PRIFYSGOL
BANGOR
U N I V E R S I T Y

Patterns in reef fish assesmblages

Samoilys, Melita; Roche, Ronan; Koldewey, Heather ; Turner, John

PLoS ONE

PLOS ONE

Patterns in reef fish assemblages: insights from the Chagos Archipelago
--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	PONE-D-17-23507R2
Article Type:	Research Article
Full Title:	Patterns in reef fish assemblages: insights from the Chagos Archipelago
Short Title:	Reef fish assemblages in the Chagos Archipelago
Corresponding Author:	Melita Samoilys CORDIO East Africa Nairobi, KENYA
Keywords:	coral reef; reef fish; reef benthic composition; fish functional groups
Abstract:	Understanding the drivers of variability in the composition of fish assemblages across the Indo-Pacific region is crucial to support coral reef ecosystem resilience. Whilst numerous relationships and feedback mechanisms between the functional roles of coral reef fishes and reef benthic composition have been investigated, certain key groups, such as the herbivores, are widely suggested to maintain reefs in a coral-dominated state. Examining links between fishes and reef benthos is complicated by the interactions between natural processes, disturbance events and anthropogenic impacts, particularly fishing pressure. This study examined fish assemblages and associated benthic variables across five atolls within the Chagos Archipelago, where fishing pressure is largely absent, to better understand these relationships. We found high variability in fish assemblages among atolls and sites across the archipelago, especially for key groups such as a suite of grazer-detritivore surgeonfish, and the parrotfishes which varied in density over 40-fold between sites. Differences in fish assemblages were significantly associated with variable levels of both live and recently dead coral cover and rugosity. We suggest these results reflect differing coral recovery trajectories following coral bleaching events and a strong influence of 'bottom-up' control mechanisms on fish assemblages. Species level analyses revealed that Scarus niger, Acanthurus nigrofuscus and Chlororus strongylocephalos were key species driving differences in fish assemblage structure. Clarifying the trophic roles of herbivorous and detritivorous reef fishes will require species-level studies, which also examine feeding behaviour, to fully understand their contribution in maintaining reef resilience to climate change and fishing impacts.
Order of Authors:	Melita Samoilys
	Ronan Roche
	Heather Koldewey
	John Turner
Opposed Reviewers:	
Response to Reviewers:	Please see attached document: response to reviewers
Additional Information:	
Question	**Response**
Financial Disclosure Please describe all sources of funding that have supported your work. **This information is required for submission and will be published with your article, should it be accepted.** A complete funding statement should do the following:	

Include **grant numbers and the URLs** of any funder's website. Use the full name, not acronyms, of funding institutions, and use initials to identify authors who received the funding. **Describe the role** of any sponsors or funders in the study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. If the funders had **no role** in any of the above, include this sentence at the end of your statement: "*The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.*" However, if the study was **unfunded**, please provide a statement that clearly indicates this, for example: "*The author(s) received no specific funding for this work.*" * typeset	https://www.fondation-bertarelli.org The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.
Competing Interests You are responsible for recognizing and disclosing on behalf of all authors any competing interest that could be perceived to bias their work, acknowledging all financial support and any other relevant financial or non-financial competing interests. Do any authors of this manuscript have competing interests (as described in the PLOS Policy on Declaration and Evaluation of Competing Interests)? **If yes**, please provide details about any and all competing interests in the box below. Your response should begin with this statement: *I have read the journal's policy and the authors of this manuscript have the following competing interests:* **If no** authors have any competing interests to declare, please enter this statement in the box: "*The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.*" * typeset	The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

Ethics Statement

You must provide an ethics statement if your study involved human participants, specimens or tissue samples, or vertebrate animals, embryos or tissues. All information entered here should **also be included in the Methods section** of your manuscript. Please write "N/A" if your study does not require an ethics statement.

Human Subject Research (involved human participants and/or tissue)

All research involving human participants must have been approved by the authors' Institutional Review Board (IRB) or an equivalent committee, and all clinical investigation must have been conducted according to the principles expressed in the Declaration of Helsinki. Informed consent, written or oral, should also have been obtained from the participants. If no consent was given, the reason must be explained (e.g. the data were analyzed anonymously) and reported. The form of consent (written/oral), or reason for lack of consent, should be indicated in the Methods section of your manuscript.

Please enter the name of the IRB or Ethics Committee that approved this study in the space below. Include the approval number and/or a statement indicating approval of this research.

Animal Research (involved vertebrate animals, embryos or tissues)

All animal work must have been conducted according to relevant national and international guidelines. If your study involved non-human primates, you must provide details regarding animal welfare and steps taken to ameliorate suffering; this is in accordance with the recommendations of the Weatherall report, "The use of non-human primates in research." The relevant guidelines followed and the committee that approved the study should be identified in the ethics statement.

If anesthesia, euthanasia or any kind of

The British Indian Ocean Territory Administration Section of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, UK Government, granted the research permit to the Darwin Initiative 2014 Expedition to work within the whole Territory. Permission was granted to all authors to visit and dive in the strict nature reserves of the Chagos Archipelago Marine Park.

animal sacrifice is part of the study, please include briefly in your statement which substances and/or methods were applied. Please enter the name of your Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) or other relevant ethics board, and indicate whether they approved this research or granted a formal waiver of ethical approval. Also include an approval number if one was obtained. **Field Permit** Please indicate the name of the institution or the relevant body that granted permission.	
Data Availability PLOS journals require authors to make all data underlying the findings described in their manuscript fully available, without restriction and from the time of publication, with only rare exceptions to address legal and ethical concerns (see the PLOS Data Policy and FAQ for further details). When submitting a manuscript, authors must provide a Data Availability Statement that describes where the data underlying their manuscript can be found. Your answers to the following constitute your statement about data availability and will be included with the article in the event of publication. **Please note that simply stating 'data available on request from the author' is not acceptable.** *If, however, your data are only available upon request from the author(s), you must answer "No" to the first question below, and explain your exceptional situation in the text box provided.* Do the authors confirm that all data underlying the findings described in their manuscript are fully available without restriction?	Yes - all data are fully available without restriction
Please describe where your data may be found, writing in full sentences. **Your answers should be entered into the box below and will be published in the form you provide them, if your manuscript is accepted.** If you are copying our sample text below, please ensure you replace any instances of XXX with the appropriate details.	All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting Information files.

If your data are all contained within the paper and/or Supporting Information files, please state this in your answer below. For example, "All relevant data are within the paper and its Supporting Information files."

If your data are held or will be held in a public repository, include URLs, accession numbers or DOIs. For example, "All XXX files are available from the XXX database (accession number(s) XXX, XXX)." If this information will only be available after acceptance, please indicate this by ticking the box below.

If neither of these applies but you are able to provide details of access elsewhere, with or without limitations, please do so in the box below. For example:

"Data are available from the XXX Institutional Data Access / Ethics Committee for researchers who meet the criteria for access to confidential data."

"Data are from the XXX study whose authors may be contacted at XXX."

* typeset

Additional data availability information:

CORDIO
East Africa

**coastal oceans research and
development
indian ocean**

P.O. Box 24562,
Nairobi 00502, Kenya
Mobile : +254
721498713/+447393622355
Email:
melita.samoilys@gmail.com
www.cordioea.net

14th November 2017

Dr Heather Patterson
Scientific Editor,
PLOS ONE

Dear Dr Patterson

Thank you for the second review of our paper: *Patterns in reef fish assemblages: insights from the Chagos Archipelago*.

We have addressed the comments from the two reviewers and your editorial comments in the revised manuscript. In making our revisions we have addressed your concerns that the conclusions of the study are overstated, there is a general lack of clarity in the paper and the points raised can be dealt with in a re-write, particularly in the Discussion. We also provide a response to each comment raised by the reviewers in the two tables appended below.

We trust that the manuscript now meets Plos One's publication criteria.

Yours sincerely

Dr Melita Samoilys
Director

1   **Patterns in reef fish assemblages: insights from the Chagos Archipelago**

2

3   Melita Samoilys[1,2] Ronan Roche[3], Heather Koldewey[4,5], John Turner[3]

4

5   [1.] CORDIO East Africa, PO Box 24562, Nairobi 00502, Kenya

6   [2.] Zoology Department, University of Oxford, Oxford OX1 3PS, UK

7   [3.] School of Ocean Sciences, Bangor University LL59 5AB, UK

8   [4.] Conservation Programmes, Zoological Society of London, Regents Park, London NW1

9   4RY, UK

10   [5.] Centre for Ecology & Conservation, University of Exeter Cornwall Campus, Penryn,

11   Cornwall, TR10 9FE, UK

12

13

14   **Abstract**

15   Understanding the drivers of variability in the composition of fish assemblages across the

16   Indo-Pacific region is crucial to support coral reef ecosystem resilience. Whilst numerous

17   relationships and feedback mechanisms between the functional roles of coral reef fishes

18   and reef benthic composition have been investigated, certain key groups, such as the

19   herbivores, are widely suggested to maintain reefs in a coral-dominated state. Examining

20   links between fishes and reef benthos is complicated by the interactions between natural

21   processes, disturbance events and anthropogenic impacts, particularly fishing pressure.

22   This study examined fish assemblages and associated benthic variables across five atolls

23   within the Chagos Archipelago, where fishing pressure is largely absent, to better

24   understand these relationships. We found high variability in fish assemblages among atolls

25   and sites across the archipelago, especially for key groups such as a suite of grazer-

26 detritivore surgeonfish, and the parrotfishes which varied in density over 40-fold between

27 sites. Differences in fish assemblages were significantly associated with variable levels of

28 both live and recently dead coral cover and rugosity. We suggest these results reflect

29 differing coral recovery trajectories following coral bleaching events and a strong

30 influence of 'bottom-up' control mechanisms on fish assemblages. Species level analyses

31 revealed that *Scarus niger*, *Acanthurus nigrofuscus* and *Chlororus strongylocephalos* were

32 key species driving differences in fish assemblage structure. Clarifying the trophic roles of

33 herbivorous and detritivorous reef fishes will require species-level studies, which also

34 examine feeding behaviour, to fully understand their contribution in maintaining reef

35 resilience to climate change and fishing impacts.

36

37 **Introduction**

38

39 Coral reefs are complex and highly biodiverse systems that are subject to a broad range of

40 natural and anthropogenic factors, operating from local to global scales, which drive or

41 impact reef fish population abundance and assemblage structure [1–4]. Reef degradation

42 from fishing pressure and climate-change induced coral bleaching and mortality have been

43 invoked to explain patterns in the structure of coral reef fish assemblages across multiple

44 scales in the Indo-Pacific [5–7]. Other studies point to scale dependence in drivers of fish

45 assemblages with geomorphology and biogeography, for example, playing a significant

46 role at larger regional scales, and fishing and reef benthic structure operating at local

47 scales [8–10]. Understanding the mechanisms by which these drivers interact and their

48 relative contributions to controlling reef fish assemblages is critical in underpinning

49 conservation planning and effective reef fisheries management.

50

51 One of the dominant paradigms used to explain impacts from the external stressors of

52 climate change and fishing on coral reefs and their fish assemblages revolves around

53 potential shifts from coral to algal-dominated reef states [11,12]. Herbivorous fishes have

54 been shown to play a leading role in preventing this shift by controlling algal abundance

55 [2,13]. The regulatory pathways involve both resource (bottom-up) and predation (top-

56 down) control of the reef ecosystem. Changes in coral cover represent bottom-up control

57 while top-down control is seen when herbivores are depleted through fishing activities,

58 which can lead to their functional role becoming compromised [4,14]. Coral reef fish

59 assemblages are known to vary in relation to several environmental characteristics such as

60 exposure to oceanic conditions, rugosity, depth, benthic composition and recent coral

61 mortality [8–10,15–18]. Bottom-up control of reef fish populations by reef benthic

62 composition has been well established [10,15,18–20], and long term studies in the

63 Philippines, for example, have shown that this pathway is the primary driver of the

64 herbivorous parrotfishes [21]. Thus, top-down and bottom-up pathways can either

65 dominate or co-occur, depending on the characteristics within the coral reef ecosystem.

66

67 From a management perspective, it is important to be able to attribute the relative

68 contribution of casual factors driving the structure of reef fish assemblages. The objective

69 of this study was to determine which of a range of largely biotic factors may be driving

70 the structure of reef fish assemblages in the absence of fishing. Our hypothesis was that

71 without the top-down influence of fishing in the Chagos Archipelago the fish assemblages

72 should reflect the relative contribution of natural drivers, both bottom up (e.g. food

73 availability) and top-down (e.g. predation), of fish populations, and one anthropogenic

74 stressor – coral mortality related to bleaching events. We also sought to describe the

75 characteristic reef fish assemblages of the atolls of the Chagos Archipelago to build on

76 earlier work that examined fish responses to declines in coral cover caused by the coral

77 bleaching event of 1998 [22] and found little change in reef fish species richness except in

78 corallivores [23]. We also examined the abundance and biomass of reef fishes from the

79 full range of trophic groups to test for relationships between trophic group and reef

80 benthic composition and so examine the functional roles of fish species in reef resilience.

81

82 The Chagos Archipelago (British Indian Ocean Territory) is an isolated archipelago of

83 atolls spanning ~60,000 km^2 and 2 degrees of latitude on the north eastern border of the

84 western Indian Ocean Province [24–26], with an area of ~9,400 km^2 of shallow coral reefs

85 (<40m depth) [27]. The islands are uninhabited except for the southern-most atoll, Diego

86 Garcia, which is classified as a Permanent Joint Operating Base of the UK and US

87 governments and hosts a US naval support facility. The archipelago, with the exception of

88 Diego Garcia where a recreational fishery is permitted, was declared a no-take marine

89 protected area (MPA) in 2010 by the UK Government [26]. Indeed, reef fish biomass in

90 the Chagos Archipelago is demonstrably one of the highest of any coral reef ecosystem in

91 the Indo-Pacific [23]. The Chagos Archipelago therefore provides an ideal location for

92 investigating the relationship between fish assemblages and variability in reef benthic

93 habitat and typology, in the absence of impacts from fishing and human populations. Our

94 study assumed that reef fish species distributions did not differ biogeographically across

95 the Chagos Archipelago due to the direction of major current systems in the western

96 Indian Ocean (WIO), and the connectivity of the pelagic larvae of most reef fish [13–16].

97 We do, however, recognise that self recruitment [32] and local oceanographic dynamics

98 [33] within and among atolls of the archipelago may affect larval recruitment patterns. An

99 earlier study reported that reef fish assemblages were highly homogeneous across the

100 northern atolls [28]. Here we use datasets from a range of atolls in the archipelago, from

101 the northernmost atolls to Diego Garcia in the south, to examine variation in the

102 abundance and species structure of fish assemblages, and to identify drivers of this

103 variability.

104

105 By confining this study to an isolated archipelago of reefs that are relatively unfished and

106 free of pollution and development, this study contributes to a better understanding of

107 intact Indian Ocean reef fish assemblages. As such, it provides a regional context for

108 interpreting coral reef fish assemblages in the wider Indian Ocean where anthropogenic

109 impacts are more prevalent.

110

111 **Methods**

112

113 *Study sites*

114

115 We surveyed reef fish assemblages and coral reef benthic assemblages in March 2014 at a

116 total of 13 (fish) and 11 (benthic) sites across 5 atolls in the Chagos Archipelago (decimal

117 minutes: 05.237333 S 71.81498 E to 07.26195 S 72.44333 E, Fig 1, Table S1). Locations

118 included the fully submerged Blenheim Reef atoll, reefs fringing islands on the west side

119 of the Great Chagos Bank (GCB) and the large, well formed Peros Banhos and Salomon

120 atolls. Reef types were defined based on the Andrefoute et al. [34] classification of coral

121 reefs and included forereefs and terraces on the outside of the atolls and pinnacles and

122 inner slopes in the atoll lagoons (Table S1). These were categorised as exposed (outside

123 atolls) or protected (inside lagoons) from oceanic seas. The British Indian Ocean Territory

124 Administration Section of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, UK Government,

125 granted the research permit to the Darwin Initiative 2014 Expedition to work within

126   the whole Territory. Permission was granted to all authors to visit and dive in the strict

127   nature reserves of the Chagos Archipelago Marine Park.

128

129   **Fig. 1.** Map of the Chagos Archipelago showing atolls surveyed and locations of dive

130   survey sites.

131

132   *Benthic surveys*

133

134   Underwater video transects were recorded using a Sony HDRCX550 camera in a Light

135   and Motion Bluefin housing with Fathom 90 wide angle port and red filter, onto which red

136   lasers with a spacing of 10 cm were mounted to provide scale. Surveys were conducted at

137   each site which ranged in depth from 5–25m. The video aimed for a constant speed (~0.1

138   m s^{-1}), with 10 min within each of four depth zones (25–20 m, 20–15 m, 15–10 m, 10–5

139   m) approximately 1 m above the substrate [32]. Percentage cover of all hard coral and

140   *Acropora* spp. alone, dead coral (defined as recently dead coral skeleton with intact

141   corallite structure), soft coral, crustose coralline algae (CCA), fleshy macroalgae, turf

142   algae, rubble and sand were assessed by randomly selecting 20 video frames from each

143   depth range, and recording what lay beneath 15 randomly selected points per frame, for a

144   total of 300 points per transect, assigned using Coral Point Count software [36]. The

145   rugosity of the reef along each transect was estimated visually using a six point scale

146   following Polunin and Roberts [37], ranging from no vertical structural complexity to

147   highly-developed reefs with large coral colonies, caves and crevasses.

