1 RUNNING HEAD: linking sensory cues, settlement and survival

2
3 TITLE: The nose knows: linking sensory cue use, settlement decisions, and post-settlement
4 survival in a temperate reef fish
5
6

7 Fobert, E.K.^{1*}, Swearer, S.E.¹
8

9 ¹ School of BioSciences, University of Melbourne, Parkville Campus, Victoria 3010, Australia
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS: EF and SES conceived and designed the experiments. EF
20 performed the experiments. EF analyzed the data and wrote the manuscript. SES funded the
21 research and edited the manuscript.

¹ * Corresponding author, email: efobert@student.unimelb.edu.au

ABSTRACT

Habitat selection by animals that migrate or disperse ultimately determines the biotic and abiotic environment they will experience in subsequent life stages. Intuitively, for habitat selection to be adaptive animals should respond positively to cues produced by habitat characteristics that will enhance their fitness in the new environment. However, there are many examples of dispersing animals where individuals are attracted to cues produced by factors that reduce their fitness after arrival. In this study, we use a temperate reef fish to examine the relative importance of habitat-associated cues in habitat selection decisions, and assess whether use of these cues is adaptive across early life stages. We used a series of laboratory and field based manipulative experiments to test: 1) what habitat-associated cues are likely used to locate suitable habitat; 2) whether *in situ* settlement patterns reflect the cue response tested in the lab; and 3) whether the aspects of the habitat that stimulate settlement are the same as those that maximize survival. We observed a positive response to multiple habitat-associated cues, with conspecific cues eliciting the strongest behavioral response in laboratory choice experiments, and a strong inverse density-dependent relationship at settlement. Macroalgal cues also elicited a positive response at settlement, but were associated with higher mortality after settlement, suggesting habitat selection decisions are not always adaptive. We argue that this non-intuitive behavior may still be adaptive if it improves fitness at an earlier life stage, as habitat selection behavior is the result of tradeoffs in fitness costs across multiple stages.

KEYWORDS: habitat choice, settlement cues, conspecific attraction, adaptive behavior, *Trachinops caudimaculatus*

INTRODUCTION

Many animal and plant species occur in a few distinct habitat types within a local heterogeneous landscape, and individuals may experience different rates of development, fecundity, and survival among habitats (Pulliam and Danielson 1991). As a result of this demographic heterogeneity, habitat selection by animals that migrate or disperse can have profound effects on population dynamics at both local (Pulliam and Danielson 1991), and regional/metapopulation scales (Doherty and Williams 1988; Greene 2003). This is particularly true in the marine environment, where habitat selection occurs for many fish and invertebrates during the transition from the pelagic larval dispersal phase to a benthic or demersal lifestyle, known as settlement. The settlement stage is often a critical bottleneck in the life history of marine organisms, as behavioral decisions during this vulnerable transitional stage can have direct and fundamental implications for future fitness and survival (Connell and Jones 1991; Tupper and Boutilier 1997; Shima and Osenberg 2003).

In the dispersal phase, marine larvae must navigate through a heterogeneous environment, where there is inherent variation in the quality of habitat patches. At the end of the dispersal period, larvae must evaluate the relative quality of the prospective habitats they encounter and select a habitat for settlement (Stamps 2001). For species that are benthic or demersal as adults, decisions at settlement ultimately determine the benthic environment an individual will experience and the community they interact with in subsequent life-stages (e.g. conspecific and competitive interactions (Jones 1988; Bonin et al. 2009; Ford and Swearer 2013a), food and shelter availability (Behrems 1987; Andrews and Anderson 2004), and predator abundance and behavior (Beukers and Jones 1998; Almany and Webster 2005; McCormick and Hoey 2006)). Therefore, poor or misinformed habitat selection decisions at settlement can be fatal (Beukers and Jones 1998; McCormick and Hoey 2006), and the ability to discriminate between habitats of varying quality can be critical for individual survival.

70 Recently, there has been significant advancement in our understanding of the role of
71 sensory abilities and behaviors in locating and selecting habitat at settlement by reef fish larvae,
72 and it is now commonly accepted that most larval fishes have highly developed sensory organs
73 (Wright et al. 2005) and likely use a combination of senses (auditory, olfactory, visual (Tolimieri
74 et al. 2000; Lecchini et al. 2005; Simpson et al. 2010)), and habitat associated (e.g. coral (Bonin
75 et al. 2009; Ben-Tzvi et al. 2010), conspecific (e.g. Sweatman 1983; 1985; Lecchini et al. 2005;
76 Coppock et al. 2013), and/or predator (McCormick and Manassa 2008; Dixon et al. 2010)) cues
77 at different spatial and temporal scales to locate and evaluate reef habitat from the pelagic
78 environment (see Kingsford et al. 2002; and Leis et al. 2011 for a review of larval sensory
79 abilities). Intuitively, for a habitat cue response to be adaptive, dispersing larvae should respond
80 positively to cues produced by habitat characteristics that will enhance their fitness in the post-
81 settlement environment (Stamps and Krishnan 2005). However, there are many examples of
82 dispersing animals in both terrestrial and marine environments where individuals are attracted to
83 cues produced by factors that reduce their fitness after arrival (e.g. Mönkkönen et al. 1990;
84 Danchin et al. 2004; Stamps and Krishnan 2005). For example, several studies have found sites
85 preferentially selected by coral reef fishes were also sites where predators were more abundant
86 and/or survival was reduced (Beukers and Jones 1998; McCormick and Hoey 2004; McCormick
87 and Hoey 2006), suggesting that characteristics that stimulate settlement are not necessarily the
88 same as those that maximize survival.

89 The aims of this study were to examine the relative importance of habitat-associated cues
90 in habitat selection, and to determine if use of these cues is an adaptive behavior. We used the
91 southern hulafish, *Trachinops caudimaculatus*, to investigate these questions, a highly abundant
92 shoaling fish found on temperate rocky reefs throughout Southern Australia. We used a series of
93 laboratory and field experiments to test: 1) what habitat-associated cues settlement stage *T*.

caudimaculatus respond to; 2) whether *in situ* settlement patterns reflect the behavioral response to the sensory cues tested; and 3) whether the aspects of the habitat that stimulate settlement are the same as those that maximize survival. We predicted that habitat selection decisions would be adaptive, and therefore *T. caudimaculatus* should respond to habitat cues and settle to reefs with characteristics that increase post-settlement survival.

METHODS

Study species and location

Trachinops caudimaculatus is a small-bodied (<150 mm), short-lived (1-5 years) zooplanktivorous fish found in high abundance on reefs throughout Victoria, Tasmania, and extending west to the Great Australian Bight in South Australia (Kuitert 2004; Ford and Swearer 2013a). It is a shoaling species, forming large shoals often in the thousands, at high densities (>100 fish m⁻²; Hunt et al. 2011). In the shallow rocky reef systems of Port Phillip Bay (PPB), a semi-enclosed embayment on the southeast coast of Australia, reefs are macroalgal dominated and have high biological complexity, species diversity and productivity (Edmunds et al. 2006, Jung et al. 2011). In PPB, *T. caudimaculatus* inhabit discrete patches of rocky reef surrounded by soft sediment; adults and recruits are positively associated with high structural complexity (Hunt et al. 2011), and recruits have been found to be negatively associated with canopy forming macroalgae on a reef (Fobert 2016). These associations are likely driven by predatory-prey interactions. Mortality rates of juvenile *T. caudimaculatus* are strongly influenced by both conspecific density and reef quality (Ford et al. 2016). As both pelagic and benthic predator guilds influence survival (Ford and Swearer 2013a), we hypothesized that high density macroalgal beds are avoided as the canopy creates a barrier between the shoaling species and its refuge within the reef as well as providing camouflage for reef-based predators, thus increasing

predation risk. *T. caudimaculatus* are highly sight-attached after settlement; no movement of *T. caudimaculatus* has been recorded across expanses of open water greater than 20 m (Ford and Swearer 2013a), and previous experiments with calcein tagging have found no movement of fish to neighboring reefs (M. Le Feuvre and J. Ford, unpublished data), however, movement within a reef (i.e. ontogenetic microhabitat shifts) is common (Fobert 2016).

