

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265880451>

# Movement patterns of fish in a Martinique MPA: implications for marine reserve design

Article in *Marine Ecology Progress Series* · November 2014

DOI: 10.3354/meps10940

CITATIONS

15

READS

504

5 authors, including:



Jessica Garcia

Université de Corse Pascal Paoli

17 PUBLICATIONS 131 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Yann Rousseau

Institut Français de Recherche pour l'Exploitation de la Mer

8 PUBLICATIONS 200 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Saragoni Gilles

Université de Perpignan

21 PUBLICATIONS 414 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE



Philippe Lenfant

Université de Perpignan

137 PUBLICATIONS 2,692 CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

## Running headline: Movement patterns of fish in MPA

\* corresponding author, present address: Departamento de Ecología e Hidrología, Facultad de Biología,  
Universidad de Murcia, Campus de Espinardo, Murcia, Spain  
jessicagarcia.mpa@gmail.com

**Key words:** Marine protected area, movement patterns, coral reef fish, Caribbean, *Lutjanus apodus*, *Sparisoma viride*, *Acanthurus chirurgus*

## INTRODUCTION

Knowledge about the spatial and temporal patterns of movement by coral reef fish is crucial for improving biodiversity conservation and fisheries management. Previous studies have demonstrated that reef fish have small home ranges ( $<100 \text{ m}^2$ ), sometimes as small as  $1 \text{ m}^2$  (Chapman & Kramer 2000). However, recent studies applying longer periods of monitoring and utilising larger spatial scales have shown home ranges that reaching  $10 \text{ km}^2$  (Farmer and Ault 2011, Fabrizio et al. 2014). Home range is defined as the spatial manifestation of animal behaviour related to survival and reproduction (Burt 1943, Börger et al. 2008). Home range is the result of spatio-temporal dynamic processes and must be measured at the same temporal scale to be compared across individuals (Wang & Grimm 2007). Site fidelity can be used as a proxy to determine whether an individual has established a home range because such fidelity is a necessary condition to maintain a home range (Powell 2000). However, fish execute occasional exploratory movements outside their home range, and these movements should not be considered part of the home range (Burt 1943, Powell 2000). Some fish families, such as wrasses, surgeonfishes, and parrotfishes, require several days to one month to cover short distances (Robertson & Hoffman 1977, Chapman & Kramer 2000, Garcia et al. 2010). By contrast, other species, such as groupers, snappers, and jacks, are able to swim long distances ranging from 10 to 100 kilometres (Colin 1992, Holland et al. 1996, Farmer and Ault 2011).

The movement patterns of fish may determine the effectiveness of a marine reserve, defined in this paper as a marine area protected from fishing activity (Afonso et al. 2008). Fish movements across reserve borders can affect the reef fish assemblage (abundance and/or distribution) within and outside the protected area (Chapman & Kramer 2000). Halpern & Warner (2003) presented a review of 89 studies of marine reserves showing a 63% increase in fish density, a 90% increase in fish biomass, and an 80% increase in fish size within the reserve. Spillover is a term used to describe the exportation of larvae and adults from a reserve to adjacent zones (Afonso et al. 2008; Meyer et al. 2010; Green et al. 2014). Spillover of mature and large individuals from the MPA should support local fisheries (Ashworth and Ormond 2005). However, spillover is a complex mechanism that is difficult to demonstrate because it largely depends on species-specific life history (Russ et al. 2003), fish densities inside the reserve and species movements.

Marine protected areas (MPAs), including marine reserves, are very popular and effective tools in biodiversity conservation. Nevertheless, the determination of the optimal size, design, and location of MPAs is a complex problem (Halpern 2003, Claudet et al. 2008). For species with small home ranges and strong site fidelity (Afonso et al. 2008, 2011), individuals' movements are often limited to the MPA, making the protection of those species effective. Individual export of these species from MPAs is often limited to the larval phase and is highly dependent on environmental conditions (Cudney-Bueno et al. 2009, Christie et al. 2010). However, species with large home ranges have a greater ability to leave MPAs to reach essential habitats (e.g., for refuge, nutrition, or reproduction). Although MPAs offer an effective conservation tool for some species, benefits decrease considerably for species that have a home range larger than the MPA boundaries. Large reserves could be a solution for these species but generate more social and economic problems with local fishermen and incur larger management and monitoring costs (Halpern & Warner 2003). Moreover, large reserves do not necessarily contain the essential habitats for the species (Chapman & Kramer 2000, Carlson et al. 2010). One solution proposed by scientists is to create networks of medium-sized MPAs (100-500 ha) with a mean distance of 4-6

km between them (Shanks et al. 2003, Claudet et al. 2008). Therefore, movement pattern studies (home range, maximum distance covered and site fidelity) of key ecological and economically important species such as grouper, snapper and parrotfish (Vallès & Oxenford 2014) are necessary to improve MPA design.

Studies of fish movements have often used conventional external tagging with a mark-recapture technique that relies on experimental recapture or visual sightings (Chapman & Kramer 2000, Zeller et al. 2003, Amargós et al. 2010). This type of tag is utilised when the animal and species can be identified visually (Kohler & Turner 2001). This method allows the tagging of a large number of individuals of many different species, yet it remains difficult to determine the fish activity between the capture and recapture events. Recently, ultrasonic telemetry has proven effective for studying the ecology and physiology of marine animals in their natural environments (Winter 1996). Based on the number and spacing of receivers and the frequency of fixed positions, acoustic tagging can produce spatio-temporal data of finer resolution than external tagging.

In the present study, the movement patterns of three coral reef fish, *Acanthurus chirurgus* (Acanthuridae), *Sparisoma viride* (Scaridae), and *Lutjanus apodus* (Lutjanidae), within and outside a Caribbean MPA were assessed using complementary methods. The main objectives were 1) to characterise the fish movements, 2) to identify what type of habitat these species used and 3) to determine the MPA effectiveness for these three species. These species represent a large portion of the fish biomass (37.2%, Garcia et al. unpubl. data) in Martinique and are intensively targeted by artisanal fishing (Antillean trap) (Bruggemann et al. 1996, Nagelkerken et al. 2002, Choat et al. 2003). Therefore, effective protection is essential to ensure stock replenishment of these species. Conventional external tags and passive acoustic telemetry were utilised to monitor long-term fish movement, whereas active acoustic tracking was used to determine short-term home range and site fidelity.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

### Study area

Work was conducted in a coastal MPA located close to the village of Le Robert in Martinique (Lesser Antilles) (Fig. 1). The Robert MPA was created in 2000 and encompasses an area of 9.56 km<sup>2</sup>. This MPA is closed to fishing, but diving and other activities are permitted. The Robert MPA (Fig. 1) is a large bay located on the Atlantic coast into which many rivers discharge. Consequently, coral reefs inside the MPA are greatly impacted by siltation and pollutants from the river discharge. The Atlantic side is a large insular shelf that stretches less than 10 nautical miles. Benthic community mapping around Martinique Island conducted by Legrand et al. (2012) indicates that Robert Bay (Fig. 1) consists of soft-bottom (sand or silt) (63.8%), algae (50.3%) and coral (10.5%). Furthermore, artificial reefs have been created on the borders of the natural reef inside the MPA.