148

149   *Fish surveys*

150

151   All fish species from 13 pre-selected families that span the full range of trophic groups,

152   from piscivores to detritivores (see Table S2) were counted in 50 x 5 m transects. Two

153   dives were conducted at each site, each approximately 300 m along the reef edge, in which

154   2–3 transects were run parallel to the reef edge (5–6 replicate transects in total per site).

155   Transects spanned the depth range of the reefs (3m - 26m), with the maximum imposed by

156   dive safety regulations. Fish counts at each site therefore had broad depth ranges, from a

157   minimum of 4m to a maximum of 18m ($\bar{x}$ = 10.2m across 13 sites), depending on the reef

158   profile. This design was used to maximise survey coverage of the fish assemblage on the

159   reef. These corresponded to the dive sites at which the benthic video transects were

160   placed; both methods spanned the same depth range at each site. Siganids (rabbitfishes)

161   were not observed at all and therefore a total of 12 families were counted (Table S2). The

162   density and size classes of species were estimated using standard underwater visual census

163   (UVC) techniques for coral reef fishes [38,39]. The size of all species >5 cm total length

164   (TL) were estimated in 5 cm size classes (e.g. 6–10 cm TL, 11–15 cm TL, 16–20 cm TL

165   etc), to obtain biomass values based on published length–weight relationships [40–42].

166   Biomass was calculated as a derived variable for the fish assemblage because it is a good

167   indicator of energy flow within the coral reef ecosystem. A fixed size category for the

168   smallest species was used because: simplifying counting procedures across a wide range

169   of species improves accuracy [39,43]; any differences in biomass in these small species

170   between sites will be smaller than the 5 cm size class accuracy used; and to enable these

171   small species to be included in total biomass calculations. Fixed size classes were as

172   follows: i) all Chaetontidae species were assigned a length size class of 6–10 cm, with the

173   exception of *C. xanthocephalos*, *C. lineolatus* and *Heniochus* spp. which were recorded as

174   11–15 cm; ii) small acanthurids, *Ctenochaetus* spp*., Acanthurus nigrofuscus, A.*

175   *leucosternon* and *Zebrasoma scopas,* were assigned a length size class of 11–15 cm; iii)

176   *Centropyge* spp. (Pomacanthidae) –were assigned a length size class of 6–10 cm. A total

177   of 110 species were identified and assigned to 12 functional trophic groups (piscivores,

178   omnivores, corallivores, invertivores, planktivores, detritivores, grazer-detritivores and 5

179   herbivore categories, *sensu* Green and Bellwood [44] using a classification system for the

180   WIO [45] (Table S2).

181

182   *Data Analyses*

183

184   For analyses, the data were organised into a series of matrices: i) fish species numerical

185   density and biomass (13 sites); ii) fish functional group numerical density and biomass (13

186   sites); iii) benthic habitat variables (11 sites) that were natural log-transformed and

187   standardised (11 variables).

188

189   <u>Fish assemblages</u>

190   Spatial autocorrelation in fish assemblages across the Chagos Archipelago was tested by

191   implementing a Mantel test using the ade4 package [46] in R [47] on a matrix of

192   geographic distances between sampling sites and a dissimilarity matrix based on fish

193   density computed using the Bray-Curtis index. The Mantel statistic was further calculated

194   within Peros Banhos, GCB and Salomon atolls, to test for a relationship with geographic

195   distance between sites within atolls. Correlations between both numerical density and

196   biomass matrices were tested for significance using 9999 permutations.

197

198   In order to visualise variation in the composition of fish assemblages across the

199   archipelago, we used non-metric multidimensional scaling (nMDS) on Bray-Curtis

200   dissimilarity distance measures obtained from fish data matrices of both abundance and

201   biomass. To determine which of the fish trophic groups were significantly related to the

202   ordination, we carried out random permutation testing using 9999 permutations. To

203   further examine for groupings within the fish assemblage data, a Ward cluster analysis

204   based on Euclidean distances was performed on hellinger-transformed data, using

205   similarity profile analysis (SIMPROF) to test the significance of clustered groups [48].

206

207   <u>Relationships between datasets</u>

208   We tested for autocorrelation within benthic variables and identified variables that were

209   correlated at $r \geq 0.7$. Three variables (calcareous substrate, sand/rubble, and other benthic)

210   were removed from further analysis and no remaining pairwise correlations between

211   variables greater than $r = 0.53$ were found. The remaining 8 variables were further tested

212   by a variance inflation factor (VIF) analysis which found that each of the retained

213   environmental variables resulted in a VIF of <10.

214

215   The Adonis function within the Vegan package [49] was used to examine for significant

216   relationships between categorical variables (atoll, reef type and exposure) and the fish

217   assemblages surveyed, also using permutation testing set at 9999 permutations. We used

218   the envfit function within the Vegan package to estimate the direction and strengths of the

219   correlation between the nMDS of fish species and the reef benthic variables surveyed.

220   Finally, we used a variation of the BIO-ENV [50] routine, termed BIO-BIO, to identify

221   the subset of fish species which best correlated to the overall biological pattern of the

222   dissimilarity matrix, using both numerical density and biomass data. They produced

223   similar results, thus density alone was presented.

224

225

226   **Results**

227

228   A total of 110 fish species from the 12 families were recorded across the Chagos

229   Archipelago. The matrices of mean species density and biomass are provided in Tables S3

230   and S4, respectively. Multivariate ANOVA (Adonis) permutation results found significant

231   differences in the fish species matrices between atolls for both density and biomass

232   datasets ($F_{4,12} = 2.068$, $P = 0.002$; $F_{4,12} = 1.760$, $P = 0.010$) and between three reef types

233   (forereef; terrace & forereef; lagoons (2 types combined), Table S1) for fish biomass ($F_{2,12}$

234    $= 1.673$, $P = 0.035$). With a limited number of sites, these differences between reef types

235   could not be tested further. There were no significant differences found in species' density

236   or biomass between sites classified as exposed (outer reefs) or protected (lagoon) sites

237   ($P > 0.05$).

238

239   Mantel tests indicated that dissimilarity in the fish assemblages using species density data

240   was strongly related to geographic distance across the archipelago (Monte Carlo

241   observation $= 0.512$; $P = 0.002$). However, within Peros Banhos, Salomon and GCB

242   atolls there was no significant relationship between geographic distance between sites and

243   the fish assemblages present (Peros Banhos: Monte Carlo Observation = -0.317, $P =$

244   0.499; Salomon: Monte Carlo Observation = -0.718, $P = 0.835$; GCB, Monte Carlo

245   Observation = -0.224, $P = 0.497$).

246

247   Ordination of species density data across the archipelago revealed three dissimilar groups

248   corresponding to the atolls of Peros Banhos, Salomon and reefs of the GCB (Fig. 2a). Fish

249   assemblages at GCB separated most strongly from other atolls, while Peros Banhos and

250   Salomon were more similar. These differences in fish assemblages were further verified

251 by the Ward cluster analysis (Fig. 2b), which showed four significant clusters (>60%

252 dissimilarity) though one cluster (cluster 3) comprised of a single site – Diego Garcia

253 Atoll's terrace and forereef, which differed from all other sites (>1.0 dissimilarity). This

254 Euclidian analysis provides a more detailed examination of dissimilarity in the fish

255 assemblages across sites: cluster 1 was most dissimilar from all other sites and consisted

256 of northern sites at Blenheim and Salomon Atoll forereefs; cluster 2 contained all lagoon

257 sites, 3 from Peros Banhos but also 1 site from each of Salomon and Diego Garcia; whilst

258 cluster 4 consisted of two sub-groups, Eagle and Egmont forereefs at GCB and Three

259 Brothers forereef (GCB) and two Peros Banhos sites (a forereef and a lagoon pinnacle).

260 Total fish density and biomass also showed broad-scale differences across the archipelago

261 with the highest densities recorded on reefs at GCB, the highest biomass recorded at Peros

262 Banhos Atoll and the lowest biomass at Diego Garcia Atoll (Fig. 3).

263

264 **Fig. 2.** Spatial variation in reef fish species assemblages across the 13 sites in the Chagos

265 Archipelago: a) non-metric multidimensional scaling plot, coloured ellipses show 95%

266 confidence intervals of site grouping; b) Ward cluster analysis, colours in dendrogram

267 highlight the four significantly different groups found (<0.6 dissimilarity).

268

269 **Fig. 3.** Total fish a) density (number of individuals per hectare) and b) biomass (kg per

270 hectare) by atoll, based on 12 reef-associated families surveyed at 13 sites. Error bars are

271 standard errors.

272

273 When fish species were categorised into the 12 trophic groups, permutation tests showed

274 only 3 trophic groups were significant in explaining the pattern in the species

275 assemblages: grazer-detritivores and corallivores for fish density and grazer-detritivores

276   and planktivores for fish biomass (Table 1, Fig. 4). These three trophic groups all

277   significantly explained fish density differences when the permutation test was stratified by

278   atoll (Table 1). Grazer-detritivores comprise a group of acanthurids and the angelfishes

279   *Centropye* spp. (Table S2). Acanthurid species in this trophic group, such as *Acanthurus*

280   *tennenti* and *A. xanthopterus,* typically feed on sand and hard surfaces to extract detritus

281   and microbes, as well as epilithic algae. The densities and biomass of these grazer-

282   detritivores were nearly three times greater at GCB and Diego Garcia compared to the

283   other atolls (Fig. 4), representing the largest difference in the fish assemblages across the

284   archipelago. The corallivores consisted of six obligate coral feeding butterflyfishes out of

285   the 18 Chaetodontidae observed in the Chagos Archipelago and were more abundant at

286   Peros Banhos and Salomon atolls, compared to other reefs (Fig. 4). When biomass was

287   considered, the planktivores, comprised of balistid, acanthurid and chaetodontid species,

288   differed significantly between the atolls with biomass at GCB three times higher than any

289   of the other reef sites (Table 1, Fig. 4).

290

291   **Table 1**. Random permutation results of 12 fish trophic groups showing only those

292   significantly related to differences: a) across all sites and; b) stratified by atoll.

293

Density			**Biomass**		
a) All sites					
Trophic group	r^2	*p*-value	Trophic group	r^2	*p*-value
Grazer-detritivores	0.769	<0.001	Grazer-detritivores	0.792	<0.001
Corallivores	0.598	0.009	Planktivores	0.515	0.026
b) Stratified by atoll					
Grazer-detritivores	0.769	0.006	Grazer-detritivores	0.641	0.016
Planktivores	0.268	0.030	Planktivores	0.515	0.034
Corallivores	0.598	0.048			

294

295

296   **Fig. 4**. Mean density (number of individuals per hectare) and biomass kg per hectare) by

297   atoll for the three functional trophic groups that were significantly related to fish

298   assemblage differences. Error bars are standard errors. Functional trophic groups are

299   explained in Table S2.

300

301   *Benthic reef characteristics and fish assemblages*

302

303   The benthic cover at reef sites was highly variable among the atolls of the archipelago.

304   Total live coral cover ranged from 15.7% (±1.6 SD) to 47.2 % (±24.1 SD), *Acropora* spp.

305   coral cover from 1.1 (±1.4 SD), to 28.1% (±12.4 SD), and dead standing coral from 5.9%

306   (±3.1 SD) to 26.4% (±13.1 SD). Non-metric multi-dimensional scaling of the relative

307   contribution of the eight benthic variables to the differences between fish assemblages

308   across the archipelago showed that reef sites grouped along two main axes (Fig. 5): the Y

309   axis with high macro-algae such as GCB reefs, versus sites with higher soft coral (Diego

310   Garcia); and the X axis with sites with high hard coral, dead coral, live *Acropora*, rugosity

311   and turf algae, at Salomon Atoll and Perhos Banhos, versus reefs at GCB with higher

312   CCA. GCB reefs had the lowest levels of hard coral, ranging from 15.7% (±5.6 SD) to

313   28.7% (±17.7 SD). However, hard coral and dead coral (i.e. structural components) were

314   the only benthic categories that were significantly related to differences in fish assemblage

315   structure when analysed with fish density data; when tested with fish biomass data,

316   rugosity also became significant (Table 2). When the permutation analysis was stratified

317   by atoll, hard coral and dead coral were no longer significant; instead soft coral showed a

318   significant correlation with fish density and CCA with fish biomass (Table 2). These

319   results corroborate the geographic differences in fish assemblages between different atolls,

320   driven by hard and dead coral cover, whereas within atolls only CCA and soft coral were

321   significantly correlated with the fish species data matrices.

322

323   **Fig. 5.** nMDS diagram showing the relationship between benthic variables at 11 reef sites

324   overlaid on the fish assemblage ordination (see Fig. 2) across the Chagos Archipelago.

325   The relative contribution of each benthic variable is displayed by the length of the vector.

326

327   **Table 2.** Significant permutation correlations between benthos and the fish species matrix,

328   for density and biomass at a) all sites and b) stratified by atoll.

329

Density			Biomass		
a) All sites					
Benthic Group	r^2	*p*-value	Benthic group	r^2	*p*-value
Hard Coral	0.63	0.021	Hard Coral	0.7	0.001
Dead Coral	0.66	0.013	Dead Coral	0.7	0.001
			Rugosity	0.55	0.034
b) Stratified by atoll					
Soft Coral	0.38	0.004	Crustose Corraline Algae	0.310	0.042

330

331

332   *Fish species*

333

334   A species-level ordination (BIOBIO) of the density of the 110 fish species which

335   determined which species were most correlated with differences in the fish assemblages

336   across all reef sites showed that 13 species best explained (rho=0.832) the fish

337   assemblages across the sites: *Acanthurus lineatus, A. nigrofuscus, Zebrasoma desjardinii*

338   (grazers)*, Cetoscarus ocellatus, Chlorurus strongylocephalus B* (large excavators)*,*

339   *Hemitaurichthys zoster, Paracanthurus hepatus* (planktivores)*, Lutjanus bohar*

340 (piscivore), *Lutjanus fulvus, Lutjanus gibbus, Lutjanus kasmira, Lethrinus enigmatus*

341 (omnivores), *Scarus niger* (scraper), *Sufflamen* spp. (invertivore) (Table 3, Table S2, Fig.

342 6). Note that none of these species were from the significant trophic groups detected in the

343 permutation tests except for *Paracanthurus hepatus*. When the ordination was restricted

344 sequentially, it showed that *Scarus niger* alone was highly correlated (rho=0.569) with

345 species assemblage differences. Further, a combination of only 6 species achieved a very

346 high correlation (rho=0.802) with species assemblage differences. Although the 13 species

347 illustrated in Fig. 6 are the best fit, other species consistently appeared in highly correlated

348 subsets (Table 3), and therefore were likely to drive differences between fish assemblages

349 across the archipelago. These included *Acanthurus thompsoni (*planktivore), *A. tennenti,*

350 *A. xanthopterus* (grazer-detritivores), *Scarus frenatus* (scraper), the invertivores

351 *Chaetodon madagascariensis* and *Sufflamen* spp. and *Lethrinus microdon* (omnivore).

352

353 **Fig. 6.** The relationship between individual species and the fish species density ordination

354 based on the 13 fish survey sites.

355

356 **Table 3.** Species strongly correlated with differences in density of fish species

357 assemblages across the Chagos Archipelago, based on a species level ordination (BIO-

358 BIO) of 110 species.

Number of Species in subset	Fish Species	Spearman's Rank Correlation (rho)
1	*Scarus niger*	0.569
2	*Acanthurus thompsoni, Scarus niger*	0.715
3	*Acanthurus tennenti, Acanthurus thompsoni, Scarus niger*	0.762
4	*Acanthurus thompsoni, Naso hexacanthus S, Scarus niger, S.russelli*	0.767
5	*Acanthurus leucosternon, Cephalopholis sexmaculata, Lethrinus obsoletus, Scarus niger, Scarus psittacus*	0.783
6	*Acanthurus thompsoni, Chaetodon madagascariensis, Lethrinus obsoletus, Scarus niger, Sufflamen spp., Zebrasoma desjardinii*	0.802

7	*Acanthurus thompsoni, Chaetodon madagascariensis, Lethrinus obsoletus, N. hexacanthus S, Scarus niger, Sufflamen spp., Zebrasoma desjardinii*	0.815
8	*Acanthurus tennenti, Acanthurus xanthopterus, Chaetodon madagascariensis, Lutjanus bohar, Scarus frenatus, Scarus niger, Sufflamen spp., Zebrasoma desjardinii*	0.813
9	*Acanthurus tennenti, Acanthurus xanthopterus, Chaetodon madagascariensis, Lutjanus bohar, Lethrinus microdon, Scarus frenatus, Scarus niger, Sufflamen spp., Zebrasoma desjardinii*	0.818
10	*Acanthurus tennenti, Acanthurus xanthopterus, Canthigaster bennetti, Chaetodon madagascariensis, Lutjanus bohar, Lethrinus microdon, Scarus frenatus, Scarus niger, Sufflamen sp., Zebrasoma desjardinii*	0.821
11	*Acanthurus tennenti, Acanthurus xanthopterus, Canthigaster bennetti, Chaetodon madagascariensis, Lutjanus bohar, Lethrinus microdon, Odonus niger, Scarus frenatus, Scarus niger, Sufflamen spp., Zebrasoma desjardinii*	0.823
12	*Acanthurus tennenti, Acanthurus xanthopterus, Canthigaster bennetti, Chaetodon madagascariensis, Lutjanus bohar, Lethrinus microdon, Odonus niger, Paracanthurus hepatus, Scarus frenatus, Scarus niger, Sufflamen spp., Zebrasoma desjardinii*	0.820
13	*Acanthurus lineatus, Acanthurus nigrofuscus, Cetoscarus ocellatus, Chlorurus strongylocephalus B, Hemitaurichthys zoster, Lutjanus bohar, Lutjanus fulvus, Lutjanus gibbus, Lutjanus kasmira, Lethrinus enigmatus, Paracanthurus hepatus, Scarus niger, Zebrasoma desjardinii*	0.831
14	*Acanthurus lineatus, Acanthurus nigrofuscus, Cetoscarus ocellatus, Chlorurus strongylocephalus B, Chaetodon striatus, Hemitaurichthys zoster, Lutjanus bohar, Lutjanus fulvus, Lutjanus gibbus, Lutjanus kasmira, Lethrinus enigmatus, Paracanthurus hepatus, Scarus niger, Zebrasoma desjardinii*	0.824

359

360

361

362 Three broad types of fish assemblages in the Chagos Archipelago are suggested through a

363 combination of highly significant species within the ordination (Fig. 6), significant benthic

364 associations (Fig. 5) and clustering of fish species (Fig. 2b). These can be defined as those

365 aligned with: 1) higher hard coral cover (27–43%), or recently dead coral; 2) high rugosity

366 and *Acropora* cover; and 3) higher soft coral, CCA, and macro-algal cover but low cover

367 of live hard coral (12–22%; Table 4). The former (groups 1 and 2, Table 4) were found

368 across Salomon and Peros Banhos atolls, whereas the latter (group 3, Table 4) was largely

369 at GCB. It is noteworthy that two of the largest excavating parrotfishes, *Cetoscarus*

370 *ocellatus* and *Chlorurus strongylocephalos* (B), showed opposing patterns of correlation

371 (Fig. 6). *Cetoscarus ocellatus* was also closely associated with *Scarus niger* on certain

372 reefs in Salomon and Peros Banhos and both these species characterise group 1 and 2

373 assemblage types (Table 4). Fish assemblages at Diego Garcia Atoll forereef site were

374 significantly different and may represent a fourth assemblage type, but there were too few

375 survey sites to assess this. Note that 3 species were rare, present only at 1 reef (*A. lineatus,*

376 *Lethrinus enigmatus* and *Lutjanus fulvus,* Table 4, Table S3).