Experiment 1: Response to habitat-associated cues

To assess how *T. caudimaculatus* respond to various habitat-associated chemosensory (i.e. olfactory, gustatory) cues, behavioral choice experiments were conducted using a two-chamber choice tank. Recently settled *T. caudimaculatus* recruits were exposed to pairwise combinations of odor treatments thought to be proxy indicators of habitat quality (both positive and negative): 1) ambient seawater (control), 2) reef odor, 3) conspecific odor, and 4) reef and conspecific odor (see Online Resource 1 for choice tank design and creation of odor treatments). The use of pre-settlement stage larvae, that have not previously been exposed to habitat associated cues, would have been ideal for this experiment, collection of pre-settlement stage *T. caudimaculatus* was not successful. Additionally, Dixon et al. (2008) found laboratory reared-juvenile clownfish *Amphiprion percula* exhibited the same positive response to habitat associated cues as pre-settlement larvae tested in the field, suggesting that cue responses are innate rather than learned. Therefore, we used newly settled *T. caudimaculatus* recruits to test cue response. Schnapper Point reef (38°12'S, 145° 01'E) was surveyed every 1-2 days during *T. caudimaculatus* settlement period, and recruits were collected immediately (< 48 hours) following a settlement pulse to minimize potential post-settlement learned behavior. Fish were then acclimated for 24 hours prior to experimental use, and were tested within 48 hours following collection to minimize stress and holding tank effects.

All odor treatments were tested against each other, resulting in six treatment combinations. At the beginning of each trial, two of the four odor treatments were randomly assigned to one of the two choice chambers at the upstream end of the choice tank. For each test, a single *T. caudimaculatus* recruit was held in the downstream holding compartment of the choice tank to acclimate for 5 minutes. After 4 minutes, flow was established and treatment water added. The trial was completed when the fish remained in one of the choice chambers for > 2 minutes, or after a 5-minute period in which the fish made no choice (i.e. remained in the downstream compartment or continuously moved between chambers). The trial duration was determined following preliminary behavioral observations, which suggested this was sufficient for *T. caudimaculatus* to respond to cues (i.e. all fish that made a ‘choice’ did so within the first two minutes). At the end of a trial, fish were removed from the choice tank, and measured for total length (TL) to the nearest millimetre. Individual fish were only used in one trial, regardless of treatment combination. Twenty individual fish were exposed to each treatment combination, and an additional 10 fish were used in control trials (ambient seawater vs. ambient seawater) to construct an expected distribution of directional movement in the absence of chemosensory cues (a control for tank artifacts). The choice tank was flushed with ambient seawater after each trial, and wiped with 90% ethanol at the beginning of each day.

Statistical analysis

The behavioral response of recruits to chemosensory cues was evaluated using a chi-square test, where the frequency of observed responses was compared against expected frequencies of a random choice for each combination of odor treatments. A chi-square test was also used to test for a choice chamber bias independent of treatments (left vs. right). Two-tailed t-tests were used to determine if there was a relationship between TL and response to the

chemosensory cues, as TL can be indicative of age, which may influence an individual's response (e.g. Dixon et al. 2011).

Experiment 2: Effects of adult conspecifics on settlement decisions

We used a set of artificial reefs constructed from milk crates and bricks to monitor settlement patterns of *T. caudimaculatus* *in situ*. This artificial reef design is very versatile, as the milk crate modules can be grouped and stacked in various configurations to adapt to the needs of each experiment (see Online Resource 2 for details). The gregarious settlement patterns of *T. caudimaculatus* were assessed in the field by manipulating the density of adult conspecifics on artificial reefs. Twelve artificial reefs were installed in a linear array at two locations within Port Phillip Bay; Altona in the north (37°54'S, 144°49'E) and Carrum in the east (38°05'S, 145°06'E). These two locations were selected due to their proximity to natural reefs that hosted *T. caudimaculatus* populations (< 2km), ensuring adequate larval supply to the reefs, and due to their accessibility by boat and divers (< 10m depth). Each reef was placed approximately 150m apart, and at least 200m from natural reef to discourage movement of *T. caudimaculatus* between reefs.

Adult *T. caudimaculatus* were transplanted onto the reefs to create three conspecific density treatments: control (0 adult fish), low density (10 adult fish), and high density (30 adult fish). Density treatments were randomly allocated to reefs, and at each location, four reefs were assigned to each treatment. Adult *T. caudimaculatus* were collected from nearby natural reefs (Wooley reef [38°09'S, 145°05'E] for Carrum; Sandringham Shoal [37°57'S, 144°59'E] for Altona). Fish were transported and released onto reefs on the day of capture. Prior to release, visual surveys were conducted to ensure the absence of resident adult *T. caudimaculatus*. Divers then released the desired number of adults into the center of each reef. Fish were observed to readily seek out and find refuge within the reef structure. Mesh nets, (4mm) lined with 6mm

galvanized chain and pegged to the bottom to prevent fish entering or leaving the reef, were placed over each treatment reef for 24-48 hours to reduce transient predator effects and allow the fish to adapt to the new reef environment. Reefs were initially stocked on 1 December 2010 (Carrum) and 13 December 2010 (Altona). Following experimental set-up and stocking, visual surveys of the reefs were carried out by SCUBA divers at variable intervals (Carrum: 13, 43, and 77 days after stocking; Altona: 24, 50, and 86 days after stocking). During each survey the number of recruits was recorded along with the number of adult *T. caudimaculatus* on each reef.

Statistical analysis

Data from the peak settlement period was used in the analysis, which was recorded in January at both sites. Due to variable loss of adult *T. caudimaculatus* on the artificial reefs, the initial density treatments of 0, 10 and 30 adult fish were not maintained throughout the duration of the experiment. Adult density was therefore treated as a continuous variable using the average density between the initial stocking and the recorded density from the January survey date, as the density on an individual reef at the time of settlement could have been any number between the initial and final recorded density. A single factor ANCOVA was conducted using location as a fixed factor and mean adult density as the covariate. Recruit density was log-transformed prior to analysis to meet model assumptions.

Experiment 3: Effects of macroalgal cover and resident fishes on settlement decisions and post-settlement mortality

Settlement patterns of *T. caudimaculatus* in habitats with varying macroalgal densities were assessed using an additional set of artificial reefs on which the percent macroalgal cover was manipulated (see Online Resource 2 for details). Twelve artificial reefs were installed in September 2013 along a 600m transect parallel to shore, approximately 300m south of Schnapper Point. Each reef was placed approximately 50m apart, and at least 50m from the nearest natural

reef to discourage movement of fish between reefs. A shorter distance between reefs was chosen in this location for logistical facility, however, any distance greater than 20m is likely to be sufficient for limiting movement of *T. caudimaculatus* between reefs (Ford and Swearer 2013a).