### Monitoring system and fish tagging

Three species were chosen for this study: *Acanthurus chirurgus* (Acanthuridae), *Sparisoma viride* (Scaridae), and *Lutjanus apodus* (Lutjanidae). These common species belong to different trophic groups (herbivores/carnivores) and were expected to exhibit different degrees of mobility. Fish were caught with Antillean traps, which are the most common coastal fishing gear in Martinique. In the Robert MPA, traps were placed in areas of rocky substrate at a depth of approximately 5 m to reduce fish decompression. The aim was to tag sexually mature individuals in each of the 3 species. Sexual maturity is reached at approximately 17 cm for

*A. chirurgus*, between 17 and 27 cm for *S. viride* and at 25 cm for *L. apodus* (Munro 1983). However, only 2 mature *L. apodus* measuring more than 25 cm were captured; the rest of the individuals studied within this group were sub-adults. For *A. chirurgus* and *S. viride*, all studied individuals were mature individuals.

#### External tagging

To examine large-scale movement patterns, we employed mark-recapture methods for the external tagging experiments. The distance between the sites of release and recapture corresponded to the distance that fish were able to cover. Each captured individual was anaesthetised, measured, weighed, tagged in the boat and directly released at the capture site. The maturity status (initial or terminal stage) of each parrotfish was recorded. Each external T-bar tag (Floy ® Tag) had a unique identification number and telephone number. Experimental fishing was conducted with traps every week inside the MPA. For zones outside the MPA, fishermen and the general public were informed about the tagging experiment through an information campaign consisting of posters, meetings and TV advertisements. A monetary reward was offered to any person who returned a tagged fish.

#### Internal tagging

Passive acoustic monitoring was used to determine the movements of reef fish inside and across the boundaries of the MPA (Fig. 1). To reduce fish stress and mortality rate, each individual was maintained in captivity and separated by family without feeding for two days before surgery. The fish were then anaesthetised with clove oil at a concentration of 0.02 ml/L, and Vemco V7-4 L ultrasonic coded transmitters (dimension 7×22.5 mm) were implanted into each fish through a 2 cm horizontal incision into the abdominal cavity. These transmitters pulse randomly every 120-360 seconds at a frequency of 69 kHz and have a nominal maximum battery life of 412 days. We used a specific implantation technique for Acanthuridae because the distance between the anal fin and the anus was too small to implant a transmitter. Instead, the transmitter was inserted in the peritoneal cavity, 0.5 centimetres above the fish's anus. For each species, fish were maintained in captivity for one week following surgery. Fish were fed the day after surgery and released at their point of capture. All individuals above 16 cm (total length) were tagged. This fish size was considered sufficient to minimise the impact of the internal tag (mass = 1.8 g and length = 22.5 mm) on fish health. Unfortunately, 3 *L. apodus*, 2 *S. viride* (1 female and 1 male) and 9 *A. chirurgus* died during the tagging procedure.

#### Monitoring system

In this study, the movement patterns of fish were studied inside the Robert MPA and along the MPA borders (monitoring fish entries and exits). A total of 25 Vemco™ VR2W receivers were deployed within the MPA. A double receiver barriers was deployed around the MPA boundary (Heupel et al. 2006) and another barrier at the edge of the bay (Fig. 1). This fixed network of 20 receivers was deployed in Robert Bay (Robert MPA + outside MPA) from November 2009 to November 2011. In addition, 5 supplementary receivers were installed in the centre of Robert Bay from December 2010 to November 2011 (Fig. 1). The VR2W acoustic data were downloaded every 6 months.

#### Range testing

VR2W test: Range tests were conducted at 3 different receivers placed in different key habitats (rocky reef, soft bottom and a combination of both) within the study area. For each habitat (i.e., receiver), 3 range tests were conducted, totalling 9 range tests. With a boat, we moved away from the receiver, stopped every 50 metres, and recorded the position using a GPS. Range tests were restricted to a maximum distance of 250 metres from the receiver. We chose to test several transmitters to investigate if there were possible differences in the transmission of acoustic signals between transmitters. The detection range was estimated to be restricted to a maximum radius of 150 metres over a soft bottom composed mainly of a silt substrate and a flat surface. The detection range for the rocky reef and combination of rocky reef and soft bottom receivers was limited to a radius of 100 metres due to the relief complexity of the bottom, which decreases the strength of the acoustic signal.

VR100 test: Two transmitters were fixed to a buoy attached to the bottom. We then moved the VR100 50 metres farther away every 12 min. Range detection was tested up to 250 metres. The transmitter signals were detected up to 100 metres.

#### Relocation

To quantify fine-scale movement patterns, fish (*A. chirurgus*, *L. apodus* and *S. viride*) were tracked using a Vemco<sup>TM</sup> VR100 mobile receiver once a week from December 2009 to August 2010. Using an omnidirectional hydrophone, we regularly relocated and monitored fish presence and their location within the study area. Overall, 30 tracking sessions were conducted on rocky and silty substrates: 15 inside the MPA and 15 outside the MPA. Every 15 minutes during tracking, the boat was positioned at a location inside the Robert MPA. This position was recorded using a GPS. Tracking was conducted once a week for 13 hours during 3 sessions: from 05:30 to 08:30, from 11:00 to 14:00 and from 18:00 to 01:00.

#### Data analysis

Movement data were obtained using the Animal Movement Extension (Hooge & Eichenlaub 1997) for ArcView 3.2 (ESRI, Redlands, CA, USA). Home range sizes were calculated from active tracking positions using kernel utilisation distributions (KUDs) and minimum convex polygon (MCP) areas (Kernohan et al. 2001). The KUD is a probabilistic method that calculates the probability of finding a fish in an area based on position data; we used 50% KUD to represent the fishes' core activity areas and 95% KUD to calculate the fishes' home ranges. The MCP estimates the maximum area covered by each fish (Worton 1989, Seaman & Powell 1996). The null hypothesis, that the movements of each detected fish were random, was tested using a site fidelity test (Wetherbee et al. 2004). The observed data were compared against 100 simulated datasets within the site fidelity test that were created using a Monte Carlo simulation (Okubo 1980, Spencer et al. 1990, Hooge & Eichenlaub 1997, Wetherbee et al. 2004). The mean squared distances from the centre of activity (MSD) and the linearity index (LI= linear distance between first and last detection points by cover distance) were also generated from the simulations (Schoener 1981, Spencer et al. 1990). We divided Robert Bay into two zones: inside and outside the MPA. A residency index ( $I_R$ ) was calculated for each tagged fish and each zone (O'Toole et al. 2011) using passive monitoring data. The  $I_R$  values were obtained by dividing the number of days that fish were detected in each zone by the number of days in the array (i.e., the number of days between the release date and the last detection).