377

378 **Table 4.** Synthesis of results from Figures 2b, 5 and 6 and Tables S3 and S4, to define

379 three broad types of fish assemblages across the Chagos Archipelago, the sites at which

380 they were found and the corresponding reef benthic characteristics. Species and benthos

381 listed are the highest abundance/cover and were significant within analyses. *= rare

382 species seen only at 1 reef. Diego Garcia Atoll forereef was an outlier and is not included.

383

No.	Fish Species	Reefs	Benthos
1			
	Scarus niger (Scraper)	**Salomon**	Hard coral
	Acanthurus nigrofuscus (Grazer)	- terrace & forereef	*Acropora*
	Hemitaurichthys zoster (Planktivore)	(2 sites)	Soft coral
	Cetoscarus ocellatus (Excavator)	**Blenheim**	Rugosity
2			
	Scarus niger (Scraper)	**Peros Banhos**	Dead coral
	Lutjanus kasmira (Omnivore)	- lagoon (2 sites)	Rugosity
	Cetoscarus ocellatus (Excavator)	**Salomon**	Turf algae
	*A. lineatus** (Grazer)	- lagoon	Hard coral
	L. gibbus (Omnivore)	**Diego Garcia**	*Acropora*
	Z. desjardinii (Grazer)	- lagoon	
3			
	Chlor. strongylocephalos (Excavator)	**GCB**	Soft coral
	Paracanthurus hepatus (Planktivore)	- forereefs	CCA
	*Lethrinus enigmatus** (Omnivore)	**Peros Banhos**	Macro-algae
	Lutjanus bohar (Piscivore)	- forereef	
	*Lutjanus fulvus** (Omnivore)	- lagoon	

384

385

386

387 *Species of conservation and fisheries interest*

388

389 The widespread Indo-Pacific coral trout grouper *Plectropomus laevis* was abundant and

390 observed at all but 3 sites, with a mean density and biomass of 17.85 ± 1.54 SD

391 individuals/ha and 104.8 ± 170.5 SD kg/ha, including several very large individuals (91–

392 110 cm TL), close to maximum size for this species. *Plectropomus punctatus*, the coral

393 trout grouper endemic to the Indian Ocean was never observed, yet it was recorded from

394 the Chagos Archipelago in the 1990s by Winterbottom and Anderson [51]. No siganids

395 were observed during the current survey, though *Siganus argenteus* and *S. canaliculatus*

396 are known from the archipelago [51]. The abundance of the larger species of grouper such

397 as *Epinephelus fuscoguttatus*, *E. malabaricus, E. multinotatus* and *E. tauvina* was

398 extremely low, ranging from a mean of 0.0–0.77 ±1.54 SD fish/ha.

399

400

401 **Discussion**

402

403 Large regional-scale [7,52] or long temporal-scale analyses [2] in the Indian Ocean and

404 across the Indo-Pacific [6] have shown that fishing and climate change are primary drivers

405 of fish assemblage structure. We found significant differences in fish assemblage structure

406 among the atolls of the Chagos Archipelago which we attribute to natural environmental

407 drivers and climate change, as reflected in the significant correlations between fish

408 assemblages and reef benthic composition. However, temporal changes before and after

409 coral bleaching events remain unknown; future work on this would greatly enhance

410   interpretation of the results of the current study. We can, however, assume that fishing

411   effects are minimal due to the lack of resident human populations on any of the atolls

412   since the 1960s (with the exception of Diego Garcia) and because of the establishment of a

413   no-take MPA in 2010. Indeed, the Chagos Archipelago is used as a benchmark for largely

414   unfished reefs in the Indian Ocean [6,23]. Further, our study assumed that reef fish species

415   distributions did not differ biogeographically because of the relatively small geographic

416   range of the Chagos Archipelago fed by the easterly flowing East African Coastal Current

417   and South Equatorial Countercurrent, both emanating from the east African mainland

418   [29], and the connectivity of the pelagic larvae of most reef fishes [30,31]. Of the 110

419   species in the dataset, there was no apparent disjunct in their distribution between the

420   northern atolls (Peros Banhos, Salomon and Blenheim) and the southern atolls (GCB and

421   Diego Garcia) except for *Acanthurus tristis*, *Chaetodon madagascariensis* and *Chlorurus*

422   *capistratoides,* which were only found in the south, and *Chaetodon lunula* which was only

423   found in the north. Of these, only *C. madagascariensis* was a significant species in the

424   ordination analysis.

425

426   *Patterns in fish species and benthic communities*

427

428   Differences in fish assemblages were significantly correlated with geographic distance

429   between sites; the relative density of the 110 fish species across the archipelago differed

430   most significantly between atolls. These atoll-scale differences were also apparent in total

431   density and biomass values (12 families), with the highest fish densities recorded on the

432   reefs of the western edge of the GCB, the highest fish biomass recorded at Peros Banhos

433   Atoll and the lowest fish biomass at Diego Garcia Atoll. Reef benthic composition also

434   varied between atolls, most notably in the relative cover of live hard coral, recently dead

435 standing coral and rugosity, and permutation testing showed that these differences were

436 significantly related to fish density (hard and dead standing coral) and fish biomass (hard

437 coral, dead standing coral, rugosity). These results are not surprising since strong positive

438 correlations between fish density or biomass and live hard coral and rugosity, benthic

439 variables that co-vary and reflect reef habitat structural complexity, are widely reported

440 [15,16,53–56]. Therefore, patterns in the fish assemblages reported here likely reflect

441 bottom-up control.

442

443 A major alteration in the benthic composition of coral reefs across the Indian Ocean

444 occurred following the severe coral bleaching event of 1998 [57]. This thermal anomaly

445 resulted in a reduction of living coral cover in the Chagos Archipelago from 50–75%

446 cover prior to the event to ~10% live coral remaining on all six atolls in 1999 [22].

447 However, a majority of reef sites across the archipelago recovered rapidly and reached

448 pre-bleaching condition by 2010 [26]. The strong benthic differences between atolls

449 observed in our surveys in 2014 possibly reflect different levels of bleaching and differing

450 recovery patterns following the 1998 event, though with little historic data this remains

451 unknown. However, early reports of highly homogenous fish assemblages across reefs in

452 the northern atolls prior to 1998 [28] suggest that the differences in the structure of the

453 fish assemblages found in 2014 are recent and may therefore, be due to differing recovery

454 patterns.

455

456 *Fishing effects*

457

458 This study was not designed to look at fishing effects because it was based on the premise

459 that there is no reef fishing in Chagos Archipelago, however, there was a small Mauritian

460   fishery targeting grouper (Epinephelidae) and snapper (Lutjanidae), which operated from

461   the 1970s until 2010 when the Chagos MPA was designated [23]. Populations of

462   piscivore and omnivore trophic categories were similar between atolls, exemplified by the

463   coral trout grouper *Plectropomus laevis*, which was abundant and observed at all but three

464   sites. However, two snappers *Lutjanus bohar* (piscivore) and *Lutjanus gibbus* (omnivore)

465   were significantly correlated with differences in fish assemblages across atolls. The

466   highest biomass of these two species was found in Peros Banhos lagoon sites (up to 861

467   kg/ha and 530 kg/ha, for *L. bohar* and *L. gibbus*, respectively). Apparently the fishery did

468   not operate in the lagoons (BIOT Fisheries Officer, pers. comm. 2014), but since our study

469   is the first to report on fish biomass in the lagoons there are no previous comparable data.

470   For *L. bohar* moderate biomass levels were found on forereefs at Salomon, Peros Banhos

471   and Blenheim, but were lower at Diego Garcia and GCB, while biomass of *L. gibbus* was

472   highly variable across all forereefs. Our surveys also suggest that three large species of

473   grouper, *Epinephelus fuscoguttatus, E. multinotatus* and *E. tauvina* may have been

474   overfished since their populations were extremely depleted across all sites. While there is

475   also some illegal fishing in BIOT, 80% by weight of illegal catches detected by the BIOT

476   patrol vessel is shark [58], therefore this poaching can be considered minimal in terms of

477   impacts on reef fishes. Our results are inconclusive and suggest that further research is

478   needed to distinguish between possible latent fishing effects or natural biotic/abiotic

479   drivers of some grouper and *Lutjanus bohar*.

480

481   A recreational fishery operates outside the MPA at the naval base in Diego Garcia and is

482   having an impact on fish biomass [23]. Our total biomass estimates with maximum values

483   of ~3,500 kg/ha (12 families) do not include sharks and trevally and therefore cannot be

484   directly compared with the estimates of >9,000 kg/ha reported from 2010–2012. However,

485 comparing relative biomass between atolls from the 2010–2012 survey [23] with our

486 survey in 2014 shows similar differences, with highest values at Peros Banhos, followed

487 by GCB, then Salomon, and the lowest values at Diego Garcia. This supports Graham et

488 al.'s [23] conclusions that the recreational fishery is having an impact. Nevertheless, we

489 measured extremely high biomass values at 10 of the 13 sites (1,501-3,000 kg/ha at six

490 sites, and > 3,000 kg/ha at four sites). These are similar, when the same families are

491 considered, to biomass at other uninhabited and protected reefs of the French territories in

492 the Mozambique Channel [59], providing strong support for using Chagos Archipelago as

493 a reference benchmark for unfished reef fish populations in the western Indian Ocean.

494

495 *Trophic dynamics in the reef fish assemblages*

496

497 Herbivory and detritivory contribute significantly to the trophic dynamics and hence

498 biomass production on coral reefs [60,61]. Indeed, the diversity of herbivores and

499 detritivores seen on modern reefs, illustrated by the parrotfishes (Labridae: Scarinae) and

500 surgeonfishes (Acanthuridae), has been linked to the massive expansion of shallow coral

501 reef habitats over the last 5 million years [62]. In the Chagos Archipelago, the grazer-

502 detritivores was the trophic group that differed most significantly between atolls. This

503 group comprises a suite of acanthurids ("ring-tail" surgeonfishes [44]), such as

504 *Acanthurus tennenti* and *A. xanthopterus,* that harvest mouthfuls of soft sediment on dead

505 coral substrate, as well as on sand, which contain the diatoms and microbes of their diet

506 [63,64]. Their highest densities at GCB and Diego Garcia (>500 and >600 individuals/ha,

507 respectively) corresponded with low hard coral cover. In contrast, low numbers of these

508 surgeonfishes were seen at Peros Banhos, Salomon and Blenheim (<130, <14, <170

509 individuals/ha, respectively), where hard coral cover was high. These results suggest that

510 these "grazer-detritivore" surgeonfish species may thrive where their benthic food sources

511 have increased due to coral mortality [65] and can therefore serve as important indicators

512 of reef degradation. The prevalence of the detritivory role is also supported by one of the

513 most common reef fishes in the world, the bristletooth surgeonfishes *Ctenochaetus* spp.

514 [66], with the combined density of two species *Ctenochaetus truncatus* and *C. striatus* at

515 ~850 individuals/ha being the second highest (*Caesio* spp. density was the highest: 936

516 individuals/ha) of all the 110 species surveyed. We propose that the importance of

517 detritivory in recovery of degraded reefs and in cycling carbon within coral reef systems is

518 not well quantified and therefore an important area for future research.

519

520 A strong relationship between hard coral cover and corallivores has been widely reported

521 [23,56,67] and was confirmed here with significantly higher densities of obligate coral-

522 feeding butterflyfishes at Peros Banhos and Salomon atolls where there was relatively

523 higher live coral cover. These coral specialists are clearly highly vulnerable to coral

524 mortality and, as such, have long been used as potential indicator species for monitoring

525 coral reef health [68]. The third trophic group that differed significantly between atolls

526 was the planktivores, comprising several acanthurids (three *Naso* spp., *Acanthurus*

527 *thompsoni* and *Paracanthurus hepatus)*, two chaetodontids, two balistids and *Caesio* spp.

528 The biomass of this group was three times higher at GCB, with a mean biomass of 1,045

529 kg/ha, compared to 338kg/ha for other atolls, and this was largely due to the caesionids

530 and *Naso hexacanthus* and *N. brevirostris*. Further, three planktivores were strongly

531 correlated with the ordination: *Paracanthurus hepatus, Acanthurus thompsoni* and the

532 chaetodon *Hemitaurichthys zoster*. Drivers of planktivore populations on coral reefs are

533 still poorly understood, but their food items are associated with reef edges and proximity

534 to deep water [69]. These acanthurid species are all zooplanktivores [70], suggesting

535   waters at GCB may be zooplankton-rich. Thus, higher Acanthuridae densities overall at

536   GCB reefs appear to reflect two different and unrelated trophic pathways: increased access

537   to soft benthic surfaces due to coral mortality for the grazer-detritivores and higher

538   zooplankton densities for planktivores. Finally, it was notable that the density and biomass

539   of the piscivore and omnivore trophic groups, species that represent important target

540   fishery species [23,39], were not significantly correlated with fish assemblage patterns

541   across the archipelago, suggesting that benthic differences did not directly affect these

542   higher trophic level taxa. Thus, when data were aggregated by trophic group, only three

543   groups differed significantly and these appeared to be influenced by reduced coral cover

544   due to climate change [22] and natural variability in zooplankton, both bottom-up control

545   pathways.

546

547   It was surprising that none of the five herbivore trophic groups, which include all the

548   parrotfishes, were significant in explaining differences in fish assemblages between sites.

549   We found species-level analyses were more informative than aggregated trophic group

550   analyses and demonstrated species from within seven trophic groups were highly related

551   to differences in the fish assemblages across the reefs of the Chagos Archipelago. *Scarus*

552   *niger* had the strongest correlation with fish assemblage structure across the archipelago,

553   with highest biomass on the high coral cover northern atolls (182 kg/ha at Peros Banhos),

554   and the lowest at Diego Garcia and the low coral cover reefs of GCB (3 kg/ha and 11–27

555   kg/ha, respectively). This species is one of the most ubiquitous parrotfishes across the

556   Indo-Pacific [71,72] and feeds on the top 1–2 mm of dead coral substrate [62,73], though

557   it probably removes epilithic algae while feeding. *Scarus niger* was associated with the

558   highly abundant surgeonfish *Acanthurus nigrofuscus*, known to graze similar substrate

559   types but feeding on epilithic algae [63,64]. These two species correlated most closely

560   with the assemblages at Salomon Atoll sites, particularly on the outer forereefs where live

561   hard coral, *Acropora* and rugosity were highest, but also at the Peros Banhos lagoon sites

562   where turf algae and dead coral were relatively high. This result may reflect "feeding

563   complimentarity" by a parrotfish and a surgeonfish, accessing different algal prey within

564   the same benthic substrate [74]. It also illustrates the challenges in using trophic

565   categories as a proxy for ecological function. Herbivorous fishes have been implicated in

566   the top-down control of reef benthos, as their grazing of recently dead coral substrate

567   prevents the rapid colonisation of macroalgae. Further, over-fishing of herbivores has been

568   invoked to explain declines in coral cover and they are consequently considered to play a

569   key functional role in maintaining coral reef resilience [4,11,12,75–77]. Parrotfishes

570   (Labridae; Scarinae) are a significant component of this herbivorous fish community on

571   account of their size, numerical abundance and hence biomass [14]. They are also targeted

572   in many reef fisheries and are frequently used as indicators for the condition or resilience

573   of reefs [14,39,44,61,78]. However, recent work on the intricacies of parrotfish feeding

574   modes and diets [14,62,73] indicates that assigning species with similar feeding modes

575   into broad trophic groups may over-simplify their functional role in reef resilience.