A monospecific assemblage of *Ecklonia radiata*, a habitat-forming brown macroalgae endemic to southern Australia (Connell and Irving 2008) was transplanted onto the reefs to create the macroalgal habitat treatments. Similarly sized *E. radiata* thalli were collected from Governor Reef (38° 9'S; 144°43'E) on the southwest side of the Bay, a location chosen for its abundance of healthy *E. radiata* plants. *E. radiata* were removed from natural reef by carefully detaching whole thalli including the holdfast. The stipes were then threaded through the braid of a rope, which was then attached onto the artificial reefs. The percentage cover of *E. radiata* was manipulated on each of the artificial reefs to conform to one of three treatments: 0% cover (no thalli), 50% cover (9 thalli), or 100% cover (18 thalli; which corresponds to a density of approximately 17 plants per m², nearing the maximum density observed in Port Phillip Bay; Johnson et al. 2015). The three treatments were assigned to reefs randomly within four blocks, to ensure treatments were evenly distributed along the 600-m reef array. All reef treatments were established five weeks prior to the beginning of the settlement surveys, and seven weeks prior to the first settlement pulse recorded on the artificial reefs.

From early November 2013 to late January 2014, (survey dates: 12, 18, 25, 30 Nov, 13, 16, 18, 31 Dec 2013, 9, and 16 Jan, 2014) between 0600-1300 h, the artificial reefs were surveyed for settlement of larval *T. caudimaculatus* – newly settled individuals were identified by their size and level of pigmentation. As differential mortality rates among treatments could mask the effects of preferential habitat selection at settlement, estimates of early post-settlement mortality were also recorded to account for this effect. Approximate age of recruits was recorded and estimates of mortality were inferred from the number of recruits remaining from each survey

count. All losses from the reefs were assumed to be the result of mortality, as post-settlement movement across open water is highly unlikely (Ford and Swearer 2013a).

Prior to and during the settlement period, reefs were surveyed for fish residents and all fish species present were recorded. These fish community data were used to calculate total species abundance and benthic predator abundance on each reef, as we hypothesized that the fish community present at settlement could also be a factor influencing both settlement decisions and post-settlement mortality. The first settlement pulse was recorded on 25 November, and reefs were surveyed 5, 18, 21, 23, 36, 45, and 52 days after settlement commenced. Due to variable recruitment across reefs, reefs were stocked halfway through the settlement period to establish similar recruit densities across treatments. This was done to standardize any potential effect of resident conspecifics on settlement decisions. Recruits were collected from the neighboring natural reef at Schnapper Point, and released on to artificial reefs to establish a density of 25 recruits per reef (see Online Resource 3, Fig. S4 for a time series of *T. caudimaculatus* abundance). This resulted in two separate experiments: the first investigating the effects of canopy cover on *T. caudimaculatus* settlement with low abundance of juvenile conspecifics present (pre-stocking), and the second investigating the effects of canopy cover on settlement with high abundance of juvenile conspecifics present (post-stocking).

Statistical Analysis

To evaluate settlement patterns in varying macroalgal treatments on artificial reefs, we fit two separate zero inflated generalized linear mixed models (GLMMs) to the low (pre-stocking) and high (post-stocking) juvenile conspecific abundance experiments. A negative binomial distribution was used to account for detected overdispersion. We included macroalgal treatment (0, 50 or 100 percent), resident conspecific abundance (the number of juvenile *T. caudimaculatus* present on the reef in the previous census), total fish abundance (excluding *T. caudimaculatus*),

and benthic predator abundance as fixed factors, and reef as a random factor to account for non-independence amongst repeat observations from a site. To test the effects of the fixed factors on *T. caudimaculatus* settlement, we compared a series of increasingly complex models using Akaike Information Criterion for small sample sizes (AIC_c) for selection of the model of best fit. These values were rescaled as the difference between each model and the model with the lowest AIC_c (ΔAIC_c) to evaluate model performance. We inferred statistical significance of the main effects that were retained in the best-fit model.

The recorded mortality rates of settled *T. caudimaculatus* were calculated as proportions of the total abundance of juveniles present on each artificial reef. To evaluate differences in mortality in the different macroalgal treatments, we fit two separate GLMMs to the low and high juvenile conspecific abundance experiments. We used a binomial distribution with a logit-link function to account for proportional data (see Warton and Hui 2011), and we used AIC_c and ΔAIC_c again for model comparison and selection to test the effects of the fixed factors (macroalgal treatment, resident conspecific abundance, total fish abundance, and benthic predator abundance) on *T. caudimaculatus* mortality. For both settlement and mortality selected GLMM models, predictions and confidence intervals were calculated from model estimates, with covariates held at their mean values, however, predictions do not take the uncertainty of the random effect parameter into account.

Statistical software

All statistical analyses were completed using the statistical software R (R Core Team 2015). The package “glmmADMB” (Fournier et al. 2012) with function `glmmadmb` was used to conduct all GLMMs, and the package “AICcmodavg” (Mazerolle 2015) with function `AICc` and “MuMIn” (Bartoń 2015) with function `AICc` was used for model comparisons. The predict

function (base R) was used to calculate GLMM model predictions and confidence intervals, and the package “ggplot2” (Wickham 2009) was used for all statistical figures.

RESULTS

Behavioral response to chemosensory cues

In the control experiment where fish were exposed to ambient seawater in both the left and right chamber of the choice tank, none of the fish made a choice in the 5 minutes allocated ($n = 10$), meaning fish either did not leave the holding chamber, or moved continuously between choice plumes. All odor treatments were clearly preferred over ambient seawater: 85 per cent of fish chose both the conspecific odor and the reef odor treatments over ambient seawater ($n = 20$; $\chi^2 = 9.8$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.0017$ in both cases; Fig. 1), and 80 per cent of fish preferred the combined conspecific and reef odor treatment over ambient seawater ($n = 20$; $\chi^2 = 7.2$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.0073$). Fish also exhibited a strong preference for conspecific cues when given the choice between conspecific (75%) and reef odor (25%; $n = 20$; $\chi^2 = 5$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.025$). Although not significant, fish did exhibit a preference towards the combination conspecific + reef odor treatment when paired with conspecific odor alone (70%, $n = 20$; $\chi^2 = 3.2$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.074$), however there was no preference observed between the combination odor treatment (45%) and the reef odor alone (55%, $n = 20$; $\chi^2 = 0.2$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.66$). There was no preference for one chamber in any of the pairwise experiments ($P > 0.05$), nor across all trials (across all trials: left = 52%, right = 48%, $n = 120$; $\chi^2 = 0.2$, $df = 1$, $P = 0.65$), and fish TL had no effect on the response behavior in any of the pairwise experiments ($P > 0.05$).

Effects of conspecifics on settlement decisions

At both sites, adult density had a significant effect on recruitment to the artificial reefs (ANCOVA: $R^2 = 0.76$; $df = 22$; $F = 20.42$; $P < 0.0001$; Fig. 2a), with the most densely populated

reefs receiving 4 and 5.2 times as many recruits as those with no adult conspecifics present at Altona and Carrum, respectively. Site location had a strong effect on recruitment (ANCOVA: $F = 39.64$, $df = 1$, $P < 0.0001$), with an average recruit number of 129 fish per reef at Altona and only 26 fish per reef at Carrum.