## RESULTS

### Spatial movements

#### Mark-recapture experiment

A total of 1021 fish were tagged (673 *Acanthurus chirurgus*, 131 *Lutjanus apodus*, and 217 *Sparisoma viride*) with external tags, of which 109 individuals were recaptured (10.7% recapture; Table 1). The percentage of recaptures differed among species, with 5.6% of tagged fish recaptured for *A. chirurgus*, 26.7% of tagged fish recaptured for *L. apodus* and 16.6% of tagged fish recaptured for *S. viride*. Several individuals were recaptured multiple times (6 *L. apodus*, 4 *S. viride*, 1 *A. chirurgus*) (Fig. 2). *L. apodus* covered a mean distance of  $671 \pm 1594$  m (mean  $\pm$  SD); however, one male covered a distance of approximately 9701 m (Fig. 3) and was caught outside the MPA behind the coral reef barrier only 23 days after its release. *A. chirurgus* was the most frequently tagged species and travelled a mean distance of  $778 \pm 1442$  m; however, 7 individuals were caught on the coral reef outside the MPA and had travelled a mean distance of  $3529 \pm 1026$  m, with one individual covering a distance of at least 4992 m (Fig. 3, Table 1). *S. viride* covered the smallest distance (mean  $\pm$  SD =  $129 \pm 139$  m) in comparison with the two other tagged species, and the longest observed movement for *S. viride* was 455 m (Table 1). There was high intra-specific variability in the distance covered by individuals.

#### Acoustic telemetry

Thirty *A. chirurgus* were tagged with acoustic transmitters between December 2009 and April 2010. A total of 47 *L. apodus* were tagged between November 2009 and May 2011. Twenty-seven *S. viride* were tagged between March 2010 and April 2011, including 18 terminal phases and 9 initial phases.

#### Relocation survey

A total of 49 fish were detected at least once, but only 12 individuals (7 *L. apodus*, 2 *A. chirurgus* and 3 *S. viride*) were detected frequently enough to be included in the home range analysis (Fig. 4, Table 2). The hypothesis that the observed movements were random was rejected for all tracked fish except individual ID#158 ( $p > 0.05$ ) (Table 2). These data confirmed that the individuals that were included in the home range analysis occupied home ranges that were restricted to a consistent area inside the MPA. The mean MCP ( $\pm$ SD) home range observed for *L. apodus* ( $n=7$ ) was  $15827 \pm 16\,912$  m<sup>2</sup>,  $11685 \pm 19889$  m<sup>2</sup> for the KUD<sup>50%</sup>, and  $66871 \pm 114398$  m<sup>2</sup> for the KUD<sup>95%</sup>. All *L. apodus* had home ranges (KUD<sup>50%</sup>) varying from 1300 to 12300 m<sup>2</sup> except one fish (ID#5257) that occupied a larger home range (56000 m<sup>2</sup>) (Table 2). This fish made several movements between two different sites on rocky substrate. Only individual ID#5257 showed spatial overlap with all other *L. apodus*. However, other individuals also presented some overlap in their distributions (Fig. 4). The home range of ID#258 only overlapped with that of individual ID#5257 and the border of the KUD<sup>95%</sup> of fish ID#276. We observed spatial overlap for all individuals. For *A. chirurgus*, only two individuals were detected frequently enough to enable kernel analyses. Each fish demonstrated differences in their home range area. The MCPs varied between 5238 m<sup>2</sup> and 9444 m<sup>2</sup> (Table 2). The same observation was visible for KUD<sup>95%</sup>, which varied from 24108 to 31863 m<sup>2</sup>, and KUD<sup>50%</sup>, which ranged from 3406 to 5913 m<sup>2</sup>. No spatial overlap was observed between the two individuals. Three male *S. viride* were detected a sufficient number of times to permit kernel analysis. These three individuals exhibited very different MCP (ID#153= 924 m<sup>2</sup>; ID#158=7548 m<sup>2</sup>; ID#297=1189 m<sup>2</sup>) and KUD<sup>95%</sup> areas (ID#153= 19826 m<sup>2</sup>; ID#158=44015 m<sup>2</sup>; ID#297=3845 m<sup>2</sup>). The MCP of individual ID#158

was eighteen times larger than that of individual ID#153. We observed that the smallest individual had the largest home range (Table 2). Spatial overlap was present between the three individuals (Fig. 4).

#### Passive survey

A total of 49 fish were detected at least once on the receivers. Our analysis was restricted to 38 individuals that had a sufficient number of detections (19 *L. apodus*, 16 *S. viride*, and 3 *A. chirurgus*). We considered a minimum of 3 consecutive detections to be representative of a true presence of the fish. The results from the acoustic monitoring confirm those from the external tagging, which showed evidence that *L. apodus* and *S. viride* were able to travel outside the Robert MPA (Fig. 5). The map of monthly numbers of detections (Fig. 5) illustrates that the maximum number of detections was restricted to the rocky substrate in the centre of the bay inside the MPA. *L. apodus* individuals were predominantly detected by the receiver located farthest inside the bay, whereas males of *S. viride* were frequently detected close to the MPA boundaries (Fig. 5). *L. apodus* individuals (n= 19) were detected primarily by the 5 receivers located along the rocky substrate (number of detections per month = 4702); detections decreased outside the MPA (number of detections per month = 0.51 recorded by the remaining 15 receivers). The receivers located in the centre of the bay (silt substrate and deeper sites) recorded more detections (range of detections: 111-2600) than the receivers on the borders (rocky side) of the bay (range of detections: 8-110) for *L. apodus*. The specific site located on the artificial reef also achieved a higher detection rate. A total of 17 *L. apodus* were regularly detected at the same site, and 8 of those travelled outside the MPA (47% of individuals). Females of *S. viride* remained around the rocky substrate inside the MPA, whereas males tended to extend their movements to the artificial reef and borders of the MPA, including one male that left the MPA (Fig. 5). Several detections of *A. chirurgus* individuals were recorded outside the MPA. The detections were always made in the central bay VR2W location (silt substrate). Two individuals were detected by the last barrier of receivers and travelled more than 4 km. These individuals were never detected by a receiver within the study area of the MPA.

The residency patterns of each species indicated that, apart from two *L. apodus* (ID#265 and #160) and one individual *S. viride* (ID#142), all fish were present for a long continuous period (range 29-279 days) within the MPA (Fig. 6, Table 3). *L. apodus* individuals exhibited more frequent movements between the MPA and the adjacent zones than *S. viride*. When individuals left the MPA, they were detected only several times (3 detections) during a short period by the receivers of the MPA boundaries and were not detected again. One *L. apodus* individual (ID#336) left the MPA and crossed Robert Bay in several hours. One *S. viride* individual (ID#150) stayed outside the MPA for 38 continuous days before its signal was lost. *A. chirurgus* was not detected by the receiver placed on the rocky substrate, which explains why we could not calculate a residency index for this species.

#### Temporal movement

Acoustic monitoring allowed us to determine when individuals left the Robert MPA. Only one male *S. viride* (ID#150) left the MPA; that fish was detected outside the MPA for 38 days (Fig. 6, Table 3). Several *L. apodus* left the MPA (47%), and none returned. These individuals travelled these long distances outside the MPA during June (n=2), September (n=3), and October (n=2). All individuals measured at least 23 cm in length. One individual (ID#265) left the MPA in December. Four individuals (1 *L. apodus* and 3 *A. chirurgus*) left the MPA on the same day (30 October 2010).