576   Further, we show that parrotfish population densities can vary by up to 43-fold between

577   reef sites in the absence of fishing and so caution against assumptions that declines in

578   parrotfish populations are necessarily due to fishing.

579

580   The largest parrotfishes, *Cetoscarus ocellatus* and *Chlororus strongylocephalos*, showed

581   completely opposing patterns in their distribution with *Cetoscarus ocellatus* closely

582   associated with healthy reefs with high coral cover at the northern atolls (Peros Banhos

583   and Salomon). In contrast, *Chlorurus strongylocephalos* was strongly correlated with reefs

584   at GCB which had the lowest live coral and the highest cover of calcareous algae, soft

585   coral and macroalgae. This opposing pattern in the distribution of these two high-biomass

586   parrotfish, functionally termed "excavators" [14,44,65], can be explained by their feeding

587   behaviour. *Cetoscarus ocellatus* are territorial, non-schooling, harvest small areas of reef

588   and are associated with reefs of high live coral cover (M. Samoilys, pers. obs.). In

589   contrast, *Chlorurus strongylocephalos* prefers disturbed reefs which offer a larger benthic

590   surface area for excavating the dead coral reef matrix [73]. They feed on these substrates,

591   typically in large schools if the disturbed substrate is of sufficient area (H. Choat, James

592   Cook University, pers. comm. 2016). The Indian Ocean endemic, *Chlorurus*

593   *enneacanthus,* was observed to have a similar feeding strategy to *Chlorurus*

594   *strongylocephalos* (M. Samoilys pers. obs.). These *Chlorurus* species conform to reports

595   from the Philippines where some parrotfish species prefer areas of reef that have become

596   damaged, for example from cyclones [21]. The patterns seen here suggest bottom-up

597   control of parrotfish populations by coral cover in positive (e.g. *S. niger, C. ocellatus*) or

598   negative (e.g. *C. strongylocephalos*) relationships. These pathways therefore need to be

599   considered when examining the role of parrotfishes in influencing coral recovery

600   trajectories.

601

602   *Conclusions*

603   The isolated Chagos Archipelago provides a valuable ecological benchmark for

604   understanding the structure of reef fish assemblages when fishing impacts are minimal.

605   Differences in fish assemblages across the archipelago were associated with variation in

606   reef benthic condition, which suggested a bottom-up response of fish populations to

607   changes in coral cover. Our results support the concept that herbivory and detrivory are

608   significant functions provided by reef fishes [60–62], but we propose that separating diet

609   from the structural impact of these feeding modes will improve our understanding of their

610 functional role in reef resilience. The large variation in parrotfish abundance found in the

611 Chagos Archipelago supports studies (e.g. Russ et al. [21]) that caution against

612 assumptions elsewhere that parrotfish population abundances are largely driven by

613 fishing. We found surgeonfish species that graze epilithic algae and parrotfish species that

614 exploit bare substrate to access nutrients within the calcareous matrix [63,64,73] are two

615 key taxa responsible for differences in fish assemblages among the atolls. Both may

616 function to keep macro-algal levels down, but the drivers of their populations are different.

617 Parrotfishes have evolved highly successful traits to exploit food sources on reefs and

618 contribute significant biomass on coral reefs [14, 62], including during declines in coral

619 cover [21,65] and some species are impacted negatively by fishing [65]. Clarifying these

620 trophic dynamics is vital to refine functional trait approaches for understanding the

621 impacts of climate change and fishing on coral reef biodiversity.

622

623

634

Figure Captions

Fig. 1. Map of the Chagos Archipelago showing atolls surveyed and locations of dive survey sites.

Fig. 2. Spatial variation in reef fish species assemblages across the 13 sites in the Chagos Archipelago: a) non-metric multidimensional scaling plot, coloured ellipses show 95% confidence intervals of site grouping; b) Ward cluster analysis, colours in dendrogram highlight the four significantly different groups found (<0.6 dissimilarity).

Fig. 3. Total fish a) density (number of individuals per hectare) and b) biomass (kg per hectare) by atoll, based on 12 reef-associated families surveyed at 13 sites. Error bars are standard errors.

Fig. 4. Mean density (number of individuals per hectare) and biomass kg per hectare) by atoll for the three functional trophic groups that were significantly related to fish assemblage differences. Error bars are standard errors. Functional trophic groups are explained in Table S2.

Fig. 5. nMDS diagram showing the relationship between benthic variables at 11 reef sites overlaid on the fish assemblage ordination (see Fig. 2) across the Chagos Archipelago. The relative contribution of each benthic variable is displayed by the length of the vector.

Fig. 6. The relationship between individual species and the fish species density ordination based on the 13 fish survey sites.

References

1.   Bellwood DR, Hughes TP. Regional-Scale Assembly Rules and Biodiversity of Coral Reefs. Science. 2001; 292: 1532–1535. doi:10.1126/science.1058635

2.   Graham NAJ, Jennings S, MacNeil MA, Mouillot D, Wilson SK. Predicting

660   climate-driven regime shifts versus rebound potential in coral reefs. Nature. 2015;

661   518: 1–17. doi:10.1038/nature14140

662   3.   Jouffray J-B, Nystrom M, Norstrom A V., Williams ID, Wedding LM, Kittinger

663   JN, et al. Identifying multiple coral reef regimes and their drivers across the

664   Hawaiian archipelago. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci . 2014; 370: 20130268–

665   20130268. doi:10.1098/rstb.2013.0268

666   4.   Mumby PJ. Fishing, Trophic Cascades, and the Process of Grazing on Coral Reefs.

667   Science. 2006; 311: 98–101. doi:10.1126/science.1121129

668   5.   Graham NAJ, Chabanet P, Evans RD, Jennings S, Letourneur Y, Aaron Macneil M,

669   et al. Extinction vulnerability of coral reef fishes. Ecol Lett 2011; 14: 341–348.

670   doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2011.01592.x

671   6.   MacNeil MA, Graham NAJ, Cinner JE, Wilson SK, Williams ID, Maina J, et al.

672   Recovery potential of the world's coral reef fishes. Nature 2015; 520: 341–344.

673   doi:10.1038/nature14358

674   7.   McClanahan TR, Maina JM, Graham NAJ, Jones KR. Modeling reef fish biomass,

675   recovery potential, and management priorities in the Western Indian Ocean. PLoS

676   One. 2016; 11: 1–21. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0156920

677   8.   Friedlander AM, Brown EK, Jokiel PL, Smith WR. Effects of habitat, wave

678   exposure, and marine protected area status on coral reef fish assemblages in the

679   Hawaiian archipelago. Coral Reefs. 2003; 22: 291–305.

680   9.   Pinca S, Kronen M, Magron F, Mcardle B, Vigliola L, Kulbicki M, et al. Relative

681   importance of habitat and fishing in influencing reef fish communities across

682   seventeen Pacific Island Countries and Territories. Fish and Fisheries. 2012;13:

683   361–379. doi:10.1111/j.1467-2979.2011.00425.x

684 10.   Taylor BM, Lindfield SJ, Choat JH. Hierarchical and scale-dependent effects of

685 fishing pressure and environment on the structure and size distribution of parrotfish

686 communities. Ecography. 2015; 38: 520–530. doi:10.1111/ecog.01093

687 11. Hughes TP. Catastrophes, Phase Shifts, and Large-Scale Degradation of a

688 Caribbean Coral Reef. Science1994; 265: 1547–1551.

689 12. Bellwood DR, Hughes TP, Folke C, Nyström M. Confronting the coral reef crisis.

690 Nature. 2004; 429: 827–833. doi:10.1038/nature02691

691 13. Hughes TP, Rodrigues MJ, Bellwood DR, Ceccarelli D, Hoegh-Guldberg O,

692 McCook L, et al. Phase Shifts, Herbivory, and the Resilience of Coral Reefs to

693 Climate Change. Current Biology. 2007; 17: 360–365.

694 doi:10.1016/j.cub.2006.12.049

695 14. Bonaldo RM, Hoey AS, Bellwood DR. The ecosystem roles of parrotfishes on

696 tropical reefs. Oceanography and Marine Biology: An Annual Review. 2014; 52:

697 81–132.

698 15. Chabanet P, Ralambondrainy H, Amanieu M, Faure G, Galzin R. Relationships

699 between coral reef substrata and fish. Coral Reefs. 1997; 16: 93–102.

700 doi:10.1007/s003380050063

701 16. Alvarez-Filip L, Gill JA, Dulvy NK, Perry AL, Watkinson AR, Côté IM. Drivers of

702 region-wide declines in architectural complexity on Caribbean reefs. Coral Reefs.

703 2011; 30: 1051–1060. doi:10.1007/s00338-011-0795-6

704 17. Osuka K, Kochzius M, Vanreusel A, Obura D, Samoilys M. Linkage between fish

705 functional groups and coral reef benthic habitat composition in the Western Indian

706 Ocean. Journal of the Marine Biological Association of United Kingdom. 2016; 1–

707 4. doi:10.1017/S0025315416001399

708 18. Syms C, Jones GP. Disturbance, habitat structure, and the dynamics of a coral-reef

709 fish community. Ecology. 2000; 81: 2714–2729. doi:10.1890/0012-

710   9658(2000)081[2714:DHSATD]2.0.CO;2

711 19. Cheal AJ, Emslie M, MacNeil MA, Miller I, Sweatman HPA. The distribution of

712   herbivorous fishes on the Great Barrier Reef. Marine Biology. 2012; 159: 1143–

713   1154.

714 20. Russ G. Distribution and abundance of herbivorous grazing fishes in the central

715   Great Barrier Reef. II: patterns of zonation of mid-shelf and outer-shelf reefs.

716   Marine Ecology Progress Series. 1984; 20: 35–44.

717 21. Russ GR, Questel SLA, Rizzari JR, Alcala AC. The parrotfish-coral relationship:

718   refuting the ubiquity of a prevailing paradigm. Marine Biology. 2015; 162: 2029–

719   2045. doi:10.1007/s00227-015-2728-3

720 22. Sheppard, CRC, Harris A, Sheppard ALS. Archipelago-wide coral recovery

721   patterns since 1998 in the Chagos Archipelago, central Indian Ocean. Marine

722   Ecology Progress Series. 2008; 362: 109-117.

723 23. Graham NAJ, Pratchett MS, Mcclanahan TR, Wilson SK. The status of coral reef

724   fish assemblages in the Chagos Archipelago, with implications for protected area

725   management and climate change. In: Sheppard CRC, editor. Coral Reefs of the

726   United Kingdom Overseas Territories, Coral Reefs of the World 4. Dordrecht:

727   Springer-Science; 2013. pp. 253–270. doi:10.1007/978-94-007-5965-7

728 24. Spalding M, Fox H, Allen G, Davidson N, Ferdana Z, Finlayson M, et al. Marine

729   Ecoregions of the World: A Bioregionalization of Coastal and Shelf Areas.

730   Bioscience. 2007; 57: 573. doi:10.1641/B570707

731 25. Obura D. The Diversity and Biogeography of Western Indian Ocean Reef-Building

732   Corals. PLoS One 2012; 7: e45013.

733 26. Sheppard CRC, Ateweberhan M, Bowen BW, Carr P, Chen CA, Clubbe C, et al.

734   Reefs and islands of the Chagos Archipelago, Indian Ocean: why it is the world's

735   largest no-take marine protected area. Aquatic Conservation: marine and freshwater

736   ecosystems. 2012; 22: 232–261.

737   27.   Dumbraveanu D, Sheppard C R C. Areas of substrate at different depths in the

738   Chagos Archipelago. In: Sheppard CRC, Seaward MRD, editors. Ecology of the

739   Chagos Archipelago. Linnean Society; 1999. pp. 35–44.

740   28.   Spalding MD. Biodiversity patterns in Chagos reef fishes. In: Sheppard CRC,

741   Seaward MRD, editors. Ecology of the Chagos Archipelago. London: Linnean

742   Society; 1999. pp. 119–136.

743   29.   Schott FA, Xie S-P, McCreary Jr JP. Indian Ocean Circulation and Climate

744   Variability. Reviews of Geophysics. 2009; 47: 1–46.

745   30.   Doherty PJ. Variable Replenishment and the Dynamics of Reef Fish Populations.

746   In: Sale PF, editor. Coral Reef Fishes: Dynamics and Diversity in a Complex

747   Ecosystem. San Diego: Elsevier Science; 2002. pp. 327–355. doi:10.1016/B978-

748   012615185-5/50019-0

749   31.   Crochelet E, Roberts J, Lagabrielle E, Obura D, Petit M, Chabanet P. A model-

750   based assessment of reef larvae dispersal in the Western Indian Ocean reveals

751   regional connectivity patterns: potential implications for conservation policies.

752   Regional Studies Marine Science. 2016; 7: 159–167.

753   doi:10.1016/j.rsma.2016.06.007

754   32.   Jones GP, Milicich MJ, Emslie MJ, Lunow, C. Self-recruitment in a coral reef fish

755   population. Nature. 1999; 402: 802–804. doi:10.1038/45538

756   33.   Jeffries TC, Ostrowski M, Williams RB, Xie C, Jensen RM, Grzymski JJ, et al.

757   Spatially extensive microbial biogeography of the Indian Ocean provides insights

758   into the unique community structure of a pristine coral atoll. Scientific Reports

759   2015; 5: 15383. doi:10.1038/srep15383

760   34.   Andréfouët S, Chagnaud NKC. Atlas of Western Indian Ocean Coral Reefs. New-

761   Caledonia: Centre IRD de Nouméa; 2009.

762   35.   Turner J, Klaus R. Coral reefs of the Mascarenes, Western Indian Ocean.

763   Philosophical Transactions Royal Society A: Mathematical Physical and

764   Engineering Sciences . 2005; 363: 229–250. doi:10.1098/rsta.2004.1489

765   36.   Kohler KE, Gill SM. Coral Point Count with Excel extensions (CPCe): A Visual

766   Basic program for the determination of coral and substrate coverage using random

767   point count methodology. Computers and Geosciences. 2006; 32: 1259–1269.

768   doi:10.1016/j.cageo.2005.11.009

769   37.   Polunin NVC, Roberts CM. Greater biomass and value of target coral reef fishes in

770   two small Caribbbean marine reserves. Marine Ecology Progress Series. 1993; 100:

771   167–176. doi:10.3354/meps100167

772   38.   Harmelin-Vivien, M.L., J.G. Harmelin, C. Chauvet C, Duval, R. Galzin, P.

773   Lejeune, G. Barnabe, F. Blanc R, Ghevalier JD and GL. Evaluation visuelle des

774   peuplements et populations de poissons: methodes et problemes. Rev Ecol (Terre

775   Vie). 1985; 40: 468–539.

776   39.   Samoilys MA, Carlos G. Determining methods of underwater visual census for

777   estimating the abundance of coral reef fishes. Environmental Biology of Fishes.

778   2000; 57. doi:10.1023/A:1007679109359

779   40.   Letourneur Y. Length-weight Relationship of Some Marine Fish Species in

780   Réunion Island, Indian Ocean. Naga. 1998. pp. 37–39.

781   41.   Kulbicki M, Guillemot N, Amand M. A general approach to length-weight

782   relationships for New Caledonian lagoon fishes. Cybium. 2005; 29: 235–252.

783   42.   Froese R, Pauly D. FishBase. 2011. Available from: http://www.fishbase.org..

784   43.   Lincoln Smith M. Improving multispecies rocky reef fish census by counting

785   different groups of species using different procedures. Environmental Biology of

786   Fishes. 1989; 26: 29–37.

787 44. Green AL, Bellwood DR. Monitoring Functional Groups of Herbivorous Reef

788   Fishes as Indicators of Coral Reef Resilience A practical guide for coral reef

789   managers in the Asia Pacific region. IUCN; 2009.

790 45. Samoilys, M. Randriamanantsoa B. Reef fishes of northeast Madagascar. In: Obura,

791   D., Di Carlo, G., Rabearisoa A and TO, editor. A Rapid Marine Biodiversity

792   Assessment of the Coral Reefs of Northeast Madagascar. Conservation

793   International/ CORDIO/The John D. & Catherie T. Macarthur Foundation; 2011.

794   pp. 29–39.

795 46. Dray S, Dufour AB. The ade4 package: implementing the duality diagram for

796   ecologists. Journal of statistical software. 2007; 22: 1–20.

797 47. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna,

798   Austria; 2014.

799 48. Whitaker D, Christman M. Clustsig: similarity profile analysis. R package version;

800   2010.

801 49. Oksanen J. The vegan Package. R. 2005; 1–71.

802 50. Clarke KR, Ainsworth M. A method of linking multivariate commnuity structure to

803   environmental variables. Marine Ecology Progress Series. 1993; 92: 205–219.

804 51. Winterbottom R, Anderson RC. Fishes of the Chagos Archipelago. Ecology of the

805   Chagos Archipelago. London: Linnean Society; 1999. pp. 101–117.

806 52. MacNeil MA, Graham NAJ, Cinner JE, Wilson SK, Williams ID, Maina J, et al.