Effects of macroalgae and resident fishes on settlement decisions

Prior to stocking the artificial reefs, when juvenile conspecific abundance was low across reefs, none of the models for settlement performed better than the null model (Online Resource 4, Table S1). The model retaining conspecific abundance as an explanatory variable was assigned a ΔAIC_c value < 2 , suggesting similar support for this model, however, the relationship between settlement and resident conspecifics was not strong (Table 1; Fig. 2b).

Based on AIC_c criteria, the best-fit model for settlement after stocking retained only the macroalgal treatment term as an explanatory variable (Online Resource 4, Table S1). Therefore, when high abundances of juvenile conspecifics were present on the artificial reefs, the macroalgal canopy cover had a significant effect on *T. caudimaculatus* settlement patterns (Table 1), with nearly three times as many fish predicted to settle to reefs with 100% macroalgal cover (GLMM model prediction = 8.35), than to reefs with 0% (GLMM model prediction = 3.17) or 50% (GLMM model prediction = 2.09) cover (Fig. 2c).

Effects of macroalgae and resident fishes on early post-settlement mortality

The best-fit model for juvenile mortality prior to stocking the reefs retained conspecific abundance as the only explanatory variable (Online Resource 4, Table S2). *T. caudimaculatus* mortality was negatively associated with the abundance of recruits that had previously settled on the reef, with lower mortality observed on reefs with higher conspecific abundance (Table 1; Fig. 3a). Although macroalgal cover was not retained in the best-fit model, it is worth noting that mortality was highest in the 100% cover treatment.

The model of best fit for mortality after stocking, when juvenile conspecific abundance was high, retained macroalgal cover, conspecific abundance, and total fish abundance as explanatory variables (Online Resource 4, Table S2). Mortality rates were variable, but decreased significantly with increased juvenile abundance (Table 1; Fig. 3b). Juvenile *T. caudimaculatus* mortality was also lower on reefs with higher total fish abundance (Fig. 3c). In addition, mortality rates increased significantly with increased macroalgal cover, with the probability of mortality 20% and 4% higher in the 100% macroalgal cover treatment (GLMM model prediction = 0.68) compared to the 0% (GLMM model prediction = 0.47) and 50% (GLMM model prediction = 0.64) treatments respectively (Fig. 3d).

DISCUSSION

Multiple cue use at settlement

Results from both laboratory and field experiments suggest that *T. caudimaculatus* may use a hierarchy of chemosensory cues to aid in habitat selection at settlement; across all experiments, recruits showed positive responses to multiple cues, however the strength of the response varied with the presence or absence of other cues. Both conspecific and reef cues elicited a strong positive response in the chemosensory choice experiment, however, when the two cues were tested against each other, conspecific cues were chosen more frequently, suggesting *T. caudimaculatus* might rely primarily on conspecific cues for habitat selection decisions. Consistent with the choice experiments, we found conspecific cues to be an important driver of settlement decisions in the field. We observed a strong inverse density-dependent relationship at settlement, with significantly higher numbers of *T. caudimaculatus* settling to patch reefs with higher adult conspecific densities, and a non-significant trend of higher settlement with higher juvenile conspecific densities.

Preferentially selecting reefs with conspecifics is likely to be an adaptive strategy for *T. caudimaculatus*, as fish in the macroalgal manipulation experiment that settled to reefs with higher abundances of juvenile conspecifics, in both the pre- and post- stocking experiments, experienced significantly lower mortality in the weeks immediately following settlement. Conspecific attraction is an adaptive strategy exhibited by many terrestrial and marine organisms (colonial, solitary, and territorial species; Stamps 2001), including several coral reef fishes (Sweatman 1985; Lecchini et al. 2005; McCormick and Hoey 2006; Coppock et al. 2013). Such gregarious settlement behavior can stem from a number of processes; individuals may settle to habitat with conspecifics because 1) search costs are reduced if dispersers use conspecifics as an indirect cue of habitat quality, 2) settlement costs are reduced in the presence of conspecifics, and/or 3) fitness costs are reduced in the presence of conspecifics after settling (Alee effects; Stamps 2001). Our study suggests the presence of resident *T. caudimaculatus* conspecifics both increases detectability of reef habitat at settlement, thus reducing dispersal costs, and also positively affects post-settlement survival. For a shoaling species such as *T. caudimaculatus*, recruiting to a reef with resident conspecifics could increase individual fitness through greater predator detection and evasion (FitzGerald and Van Havre 1985; Roberts 1996), increased foraging success and feeding efficiency (Pitcher et al. 1982; Partridge et al. 1983; FitzGerald and Van Havre 1985), and thus enhanced post-settlement survival (White and Warner 2007). Although intraspecific competition can be high, the costs of the increased conspecific density can be outweighed by the benefits gained from group living strategies (Shima 2001). It should be noted, however, that if shelter on a patch reef becomes saturated at high densities, refuge competition will increase and can reverse this positive density-dependence. On similar sized patch reefs, Ford and Swearer (2013b) found this density-dependent relationship switched with densities of *T. caudimaculatus* ≥ 50 fish m⁻². In our study, the highest density of recruits observed

on a patch reef was 37 fish m⁻². Therefore, at these lower densities, the fitness benefits gained from the presence of conspecifics outweighed the costs of increased competition.

Using habitat cues: is it always adaptive?

Interestingly, in our macroalgal manipulation experiment, *T. caudimaculatus* preferentially settled to the patch reefs with the highest macroalgal canopy cover. This result was not expected, as past studies have found no association between *T. caudimaculatus* adults, and a negative relationship between juveniles and macroalgal cover (Hunt et al. 2011; Fobert 2016). This settlement choice does not appear to be an intuitively adaptive behavior for *T. caudimaculatus*, as the highest macroalgal treatment, which received the highest number of recruits, also yielded the highest mortality rates (in both pre- and post-stocking experiments). Additionally, although the trend was consistent, the positive relationship between macroalgal cover and mortality was not significant in the pre-stocking experiment, however, this could be explained by the shoaling behavior of the study species. When *T. caudimaculatus* are found in small groups (< 20 fish) shoaling does not occur and fish are more likely to forage as individuals close to the substrate (Fumei 2011, Ford and Swearer 2013a). The abundances of *T. caudimaculatus* on the reefs during the pre-stocking experiment (Online Resource 3, Fig. S4) were below the minimum threshold for shoaling above the canopy to be initiated, and therefore the canopy effect on survival would not have manifested itself. Our results therefore suggest that cues used to locate and select habitat may not always deliver maximum fitness and survival in subsequent life stages. Animals might benefit from responding positively to cues associated with habitat characteristics that would intuitively reduce fitness for two reasons: 1) if a cue increases the detectability of the habitat in the search phase, and 2) if a cue is associated with other factors that increase individual fitness, and therefore provide indirect information about habitat quality (Stamps and Krishnan 2005). As habitat features can have additive or interactive effects on

fitness, and not all factors that might influence post-settlement fitness will be evident at the time of settlement (Stamps 2001), indirect cues are often used as proxy indicators of habitat quality to help animals make quick and efficient habitat selection decisions (Mönkkönen et al. 1990; 1999; Danchin et al. 2004).