## DISCUSSION

This study investigated home range size, site fidelity and movement patterns of *Lutjanus apodus*, *Acanthurus chirurgus*, and *Sparisoma viride* inside the Robert MPA in Martinique. This is the first time that 1) fish movement patterns have been studied in Martinique and that 2) these movements (home range and site fidelity) have been described for *S. viride* and *A. chirurgus* using acoustic telemetry. These species are among the most abundant species in the coral reef fish population in Martinique (Bruggemann et al. 1996, Nagelkerken et al. 2002, Choat et al. 2003) and play an important role in coral reef ecosystems (Bruggemann et al. 1996). In another study (Garcia et al. unpubl. data), visual censuses were conducted in the Robert MPA and revealed that these three species represented 37.2% of the total biomass of reef fish. These species represent a large proportion of fishing captures in Martinique and in other locations in the Caribbean (Polunin & Roberts 1993). In Martinique, reef fish stocks have been intensively exploited by artisanal fishing (Munro 1983). Several larger parrotfish species such as *S. viride* are listed on the IUCN Red List with the status of Least Concern (Rochas et al. 2012); however, these species are highly fished in Martinique and other Caribbean islands (Hawkins & Roberts 2004).

For individuals identified by the relocation survey (*S. viride*, *L. apodus* and *A. chirurgus*), we observed that movement patterns were restricted to the same small area located within the MPA. This coastal MPA is highly silty, but the area of site fidelity is located on the largest band of rocky substrate, which is less than 650 m<sup>2</sup>. This rocky substrate consists of a 1-m-deep plateau surrounded by a drop-off ranging from 1 m to 6 m. The plateau is covered with algae, seagrass, coral and gorgonian patches (Legrand et al. 2012). The acoustic monitoring results demonstrate that the individuals in this study remained within a small area for long periods of time (from 2 months to 1 year) within the MPA and that many individuals were also able to travel very long distances (2-4 km) in a short period of time (1-4 days) and were not detected again within the MPA. The external tagging results showed that several individuals covered large distance ranging from 2 and 9 km.

### Limitations of this study

Despite 6 *L. apodus*, 4 *S. viride* and 1 *A. chirurgus* being recaptured multiple times (range: 2-4 recaptures/individual), most of the external tagging data were calculated for only one recapture of each individual. We tagged a high number of individuals, and the mean distance was calculated for more than 35 individuals per species. Under natural conditions, recapture events are variable, but mark-recapture techniques provide a reliable tool to gain information on the minimum distance that fish can cover between release and recapture sites. However, the precise routes followed by individuals remain unknown. Acoustic monitoring is also an effective approach that provides a higher sampling effort than fishing sessions. However, this method is relatively expensive, and thus, the data may be spatially restricted by the number and location of receivers utilised in the study. Although the largest recorded movements were only exhibited by several individuals, the results from passive acoustic monitoring tend to confirm the same trend as external tagging: some individuals were able to travel several kilometres. We did not observe any fish returning to the MPA, although the presence of only one receiver barrier close to the bay may have limited our ability to assess whether fish detected at this barrier truly left the MPA or simply returned between the two barriers of receivers. The detection range of receivers on the soft bottom was limited to 150 metres, which corresponded to 600 metres of detection distance for the double barrier composed of 2 juxtaposed lines of receivers. The transmission rate of acoustic tags varied randomly between 120 and 360 seconds. Therefore, to remain undetected by the receiver barriers, the swimming

speed of fish must be faster than  $1.67 \text{ m.s}^{-1}$ . Although information about swimming speed for the adult phase of our studied species was not available in the literature, we chose the swimming speeds of related species that are biologically and ecologically similar as a proxy for the swimming speeds of our studied species. We used the swimming speed of *Lutjanus griseus* ( $<1 \text{ m.s}^{-1}$ ; Luo et al. 2009), *Scarus niger* ( $<0.53 \text{ m.s}^{-1}$ ; Wainwright et al. 2002), and *Acanthurus coeruleus* ( $<0.34 \text{ m.s}^{-1}$ ; Morgan et al. 2010) for the maximum values of *L. apodus*, *S. viride* and *A. chirurgus*, respectively. Therefore, given the related swimming speeds, we are confident that any fish crossing the double barrier would be detected even if the tag transmission rate was low, as it appears impossible for any of the species to cross the 600 m detection range in under 120 seconds.

#### Site fidelity and movement patterns

This study is the first to determine the home ranges of *S. viride* and *A. chirurgus* using acoustic telemetry. Their home ranges were identified inside the Robert MPA using acoustic relocation. The three tagged species showed important intraspecific variability in home range. Several factors, such as resource availability, competitor density, body size, fish behaviour or environmental conditions, could explain home range variations (Eristhee & Oxenford 2001, Hitt et al. 2011a). For *A. chirurgus* ( $n=2$ ) and *S. viride* ( $n=3$ ), these variations could be caused by the low number of fish studied, which could be insufficient to obtain a reliable estimation of their home range. However, this study provides an important initial estimation of the home range for these species.

This study demonstrated that *S. viride* regularly maintain a restricted home range with a high degree of site fidelity (Table 2). The biology and ecology of the Caribbean fish fauna are relatively well documented, but there is little information on movement patterns (van Rooij et al. 1996, Chapman & Kramer 2000). Chapman & Kramer (2000) tagged 56 *S. viride*, and the longest movement they recorded was 110 metres. These differences are most likely related to both the number and size of essential habitats used by this species, including seagrass and corals, inside the MPA. If their essential habitats are absent from the MPA, individuals may leave in search of feeding or reproduction areas. Moreover, not every *S. viride* was detected in every session using acoustic tracking. Several hypotheses may explain the absence of detection in active and passive monitoring: 1) fish may hide in crevices in the rocky substrate; 2) *S. viride* may have moved to the silt area at a 15 m depth, where the water turbidity is high (Garcia et al. unpubl. data), which could have reduced detection efficiency; or 3) the boat travelling over the shallow reef plateau was very near the bottom (depth  $< 1 \text{ m}$ ), and thus, the depth was insufficient to detect the acoustic signal; or (4) fish were frightened by the boat and moved outside the detection range. In these last two scenarios, the transmitter signals would not have been detected by acoustic telemetry (VR2W and VR100) due to technical and environmental limits. *S. viride* is often reported to inhabit seagrass beds (Nagelkerken et al. 2000); thus, the nearby seagrass habitat may have sheltered the *S. viride* that were no longer detected.

For *A. chirurgus*, our home ranges ( $\text{KUD}^{50\%} = 4660 \text{ m}^2$ , mean distance covered =  $725 \pm 1442 \text{ m}$ , maximum distance =  $4992 \text{ m}$ ) were larger than the values previously reported in the literature (Chapman & Kramer 2000, dos Santos et al. 2010). Moreover, some individuals likely left the MPA. Using external tagging, Chapman & Kramer (2000) have shown that *Acanthurus bahianus* and *Acanthurus coeruleus* can cover a distance of approximately 100 m; however, Caribbean surgeonfish movement patterns have been poorly documented.

Some *L. apodus* were not detected by active and passive acoustic monitoring. The death of individuals is one possibility to explain these results. However, this species is robust to tagging procedures (Garcia et al. unpubl. data), and the tagged individuals recovered well during the acclimation period in captivity, displaying normal swimming and feeding behaviour. It is possible that some individuals may have left the MPA due to the stress induced by the capture and tag implantation. It is also possible that some individuals may have explored the waters outside the MPA to find another preferential site. Although individuals that left the MPA should have been detected by the double barrier of receivers deployed at its boundaries, it is possible that some individuals may have passed through the receiver array without being detected. It is also possible that fouling developed on the receivers, which may have decreased the detection range despite regular cleaning.