807   Predicting climate-driven regime shifts versus rebound potential in coral reefs.

808   Nature. 2015; 520: 341–344.

809 53. Wilson SK, Graham NAJ, Pratchett MS, Jones GP, Polunin NVC. Multiple

810   disturbances and the global degradation of coral reefs: are reef fishes at risk or

811   resilient? Global Change Biology. 2006; 12: 2220–2234. doi:10.1111/j.1365-

812   2486.2006.01252.x

813   54.   Jones GP, Syms C. Disturbance, habitat structure and the ecology of fishes on coral

814   reefs. Austral Ecology. 1998; 23: 287–297. doi:10.1111/j.1442-

815   9993.1998.tb00733.x

816   55.   Jones GP, McCormick MI, Srinivasan M, Eagle JV. Coral decline threatens fish

817   biodiversity in marine reserves. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences

818   USA 2004; 101: 8251–3. doi:10.1073/pnas.0401277101

819   56.   Pratchett M, Munday P, Wilson S, Graham N, Cinner J, Bellwood D, et al. Effects

820   Of climate-Induced coral bleaching on coral-reef fishes - Ecological And Economic

821   Consequences. Oceanography and Marine Biology 2008; 251–296.

822   doi:10.1201/9781420065756.ch6

823   57.   Ateweberhan M, McClanahan TR, Graham NAJ, Sheppard CRC. Episodic

824   heterogeneous decline and recovery of coral cover in the Indian Ocean. Coral

825   Reefs. 2011; 30: 739–752. doi:10.1007/s00338-011-0775-x

826   58.   Moir Clark J, Duff H, Pearce J, Mees C. Update on the catch and bycatch
827   composition of illegal fishing in the British Indian Ocean Territory (BIOT) and a
828   summary of abandoned and lost fishing gear. 2015; Marine Resource Assessment
829   Group (UK) report to the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission. OTC–2015–WPEB11–
830   48. 10pp.

831   59.   Chabanet P, Bigot L, Nicet JB, Durville P, Massé L, Mulochau T, et al. Coral reef

832   monitoring in the Iles Eparses, Mozambique Channel (2011-2013). Acta Oecol.

833   2015; 1–11.

834   60.   Wilson SK, Bellwood DR, Choat JH, Furnas MJ. Detritus in the epilithic algal

835   matrix and its use by coral reef fishes. Oceanography and Marine Biology Annual

836   Review. 2003; 41: 279–309.

837 61. Bellwood DR, Goatley CHR, Brandl SJ, Bellwood O. Fifty million years of

838   herbivory on coral reefs: fossils, fish and functional innovations. Proceedings of the

839   Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 2014; 281: 20133046–20133046.

840   doi:10.1098/rspb.2013.3046

841 62. Bellwood DR, Goatley CHR, Bellwood O. The evolution of fishes and corals on

842   reefs: Form, function and interdependence. Biological Reviews. 2017; 92: 878–901.

843   doi:10.1111/brv.12259

844 63. Choat JH, Clements KD. Vertebrate herbivores in marine and terrestrial

845   environments: a nutritional ecology perspective. Annual Review of Ecology and

846   Systematics. 1998; 29: 375–403.

847 64. Choat JH, Clements KD, Robbins WD. The trophic status of herbivorous fishes on

848   coral reefs. I: dietary analyses. Marine Biology. 2002; 140: 613–623.

849 65. Heenan A, Hoey AS, Williams GJ, Williams ID. Natural bounds on herbivorous

850   coral reef fishes. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 2016;

851   283: 20161716. doi:10.1098/rspb.2016.1716

852 66. Lieske E, Myers R. Coral Reef Fishes. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton Academic

853   Press; 1996.

854 67. Cole A, Pratchett M, Jones G. Diversity and functional importance of coral-feeding

855   fishes on tropical coral reefs. Fish and Fisheries. 2008; 9: 286–307.

856   doi:10.1111/j.1467-2979.2008.00290.x

857 68. Reese ES. Reef fishes as indicators of conditions on coral reefs. Proceedings of the

858   colloquium on global aspects of coral reefs. Miami; 1993. pp. 59–65.

859 69. Hobson ES. Trophic relationships of fishes specialised to feed on zooplankters

860   above coral reefs. In: Sale PF, editor. The Ecology of Fishes on Coral Reefs.

861 Academic Press Inc.; 1991. pp. 69–95.

862 70. Friedman ST, Price SA, Hoey AS, Wainwright PC. Ecomorphological convergence

863 in planktivorous surgeonfishes. Journal of Evolutionary Biology. 2016; 29: 965–

864 978. doi:10.1111/jeb.12837

865 71. Hoey AS, Bellwood DR. Cross-shelf variation in the role of parrotfishes on the

866 Great Barrier Reef. Coral Reefs. 2008; 27: 37–47. doi:10.1007/s00338-007-0287-x

867 72. Nash KL, Graham NAJ, Januchowski-Hartley FA, Bellwood DR. Influence of

868 habitat condition and competition on foraging behaviour of parrotfishes. Marine

869 Ecology Progress Series. 2012; 457: 113–124. doi:10.3354/meps09742

870 73. Clements KD, German DP, Piche J, Tribollet A, Choat JH. Integrating ecological

871 roles and trophic diversification on coral reefs: Multiple lines of evidence identify

872 parrotfishes as microphages. Biological Journal Linnaean Society. 2016; 120: 729–

873 751. doi:10.1111/bij.12914

874 74. Burkepile DE, Hay ME. Herbivore species richness and feeding complementarity

875 affect community structure and function on a coral reef. Proceedings National

876 Academy Sciencs USA. 2008; 105: 16201–16206. doi:10.1073/pnas.0801946105

877 75. Hughes TP, Baird AH, Bellwood DR, Card M, Connolly SR, Folke C, et al.

878 Climate Change, Human Impacts, and the Resilience of Coral Reefs. Science. 2003;

879 301: 929–933. doi:10.1126/science.1085046

880 76. Anthony KRN, Marshall PA, Abdulla A, Beeden R, Bergh C, Black R, et al.

881 Operationalizing resilience for adaptive coral reef management under global

882 environmental change. Global Change Biology. 2015; 21: 48–61.

883 doi:10.1111/gcb.12700

884 77. Jackson JBC, Donovan MK, Cramer KL, Lam K L. Status and trends of Caribbean

885 coral reefs: 1970–2012. Gland; 2014.

886 78. Edwards CB, Friedlander AM, Green AG, Hardt MJ, Sala E, Sweatman HP, et al.

887   Global assessment of the status of coral reef herbivorous fishes: evidence for

888   fishing effects. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences.

889   2014; 281: 20131835. doi:10.1098/rspb.2013.1835

890
891

892

Fig1   Click here to download Figure Fig1.eps.tif

Fig2

Click here to download Figure Fig2.tif ±

a)

b)

Fig3

Fig4

Fig5

Fig6

Study sites

Click here to access/download
Supporting Information
S1 Table.docx

Fish taxa and trophic groups

Click here to access/download
**Supporting Information
S2 Table.docx**

Fish species density

Click here to access/download
Supporting Information
S3 Table.xls

Fish species biomass

Click here to access/download
Supporting Information
S4 Table.xls

Benthic cover

Fish and reef benthos in the Chagos Archipelago

1   **Patterns in reef fish assemblages: insights from the Chagos Archipelago**

2

3   Melita Samoilys[1,2] Ronan Roche[3], Heather Koldewey[4,5], John Turner[3]

4

5   [1.] CORDIO East Africa, PO Box 24562, Nairobi 00502, Kenya

6   [2.] Zoology Department, University of Oxford, Oxford OX1 3PS, UK

7   [3.] School of Ocean Sciences, Bangor University LL59 5AB, UK

8   [4.] Conservation Programmes, Zoological Society of London, Regents Park, London NW1

9   4RY, UK

10   [5.] Centre for Ecology & Conservation, University of Exeter Cornwall Campus, Penryn,

11   Cornwall, TR10 9FE, UK

12

13

14   **Abstract**

15   Understanding the drivers of variability in the composition of fish assemblages across the

16   Indo-Pacific region is crucial to support coral reef ecosystem resilience. Whilst numerous

17   relationships and feedback mechanisms between the functional roles of coral reef fishes

18   and reef benthic composition have been investigated, certain key groups, such as the

19   herbivores, are widely suggested to maintain reefs in a coral-dominated state. Examining

20   links between fishes and reef benthos is complicated by the interactions between natural

21   processes, disturbance events and anthropogenic impacts, particularly fishing pressure.

22   This study examined fish assemblages and associated benthic variables across five atolls

23   within the Chagos Archipelago, where fishing pressure is largely absent, to better

24   understand these relationships. We found high variability in fish assemblages ~~between~~

25   among atolls and sites across the archipelago, especially for key groups such as a suite of

26   grazer-detritivore surgeonfish and the parrotfishes, which varied in density over 40-fold

27   between sites. Differences in fish assemblages were significantly associated with variable

28   levels of both live and recently dead coral cover and rugosity. We and suggest these

29   results reflect differing coral recovery trajectories following coral bleaching events anded

30   a strong influence of 'bottom-up' control mechanisms on fish assemblages. Species level

31   analyses revealed that *Scarus niger*, *Acanthurus nigrofuscus* and *Chlororus*

32   *strongylocephalos* were key species driving differences in assemblage structureWe

33   highlight the importance of examining variability in feeding behaviour within herbivorous

34   and detritivorous fishes to explain their relationship with reef benthic composition.

35   Clarifying the trophic roles of herbivorous and detritivorous reef fishes will require

36   species-level studies which also examine feeding behaviour to fully understand their

37   contribution in maintaining reef resilience to climate change and fishing impacts.

38

39   **Introduction**

40

41   Coral reefs are complex and highly biodiverse systems that are subject to a broad range of

42   natural and anthropogenic factors, operating from local to global scales, which drive or

43   impact reef fish population abundance and assemblage structure [1–4]. Reef degradation

44   from fishing pressure and climate-change induced coral bleaching and mortality have been

45   invoked to explain patterns in the structure of coral reef fish assemblages across multiple

46   scales in the Indo-Pacific [5–7]. Other studies point to scale dependence in drivers of fish

47   assemblages with geomorphology and biogeography, for example, playing a significant

48   role at larger regional scales, and fishing and reef benthic structure operating at local

49   scales [8–10]. Understanding the mechanisms by which these drivers interact and their

50 relative contributions to controlling reef fish assemblages is critical in underpinning

51 conservation planning and effective reef fisheries management.

52

53 One of the dominant paradigms used to explain impacts from the external stressors of

54 climate change and fishing on coral reefs and their fish assemblages revolves around

55 potential shifts from coral to algal-dominated reef states [11,12]. Herbivorous fishes ~~are~~

56 ~~postulated~~have been shown to play a leading role in preventing this shift by controlling

57 algal abundance [2,13]. The regulatory pathways involve both resource (bottom-up)~~,~~ and

58 predation (top-down) control of the reef ecosystem. Changes in coral cover represent

59 bottom-up control while top-down control is seen when herbivores are depleted through

60 fishing activities, which can lead to their functional role becoming compromised [4,14].

61 Coral reef fish assemblages are known to vary in relation to several environmental

62 characteristics such as exposure to oceanic conditions, rugosity, depth, benthic

63 composition and recent coral mortality [8–10,15–18]. ~~,~~Bottom-up control of reef fish

64 populations by reef benthic composition has been well established [10,15,18–20], and

65 long term studies in the Philippines, for example, have shown that this pathway is the

66 primary driver of the herbivorous parrotfishes [21]. Thus, top-down and bottom-up

67 pathways can either dominate or co-occur, depending on the characteristics within the

68 coral reef ecosystem.

69

70 From a management perspective, it is important to be able to attribute the relative

71 contribution of casual factors driving the structure of reef fish assemblages. The objective

72 of this study was to determine which of a range of largely biotic ~~and abiotic~~ factors may

73 be driving the structure of reef fish assemblages in the absence of fishing. Our hypothesis

74 was that without the top-down influence of fishing in the Chagos Archipelago the fish

3

75 assemblages should reflect the relative contribution of ~~largely bottom-up~~ natural drivers,

76 both bottom up (e.g. food availability) and top-down (e.g. predation), of fish populations,

77 and one anthropogenic stressor – coral mortality related to bleaching events. We also

78 sought to describe the characteristic reef fish assemblages of the atolls of the Chagos

79 Archipelago to build on earlier work that examined fish responses to declines in coral

80 cover caused by the coral bleaching event of 1998 [22] and found little change in reef fish

81 species richness except in corallivores [23]. We also examined the abundance and ~~size~~

82 biomass of reef fishes from the full range of trophic groups to test for relationships

83 between trophic group and reef benthic composition and so examine ~~species'~~ the

84 functional roles of fish species in reef resilience.~~. .~~

85

86 The Chagos Archipelago (British Indian Ocean Territory) is an isolated archipelago of

87 atolls spanning ~60,000 km^2 and 2 degrees of latitude on the north eastern border of the

88 western Indian Ocean Province [24–26], with an area of ~9,400 km^2 of shallow coral reefs

89 (<40m depth) [27]. The islands are uninhabited except for the southern-most atoll, Diego

90 Garcia, which is classified as a Permanent Joint Operating Base of the UK and US

91 governments and hosts a US naval support facility. The archipelago, with the exception of

92 Diego Garcia where a recreational fishery is permitted, was declared a no-take marine

93 protected area (MPA) in 2010 by the UK Government [26]. Indeed, reef fish biomass in

94 the Chagos Archipelago is demonstrably one of the highest of any coral reef ecosystem in

95 the Indo-Pacific [23]. The Chagos Archipelago therefore provides an ideal location for

96 investigating the relationship between fish assemblages and variability in reef benthic

97 habitat and typology, in the absence of impacts from fishing and human populations. Our

98 study assume~~s~~d that reef fish species distributions ~~will~~ did not differ biogeographically

99 across the Chagos Archipelago due to the direction of major current systems in the

4

100 western Indian Ocean (WIO), and the connectivity of the pelagic larvae of most reef fish

101 [13–16]. We do, however, recognise that self recruitment [32] and local oceanographic

102 dynamics [33] within and among atolls of the archipelago may affect larval recruitment

103 patterns. An earlier study reported thats reef fish assemblages were highly homogeneous

104 across the northern atolls [28]. Here we use datasets from a range of atolls in the

105 archipelago, from the northernmost atolls to Diego Garcia in the south, to examine

106 variation in the abundance and species structure of fish assemblages, and to identify

107 drivers of this variability.

108

109 By confining this study to an isolated archipelago of reefs that are relatively unfished and

110 free of pollution and development, this study contributes to a better understanding of

111 intact Indian Ocean reef fish assemblages. As such, it provides a regional context for

112 interpreting coral reef fish assemblages in the wider Indian Ocean where anthropogenic

113 impacts are more prevalent.

114

115 **Methods**

116

117 *Study sites*

118

119 We surveyed reef fish assemblages and coral reef benthic assemblages in March 2014 at a

120 total of 13 (fish) and 11 (benthic) sites across 5 atolls in the Chagos Archipelago (decimal

121 minutes: 05.237333 S 71.81498 E to 07.26195 S 72.44333 E, Fig 1, Table S1). Locations

122 included the fully submerged Blenheim Reef atoll, reefs fringing islands on the west side

123 of the Great Chagos Bank (GCB) and the large, well formed Peros Banhos and Salomon

124 atolls. Reef types were defined based on the Andrefoute et al. [34] classification of coral

5

125   reefs and included forereefs and terraces on the outside of the atolls and pinnacles and

126   inner slopes in the atoll lagoons (Table S1). These were categorised as exposed (outside

127   atolls) or protected (inside lagoons) from oceanic seas. The British Indian Ocean Territory

128   Administration Section of the Foreign and Commonwealth Office, UK Government,

129   granted the research permit to the Darwin Initiative 2014 Expedition to work within

130   the whole Territory. Permission was granted to all authors to visit and dive in the strict

131   nature reserves of the Chagos Archipelago Marine Park.

132

133   **Fig. 1.** Map of the Chagos Archipelago showing atolls surveyed and locations of dive

134   survey sites.

135

136   *Benthic surveys*

137

138   Underwater video transects were recorded using a Sony HDRCX550 camera in a Light

139   and Motion Bluefin housing with Fathom 90 wide angle port and red filter, onto which red

140   lasers with a spacing of 10 cm were mounted to provide scale. Surveys were conducted at

141   each site which ranged in depth from 5–25m. The video aimed for a constant speed (~0.1

142   m s^{-1}), with 10 min within each of four depth zones (25–20 m, 20–15 m, 15–10 m, 10–5

143   m) approximately 1 m above the substrate [32]. Percentage cover of all hard coral and

144   *Acropora* spp. alone, dead coral (defined as recently dead coral skeleton with intact

145   corallite structure), soft coral, crustose coralline algae (CCA), fleshy macroalgae, turf

146   algae, rubble and sand were assessed by randomly selecting 20 video frames from each

147   depth range, and recording what lay beneath 15 randomly selected points per frame, for a

148   total of 300 points per transect, assigned using Coral Point Count software [36]. The

149   rugosity of the reef along each transect was estimated visually using a six point scale

6

150 following Polunin and Roberts [37], ranging from no vertical structural complexity to

151 highly-developed reefs with large coral colonies, caves and crevasses.