If macroalgal cues are used by *T. caudimaculatus* as a result of increased detectability, use of this cue to locate habitat may result in decreased fitness in the post-settlement environment, but reduced costs of searching and therefore increased fitness in the searching and settlement stages. As habitat selection is a multi-stage process, a behavior that improves fitness in one stage does not necessarily lead to improved fitness at subsequent stages, and therefore individuals may preferentially select a sub-optimal post-settlement habitat to reduce immediate fitness costs of dispersal. Because of this trade-off between immediate and delayed costs, the relative importance of a cue may shift over time, as larvae at varying stages of their pelagic larval dispersal period may be more or less selective about the suitability of settlement habitat (Burgess et al. 2012). Dispersers can be more selective at the beginning of the search phase, as individuals have more time and/or energy available for searching for high quality habitats, however this selectivity declines with energy reserves and time spent in the plankton (Ward 1987; Marshall and Keough 2003). Larvae may therefore benefit from using cues that are not necessarily associated with high quality habitat, simply because they indicate habitat that is good enough, or there at all. Further research examining if habitat selection behavior in *T. caudimaculatus* is related to length of dispersal period or larval quality or condition at settlement would provide interesting insight into the mechanisms driving this seemingly maladaptive behavior.

The apparent maladaptive use of macroalgal cues for habitat selection at settlement could also be a by-product of the scale of the artificial patch reef system used to test the selection behavior. Although ecological experiments are most often performed in systems that are much

smaller than the natural system of interest (e.g. Petersen et al. 1999), the relatively small size of these experimental systems may elicit different responses to experimental treatments than would be observed on their large-scale natural counterparts (Englund and Cooper 2003). For example, heterogeneity is often distorted in small-scale experiments; spatial heterogeneity of biotic and abiotic attributes generally increases with increasing size of the experimental arena (Englund and Cooper 2003). This is true for macroalgal cover on our artificial reefs compared to natural reefs in PPB. Although our 100% macroalgal treatment was based on maximum densities of *E. radiata* recorded on natural reefs, even the most densely populated macroalgal canopies rarely reach contiguous 100% cover at the reef scale, but instead exhibit a mosaic of canopy forming algae, understory algae, and barren patches (E. Fobert, personal obs.). In the natural system, *T. caudimaculatus* could use macroalgal cues as a proxy indicator of reef quality to locate suitable habitat, however once settled on natural reef, choose to move to patches devoid of macroalgae within that same reef, where recruits are less vulnerable to predation. This hypothesis is supported by results from a concurrent study showing *T. caudimaculatus* recruits are primarily associated with microhabitat patches defined by an absence of macroalgal cover (Fobert 2016). On the small experimental patch reefs, particularly for individuals that settled to the 100% macroalgal cover treatment, canopy free patches were not available, resulting in higher juvenile mortality. However, on larger, natural reefs, use of macroalgal cues to locate settlement habitat may not be linked to high subsequent mortality, and therefore may, in fact, be an adaptive behavior.

Conclusion

Animals use habitat-associated cues for multiple and mutually nonexclusive reasons while seeking habitat, and the use and function of these cues can shift with spatial and temporal scales. Our study on temperate rocky reefs found *T. caudimaculatus* to be attracted to multiple cues that

were associated with both increased survival (conspecific cues) and increased mortality (macroalgal cues), however, the non-intuitive habitat selection behavior observed could be explained by fitness trade-offs across life-stages, or by the distortion of spatial heterogeneity in small-scale experiments. This study has provided valuable insight into the importance of sensory information for habitat selection decisions at settlement as well as post-settlement survival, and thus the recruitment patterns of a temperate reef fish. Further research into the mechanisms driving non-intuitive habitat selection behavior is needed to increase our understanding of the drivers of habitat selection and their consequences for recruitment dynamics in reef fishes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS: Funding was provided through the Victorian Government's Seagrass and Reefs program (to S.E. Swearer) and a Holsworth Wildlife Research Endowment – Equity Trustees Charitable Foundation grant (to E.K. Fobert). We thank S. Pahor for use of his unpublished data, which was reanalyzed as part of experiment 2, and N. Phillips and two anonymous reviewers for constructive feedback. Field assistance was provided by, L. Barrett, D. Chamberlain, S. Chia, R. Chisolm, A. Clough, J. Ford, V. Komyakova, M. Le Feuvre, J. O'Connor, S. Reeves, and C. Taylor.

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest. All applicable institutional and national guidelines for the care and use of animals were followed in this study.

LITERATURE CITED

- Almany GR, Webster MS (2005) The predation gauntlet: early post-settlement mortality in reef fishes. *Coral Reefs* 25:19-22
- Andrews KS, Anderson TW (2004) Habitat-dependent recruitment of two temperate reef fishes at multiple spatial scales. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 277:231-244
- Bartoń K (2015) MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference. R package version 1.15.1. <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=MuMIn>
- Behrents KC (1987) The influence of shelter availability on recruitment and early juvenile survivorship of *Lythypnus dalli* Gilbert (Pisces: Gobiidae). *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 107:45-59
- Ben-Tzvi O, Tchernov D, Kiflawi M (2010) Role of coral-derived chemical cues in microhabitat selection by settling *Chromis viridis*. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 409:181-187
- Beukers JS, Jones GP (1998) Habitat complexity modifies the impact of piscivores on a coral reef fish population. *Oecologia* 114:50-59
- Bonin M, Srinivasan M, Almany G, Jones G (2009) Interactive effects of interspecific competition and microhabitat on early post-settlement survival in a coral reef fish. *Coral Reefs* 28:265-274
- Burgess SC, Trembl EA, Marshall DJ (2012) How do dispersal costs and habitat selection influence realized population connectivity? *Ecology* 93:1378-1387
- Connell S, Jones G (1991) The influence of habitat complexity on postrecruitment processes in a temperate reef fish population. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 151:271-294

493 Connell SD, Irving AD (2008) Integrating ecology with biogeography using landscape
494 characteristics: a case study of subtidal habitat across continental Australia. *Journal of*
495 *Biogeography* 35:1608-1621

496 Coppock AG, Gardiner NM, Jones GP (2013) Olfactory discrimination in juvenile coral reef
497 fishes: response to conspecifics and corals. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and*
498 *Ecology* 443:21-26

499 Danchin E, Giraldeau L-A, Valone T, Wagner R (2004) Public information: from nosy neighbors
500 to cultural evolution. *Science* 305:487-491

501 Dixson DL, Munday PL, Jones GP (2010) Ocean acidification disrupts the innate ability of fish
502 to detect predator olfactory cues. *Ecology Letters* 13:68-75

503 Dixson DL, Munday PL, Pratchett M, Jones GP (2011) Ontogenetic changes in responses to
504 settlement cues by Anemonefish. *Coral Reefs* 30:903-910

505 Doherty P, Williams D (1988) The replenishment of coral reef fish populations. *Oceanography*
506 *and Marine Biology: An Annual Review* 26:551

507 Edmunds M, Pickett P, Stewart K (2006) Port Phillip Bay channel deepening project
508 supplementary environmental effects statement – marine ecology specialist studies.
509 Volume 5: seagrass beds. Report to Port of Melbourne Corporation and Maunsell.
510 Australian Marine Ecology, Melbourne

511 Englund G, Cooper SD (2003) Scale effects and extrapolation in ecological experiments.
512 *Advances in Ecological Research* 33:161-213

513 FitzGerald G, Van Havre N (1985) Flight, fright and shoaling in sticklebacks (*Gasterosteidae*).
514 *Biology of Behaviour* 10:321-331

515 Fobert EK (2016) Early life-history drivers of connectivity in a temperate marine fish
516 metapopulation. PhD dissertation, School of BioSciences, University of Melbourne,
517 Melbourne, Australia

518 Ford JR, Shima JS, Swearer SE (2016) Interactive effects of shelter and conspecific density shape
519 mortality, growth, and condition in juvenile reef fish. *Ecology* 97:1373-1380