This present study reports the largest home range size (KUD<sup>95%</sup>) thus far described for *L. apodus* (Hitt et al. 2011a, b). Our estimates were 6 times larger than the home ranges (KUD<sup>95%</sup>) reported by Hitt et al. (2011a). Environmental conditions, predation risk, competition and body size could explain these differences in home range (Hitt et al. 2011a, b). The residency index we calculated suggests that 8 *L. apodus* (47%) left the Robert MPA after a period (from three weeks to several months) spent in their preferential sites. Once a fish left the MPA, it was not detected again. Except for two individuals, all fish that left the MPA had a minimum size of 23 cm (sexual maturity ~25 cm, Munro 1983). These departures from the MPA occurred within the reproductive period indicated by Munro (1983). Departures were concentrated within the months of June (n=2), September (n=3), and October (n=2), which coincide with the reproductive season estimated by Munro (1983), thus suggesting that these movements could be linked to reproduction. The capture of sexually mature *L. apodus* (>25 cm) in the Robert MPA was rare. The tagged individuals were mostly sub-adult and were nearing maturity. Therefore, it could be assumed that individuals that left the MPA were migrating for their first reproduction event. Hammerschlag et al. (2010) suggested that some *L. apodus* individuals may forage around their preferential sites, whereas others may extend their movements to investigate further foraging areas. In this study, residency inside the MPA was very high, and foraging most likely occurred along the reef inside the MPA. We propose two complementary hypotheses: (1) immature individuals may remain within their home range and forage inside the MPA, and (2) mature individuals may stay in the proximity of their home range but may migrate outside the MPA during the reproductive period. However, two individuals measuring 19 cm left the MPA, whereas two other fish measuring 23.5 cm remained within the MPA. This finding could reflect individual variability in maturation.

We also observed 4 individuals (1 *L. apodus* and 3 *A. chirurgus*) that left the MPA on 30 October 2010. This date also corresponds to the occurrence of tropical storm “Tomas” on Martinique Island. We propose that the storm or associated strong precipitation could have induced rapid, escape-like movements in some species. For the *L. apodus* individual, it is difficult to conclude if this departure was caused by the storm or movements associated with reproductive behaviour. Some studies have observed that hurricanes cause modifications of fish assemblages (Craig 1996, Heupel et al. 2003, Greenwood et al. 2006, Rousseau et al. 2010) and are capable of inducing fish movement (Kawabata et al. 2010). In the present study, we suggest two possible explanations regarding why none of the tagged fish that left the MPA returned: 1) fish were most likely caught by fishing traps that are abundant at the edges of the MPA (Garcia et al. unpubl. data), or 2) fish may have settled in a new area (relocation). The other possible hypothesis is the “member-vagrant hypothesis” that has been developed in a series of papers (Iles & Sinclair 1982, Sinclair & Iles 1988, 1989). The individuals that left the MPA can be

considered migrant individuals of this population. These individuals were lost from the local population of the MPA, and if they survived outside the MPA, they spawned in other locations.

Mangroves, as well as small coral patches (not represented due to scale used in mapping benthic communities; Legrand et al. 2012), are present close to a location where individuals were found to show high site attachment (Fig. 1.), thus suggesting mangroves as an essential habitat type for the species under investigation. We also observed that many fish used the centre of the bay (silty and deep) to leave the MPA. This observation is contrary to the common hypothesis that large bands of silty or sandy substrate represent a physical barrier for reef fish movement (Chapman & Kramer 2000). However, Chateau & Wantiez (2008) demonstrated that some reef-associated species used sand substrate during their inter-island movements. Our results demonstrated that presumed unfavourable habitats were occasionally used by reef fish as corridors. We suggest that sand or silt substrates could play a temporary ecological role in reef fish life.

#### Implications for the design of marine reserves

The Robert MPA is relatively small in comparison with other MPAs in the world. In addition, it is mainly composed of large expanses of silty bottoms with small patches of coral reef. The size and location of the Robert MPA were established by fishermen without complimentary scientific information regarding benthic or fish communities to support the decision-making and design process. However, we observed a high site attachment as well as restricted movements indicating that most fish were resident within the MPA, as only a few individuals migrated outside this zone. The Robert MPA appears to be effective for the three species in this study. The fish spent most of their time in areas of rocky substrate within the MPA where corals, seagrass and algae occur, suggesting that these rocky areas are essential habitats for the three species. However, the surface covered by this type of substrate within this MPA is limited. It appears that this MPA was effective to protect juveniles and sub-adults of *L. apodus*, as they mostly remained within the MPA. However, adult *L. apodus* were able to travel long distances outside the MPA and were therefore more vulnerable to fishing pressure occurring outside the MPA. Such movements are usually made by the largest individuals, which are the most important for population or stock replenishment (Birkeland & Dayton 2005). Indeed, we observed intensive fishing concentrated on the MPA boundaries and around the numerous rocky substrates of the unprotected area of Robert Bay (Fig. 1). We suggest that the MPA should include additional rocky substrate to improve its effectiveness. Even if the Robert MPA seems to be of adequate size to protect these species, we encourage an expansion of the MPA to include the entire bay, which will increase the quantity of protected rocky substrate. By protecting more of the habitats that are essential to commercially valuable species during different lifecycle stages, the Robert MPA can ensure better protection of these species, thus allowing them to reach maturity, which in turn will allow stock replenishment, increase fish abundance, and increase biomass. Moreover, the spillover of the largest individuals and mature individuals could further benefit fishermen and the local economy. The locations of spawning aggregation sites for *L. apodus* is currently unknown in Martinique. The identification of these sites should be a priority for future studies to determine whether any of these sites are protected under the current MPA design. In addition, the number of traps placed on the MPA boundaries should be restricted and controlled to encourage successful stock replenishment.

This study showed that MPAs established on degraded coral reef habitat could be effective to protect some species. Currently, marine coastal habitats are increasingly degraded by anthropogenic activities (Ban et al.

2010). Although the protection of healthy coral reefs should be a priority, the present study demonstrates that the protection of degraded habitat can also be effective within the context of degraded ecosystems.

In conclusion, the utilisation of multiple tools such as conventional external tagging and active and passive acoustic tracking provided complementary information on spatial and temporal patterns of fish movements. Small MPAs can be very useful to protect fish if they include the essential habitat used by coral reef fish. However, we revealed that some individuals were able to occasionally travel several kilometres outside the MPA; the silty habitats were not impassable natural barriers for these species. An understanding of the biological and environmental factors inducing these large movements is essential and should be a priority for improving MPA design and effectiveness.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Financial support for this study was provided by the Fondation d'entreprise TOTAL d' and the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes. We thank the Observatoire du Milieu Marin Martiniquais (OMMM) and the Institut Français de Recherche pour l'Exploitation de la Mer (IFREMER) for technical support. We are grateful to fishermen Pierre Pancarte and Rémy Surena. We thank Johann Mourier for his helpful comments to improve the manuscript and Romain Crec'hriou and Anne Tessier for assistance in the field. We are grateful to Gary Fowler and American Journal Experts for English language and manuscript revisions.