152

153 *Fish surveys*

154

155 All fish species from 13 pre-selected families that span the full range of trophic groups,

156 from piscivores to detritivores (see Table S2) were counted in 50 x 5 m transects run

157 parallel to the reef edge. Two dives were conducted at each site, each approximately 300

158 m along the reef edge, in which 2–3 transects were run parallel to the reef edge (5–6

159 replicate transects in total per site). Transects spanned the depth range of the reefs (3m -

160 26m), with the maximum imposed by dive safety regulations. Fish counts at each site

161 therefore had broad depth ranges, from a minimum of 4m to a maximum of 18m ($\bar{x}$ =

162 10.2m across 13 sites), depending on the reef profile. This design was used to maximise

163 survey coverage of the fish assemblage on the reef. These corresponded to the dive sites at

164 which the benthic video transects were placed; thus both methods spanned the same depth

165 range at each site. Siganids (rabbitfishes) were not observed at all and therefore a total of

166 12 families were counted (Table S2). The density and size classes of species were

167 estimated using standard underwater visual census (UVC) techniques for coral reef fishes

168 [38,39]. The size of all species >5 cm total length (TL) were estimated in 5 cm size classes

169 (e.g. 6–10 cm TL, 11–15 cm TL, 16–20 cm TL etc), to obtain biomass values based on

170 published length–weight relationships [40–42]. Biomass was calculated as a derived

171 variable for the fish assemblage because it is a good indicator of energy flow within the

172 coral reef ecosystem. A fixed size category for the smallest species was used because: a)

173 simplifying counting procedures across a wide range of species improves accuracy

174 [39,43]; b) any differences in biomass in these small species between sites will be smaller

175   than the 5 cm size class accuracy used; and e) to enable these small species to be included

176   in total biomass calculations. Fixed size classes were as follows: i) all Chaetontidae

177   species were assigned a length size class of 6–10 cm, with the exception of *C.*

178   *xanthocephalos*, *C. lineolatus* and *Heniochus* spp. which were recorded as 11–15 cm; ii)

179   small acanthurids, *Ctenochaetus* spp*., Acanthurus nigrofuscus, A. leucosternon* and

180   *Zebrasoma scopas,* were assigned a length size class of 11–15 cm; iii) *Centropyge* spp.

181   (Pomacanthidae) –were assigned a length size class of 6–10 cm. A total of 110 species

182   were identified and assigned to 12 functional trophic groups (piscivores, omnivores,

183   corallivores, invertivores, planktivores, detritivores, grazer-detritivores and 5 herbivore

184   categories, *sensu* Green and Bellwood [44] using a classification system for the WIO [45]

185   (Table S2).

186

187   *Data Analyses*

188

189   For analyses, the data were organised into a series of matrices: i) fish species numerical

190   density and biomass (13 sites); ii) fish functional group numerical density and biomass (13

191   sites); iii) benthic habitat variables (11 sites) that were natural log-transformed and

192   standardised (11 variables).

193

194   <u>Fish assemblages</u>

195   Spatial autocorrelation in fish assemblages across the Chagos Archipelago was tested by

196   implementing a Mantel test using the ade4 package [46] in R [47] on a matrix of

197   geographic distances between sampling sites and a dissimilarity matrix based on fish

198   density computed using the Bray-Curtis index. The Mantel statistic was further calculated

199   within Peros Banhos, GCB and Salomon atolls, to test for a relationship with geographic

200   distance between sites within atolls. Correlations between both numerical density and

201   biomass matrices were tested for significance using 9999 permutations.

202

203   In order to visualise variation in the composition of fish assemblages across the

204   archipelago, we used non-metric multidimensional scaling (nMDS) on Bray-Curtis

205   dissimilarity distance measures obtained from fish data matrices of both abundance and

206   biomass. To determine which of the fish trophic groups were significantly related to the

207   ordination, we carried out random permutation testing using 9999 permutations. To

208   further examine for groupings within the fish assemblage data, a Ward cluster analysis

209   based on Euclidean distances was performed on hellinger-transformed data, using

210   similarity profile analysis (SIMPROF) to test the significance of clustered groups [48].

211

212   <u>Relationships between datasets</u>

213   We tested for auto-correlation within benthic variables, and identified variables that were

214   correlated at $r \geq 0.7$. Three variables (calcareous substrate, sand/rubble, and other benthic)

215   were removed from further analysis and no remaining pairwise correlations between

216   variables greater than $r = 0.53$ were found. The remaining 8 variables were further tested

217   by a variance inflation factor (VIF) analysis which found that each of the retained

218   environmental variables resulted in a VIF of <10.

219

220   The Adonis function within the Vegan package [49] was used to examine for significant

221   relationships between categorical variables (atoll, reef type and exposure) and the fish

222   assemblages surveyed, also using permutation testing set at 9999 permutations. We used

223   the envfit function within the Vegan package to estimate the direction and strengths of

224   the correlation between the nMDS of fish species and the reef benthic variables surveyed.

225 Finally, we used a variation of the BIO-ENV [50] routine, termed BIO-BIO, to identify

226 the subset of fish species which best correlated to the overall biological pattern of the

227 dissimilarity matrix, using both numerical density and biomass data. They produced

228 similar results, thus density alone was presented.

229

230 **Results**

231

232 A total of 110 fish species from the 12 families were recorded across the Chagos

233 Archipelago. The matrices of mean species density and biomass are provided in

234 ~~Supplementary~~ Tables S3 and S4, respectively. Multivariate ANOVA (Adonis)

235 permutation results found significant differences in the fish species matrices between

236 atolls for both density and biomass datasets ($F_{4,12} = 2.068$, $P = 0.002$; $F_{4,12} = 1.760$, $P = $

237 0.010)~~;~~ and between three reef types (forereef; terrace & forereef; lagoons (2 types

238 combined), Table S1) for fish biomass ($F_{2,12} = 1.673$, $P = 0.035$). With a limited number of

239 sites, these differences between reef types could not be tested further. There were no

240 significant differences found in species' density or biomass between sites classified as

241 exposed (outer reefs) or protected (lagoon) sites ($P>0.05$).

242

243 Mantel tests indicated that dissimilarity in the fish assemblages using species density data

244 was strongly related to geographic distance across the archipelago (Monte Carlo

245 o~~O~~bservation = 0.512; $P = 0.002$). However, within Peros Banhos, Salomon and GCB

246 atolls there was no significant relationship between geographic distance between sites and

247 the fish assemblages present (Peros Banhos: Monte Carlo Observation = -0.317, $P = $

248 0.499; Salomon: Monte Carlo Observation = -0.718, $P = 0.835$; GCB, Monte Carlo

249 Observation = -0.224, $P = 0.497$).

10

250

251 Ordination of species density data across the archipelago revealed three dissimilar groups

252 corresponding to the atolls of Peros Banhos, Salomon and reefs of the GCB (Fig. 2a). Fish

253 assemblages at GCB separated most strongly from other atolls, while Peros Banhos and

254 Salomon were more similar. These differences in fish assemblages were further verified

255 by the Ward cluster analysis (Fig. 2b), which showed four significant clusters (>60%

256 dissimilarity) though one cluster (cluster 3) comprised of a single site – Diego Garcia

257 Atoll's terrace and& forereef, which differed from all other sites (>1.0 dissimilarity). This

258 Euclidian analysis provides a more detailed examination of dissimilarity in the fish

259 assemblages across sites: cluster 1 was most dissimilar from all other sites and consisted

260 of northern sites at Blenheim and Salomon Atoll forereefs; cluster 2 contained all lagoon

261 sites, 3 from Peros Banhos but also 1 site from each of Salomon and Diego Garcia; whilst

262 cluster 4 consisted of two sub-groups, Eagle and Egmont forereefs at GCB, and Three

263 Brothers forereef (GCB) and two Peros Banhos sites (a forereef and a lagoon pinnacle).

264 Total fish density and biomass also showed broad--scale differences across the archipelago

265 with the highest densities recorded on reefs at GCB, the highest biomass recorded at Peros

266 Banhos Atoll and the lowest biomass at Diego Garcia Atoll (Fig. 3).

267

268 **Fig. 2.** Spatial variation in reef fish species assemblages across the 13 sites in the Chagos

269 Archipelago: a) non-metric multidimensional scaling plot, coloured ellipses show 95%

270 confidence intervals of site grouping; b) Ward cluster analysis, colours in dendrogram

271 highlight the four significantly different groups found (<0.6 dissimilarity).

272 Significant fish species assemblages across 13 sites in the Chagos Archipelago based on a)

273 nMDS analysis of fish species density data and b) Ward cluster analysis showing four

274 significant groups (>0.6 dissimilarity).

275

Fig. 3. Total fish a) density (number of individuals per hectare) and b) biomass (kg per hectare) by atoll, based on 12 reef-associated families surveyed at 13 sites. Error bars are standard errors.

279

When fish species were categorised into the 12 trophic groups, permutation tests showed only 3 trophic groups were significant in explaining the pattern in the species assemblages: grazer-detritivores and corallivores for fish density and grazer-detritivores and planktivores for fish biomass (Table 1, Fig. 4). These three trophic groups all significantly explained fish density differences when the permutation test was stratified by atoll (Table 1). Grazer-detritivores comprise a group of acanthurids and the angelfishes *Centropye* spp. (Table S2). Acanthurid species in this trophic group, such as *Acanthurus tennenti* and *A. xanthopterus,* typically feed on sand and hard surfaces to extract detritus and microbes, as well as epilithic algae. The densities and biomass of these grazer-detritivores were nearly three times greater at GCB and Diego Garcia compared to the other atolls (Fig. 4), representing the largest difference in the fish assemblages across the archipelago. The corallivores consisted of six obligate coral feeding butterflyfishes out of the 18 Chaetodontidae observed in the Chagos Archipelago and were more abundant at Peros Banhos and Salomon atolls, compared to other reefs (Fig. 4). When biomass was considered, the planktivores, comprised of balistid, acanthurid and chaetodontid species, differed significantly between the atolls with biomass at GCB three times higher than any of the other reef sites (Table 1, Fig. 4).

297

Table 1. Random permutation results of 12 fish trophic groups showing only those significantly related to differences: a) across all sites and; b) stratified by atoll.

Density			Biomass		
a) All sites					
Trophic group	r^2	*p*-value	Trophic group	r^2	*p*-value
Grazer-detritivores	0.769	<0.001	Grazer-detritivores	0.792	<0.001
Corallivores	0.598	0.009	Planktivores	0.515	0.026
b) Stratified by atoll					
Grazer-detritivores	0.769	0.006	Grazer-detritivores	0.641	0.016
Planktivores	0.268	0.030	Planktivores	0.515	0.034
Corallivores	0.598	0.048			

301
302

303

Fig. 4. Mean density (number of individuals per hectare) and biomass kg per hectare) by atoll for the three functional trophic groups that were significantly related to fish assemblage differences. Error bars are standard errors. Functional trophic groups are explained in Table S2.

Benthic reef characteristics and fish assemblages

The benthic cover at reef sites was highly variable among the atolls of the archipelago. Total live coral cover ranged from 15.7% (±1.6 SD) to 47.2 % (±24.1 SD), *Acropora* spp. coral cover from 1.1 (±1.4 SD), to 28.1% (±12.4 SD), and dead standing coral from 5.9% (±3.1 SD) to 26.4% (±13.1 SD). Non-metric multi-dimensional scaling of the relative contribution of the eight benthic variables to the differences between fish assemblages across the archipelago showed that reef sites grouped along two main axes (Fig. 5): the Y axis with high macro-algae such as GCB reefs, versus sites with higher soft coral (Diego Garcia); and the X axis with sites with high hard coral, dead coral, live *Acropora*, rugosity

319 and turf algae, at Salomon Atoll and Perhos Banhos, versus reefs at GCB with higher

320 CCA. GCB reefs had the lowest levels of hard coral, ranging from 15.7% (±5.6 SD) to

321 28.7% (±17.7 SD). However, hard coral and dead coral (i.e. structural components) were

322 the only benthic categories that were significantly related to differences in fish assemblage

323 structure when analysed with fish density data; when tested with fish biomass data,

324 rugosity also became significant (Table 2). When the permutation analysis was stratified

Density	Biomass

325 by atoll, hard coral and dead coral were no longer significant; instead soft coral showed a

326 significant correlation with fish density and CCA with fish biomass (Table 2). These

327 results corroborate the geographic differences in fish assemblages between different atolls,

328 driven by hard and dead coral cover, whereas within atolls only CCA and soft coral were

329 significantly correlated with the fish species data matrices.

330

331 **Fig. 5.** nMDS diagram showing the relationship between benthic variables at 11 reef sites

332 overlaid on the fish assemblage ordination (see Fig. 2) across the Chagos Archipelago.

333 The relative contribution of each benthic variable is displayed by the length of the vector.

334

335 **Table 2.** Significant permutation correlations between benthos and the fish species matrix,

336 for density and biomass at: a) all sites and; b) stratified by atoll.

337

338

14

a) All sites					
Benthic Group	r^2	*p*-value	Benthic group	r^2	*p*-value
Hard Coral	0.63	0.021	Hard Coral	0.7	0.001
Dead Coral	0.66	0.013	Dead Coral	0.7	0.001
			Rugosity	0.55	0.034
b) Stratified by atoll					
Soft Coral	0.38	0.004	Crustose Corraline Algae	0.310	0.042

339 *Fish species*

340

341 A species-level ordination (BIOBIO) of the density of the 110 fish species which

342 determined which species were most correlated with differences in the fish assemblages

343 across all reef sites showed that 13 species best explained (rho=0.832) the fish

344 assemblages across the sites: *Acanthurus lineatus, A. nigrofuscus, Zebrasoma desjardinii*

345 (grazers)*, Cetoscarus ocellatus, Chlorurus strongylocephalus B* (large excavators)*,*

346 *Hemitaurichthys zoster, Paracanthurus hepatus* (planktivores)*, Lutjanus bohar*

347 (piscivore)*, Lutjanus fulvus, Lutjanus gibbus, Lutjanus kasmira, Lethrinus enigmatus*

348 (omnivores)*, Scarus niger* (scraper)*, Sufflamen* spp. (invertivore) (Table 3, Table S2, Fig.

349 6). Note that none of these species were from the significant trophic groups detected in the

350 permutation tests except for *Paracanthurus hepatus*. When the ordination was restricted

351 sequentially, it showed that *Scarus niger* alone was highly correlated (rho=0.569) with

352 species assemblage differences. Further, a combination of only 6 species achieved a very

353 high correlation (rho=0.802) with species assemblage differences. Although the 13 species

354 illustrated in Fig. 6 are the best fit, other species consistently appeared in highly correlated

355 subsets (Table 3), and therefore were likely to drive differences between fish assemblages

356 across the archipelago. These included *Acanthurus thompsoni (*planktivore), *A. tennenti,*

357 *A. xanthopterus* (grazer-detritivores)*, Scarus frenatus* (scraper)*,* the invertivores

358 *Chaetodon madagascariensis* and *Sufflamen* spp. and *Lethrinus microdon* (omnivore).

15

359

360 **Fig. 6.** The relationship between individual species and the fish species density ordination

361 based on the 13 fish survey sites.

362

363 **Table 3.** Species strongly correlated with differences in density of fish species

364 assemblages across the Chagos Archipelago, based on a species level ordination (BIO-

365 BIO) of 110 species.

Number of Species in subset	Fish Species	Spearman's Rank Correlation (rho)
1	*Scarus niger*	0.569
2	*Acanthurus thompsoni, Scarus niger*	0.715
3	*Acanthurus tennenti, Acanthurus thompsoni, Scarus niger*	0.762
4	*Acanthurus thompsoni, Naso hexacanthus S, Scarus niger, S.russelli*	0.767
5	*Acanthurus leucosternon, Cephalopholis sexmaculata, Lethrinus obsoletus, Scarus niger, Scarus psittacus*	0.783
6	*Acanthurus thompsoni, Chaetodon madagascariensis, Lethrinus obsoletus, Scarus niger, Sufflamen spp., Zebrasoma desjardinii*	0.802
7	*Acanthurus thompsoni, Chaetodon madagascariensis, Lethrinus obsoletus, N. hexacanthus S, Scarus niger, Sufflamen spp., Zebrasoma desjardinii*	0.815
8	*Acanthurus tennenti, Acanthurus xanthopterus, Chaetodon madagascariensis, Lutjanus bohar, Scarus frenatus, Scarus niger, Sufflamen spp., Zebrasoma desjardinii*	0.813
9	*Acanthurus tennenti, Acanthurus xanthopterus, Chaetodon madagascariensis, Lutjanus bohar, Lethrinus microdon, Scarus frenatus, Scarus niger, Sufflamen spp., Zebrasoma desjardinii*	0.818
10	*Acanthurus tennenti, Acanthurus xanthopterus, Canthigaster bennetti, Chaetodon madagascariensis, Lutjanus bohar, Lethrinus microdon, Scarus frenatus, Scarus niger, Sufflamen sp., Zebrasoma desjardinii*	0.821
11	*Acanthurus tennenti, Acanthurus xanthopterus, Canthigaster bennetti, Chaetodon madagascariensis, Lutjanus bohar, Lethrinus microdon, Odonus niger, Scarus frenatus, Scarus niger, Sufflamen spp., Zebrasoma desjardinii*	0.823
12	*Acanthurus tennenti, Acanthurus xanthopterus, Canthigaster bennetti, Chaetodon madagascariensis, Lutjanus bohar, Lethrinus microdon, Odonus niger, Paracanthurus hepatus, Scarus frenatus, Scarus niger, Sufflamen spp., Zebrasoma desjardinii*	0.820
13	*Acanthurus lineatus, Acanthurus nigrofuscus, Cetoscarus ocellatus, Chlorurus strongylocephalus B, Hemitaurichthys zoster, Lutjanus bohar, Lutjanus fulvus, Lutjanus gibbus, Lutjanus kasmira, Lethrinus enigmatus, Paracanthurus hepatus, Scarus niger, Zebrasoma desjardinii*	0.831

14	*Acanthurus lineatus, Acanthurus nigrofuscus, Cetoscarus ocellatus, Chlorurus strongylocephalus B, Chaetodon striatus, Hemitaurichthys zoster, Lutjanus bohar, Lutjanus fulvus, Lutjanus gibbus, Lutjanus kasmira, Lethrinus enigmatus, Paracanthurus hepatus, Scarus niger, Zebrasoma desjardinii*	0.824

Three broad types of fish assemblages in the Chagos Archipelago are suggested through a combination of highly significant species within the ordination (Fig. 6), significant benthic associations (Fig. 5) and clustering of fish species (Fig. 2b). These can be defined as those aligned with: 1) ~~those aligned with~~ higher hard coral cover (27–43%), or recently dead coral; 2) ~~with~~ high rugosity and *Acropora* cover; and 3) ~~those associated with~~ higher soft coral, CCA, and macro-algal cover but low cover of live hard coral (12–22%; Table 4). The former (groups 1 and 2, Table 4) were found across Salomon and Peros Banhos atolls, whereas the latter (group 3, Table 4) was largely at GCB. It is noteworthy that two of the largest excavating parrotfishes, *Cetoscarus ocellatus* and *Chlorurus strongylocephalos* (B), showed opposing patterns of correlation (Fig. 6). *Cetoscarus ocellatus* was also closely associated with *Scarus niger* on certain reefs in Salomon and Peros Banhos and both these species characterise group 1 and 2 assemblage types (Table 4). Fish assemblages at Diego Garcia Atoll forereef site were significantly different and may represent a fourth assemblage type, but there were too few survey sites to assess this. Note that 3 species were rare, present only at 1 reef (~~:~~ *A. lineatus, Lethrinus enigmatus* and *Lutjanus fulvus,* ~~(~~Table 4, Table S3).