520 Ford JR, Swearer SE (2013a) Shoaling behaviour enhances risk of predation from multiple
521 predator guilds in a marine fish. *Oecologia* 172:387-397

522 Ford JR, Swearer SE (2013b) Two's company, three's a crowd: Food and shelter limitation
523 outweigh the benefits of group living in a shoaling fish. *Ecology* 94:1069-1077

524 Fournier D, Skaug, H, Ancheta, J, Ianelli, J, Magnusson, A, Maunder, M, Nielsen, A, Sibert, J
525 (2012) AD Model Builder: using automatic differentiation for statistical inference of
526 highly parameterized complex nonlinear model. *Optimization Methods and Software*
527 27:233-249

528 Fumei S (2011) Growing together: group living behaviour and the relationship between density
529 and growth in a shoaling fish. MSc thesis, Department of Zoology, University of
530 Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

531 Greene CM (2003) Habitat selection reduces extinction of populations subject to Allee effects.
532 *Theoretical Population Biology* 64:1-10

533 Hunt TL, Ford JR, Swearer SE (2011) Ecological determinants of recruitment to populations of a
534 temperate reef fish, *Trachinops caudimaculatus* (Plesiopidae). *Marine and Freshwater*
535 *Research* 62:502-509

536 Johnson C et al. (2015) The Reef Ecosystem Evaluation Framework: Managing for Resilience in
537 Temperate Environments. Department of Environment, Land, Water and Planning,
538 Melbourne

539 Jones G (1988) Experimental evaluation of the effects of habitat structure and competitive
540 interactions on the juveniles of two coral reef fishes. *Journal of Experimental Marine*
541 *Biology and Ecology* 123:115-126

542 Jung C, Swearer S, Jenkins G (2011) Changes in diversity in the fish assemblage of a southern
543 Australian embayment: consistent spatial structuring at decadal scales. *Marine and*
544 *Freshwater Research* 61:1425-1434

545 Kingsford MJ, Leis JM, Shanks A, Lindeman KC, Morgan SG, Pineda J (2002) Sensory
546 environments, larval abilities and local self-recruitment. *Bulletin of Marine Science*
547 70:309-340

548 Kuiter RH (2004) Basslets, hamlets and their relatives: a comprehensive guide to selected
549 Serranidae and Plesiopidae. TMC Pub.

550 Lecchini D, Shima J, Banaigs B, Galzin R (2005) Larval sensory abilities and mechanisms of
551 habitat selection of a coral reef fish during settlement. *Oecologia* 143:326-334

552 Leis JM, Siebeck U, Dixon DL (2011) How Nemo finds home: the neuroecology of dispersal
553 and of population connectivity in larvae of marine fishes. *Integrative and Comparative*
554 *Biology* 51:826-843

555 Marshall DJ, Keough MJ (2003) Variation in the dispersal potential of non-feeding invertebrate
556 larvae: the desperate larva hypothesis and larval size. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*
557 255:145-153

558 Mazerolle MJ (2015) AICcmodavg: model selection and multimodel inference based on
559 (Q)AIC(c). R package version 2.0-3. <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=AICcmodavg>

560 McCormick M, Manassa R (2008) Predation risk assessment by olfactory and visual cues in a
561 coral reef fish. *Coral Reefs* 27:105-113

562 McCormick MI, Hoey AS (2004) Larval growth history determines juvenile growth and survival
563 in a tropical marine fish. *Oikos* 106:225-242

564 McCormick MI, Hoey AS (2006) Biological and physical correlates of settlement and survival
565 for a coral reef fish, *Pomacentrus amboinensis* (Pomacentridae). *Proceedings of the 10th*
566 *International Coral Reef Symposium, Okinawa*:425-430

567 Mönkkönen M, Härdling R, Forsman JT, Tuomi J (1999) Evolution of heterospecific attraction:
568 using other species as cues in habitat selection. *Evolutionary Ecology* 13:93-106

569 Mönkkönen M, Helle P, Soppela K (1990) Numerical and behavioural responses of migrant
570 passerines to experimental manipulation of resident tits (*Parus spp.*): heterospecific
571 attraction in northern breeding bird communities? *Oecologia* 85:218-225

572 Partridge BL, Johansson J, Kalish J (1983) The structure of schools of giant bluefin tuna in Cape
573 Cod Bay. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* 9:253-262

574 Petersen JE, Cornwell JC, Kemp WM (1999) Implicit scaling in the design of experimental
575 aquatic ecosystems. *Oikos*:3-18

576 Pitcher T, Magurran A, Winfield I (1982) Fish in larger shoals find food faster. *Behavioral*
577 *Ecology and Sociobiology* 10:149-151

578 Pulliam HR, Danielson BJ (1991) Sources, sinks, and habitat selection: a landscape perspective
579 on population dynamics. *The American Naturalist* 137:S50-S66

580 R Core Team (2015) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for
581 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>

582 Roberts G (1996) Why individual vigilance declines as group size increases. *Animal Behaviour*
583 51:1077-1086

584 Shima JS (2001) Recruitment of a coral reef fish: roles of settlement, habitat, and postsettlement
585 losses. Ecology 82:2190-2199

586 Shima JS, Osenberg CW (2003) Cryptic density dependence: effects of covariation between
587 density and site quality in reef fish. Ecology 84:46-52

588 Simpson SD, Meekan MG, Larsen NJ, McCauley RD, Jeffs A (2010) Behavioral plasticity in
589 larval reef fish: orientation is influenced by recent acoustic experiences. Behavioral
590 Ecology 21:1098-1105. doi: 10.1093/beheco/arq117

591 Stamps J (2001) Habitat selection by dispersers: integrating proximate and ultimate approaches.
592 In: Clobert J, Danchin E, Dhondt A, JD N (eds) Dispersal: individual, population, and
593 community. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK, pp 230-242

594 Stamps J, Krishnan V (2005) Nonintuitive cue use in habitat selection. Ecology 86:2860-2867

595 Sweatman HP (1983) Influence of conspecifics on choice of settlement sites by larvae of two
596 pomacentrid fishes (*Dascyllus aruanus* and *D. reticulatus*) on coral reefs. Marine Biology
597 75:225-229

598 Sweatman HP (1985) The influence of adults of some coral reef fishes on larval recruitment.
599 Ecological Monographs:469-485

600 Tolimieri N, Jeffs A, Montgomery JC (2000) Ambient sound as a cue for navigation by the
601 pelagic larvae of reef fishes. Marine Ecology Progress Series 207:219-224

602 Tupper M, Boutilier R (1997) Effects of habitat on settlement, growth, predation risk and
603 survival of a temperate reef fish. Oceanographic Literature Review 10:1149

604 Ward S (1987) Optimal habitat selection in time-limited dispersers. American Naturalist:568-579

605 Warton DI, Hui FK (2011) The arcsine is asinine: the analysis of proportions in ecology. Ecology
606 92:3-10

White JW, Warner RR (2007) Behavioral and energetic costs of group membership in a coral reef fish. *Oecologia* 154:423-433

Wickham H (2009) *ggplot2: elegant graphics for data analysis*. Springer New York

Wright KJ, Higgs DM, Belanger AJ, Leis JM (2005) Auditory and olfactory abilities of pre-settlement larvae and post-settlement juveniles of a coral reef damselfish (Pisces: Pomacentridae). *Marine Biology* 147:1425-1434