## REFERENCES

- Afonso P, Fontes J, Holland KN, Santos RS (2008) Social status determines behaviour and habitat usage in a temperate parrotfish: Implications for marine reserve design. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 359: 215–227
- Afonso P, Fontes J, Santos RS (2011) Small marine reserves can offer long term protection to an endangered fish. *Biol Conserv* 144: 2739–2744
- Amargós FP, Sansón GG, del Castillo AJ, Fernández AZ, Blanco FM, de la Red WA (2010) An experiment of fish spillover from a marine reserve in Cuba. *Environ Biol Fishes* 87: 363–372
- Ashworth JS, Ormond RFG (2005) Effects of fishing pressure and trophic group on abundance and spillover across boundaries of a no-take zone. *Biol Conserv* 121:333–344
- Ban N, Alidina H, Ardron J (2010). Cumulative impact mapping: advances, relevance and limitations to marine management and conservation, using Canada's Pacific waters as a case study. *Mar Policy* 34:876–86
- Birkeland C, Dayton PK (2005) The importance in fishery management of leaving the big ones. *Trends Ecol Evol* 20: 356–358
- Börger L, Dalziel BD, Fryxell JM (2008) Are there general mechanisms of animal home range behaviour? A review of prospects for future research. *Ecol Lett* 11: 637–650
- Bruggemann JH, van Kessel AM, van Rooij JM, Breeman AM (1996) Bioerosion and sediment ingestion by the Caribbean parrotfish *Scarus vetula* and *Sparisoma viride*: implications of fish size, feeding mode and habitat use. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 134:59–71
- Burt WH (1943) Territoriality and home range concepts as applied to mammals. *J Mammal* 24: 346–352
- Carlson JK, Ribera MM, Conrath CL, Heupel MR, Burgess GH (2010) Habitat use and movement patterns of bull sharks *Carcharhinus leucas* determined using pop-up satellite archival tags. *J Fish Biol* 77: 661–675.

477 Chapman MR, Kramer DL (2000) Movements of fishes within and among fringing coral reefs in Barbados.  
 478 Environ Biol Fishes 57: 11–24

479 Chateau O, Wantiez L (2008) Movement patterns of four coral reef species in a fragmented habitat in New  
 480 Caledonia: implications for the design of marine protected area networks. ICES J Mar Sci 66: 50–55

481 Choat JH, Robertson DR, Ackerman J.L, Posada JM (2003) An age-based demographic analysis of the  
 482 Caribbean stoplight parrotfish *Sparisoma viride*. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 246:265–277

483 Christie MR, Tissot BN, Albins MA, Beets JP, Jia Y, Ortiz DM, Thompson SE, Hixon MA (2010) Larval  
 484 connectivity in an effective network of marine protected areas. PLoS One 5: e15715

485 Claudet J, Osenberg CW, Benedetti-Cecchi L, Domenici P, García-Charton JA, Pérez-Ruzafa A, Badalamenti F,  
 486 Bayle-Sempere J, Brito A, Bulleri F, Culioli JM, Dimech M, Falcón JM, Guala I, Milazzo M, Sánchez-  
 487 Meca J, Somerfield PJ, Stobart B, Vandeperre F, Valle C, Planes S (2008) Marine reserves: Size and  
 488 age do matter. Ecol Lett 11:481–489

489 Colin PL (1992) Reproduction of the nassau grouper, *Epinephelus striatus* (Pisces: Serranidae) and it  
 490 relationship to environmental conditions. Environ Biol Fishes 34:357–377

491 Craig P (1996) Intertidal territoriality and time-budget of the surgeonfish, *Acanthurus lineatus*, in American  
 492 Samoa. Environ Biol Fishes 46: 27–36

493 Cudney-Bueno R, Lavín MF, Marinone SG, Raimondi PT, Shaw WW (2009) Rapid effects of marine reserves  
 494 via larval dispersal. PLoS One 4(1):e4140

495 dos Santos LN, Brotto DS, Zalmon IR (2010) Fish responses to increasing distance from artificial reefs on the  
 496 Southeastern Brazilian Coast. J Exp Mar Biol Ecol 386: 54–60

497 Eristhee N, Oxenford HA (2001) Home range size and use of space by Bermuda chub *Kyphosus sectatrix* (L.) in  
 498 two marine reserves in the Soufriere Marine Management Area, St Lucia, West Indies. J Fish Biol 59:  
 499 129–151

500 Fabrizio MC, Manderson JP, Pessutti JP (2014) Home range and seasonal movements of Black Sea Bass  
 501 (*Centropristis striata*) during their inshore residency at a reef in the mid-Atlantic Bight. Fish. Bull  
 502 112:82–97

503 Farmer NA, Ault JS (2011) Grouper and snapper movements and habitat use in Dry Tortugas, Florida. Mar Ecol  
 504 Prog Ser 433:169–184.

505 Garcia J, Saragoni G, Tessier A, Lenfant P (2010) Herbivorous Reef Fish Movement Ability Estimation in  
 506 Marine Protected Areas of Martinique (FWI). Proc Gulf Carib Fish Inst 63: 254–259

507 Green AL, Fernandes L, Almany G, Abesamis R, McLeod E, Aliño PM, White AT, Salm R, Tanzer J,  
 508 Pressey RL. 2014. Designing marine reserves for fisheries management, biodiversity conservation and  
 509 climate change adaptation. Coastal Management 42:143–159

510 Halpern BS (2003) The impact of marine reserves: do reserves work and does reserve size matter? Ecol Appl 13:  
 511 117–137

512 Halpern BS, Warner RR (2003) Matching marine reserve design to reserve objectives. Proc R Soc Lond B Biol  
 513 270:1871–1878

514 Hammerschlag N, Heithaus MR, Serafy JE (2010) Influence of predation risk and food supply on nocturnal fish  
 515 foraging distributions along a mangrove-seagrass ecotone. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 414: 223–235

516 Hawkins JP, Roberts CM. (2004) Effects of artisanal fishing on Caribbean coral reefs. Conserv Biol

517 18:215–226.

518 Heupel MR, Simpfendorfer CA, Hueter RE (2003) Running before the storm: Blacktip sharks respond to falling  
519 barometric pressure associated with Tropical Storm Gabrielle. *J Fish Biol* 63: 1357–1363

520 Heupel MR, Semmens JM, Hobday AJ (2006) Automated acoustic tracking of aquatic animals: Scales, design  
521 and deployment of listening station arrays. *Mar Fresh Res* 57: 1–13

522 Hitt S, Pittman SJ, Nemeth RS (2011a) Diel movements of fishes linked to benthic seascape structure in a  
523 caribbean coral reef ecosystem. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 427: 275–291

524 Hitt S, Pittman SJ, Brown KA (2011b) Tracking and mapping sun-synchronous migrations and diel  
525 space use patterns of *Haemulon sciurus* and *Lutjanus apodus* in the US Virgin Islands. *Environmental*  
526 *biology of fishes* 92:525–538

527 Holland KN, Lowe CG, Wetherbee BM (1996) Movements and dispersal patterns of blue trevally (*Caranx*  
528 *melampygus*) in a fisheries conservation zone. *Fish Res* 25:279–292

529 Hooge P, Eichenlaub E (1997) Animal movements extension to Arcview. Alaska Biological Center, US  
530 Geological Survey, Anchorage, Alaska