Table 4. Synthesis of results from Figures 2b, 5 and 6 and ~~Suppl.~~ Tables S3 and S4, to define three broad types of fish assemblages across the Chagos Archipelago, the sites at which they were found and the corresponding reef benthic characteristics. Species and

389 benthos listed are the highest abundance/cover and were significant within analyses. *=

390 rare species seen only at 1 reef. Diego Garcia Atoll forereef was an outlier and is not

391 included.

392

No.	Fish Species	Reefs	Benthos
1			
	Scarus niger (Scraper)	**Salomon**	Hard coral
	Acanthurus nigrofuscus (Grazer)	- terrace & forereef	*Acropora*
	Hemitaurichthys zoster (Planktivore)	(2 sites)	Soft coral
	Cetoscarus ocellatus (Excavator)	**Blenheim**	Rugosity
2			
	Scarus niger (Scraper)	**Peros Banhos**	Dead coral
	Lutjanus kasmira (Omnivore)	- lagoon (2 sites)	Rugosity
	Cetoscarus ocellatus (Excavator)	**Salomon**	Turf algae
	*A. lineatus** (Grazer)	- lagoon	Hard coral
	L. gibbus (Omnivore)	**Diego Garcia**	*Acropora*
	Z. desjardinii (Grazer)	- lagoon	
3			
	Chlor. strongylocephalos (Excavator)	**GCB**	Soft coral
	Paracanthurus hepatus (Planktivore)	- forereefs	CCA
	*Lethrinus enigmatus** (Omnivore)	**Peros Banhos**	Macro-algae
	Lutjanus bohar (Piscivore)	- forereef	
	*Lutjanus fulvus** (Omnivore)	- lagoon	

393

394

395

396 *Species of conservation and fisheries interest*

397

398 The widespread Indo-Pacific coral trout grouper *Plectropomus laevis* was abundant and

399 observed at all but 3 sites, with a mean density and biomass of 17.85 ± 1.54 SD

400 individuals-/-ha and 104.8 ± 170.5 SD kg/ha, including several very large individuals (91–

401 110 cm TL), close to maximum size for this species. *Plectropomus punctatus*, the coral

402 trout grouper endemic to the Indian Ocean was never observed, yet it was recorded from

18

403   the Chagos Archipelago in the 1990s by Winterbottom and Anderson [51~~45~~]. No siganids

404   were observed during the current survey, ~~yet~~ though ~~two species,~~ *Siganus argenteus* and *S.*

405   *canaliculatus* ~~were reported from~~are known from the archipelago ~~in the 1990s~~[51]. The

406   abundance of the larger species of grouper such as *Epinephelus fuscoguttatus*, *E.*

407   *malabaricus, E. multinotatus* and *E. tauvina* was extremely low, ranging from a mean of

408   0.0–0.77 ±1.54 SD fish~~/~~-ha.

409

410

411   **Discussion**

412

413   Large regional--scale [7,52] or long temporal--scale analyses [2] in the Indian Ocean and

414   across the Indo-Pacific [6] -have shown that fishing and climate change are primary

415   drivers of fish assemblage structure. We found significant differences in fish assemblage

416   structure among the atolls of the Chagos Archipelago which we attribute to natural

417   environmental drivers and climate change, as reflected in the significant correlations

418   between fish assemblages and reef benthic composition. However, temporal changes

419   before and after coral bleaching events remain unknown; thus, future work on this would

420   greatly enhance interpretation of the results of the current study. ~~We found significant~~

421   ~~differences in fish assemblage structure between the atolls of the Chagos Archipelago~~

422   ~~which we attribute to natural environmental drivers and climate change.~~We can, however,

423   ~~We~~ assume~~d~~ that fishing effects ~~would be~~are minimal due to the lack of resident human

424   populations on any of the atolls since the 1960s (with the exception of Diego Garcia) and

425   because of the establishment of a no-take MPA in 2010. Indeed, the Chagos Archipelago

426   is used as a benchmark for largely unfished reefs in the Indian Ocean [6,23]. Further, our

427   study assumed that reef fish species distributions did not differ biogeographically because

428   of the relatively small geographic range of the Chagos Archipelago fed by the easterly

429   flowing East African Coastal Current and South Equatorial Countercurrent, both

430   emanating from the east African mainland [29], and the connectivity of the pelagic larvae

431   of most reef fishes [30,31]. Of the 110 species in the dataset, there was no apparent

432   disjunct in their distribution between the northern atolls (Peros Banhos, Salomon and

433   Blenheim) and the southern atolls (GCB and Diego Garcia) except for *Acanthurus tristis*,

434   *Chaetodon madagascariensis* and *Chlorurus capistratoides,* which were only found in the

435   south, and *Chaetodon lunula* which was only found in the north. Of these, only *C.*

436   *madagascariensis* was a significant species in the ordination analysis.

437

438   *Patterns in fish species and benthic communities*

439

440   Differences in fish assemblages were significantly correlated with geographic distance

441   between sites; the relative density of the 110 fish species fish across the archipelago

442   differed most significantly between atolls. These atoll-scale differences were also apparent

443   in total density and biomass values (12 families), with the highest fish densities recorded

444   on the reefs of the western edge of the GCB, the highest fish biomass recorded at Peros

445   Banhos Atoll and the lowest fish biomass at Diego Garcia Atoll. Reef benthic composition

446   also varied between atolls, most notably in the relative cover of live hard coral, recently

447   dead standing coral and rugosity, and permutation testing showed that these differences

448   were significantly related to fish density (hard and dead standing coral) and fish biomass

449   (hard coral, dead standing coral, rugosity). These results are not surprising since strong

450   positive correlations between fish density or biomass and live hard coral and rugosity,

451   benthic variables that co-vary and reflect reef habitat structural complexity, are widely

452   reported [15,16,53–56]. Therefore, patterns in the fish assemblages reported here likely

453   reflect bottom-up control.

454

455   A major alteration in the benthic composition of coral reefs across the Indian Ocean

456   occurred following the severe coral bleaching event of 1998 [57]. This thermal anomaly

457   resulted in a reduction of living coral cover in the Chagos Archipelago from 50–75%

458   cover prior to the event, to ~10% live coral remaining on all six atolls in 1999 [22].

459   However, a majority of reef sites across the archipelago recovered rapidly and reached

460   pre-bleaching condition by 2010 [26]. The strong benthic differences between atolls

461   observed in our surveys in 2014 possibly reflect different levels of bleaching and differing

462   recovery patterns following the 1998 event, though with little historic data this remains

463   unknown. However, early reports of highly homogenous fish assemblages across reefs in

464   the northern atolls prior to 1998 [28] suggest that the differences in the structure of the

465   fish assemblages found in 2014 are recent and may therefore, be due to differing recovery

466   patterns. ~~We propose this reflects differing trajectories of coral bleaching and recovery~~

467   ~~between the atolls since the 1998 extreme thermal anomaly.~~

468

469   *Fishing effects*

470

471   This study was not designed to look at fishing effects because it was based on the premise

472   that there is no reef fishing in Chagos Archipelago, however, ~~Most reef fishes in the~~

473   ~~Indian Ocean are targeted, and in many cases are over-exploited, within multi-species~~

474   ~~fisheries [58,59]. In the Chagos Archipelago,~~ there was a small Mauritian fishery targeting

475   grouper (Epinephelidae) and snapper (Lutjanidae), which operated from the 1970s until

476   2010 when the Chagos MPA was designated [23]. Populations of piscivore and omnivore

477   trophic categories were similar between atolls, exemplified by the coral trout grouper

478 *Plectropomus laevis*, which was abundant and observed at all but three sites. However,

479 two snappers *Lutjanus bohar* (piscivore) and *Lutjanus gibbus* (omnivore), were

480 significantly correlated with differences in fish assemblages across atolls. The highest

481 biomass of these two species was found in Peros Banhos lagoon sites (up to 861 kg/ha

482 and 530 kg/ha, for *L. bohar* and *L. gibbus*, respectively). Apparently the fishery did not

483 operate in the lagoons (BIOT Fisheries Officer, pers. comm. 2014), but since our study is

484 the first to report on fish biomass in the lagoons there are no previous comparable data.

485 For *L. bohar*, moderate biomass levels (175–263 kg/ha) were found on forereefs at

486 Salomon, Peros Banhos and Blenheim, but were lower at Diego Garcia and GCB.

487 while(69-108 kg/ha and 16-148 kg/ha, respectively). For *L. gibbus*, biomass of *L. gibbus*

488 was highly variable across all forereefs. Our surveys also suggest that three large species

489 of grouper, *Epinephelus fuscoguttatus, E. multinotatus* and *E. tauvina* may have been

490 over-fished since their populations were extremely depleted across all sites. It is also

491 likely thatWhile there is also some illegal fishing is ongoingin BIOT, 80% by weight of

492 illegal catches detected by the BIOT patrol vessel is shark [58], therefore this poaching

493 can be considered minimal in terms of impacts on reef fishes.: anecdotal reports from

494 India cite grouper landings reputedly captured in the Chagos Archipelago (MS pers.

495 obs).TheseOur results are inconclusive but and suggest that further research is needed to

496 distinguish between possible latent fishing effects or natural biotic/abiotic drivers on of

497 some species grouper and *Lutjanus bohar*at certain atolls..

498

499 A recreational fishery operates outside the MPA at the naval base in Diego Garcia and is

500 having an impact on fish biomass [23]. Our total biomass estimates with maximum values

501 of ~3,500 kg/ha (12 families), do not include sharks and trevally and therefore cannot be

502 directly compared with the estimates of ->9,000 kg/ha reported from 2010–2012.

22

503 However, comparing relative biomass between atolls ~~during~~ from the 2010–2012 survey

504 [23] with our survey in 2014 shows similar differences, with highest values at Peros

505 Banhos, followed by GCB, then Salomon, and the lowest values at Diego Garcia. This

506 supports Graham et al.'s [23] conclusions that the recreational fishery is having an impact.

507 Nevertheless, we measured extremely high biomass values at 10 of the 13 sites (1,501-

508 3,000 kg/ha at six sites, and > 3,000 kg/ha at four sites). These are similar, when the same

509 families are considered, to biomass at other uninhabited and protected reefs of the French

510 territories in the Mozambique Channel [59], providing strong support for using Chagos

511 Archipelago as a reference benchmark for unfished reef fish populations in the western

512 Indian Ocean.

513

514 *Trophic dynamics in the reef fish assemblages*

515

516 Herbivory and detritivory contribute significantly to the trophic dynamics and hence

517 biomass production on coral reefs [60,61]. Indeed, the diversity of herbivores and

518 detritivores seen on modern reefs, illustrated by the parrotfishes (Labridae: Scarinae) and

519 surgeonfishes (Acanthuridae), has been linked to the massive expansion of shallow coral

520 reef habitats over the last 5 million years [62]. In the Chagos Archipelago, the grazer-

521 detritivores was the trophic group that differed most significantly between atolls. This

522 group comprises a suite of acanthurids ("ring-tail" surgeonfishes [44]), such as

523 *Acanthurus tennenti* and *A. xanthopterus,* that harvest mouthfuls of soft sediment on dead

524 coral substrate, as well as on sand, which contain the diatoms and microbes of their diet

525 [63,64]. Their highest densities at GCB and Diego Garcia (>500 and >600

526 individuals/ha, respectively) corresponded with low hard coral cover. In contrast, low

527 numbers of these surgeonfishes were seen at Peros Banhos, Salomon and Blenheim (<130,

528   <14, <170 individuals/ha, respectively), where hard coral cover was high. These results

529   suggest that these "grazer-detritivore" surgeonfish species may thrive where their benthic

530   food sources have increased due to coral mortality [65] and ~~may~~ can therefore serve as

531   important indicators of reef degradation. ~~They may also help reduce the growth of~~

532   ~~macroalgae.~~ The prevalence of the ~~The~~ detritivory role is also supported by one of the

533   most common reef fishes in the world, the bristletooth surgeonfishes *Ctenochaetus* spp.

534   [66], with the combined density of two species ~~ous~~ *Ctenochaetus truncatus* and *C. striatus*

535   at ~850 individuals/ha being the second highest (*Caesio* spp. were the highest: 936

536   individuals/ha) ~~spp. are one of the most common reef fishes in the world [66] and *C.*~~

537   ~~*truncatus* and *C. striatus* were the most abundant~~ of all the 110 species surveyed~~, with~~

538   ~~densities of up to 1,800 individuals/ha.~~ We propose that ~~*These results suggest that this*~~

539   ~~*genus is highly successful and*~~ the importance of detritivory in recovery of degraded reefs

540   and in cycling carbon within ~~these~~ coral reef systems ~~systems~~ is not well quantified and

541   therefore an important area for future research.

542

543   A strong relationship between hard coral cover and corallivores has been widely reported

544   [23,56,67]~~;~~ and was confirmed here with significantly higher densities of obligate coral-

545   feeding butterflyfishes at Peros Banhos and Salomon atolls where there was relatively

546   higher live coral cover~~, and the highest densities of corallivores in the lagoons of Peros~~

547   ~~Banhos where the highest coral cover was recorded~~. These coral specialists are clearly

548   highly vulnerable to coral mortality and, as such, have ~~been~~ long been used as potential

549   indicator species for monitoring coral reef health [68]. The third trophic group that

550   differed significantly between atolls was the planktivores, comprising several acanthurids

551   (three *Naso* spp., *Acanthurus thompsoni* and *Paracanthurus hepatus)*, two chaetodontids,

552   two balistids and *Caesio* spp. The biomass of this group was three times higher at GCB,

24

553   with a mean biomass of ~~860~~ 1,045 kg/ha, compared to ~~277kg~~338kg/ha for other atolls, and

554   this was largely due to the caesionids and *Naso hexacanthus* and *N. brevirostris*. Further,

555   three planktivores were strongly correlated with the ordination: *Paracanthurus hepatus,*

556   *Acanthurus thompsoni* and the chaetodon *Hemitaurichthys zoster*. Drivers of planktivore

557   populations on coral reefs are still poorly understood, but their food items are associated

558   with reef edges and proximity to deep water [69]. These acanthurid species are all

559   zooplanktivores [70], suggesting waters at GCB may be zooplankton-rich. Thus, higher

560   Acanthuridae densities overall at ~~the more degraded~~ GCB reefs appear to reflect two

561   different and unrelated trophic pathways: increased access to soft benthic surfaces due to

562   coral mortality for the grazer-detritivores and higher zooplankton densities for

563   planktivores. Finally, it was notable that the density and biomass of the piscivore and

564   omnivore trophic groups, species that represent important target fishery species [23,39],

565   were not significantly correlated with fish assemblage patterns across the archipelago,

566   suggesting that benthic differences did not directly affect these higher trophic level taxa.

567   Thus, when data were aggregated by trophic group, only three groups differed

568   significantly and these appeared to be influenced by reduced coral cover due to climate

569   change [22] and natural variability in zooplankton, both bottom-up control pathways.

