 2008/9: 62% ; 2016: 44% <u>PERMANOVA:</u> P(MC)=0.14 (comparison between years) <u>IMD:</u> 2008/9: 0.71 ; 2016: 1.35 <u>SIM/SD ≥2:</u> 2008/9: <i>Zebrasoma scopas</i> , <i>Ctenochaetus striatus</i> , <i>Scarus frenatus</i> , <i>Acanthurus nigrofuscus</i> , <i>Naso unicornis</i> , <i>Siganus coralinus</i> , <i>Scarus niger</i> , <i>Chlorurus spilurus</i> 2016: <i>Acanthurus nigrofuscus</i>	Av. disssim: 2008/9: 62% ; 2016: 71%
Outer	IMD: 2008/9: -0.44 ; 2016: -0.18	IMD: 2008/9: 0.42 ; 2016: 0.49	<u>Av. sim:</u> 2008/9: 69% ; 2016: 57%

	2008/9: P: 0.0001 (MC) ; 2016: 0.0001 (MC)	2008/9: P: 0.0002 (MC) ; 2016: 0.002 (perm)	<u>PERMANOVA</u> : P=0.03 (comparison between years) <u>IMD</u> : 2008/9: 0.38 ; 2016: 0.89 <u>SIM/SD ≥2</u> : 2008/9: <i>Naso tonganus</i> , <i>Naso unicornis</i> , <i>Acanthurus lineatus</i> , <i>Chlorurus microrhinos</i> , <i>Ctenochaetus striatus</i> , <i>Acanthurus nigricans</i> , <i>Naso lituratus</i> , <i>Acanthurus triostegus</i> 2016: <i>Acanthurus lineatus</i> , <i>Ctenochaetus striatus</i>
--	---	--	--

Table S3 Pairwise comparisons (with lower and upper 95% confidence intervals: CI) of linear mixed effects models of variation in cross-shelf benthic composition and herbivorous fish assemblage structure in 2008/9 and 2016.

Response	Contrast	Contrast estimate	Lower CI	Upper CI	Test stat	P
Total hard coral cover (%)	Inner: 2008/9 vs 2016	-23.75	-29.80	-17.70	-7.77	<0.0001
	Mid: 2008/9 vs 2016	-42.20	-48.40	-36.01	-13.49	<0.0001
	Outer: 2008/9 vs 2016	-48.24	-54.29	-42.19	-15.79	<0.0001
Total macroalgal cover (%)	Inner: 2008/9 vs 2016	21.06	13.01	29.11	5.18	<0.0001
	Mid: 2008/9 vs 2016	-0.28	-1.40	0.85	-0.48	0.63
	Outer: 2008/9 vs 2016	-0.39	-1.06	0.28	-1.16	0.25
Shannon diversity (H)	2008/9 vs 2016	-0.43	-0.58	-0.27	-5.48	<0.0001
	Inner vs Mid	0.59	0.31	0.87	4.88	<0.0001
	Inner vs Outer	-0.19	-0.50	0.12	-1.45	0.32
	Outer vs Mid	-0.78	-1.06	-0.50	-6.46	<0.0001
Functional richness	2008/9 vs 2016	-0.16	-0.20	-0.13	-9.54	<0.0001
	Inner vs Mid	0.07	0.02	0.12	3.07	0.01
	Inner vs Outer	-0.004	-0.05	0.06	0.17	0.98
	Outer vs Mid	-0.06	-0.11	-0.01	-2.99	0.01
	Inner: 2008/9 vs 2016	0.09	0.09	0.23	4.32	<0.0001

Functional specialisation	Mid: 2008/9 vs 2016	-0.07	-0.11	-0.03	-3.35	0.001
	Outer: 2008/9 vs 2016	-0.02	-0.45	0.01	-1.54	0.13
Functional originality	Inner: 2008/9 vs 2016	-0.24	-0.37	-0.11	-3.72	0.0004
	Mid: 2008/9 vs 2016	-0.04	-0.14	0.06	-0.85	0.40
	Outer: 2008/9 vs 2016	0.01	-0.19	0.21	0.14	0.89
Total herbivores (log kg ha ⁻¹)	Inner: 2008/9 vs 2016	0.13	-0.20	0.47	0.79	0.43
	Mid: 2008/9 vs 2016	0.4	0.16	0.64	3.33	0.001
	Outer: 2008/9 vs 2016	0.84	0.51	1.17	4.98	<0.0001
Macroalgal browsers (kg ha ⁻¹)	2008/9 vs 2016	-114.28	-158.35	-70.22	-5.16	<0.0001
	Inner vs Mid	60.07	-18.71	138.85	1.74	0.17
	Inner vs Outer	1153.00	811.56	1494.44	7.71	<0.0001
	Outer vs Mid	1092.93	746.38	1439.48	7.20	<0.0001
Croppers (kg ha ⁻¹)	Inner: 2008/9 vs 2016	-37.65	-113.58	38.29	-0.99	0.33
	Mid: 2008/9 vs 2016	280.67	111.87	449.46	3.31	0.001
	Outer: 2008/9 vs 2016	538.67	348.90	728.433	5.65	<0.0001
Scrapers (kg ha ⁻¹)	2008/9 vs 2016	-43.94	-72.51	-15.38	-3.06	0.002
	Inner vs Mid	60.10	12.19	108.01	2.84	0.01
	Inner vs Outer	-275.64	-36.56	587.84	2.00	0.09
	Outer vs Mid	215.54	-99.38	530.46	1.55	0.24
Detrital feeders (kg ha ⁻¹)	Inner: 2008/9 vs 2016	0.42	-0.19	1.03	1.37	0.18
	Mid: 2008/9 vs 2016	171.76	94.92	248.60	4.45	<0.0001
	Outer: 2008/9 vs 2016	157.50	82.89	232.11	4.20	<0.0001
Excavators (kg ha ⁻¹)	2008/9 vs 2016	-8.39	-17.54	0.76	-1.82	0.07
	Inner vs Mid	87.64	38.89	136.40	4.17	<0.0001
	Inner vs Outer	108.85	61.87	155.84	5.37	<0.0001
	Outer vs Mid	21.21	-46.07	88.50	0.73	0.74

Supplemental information references

1. Green, A.L.; Bellwood, D.R. *Monitoring Functional Groups of Herbivorous Reef Fishes as Indicators of Coral Reef Resilience: A Practical Guide for Coral Reef Managers in the Asia Pacific Region (No.7)*; IUCN working group on Climate Change and Coral Reefs. IUCN: Gland, Switzerland, 2009.
2. Mouillot, D.; Graham, N.A.J.; Villéger, S.; Mason, N.W.H.; Bellwood, D.R. A functional approach reveals community responses to disturbances. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **2013**, *28*, 167–177.
3. Froese, R.; Pauly, D. Fishbase. World Wide Web electronic publication. Available online: www.fishbase.org (accessed on 11 November 2018)