531 Humann P, DeLoach N (2002) Reef coral identification, Florida Caribbean Bahamas. New World, Jacksonville,  
532 FL

533 Iles TD, Sinclair M (1982) Atlantic herring: stock discreteness and abundance. *Science* 215:627–632

534 Kawabata Y, Okuyama J, Asami K, Okuzawa K, Yoseda K, Arai N (2010) Effects of a tropical cyclone on the  
535 distribution of hatchery-reared black-spot tuskfish *Choerodon schoenleinii* determined by acoustic  
536 telemetry. *J Fish Biol* 77: 627–642

537 Kernohan BJ, Gitzen RA, Millspaugh JJ (2001) Analysis of animal space use and movements. In: Millspaugh JJ  
538 MJ (ed) *Radio tracking of animal populations* Academic Press, San Diego, CA, pp 126–168

539 Kohler NE, Turner PA (2001) Shark tagging: a review of conventional methods and studies. *Environ Biol*  
540 *Fish* 60:191–223

541 Legrand H, Lenfant P, Sotheran IS, Foster-Smith RL, Galzin R, Maréchal JP (2012) Mapping marine benthic  
542 habitats in Martinique (French West Indies). *Caribb J Sci* 46: 1–16

543 Luo J, Serafy JE, Sponaugle S, Teare PB, Kieckbusch D (2009) Movement of gray snapper *Lutjanus griseus*  
544 among subtropical seagrass, mangrove, and coral reef habitats. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 380:255–269

545 Meyer CG, Papastamatiou YP, Clark TB (2010) Differential movement patterns and site fidelity among trophic  
546 groups of reef fishes in a Hawaiian marine protected area. *Mar Biol* 157:1499–1511

547 Morgan IE, Kramer DL (2004) The social organization of adult blue tangs, *Acanthurus coeruleus*, on a fringing  
548 reef, Barbados, West Indies. *Environ Biol Fishes* 71:261–273

549 Munro JL (1983) Caribbean Coral Reef Fishery Resources. In: I.C.L.A.R.M (ed)

550 Nagelkerken I, van der Velde G, Gorissen MW, Meijer GJ, van't Hof T, den Hartog C (2000) Importance of  
551 mangroves, seagrass beds and the shallow coral reef as a nursery for important coral reef fishes, using a  
552 visual census technique. *Estuar Coast Shelf Sci* 51:31–44

553 Nagelkerken I, Roberts CM, van der Velde G, Dorenbosch M, van Riel MC, de la Morinere EC, Nienhuis PH  
554 (2002) How important are mangroves and seagrass beds for coral-reef fish? The nursery hypothesis  
555 tested on an island scale. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 244:299–305

556 O'Toole AC, Danylchuk AJ, Goldberg TL, Suski CD, Philipp DP, Brooks E, Cooke SJ (2011) Spatial ecology

557 and residency patterns of adult great barracuda (*Sphyraena barracuda*) in coastal waters of The  
558 Bahamas. Mar Biol 158:2227–2237

559 Polunin NVC, Roberts CM (1993) Greater biomass and value of target coral-reef fishes in two small Caribbean  
560 marine reserves. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 100:167–176

561 Powell RA (2000) Animal home ranges, territories and home range estimators. In: Boitani L, Fuller TK (ed)  
562 Research techniques in animal ecology: controversies and consequences. Columbia University Press,  
563 New York, pp 65–103

564 Robertson DR, Hoffman SG (1977) The roles of female mate choice and predation in the mating systems of  
565 some tropical Labroid fishes. Z Tierpsychol 45:298–320

566 Rocha LA, Choat JH, Clements KD, Russell B, Myers R, Lazuardi ME, Muljadi A, Pardede S, Rahardjo P  
567 (2012) *Sparisoma viride*. In: IUCN 2013. IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2013.2.  
568 <www.iucnredlist.org>.

569 Rousseau Y, Galzin R, Marechal JP (2010) Impact of hurricane Dean on coral reef benthic and fish structure of  
570 Martinique, French West Indies. Cybium 34: 243–256.

571 Russ GR, Alcala AC, Maypa AP (2003) Spillover from marine reserves: the case of *Naso vlamingii* at  
572 Apo Island, the Philippines. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 264: 15–20

573 Schoener TW (1981). An empirically based estimate of home range. Theoretical Population Biology, 20: 281–  
574 325.

575 Seaman DE, Powell RA (1996) An evaluation of the accuracy of kernel density estimators for home range  
576 analysis. Ecology 77: 2075–2085

577 Shanks AL, Grantham BA, Carr MH (2003) Propagule dispersal distance and the size and spacing of marine  
578 reserves. Ecol Appl 13: S159–S169

579 Sinclair M, Iles TD (1988) Population richness of marine fish species. Aquat Living Resour 1:71–83

580 Sinclair M, Iles TD (1989) Population regulation and speciation in the ocean. J Cons int Explor Mer 45:165–175.

581 Spencer SR, Cameron GN, Swihart RK (1990) Operationally defining home range: temporal dependence  
582 exhibited by hispid cotton rats. Ecology 71: 1817–1822

583 Topping DT, Szedlmayer ST (2011) Home range and movement patterns of red snapper (*Lutjanus campechanus*)  
584 on artificial reefs. Fish Res 112:77–84

585 Vallès H, Oxenford, HA (2014) Parrotfish Size: A Simple yet Useful Alternative Indicator of Fishing Effects  
586 on Caribbean Reefs? PloS one 9: e86291.

587 van Rooij JM, Kroon FJ, Videler JJ (1996) The social and mating system of the herbivorous reef fish *Sparisoma*  
588 *viride*: one-male versus multi-male groups. Environ Biol Fishes 47:353–378

589 Wainwright PC, Bellwood DR, Westneat MW (2002) Ecomorphology of locomotion in labrid fishes. Environ  
590 Biol Fishes 65:47–62

591 Wang M, Grimm V (2007) Home range dynamics and population regulation: an individual-based model of  
592 the common shrew *Sorex araneus*. Ecol Modell 205: 397–409


593 Wetherbee BM, Holland KN, Meyer CG, Lowe CG (2004) Use of a marine reserve in Kaneohe Bay, Hawaii by  
594 the giant trevally, *Caranx ignobilis*. Fish Res 67: 253–263. doi: 10.1016/j.fishres.2003.11.004

595 Winter J (1996) Advances in underwater biotelemetry. In: Murphy BR, Willis DW (eds). Fisheries Techniques,  
596 2nd ed., Amer. Fish. Soc, Bethesda., pp 555–590




597 Worton BJ (1989) Kernel Methods for Estimating the Utilization Distribution in Home-Range Studies. *Ecology*  
598 70: 164–168  
599 Zeller DC, Stoute SL, Russ GR (2003) Movements of reef fishes across marine reserve boundaries: effects of  
600 manipulating a density gradient. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 254: 269–280  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630

## FIGURES




**Fig. 1** Location of the Robert marine protected area ((left of the red line) in Robert Bay (dotted line), Martinique. Locations of the 25 acoustic receivers in Robert Bay (Point: receiver location; Circle: detection range).

648  
649  
650  
651  
652




653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659


**Fig. 2** Locations of multiple captures and recaptures for *L. apodus* and *S. viride* tagged with T-bar tags. Only individuals with multiple recapture spacing of a minimum of 50 metres are presented. The blue Xs are the locations of all captures, and dark crosses are the sites of recapture for each individual. Numbers correspond to recapture chronology.