Table 1 Parameter estimates and test statistics for best models describing a) settlement and b) post-settlement mortality of *Trachinops caudimaculatus* prior to and post stocking of artificial reefs (zero-inflated negative binomial GLMM fitted by glmmADMB)

Time	Parameter	Estimate (SE)	Z stat	P value	- CI	+ CI
a) Settlement						
Prior to stocking	<i>Intercept</i>	2.035 (0.134)	15.2	<0.001*	1.773	2.297
Post stocking	<i>Intercept (0%)</i>	1.155 (0.428)	2.7	0.0069*	0.317	1.993
	Macroalgal cover (50%)	-0.42 (0.532)	-0.79	0.4294	-1.463	0.622
	Macroalgal cover (100%)	0.967 (0.499)	1.94	0.0524	-0.01	1.945
b) Mortality						
Prior to stocking	<i>Intercept</i>	0.010 (0.352)	0.03	0.977	-0.679	0.7
	<i>Conspecific abund.</i>	-0.079 (0.035)	-2.27	0.023*	-0.147	-0.011
Post stocking	<i>Intercept (0%)</i>	-0.105 (0.247)	-0.42	0.672	-0.589	0.38
	Macroalgal cover (50%)	0.678 (0.221)	3.07	<0.01*	0.449	1.278
	Macroalgal cover (100%)	0.863 (0.212)	4.08	<0.001*	0.245	1.111
	<i>Conspecific abund.</i>	-0.038 (0.009)	-4.38	<0.001*	-0.055	-0.021
	<i>Total fish abund.</i>	-0.066 (0.018)	-3.69	<0.001*	-0.101	-0.031

* Indicates a significant P value.

± CI represents lower and upper confidence intervals

FIGURE LEGENDS

Fig. 1 Proportion of *Trachinops caudimaculatus* recruits that chose each treatment odor in pairwise comparison trials in a two-chamber choice tank (n = 20 in each pairwise comparison). NS = non-significant results based on chi-square comparison with expected frequencies of a random choice

Fig. 2 Relationship ($\pm$ 95% CI) between a) recruitment of juvenile *Trachinops caudimaculatus* and mean adult density on artificial reefs at two locations – Altona (hollow circles; $r^2 = 0.256$) and Carrum (filled circles; $r^2 = 0.302$) – in Port Phillip Bay, b) settlement of juvenile *T. caudimaculatus* and the density of previously settled juvenile conspecifics present on the Mornington patch reefs during the pre-stocking experiment (relationship not statistically significant), and c) settlement of juvenile *T. caudimaculatus* in 0%, 50%, and 100% macroalgal canopy cover treatments on the Mornington patch reefs during the post-stocking experiment. Panels b and c are predictions based on ZINB GLMM model estimates for fixed effects only, back-transformed to the original scale, with other covariates held at their mean values. Predictions do not take the uncertainty of the random effect into account. Note the log scale used on the y-axis in panels a and c

Fig. 3 Relationship ($\pm$ 95% CI) between mortality of juvenile *Trachinops caudimaculatus* a) and density of previously settled juvenile conspecifics present on the Mornington artificial patch reefs during the pre-stocking experiment, and b) density of previously settled juvenile conspecifics, c) total fish abundance present, and d) 0%, 50%, and 100% macroalgal canopy cover on patch reefs during the post-stocking experiment. Curves and means are predictions based on GLMM binomial model estimates for fixed effects only, back-transformed to the original scale, with other

covariates held at their mean values. Note that predictions do not take the uncertainty of the random effect into account

ONLINE RESOURCE 1

654

655 **The nose knows: linking sensory cue use, settlement decisions, and post-**
656 **settlement survival in a temperate reef fish**

657

658 EMILY K. FOBERT¹, STEPHEN E. SWEARER¹

659

660 ¹ School of BioSciences, University of Melbourne, Parkville Campus, Victoria 3010, Australia

661

662

663

664

ONLINE RESOURCE 1: DETAILS ON CHOICE TANK DESIGN AND ODOR TREATMENTS

Choice tank design

The two-chamber choice tank used in the habitat cue response experiment consisted of a holding chamber at the downstream end, the main chamber, and the two choice chambers at the upstream end (Fig. S1). Treatment water was gravity fed into the choice flume through plastic tubing at the upstream end (one treatment into each of the choice chambers), and two drainage taps at the downstream end established flow through the tank (2 L min⁻¹). Ambient seawater was collected in 25 L barrels from a beach near Patterson Lakes, VIC (38° 04'S; 145° 7'E), a location chosen as it is > 8km away from reef to both the north and the south.

Fig. S1 Diagram of the two-chamber choice tank used for testing olfactory cue detection abilities of recently settled *Trachinops caudimaculatus*

Creating odor treatments

Odor treatments were created by exposing the ambient seawater to various 'smells'. The reef odor treatment was created by submersing boulders with the attached algal community (including encrusting algae, understory and macroalgae (*Ecklonia radiata*)) collected from

natural reef off Schnapper Point, Mornington (38°12'S; 145° 01'E) in an aquarium with 50 L of ambient seawater. To create the conspecific odor treatment, 20 adult *T. caudimaculatus* were placed in a separate aquarium with 50 L of ambient seawater, and to create the reef and conspecific odor treatment, an aquarium was set up with both reef habitat and 20 adult *T. caudimaculatus* in 50 L of ambient seawater. Adult fish used for creating odor treatments were collected from natural reef off Schnapper Point, using a 135 cm square set net (4mm mesh with a 3m cod end). All treatments were set up and left for a minimum of 16 hours before being used in experiments. Prior to use in an experiment, treatment water was transferred from the aquaria to 25 L plastic barrels that were connected to the upstream end of the choice tank by aquarium tubing.

ONLINE RESOURCE 2

The nose knows: linking sensory cue use, settlement decisions, and post-settlement survival in a temperate reef fish

EMILY K. FOBERT¹, STEPHEN E. SWEARER¹

¹ School of BioSciences, University of Melbourne, Parkville Campus, Victoria 3010, Australia

ONLINE RESOURCE 2: ARTIFICIAL REEF DESIGN AND EXPERIMENTAL CONFIGURATIONS

The artificial reefs used in the *in situ* settlement experiments were constructed using milk crates (Viscount Plastics IH120; 355x 355 x 322mm) lined with eight bricks (230 x 110 x 75mm), filled with cushion foam in the center to prevent access to the internal space, and a concrete paver (300 x 300 x 45mm) covering each crate. Four bricks within a milk crate contained eight 20mm diameter holes, which created refuge for *Trachinops caudimaculatus* and other small fauna.

Experimental set-up A

The artificial reef configuration used to assess gregarious settlement patterns of *T. caudimaculatus* was composed of ten milk crate modules, arranged in a 3 x 3 grid (approx. 1m²). The ten modules within each reef were arranged in five stacks of two crates, and secured in place by a Qubelok (Capral Ltd) extruded aluminum frame. Each reef unit was covered with a 6-mm PVC sheet (1600 x 1200mm) to provide an overhang, which is the preferred shelter type of *T. caudimaculatus* (personal obs.). The final reef layout had three milk crate stacks abutting to form one solid wall with the remaining two being situated on the far corners of the square frame (Fig. S2). This artificial reef configuration was designed to mimic the preferred natural reef habitat of *T. caudimaculatus*, providing both small refuge spaces and large cavities and overhangs for ample shelter for both the *T. caudimaculatus* recruits, and the adults that were released onto the reefs to create the density treatments. All reefs in the gregarious settlement experiment were of the same design to control for the effects of physical habitat complexity on settlement.