**Fig. 3** Locations of the longest observed movements covered by 7 *Acanthurus chirurgus* (▲) and 1 *Lutjanus apodus* (★) obtained using T-bar tags. Different colours represent individual fish.



**Fig. 4** Location and size of the home range relocation (MCP and KUD<sup>95%</sup>) and core area (KUD<sup>50%</sup>) of seven *L. apodus*, three *S. viride* and two *A. chirurgus*. The capture and release location of each individual is represented by (x) on each individual home range map. Individuals #257 and #258 were captured in the same location outside the map, indicated by the cross on the Robert Bay map on the top, left-hand side.



**Fig. 5** Map of the numbers of detections per month over the number of days of deployment for each receiver (each receiver was deployed during different periods) for *L. apodus*, *A. chirurgus*, and *S. viride* (males and females) in Robert Bay. Circle size is proportional to the number of detections per month per number of days of deployed that were recorded on each receiver. The dark line represents the border of the MPA (Marine Protected Area).



**Fig. 6** Residency patterns of *L. apodus* and *S. viride* inside the Marine Protected Area (MPA) (grey bar) and outside the MPA (red bar). Each bar begins on the day of release (dark diamond) and ends on the day of the last detection recorded on VR2Ws. Full bars represent continuous detections recorded by the VR2Ws. Dark triangles represent the predicted date of transmitter battery depletion. The double-headed arrows represent the reproduction period (=spawning season) for each species.

## TABLES

**Table 1** Summary results of mark-recapture with external tags. The numbers of tagged and recaptured fish, the percentages of recapture, and the mean and minimum distance between sites of release and recapture of each species are presented.

Species	Fork length (cm)		Mass (g)		Number tagged-recaptured	Per cent recaptured (%)	Mean distance covered (m)	Range of distance (m)
	Mean	Range	Mean	Range				
<i>Acanthurus chirurgus</i>	15.8	10.0-23.5	90	40-260	673/38	<b>5.6</b>	778(±1446)	5-4992
<i>Lutjanus apodus</i>	22.1	15.0-34.0	188	80-640	131/35	<b>26.7</b>	671(±1594)	22-9701
<i>Sparisoma viride</i>	20.9	13.5-28.5	166	60-360	217/36	<b>16.6</b>	129(±139)	5-455

**Table 2** Summary of the home range relocations (MCP: Minimum convex polygon, KUD: kernel utilisation distributions) for the seven *L. apodus*, two *A. chirurgus*, and three *S. viride* individuals. The percentage of days detected is (Number of days detected)/ (Number of monitoring days) × 100. p is the proportion of Monte Carlo simulated movement paths with higher MSD (mean squared distance) values than the observed data. MSD is the mean squared distance from the centre of activity. ND: Not determined.

ID tag	Species	Sex	Fork length (cm)	Release date	Period of monitoring (days)	Percentage of days detected	Home range relocation			MSD (±SD) (m <sup>2</sup> )	Site fidelity (p)
							MCP	KUD <sup>50</sup>	KUD <sup>95</sup>		
							(10 <sup>3</sup> m <sup>2</sup> )	(10 <sup>3</sup> m <sup>2</sup> )	(10 <sup>3</sup> m <sup>2</sup> )		
#306	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	25	27/04/2010	11	72.7	3.1	2.8	17.2	6.6(±3.03)	0.049
#312	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	20.5	22/03/2010	13	23	0.28	1.3	6.3	58.2(±0.01)	0.001
#270	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	22.5	16/03/2010	13	69.2	14.6	2.3	19.4	15.7(±8.1)	0.01
#258	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	22	10/11/2009	15	60	4.9	3.5	21.7	9.3(±3.03)	0.01
#276	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	23.5	25/02/2010	15	40	15.6	12.3	54.5	0.78(±0.23)	0.001
#5257	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	24	10/11/2009	15	40	49.7	56	324.1	217.3(±63.37)	0.001
#346	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	22	27/04/2010	11	90.9	22.5	3.6	24.9	23(±9.99)	0.01
#338	<i>A. chirurgus</i>	ND	16	22/03/2010	13	30.7	5.2	3.4	24.1	14.4(±0.71)	0.01
#334	<i>A. chirurgus</i>	ND	16	29/03/2010	11	45.5	9.4	5.9	31.9	25.5(±1.2)	0.01
#153	<i>S. viride</i>	Male	24	30/06/2010	5	60	0.9	6.6	19.8	5.3(±0.009)	0.01
#158	<i>S. viride</i>	Male	17.5	30/06/2010	5	80	7.5	17.7	44	4.7(±0.01)	0.89
#297	<i>S. viride</i>	Male	22.5	16/03/2010	13	30.8	1.2	0.5	3.8	2.1(±0.088)	0.01



**Table 3** Summary data and residency index (%) for *L. apodus* (n=17) and *S. viride* (n=12) obtained by passive acoustic telemetry for each zone (inside and outside the MPA). The results presented in this table are restricted to the fish detected on at least 15 consecutive days. The number of days in the array is the number of days between the release and the last detection of the individual. ND : Not determined.

ID tag	Species	Sex	Fork length (cm)	Tag date	Number of days in array	Residency index (I <sub>R</sub> %)	
						In MPA	Out MPA
#5265	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	22.5	17/06/2010	295	100	0
#265	<i>L. apodus</i>	Male	26	03/12/2009	23	95.7	4.3
#260	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	23	23/06/2010	130	99.2	0.8
#270	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	22.5	16/03/2010	405	100	0
#257	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	24	22/03/2010	202	99.5	0.5
#336	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	19	29/03/2010	89	93.1	6.9
#176	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	20	26/04/2010	208	100	0
#154	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	23.5	26/04/2010	131	99.2	0.8
#308	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	19.5	27/04/2010	402	100	0
#160	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	19	19/04/2011	19	94.7	5.3
#167	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	19.5	26/04/2011	208	100	0
#169	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	18.5	26/04/2011	208	100	0
#171	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	22.5	09/05/2011	29	100	0
#163	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	23.5	09/05/2011	122	100	0
#162	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	23.5	09/05/2011	195	100	0
#170	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	23	09/05/2011	40	97.5	2.5
#164	<i>L. apodus</i>	ND	26.5	09/05/2011	142	99.3	0.7
#158	<i>S. viride</i>	Male	17.5	30/06/2010	279	100	0
#142	<i>S. viride</i>	Male	25	19/04/2011	15	100	0
#144	<i>S. viride</i>	Male	20.5	19/04/2011	208	100	0
#150	<i>S. viride</i>	Male	19	19/04/2011	174	78.2	21.8
#152	<i>S. viride</i>	Male	23.5	19/04/2011	75	100	0
#165	<i>S. viride</i>	Male	22.5	19/04/2011	65	100	0
#174	<i>S. viride</i>	Male	27	26/04/2011	128	100	0
#178	<i>S. viride</i>	Male	21	19/04/2011	211	100	0
#146	<i>S. viride</i>	Female	19	19/04/2011	155	100	0
#151	<i>S. viride</i>	Female	21.5	19/04/2011	211	100	0
#173	<i>S. viride</i>	Female	18	03/05/2011	194	100	0
#180	<i>S. viride</i>	Female	21	19/04/2011	137	100	0