Fig. S2 Illustration showing a) top-down view and b) side view, and c) photograph of the artificial reef set-up for testing the effects of conspecific density on *Trachinops caudimaculatus* settlement. White boxes show the placement of modules arranged in the 3 x 3 grid (approx. 1m²); each module consisting of a plastic milk crate (355 x 355 x 322mm) lined with eight bricks (230 x 110 x 75mm), filled with cushion foam in the center, and covered by a concrete paver. Ten modules were arranged in five stacks of two crates, with three module stacks abutting to form one solid wall and the remaining two stacks situated on the far corners of the square. The reef unit was covered with a 6-mm PVC sheet (1600 x 1200mm) to provide an overhang

Experimental set-up B

The artificial reef configuration used to assess the effects of macroalgal cover on *T. caudimaculatus* settlement and recruitment were composed of 6 milk crate modules arranged in a 3 x 3 grid (approx. 1m²). Five modules in each reef were arranged to form a cross through the grid, with the sixth module adding a second level at the center position. Modules were secured in

place by cable ties to an extruded aluminum frame. Four additional concrete pavers were set in the corner positions (Fig. S3). This design was chosen to provide a level of rugosity, as well as a number of flat surfaces necessary for attachment of macroalgal plants.

Fig. S3 Illustration showing a) top-down view and b) side view, and c) photograph of the artificial reef set-up for testing the effects of macroalgal cover on *Trachinops caudimaculatus* settlement and survival. White boxes show the placement of modules arranged in the 3 x 3 grid (approx. 1m²); each module consisting of a plastic milk crate (355 x 355 x 322mm) lined with eight bricks (230 x 110 x 75mm), filled with cushion foam in the center, and covered by a concrete paver (300 x 300 x 45mm). Grey squares show the placement of an additional four concrete pavers in the corner positions

ONLINE RESOURCE 3

767 **The nose knows: linking sensory cue use, settlement decisions, and post-**
768 **settlement survival in a temperate reef fish**

769

770 EMILY K. FOBERT¹, STEPHEN E. SWEARER¹

771

772 ¹ School of BioSciences, University of Melbourne, Parkville Campus, Victoria 3010, Australia

773

774

ONLINE RESOURCE 3: RATIONAL FOR STANDARISING *TRACHINOPS*

***CAUDIMACULATUS* RECRUIT DENSITIES ON ARTIFICIAL REEFS**

During the artificial reef experiment testing for the effect of macroalgal canopy cover on settlement decisions and post-settlement mortality, the first two surveys following the initial settlement pulse (25, 30 Nov; Fig. S4) revealed substantial variability in the number of *Trachinops caudimaculatus* recruits that settled across the reef units (i.e. some reefs had consistent recruitment, while other reefs consistently had no recruitment). This early result led to the decision to stock the reefs halfway through the settlement period to establish similar recruit densities (25 recruits) across treatments, and standardize any potential effect of resident conspecifics on settlement decisions. Following the stocking event, *T. caudimaculatus* densities did increase beyond the initial 25 fish/reef on some of the reef units, as settlement continued in the weeks after stocking. Recruits were never removed from the reefs to maintain a consistent density, as this would impact our ability to monitor post-settlement survival. However, the aim of the stocking, which was to remove any significant differences in conspecific abundance across macroalgal treatments, was achieved for the duration of the post-stocking experiment (Fig. S4).

Fig. S4 Time series showing the mean $\pm$ SE juvenile *Trachinops caudimaculatus* abundance on artificial reefs with 0% (hollow circles), 50% (grey circles), and 100% (black circles) macroalgal canopy cover during the 2013-2014 *T. caudimaculatus* settlement period (Austral spring – summer). All artificial reefs were stocked with *T. caudimaculatus* recruits collected from neighboring reef on 16 Dec 2013; vertical black line divides the figure into pre-stocking (18 Nov – 16 Dec) and post-stocking (18 Dec – 16 Jan) abundances

ONLINE RESOURCE 4

The nose knows: linking sensory cue use, settlement decisions, and post-settlement survival in a temperate reef fish

811 EMILY K. FOBERT¹, STEPHEN E. SWEARER¹

812

813 ¹ School of BioSciences, University of Melbourne, Parkville Campus, Victoria 3010, Australia

814

Table S1 Results of the mixed effects model selection for zero-inflated negative binomial GLMM models comparing the effects of macroalgal treatment (0, 50 and 100% cover), resident conspecific abundance (the number of juvenile *Trachinops caudimaculatus* present on the reef in the previous census), total fish abundance (excluding *T. caudimaculatus*), and benthic predator abundance on *T. caudimaculatus* settlement. Presented are models with $\Delta AIC_c \leq 4$; the best overall model is highlighted in bold

Model	df	AIC _c	ΔAIC_c	Log likelihood
<i>Settlement prior to stocking</i>				
Reef	4	219.3	0	-105.17
Conspecific abundance + reef	5	220.8	1.5	-104.67
Benthic predator abundance + reef	5	221.4	2.1	-104.98
Total fish abundance + reef	5	221.7	2.5	-105.16
Conspecific abundance + benthic predator abundance + reef	6	223.1	3.8	-104.51
<i>Settlement post stocking</i>				
Macroalgal treatment + reef	6	191.5	0	-88.73
Macroalgal treatment + total fish abundance + reef	7	193.1	1.6	-88.15
Macroalgal treatment + conspecific abundance + reef	7	194.0	2.5	-88.61
Macroalgal treatment + benthic predator abundance + reef	7	194.3	2.8	-88.73
Reef	4	194.4	2.9	-92.73
Macroalgal treatment * conspecific abundance + total fish abundance + benthic predator abundance + reef	11	194.9	3.4	-82.79

Table S2 Results of the mixed effects model selection for binomial GLMM models with a logit-link function, comparing the effects of macroalgal treatment (0, 50 and 100% cover), resident conspecific abundance (the number of juvenile *Trachinops caudimaculatus* present on the reef in the previous census), total fish abundance (excluding *T. caudimaculatus*), and benthic predator abundance on *T. caudimaculatus* mortality. Presented are models with $\Delta AIC_c \leq 4$; the best overall model is highlighted in bold

Model	df	AIC _c	ΔAIC_c	Log likelihood
<i>Mortality prior to stocking</i>				
Conspecific abundance + reef	3	62.1	0	-27.21
Reef	2	64.1	2	-29.65
Macroalgal treatment + conspecific abundance + reef	5	65.3	3.1	-25.13
Conspecific abundance + total fish abundance + reef	4	65.3	3.1	-27.09
Macroalgal treatment + reef	4	65.9	3.8	-27.42
<i>Mortality post stocking</i>				
Macroalgal treatment + conspecific abundance + total fish abundance + reef	6	322.3	0	-154.12
Macroalgal treatment + conspecific abundance + total fish abundance + benthic predator abundance + reef	7	324.4	2.1	-153.81

817
818
819

Minerva Access is the Institutional Repository of The University of Melbourne

Author/s:

Fobert, EK;Swearer, SE

Title:

The nose knows: linking sensory cue use, settlement decisions, and post-settlement survival in a temperate reef fish

Date:

2017-04-01

Citation:

Fobert, E. K. & Swearer, S. E. (2017). The nose knows: linking sensory cue use, settlement decisions, and post-settlement survival in a temperate reef fish. *Oecologia*, 183 (4), pp.1041-1051. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-017-3843-2>.

Persistent Link:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11343/282610>