570

571   It was surprising that none of the five herbivore trophic groups, which include all the

572   parrotfishes, were significant in ~~the aggregated trophic group analyses~~explaining

573   differences in fish assemblages between sites. We found species-level analyses were more

574   informative than aggregated trophic group analyses and demonstrated species from within

575   seven trophic groups were highly related to differences in the fish assemblages across the

576   reefs of the Chagos Archipelago. *Scarus niger* had the strongest correlation with fish

577   assemblage structure across the archipelago, with highest biomass on the high coral cover

578 northern atolls (182 kg/ha at Peros Banhos), and the lowest at Diego Garcia and the low

579 coral cover reefs of GCB (3 kg/ha and 11–27 kg/ha, respectively). This species is one of

580 the most ubiquitous parrotfishes across the Indo-Pacific [71,72] and feeds on the top 1–2

581 mm of dead coral substrate [62,73], though it probably removes epilithic algae while

582 feeding. *Scarus niger* was associated with the highly abundant surgeonfish *Acanthurus*

583 *nigrofuscus*, known to graze similar substrate types ~~but~~ but feed*ing*~~s~~ on epilithic algae

584 [63,64]. These two species correlated most closely with the assemblages at Salomon Atoll

585 sites, particularly on the outer forereefs where live hard coral, *Acropora* and rugosity were

586 highest, but also at the Peros Banhos lagoon sites where turf algae and dead coral were

587 relatively high. This result may reflect "feeding complimentarity" by a parrotfish and a

588 surgeonfish, accessing different algal prey within the same benthic substrate [74]. It also

589 illustrates the challenges in using trophic categories as a proxy for ecological function.

590 Herbivorous fishes have been implicated in the top-down control of reef benthos, as their

591 grazing of recently dead coral substrate prevents the rapid colonisation of macro algae.~~;~~

592 ~~F~~further, over-fishing of herbivores has been invoked to explain declines in coral cover

593 and they are consequently considered to play a key functional role in maintaining coral

594 reef resilience [4,11,12,75–77]. Parrotfishes (Labridae: —Scarinae) are a significant

595 component of this herbivorous fish community on account of their size, numerical

596 abundance and hence biomass [14]. They are also targeted in many reef fisheries and are

597 frequently used as indicators for the condition or resilience of reefs [14,39,44,61,78].

598 However, recent work on the intricacies of parrotfish feeding modes and diets [14,62,73]

599 indicates that assigning species with similar feeding modes into broad trophic groups may

600 over-simplify their functional role in reef resilience. Further, we show that parrotfish

601 population densities can vary by up to 43-fold between reef sites in the absence of fishing

602   and so caution against assumptions that declines in parrotfish populations are necessarily

603   due to fishing.

604

605   The largest parrotfishes, ~~the excavators~~ *Cetoscarus ocellatus* and *Chlororus*

606   *strongylocephalos*, showed completely opposing patterns in their distribution with

607   *Cetoscarus ocellatus* closely associated with healthy reefs with high coral cover at the

608   northern atolls (Peros Banhos and Salomon). In contrast, *Chlorurus strongylocephalos*

609   was strongly correlated with reefs at GCB which had the lowest live coral and the highest

610   cover of calcareous algae, soft coral and macroalgae. This opposing pattern in the

611   distribution of these two high-biomass parrotfish, functionally termed "excavators"

612   [14,44,65], can be explained by their feeding behaviour. *Cetoscarus ocellatus* are

613   territorial, non-schooling, harvest small areas of reef and are associated with reefs of high

614   live coral cover (M. Samoilys, pers. obs.). In contrast, *Chlorurus strongylocephalos*

615   prefers disturbed reefs which offer a larger benthic surface area for excavating the dead

616   coral reef matrix [73]. They feed on these substrates, typically in large schools if the

617   disturbed substrate is of sufficient area (H. Choat, James Cook University, pers. comm.

618   2016). The Indian Ocean endemic, *Chlorurus enneacanthus,* was observed to have a

619   similar feeding strategy to *Chlorurus strongylocephalos* (M. Samoilys pers. obs.). These

620   *Chlorurus* species conform to reports from the Philippines where some parrotfish species

621   prefer areas of reef that have become damaged, for example from cyclones [21]. The

622   patterns seen here suggest bottom-up control of parrotfish populations by coral cover in

623   positive (e.g. *S. niger, C. ocellatus*) or negative (e.g. *C. strongylocephalos*) relationships.

624   These pathways therefore need to be considered when examining the role of parrotfishes

625   in influencing coral recovery trajectories. ~~Our results are consistent with recent findings~~

626 ~~from the Pacific where the responses of herbivorous fishes to biophysical attributes of~~

627 ~~reefs differed between five trophic groups [65].~~

628

629 *Conclusions*

630 The isolated Chagos Archipelago provides a valuable ecological benchmark for

631 understanding the structure of reef fish assemblages ~~in the absence of fishing~~when fishing

632 impacts are minimal. Differences in fish assemblages across the archipelago were

633 associated with variation in reef benthic condition, ~~confirming~~ suggesting a bottom-up

634 response of fish populations to changes in coral cover. Our results support the concept that

635 herbivory and detrivory are significant functions provided by reef fishes [60–62], but we

636 propose that separating diet from the structural impact of these feeding modes will

637 improve our understanding of their functional role in reef resilience. The large variation in

638 parrotfish abundance found in the Chagos Archipelago supports studies (e.g. Russ et al.

639 [21]) that caution against ~~the~~ assumptions elsewhere that parrotfish population

640 abundance~~s~~ are largely driven by fishing. We found surgeonfish species that graze

641 epilithic algae and parrotfish species that exploit bare substrate to access nutrients within

642 the calcareous matrix [63,64,73] are two key taxa responsible for differences in fish

643 assemblages between the atolls. Both may function to keep macro-algal levels down, but

644 the~~ir~~ drivers of their populations are different. Parrotfishes have evolved highly successful

645 traits to exploit food sources on reefs and contribute significant biomass on coral reefs

646 [14, 62], including during declines in coral cover [21,65] and some species are impacted

647 negatively by fishing [65]. Clarifying the~~se~~ trophic dynamics is vital to refine functional

648 trait approaches for understanding the impacts of climate change and fishing on coral reef

649 biodiversity.

650

651

Figure Captions

Fig. 1. Map of the Chagos Archipelago showing atolls surveyed and locations of dive

survey sites.

Fig. 2. ~~Significant fish species assemblages across 13 sites in the Chagos Archipelago~~

~~based on a) nMDS analysis of fish species density data and b) Ward cluster analysis~~

~~showing four significant groups (>0.6 dissimilarity).~~ Spatial variation in reef fish species

assemblages across the 13 sites in the Chagos Archipelago: a) non-metric

multidimensional scaling plot, coloured ellipses show 95% confidence intervals of site

grouping; b) Ward cluster analysis, colours in dendrogram highlight the four significantly

different groups found (<0.6 dissimilarity).

29

674   **Fig. 3.** Total fish a) density (number of individuals per hectare) and b) biomass (kg per

675   hectare) by atoll, based on 12 reef-associated families surveyed at 13 sites. Error bars are

676   standard errors.

677   **Fig. 4**. Mean density (number of individuals per hectare) and biomass kg per hectare) by

678   atoll for the three functional trophic groups that were significantly related to fish

679   assemblage differences. Error bars are standard errors. Functional trophic groups are

680   explained in Table S2.

681   **Fig. 5.** nMDS diagram showing the relationship between benthic variables at 11 reef sites

682   overlaid on the fish assemblage ordination (see Fig. 2) across the Chagos Archipelago.

683   The relative contribution of each benthic variable is displayed by the length of the vector.

684   **Fig. 6.** The relationship between individual species and the fish species density ordination

685   based on the 13 fish survey sites.

686

687   **References**

688   1.   Bellwood DR, Hughes TP. Regional-Scale Assembly Rules and Biodiversity of

689   Coral Reefs. Science. 2001; 292: 1532–1535. doi:10.1126/science.1058635

690   2.   Graham NAJ, Jennings S, MacNeil MA, Mouillot D, Wilson SK. Predicting

691   climate-driven regime shifts versus rebound potential in coral reefs. Nature. 2015;

692   518: 1–17. doi:10.1038/nature14140

693   3.   Jouffray J-B, Nystrom M, Norstrom A V., Williams ID, Wedding LM, Kittinger

694   JN, et al. Identifying multiple coral reef regimes and their drivers across the

695   Hawaiian archipelago. Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci . 2014; 370: 20130268–

696   20130268. doi:10.1098/rstb.2013.0268

697   4.   Mumby PJ. Fishing, Trophic Cascades, and the Process of Grazing on Coral Reefs.

698   Science. 2006; 311: 98–101. doi:10.1126/science.1121129

699   5.   Graham NAJ, Chabanet P, Evans RD, Jennings S, Letourneur Y, Aaron Macneil M,

700   et al. Extinction vulnerability of coral reef fishes. Ecol Lett 2011; 14: 341–348.

701   doi:10.1111/j.1461-0248.2011.01592.x

702   6.   MacNeil MA, Graham NAJ, Cinner JE, Wilson SK, Williams ID, Maina J, et al.

703   Recovery potential of the world's coral reef fishes. Nature 2015; 520: 341–344.

704   doi:10.1038/nature14358

705   7.   McClanahan TR, Maina JM, Graham NAJ, Jones KR. Modeling reef fish biomass,

706   recovery potential, and management priorities in the Western Indian Ocean. PLoS

707   One. 2016; 11: 1–21. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0156920

708   8.   Friedlander AM, Brown EK, Jokiel PL, Smith WR. Effects of habitat, wave

709   exposure, and marine protected area status on coral reef fish assemblages in the

710   Hawaiian archipelago. Coral Reefs. 2003; 22: 291–305.

711   9.   Pinca S, Kronen M, Magron F, Mcardle B, Vigliola L, Kulbicki M, et al. Relative

712   importance of habitat and fishing in influencing reef fish communities across

713   seventeen Pacific Island Countries and Territories. Fish and Fisheries. 2012;13:

714   361–379. doi:10.1111/j.1467-2979.2011.00425.x

715   10.   Taylor BM, Lindfield SJ, Choat JH. Hierarchical and scale-dependent effects of

716   fishing pressure and environment on the structure and size distribution of parrotfish

717   communities. Ecography. 2015; 38: 520–530. doi:10.1111/ecog.01093

718   11.   Hughes TP. Catastrophes, Phase Shifts, and Large-Scale Degradation of a

719   Caribbean Coral Reef. Science1994; 265: 1547–1551.

720   12.   Bellwood DR, Hughes TP, Folke C, Nyström M. Confronting the coral reef crisis.

721   Nature. 2004; 429: 827–833. doi:10.1038/nature02691

722   13.   Hughes TP, Rodrigues MJ, Bellwood DR, Ceccarelli D, Hoegh-Guldberg O,

723   McCook L, et al. Phase Shifts, Herbivory, and the Resilience of Coral Reefs to

724 Climate Change. Current Biology. 2007; 17: 360–365.

725 doi:10.1016/j.cub.2006.12.049

726 14. Bonaldo RM, Hoey AS, Bellwood DR. The ecosystem roles of parrotfishes on

727   tropical reefs. Oceanography and Marine Biology: An Annual Review. 2014; 52:

728   81–132.

729 15. Chabanet P, Ralambondrainy H, Amanieu M, Faure G, Galzin R. Relationships

730   between coral reef substrata and fish. Coral Reefs. 1997; 16: 93–102.

731   doi:10.1007/s003380050063

732 16. Alvarez-Filip L, Gill JA, Dulvy NK, Perry AL, Watkinson AR, Côté IM. Drivers of

733   region-wide declines in architectural complexity on Caribbean reefs. Coral Reefs.

734   2011; 30: 1051–1060. doi:10.1007/s00338-011-0795-6

735 17. Osuka K, Kochzius M, Vanreusel A, Obura D, Samoilys M. Linkage between fish

736   functional groups and coral reef benthic habitat composition in the Western Indian

737   Ocean. Journal of the Marine Biological Association of United Kingdom. 2016; 1–

738   4. doi:10.1017/S0025315416001399

739 18. Syms C, Jones GP. Disturbance, habitat structure, and the dynamics of a coral-reef

740   fish community. Ecology. 2000; 81: 2714–2729. doi:10.1890/0012-

741   9658(2000)081[2714:DHSATD]2.0.CO;2

742 19. Cheal AJ, Emslie M, MacNeil MA, Miller I, Sweatman HPA. The distribution of

743   herbivorous fishes on the Great Barrier Reef. Marine Biology. 2012; 159: 1143–

744   1154.

745 20. Russ G. Distribution and abundance of herbivorous grazing fishes in the central

746   Great Barrier Reef. II: patterns of zonation of mid-shelf and outer-shelf reefs.

747   Marine Ecology Progress Series. 1984; 20: 35–44.

748 21. Russ GR, Questel SLA, Rizzari JR, Alcala AC. The parrotfish-coral relationship:

749   refuting the ubiquity of a prevailing paradigm. Marine Biology. 2015; 162: 2029–

750   2045. doi:10.1007/s00227-015-2728-3

751 22.   Sheppard, CRC, Harris A, Sheppard ALS. Archipelago-wide coral recovery

752   patterns since 1998 in the Chagos Archipelago, central Indian Ocean. Marine

753   Ecology Progress Series. 2008; 362: 109-117.~~Sheppard CRC. Coral decline and~~

754   ~~weather patterns over 20 years in the Chagos Archipelago, Central Indian Ocean.~~

755   ~~Ambio. 1999; 28: 472–478.~~

756 23.   Graham NAJ, Pratchett MS, Mcclanahan TR, Wilson SK. The status of coral reef

757   fish assemblages in the Chagos Archipelago, with implications for protected area

758   management and climate change. In: Sheppard CRC, editor. Coral Reefs of the

759   United Kingdom Overseas Territories, Coral Reefs of the World 4. Dordrecht:

760   Springer-Science; 2013. pp. 253–270. doi:10.1007/978-94-007-5965-7

761 24.   Spalding M, Fox H, Allen G, Davidson N, Ferdana Z, Finlayson M, et al. Marine

762   Ecoregions of the World: A Bioregionalization of Coastal and Shelf Areas.

763   Bioscience. 2007; 57: 573. doi:10.1641/B570707

764 25.   Obura D. The Diversity and Biogeography of Western Indian Ocean Reef-Building

765   Corals. PLoS One 2012; 7: e45013.

766 26.   Sheppard CRC, Ateweberhan M, Bowen BW, Carr P, Chen CA, Clubbe C, et al.

767   Reefs and islands of the Chagos Archipelago, Indian Ocean: why it is the world's

768   largest no-take marine protected area. Aquatic Conservation: marine and freshwater

769   ecosystems. 2012; 22: 232–261.

770 27.   Dumbraveanu D, Sheppard C R C. Areas of substrate at different depths in the

771   Chagos Archipelago. In: Sheppard CRC, Seaward MRD, editors. Ecology of the

772   Chagos Archipelago. Linnean Society; 1999. pp. 35–44.

773 28.   Spalding MD. Biodiversity patterns in Chagos reef fishes. In: Sheppard CRC,

774   Seaward MRD, editors. Ecology of the Chagos Archipelago. London: Linnean

775   Society; 1999. pp. 119–136.

776   29.   Schott FA, Xie S-P, McCreary Jr JP. Indian Ocean Circulation and Climate

777   Variability. Reviews of Geophysics. 2009; 47: 1–46.

778   30.   Doherty PJ. Variable Replenishment and the Dynamics of Reef Fish Populations.

779   In: Sale PF, editor. Coral Reef Fishes: Dynamics and Diversity in a Complex

780   Ecosystem. San Diego: Elsevier Science; 2002. pp. 327–355. doi:10.1016/B978-

781   012615185-5/50019-0

782   31.   Crochelet E, Roberts J, Lagabrielle E, Obura D, Petit M, Chabanet P. A model-

783   based assessment of reef larvae dispersal in the Western Indian Ocean reveals

784   regional connectivity patterns: potential implications for conservation policies.

785   Regional Studies Marine Science. 2016; 7: 159–167.

786   doi:10.1016/j.rsma.2016.06.007

787   32.   Jones GP, ~~Jones GP,~~ Milicich MJ, ~~Milicich MJ,~~ Emslie MJ~~, Emslie MJ~~, <u>Lunow, C.</u>

788   <u>et al.</u> Self-recruitment in a coral reef fish population. Nature. 1999; 402: 802–804.

789   doi:10.1038/45538

790   33.   Jeffries TC, Ostrowski M, Williams RB, Xie C, Jensen RM, Grzymski JJ, et al.

791   Spatially extensive microbial biogeography of the Indian Ocean provides insights

792   into the unique community structure of a pristine coral atoll. Scientific Reports

793   2015; 5: 15383. doi:10.1038/srep15383

794   34.   Andréfouët S~~.~~, Chagnaud N~~.~~KC. Atlas of Western Indian Ocean Coral Reefs. New-

795   Caledonia: Centre IRD de Nouméa; 2009.

796   35.   Turner J, Klaus R. Coral reefs of the Mascarenes, Western Indian Ocean.

797   Philosophical Transactions Royal Society A: Mathematical Physical and

798   Engineering Sciences . 2005; 363: 229–250. doi:10.1098/rsta.2004.1489

799   36.   Kohler KE, Gill SM. Coral Point Count with Excel extensions (CPCe): A Visual

800   Basic program for the determination of coral and substrate coverage using random

801   point count methodology. Computers and Geosciences. 2006; 32: 1259–1269.

802   doi:10.1016/j.cageo.2005.11.009

803   37.   Polunin NVC, Roberts CM. Greater biomass and value of target coral reef fishes in

804   two small Caribbbean marine reserves. Marine Ecology Progress Series. 1993; 100:

805   167–176. doi:10.3354/meps100167

806   38.   Harmelin-Vivien, M.L., J.G. Harmelin, C. Chauvet C, Duval, R. Galzin, P.

807   Lejeune, G. Barnabe, F. Blanc R, Ghevalier JD and GL. Evaluation visuelle des

808   peuplements et populations de poissons: methodes et problemes. Rev Ecol (Terre

809   Vie). 1985; 40: 468–539.

810   39.   Samoilys MA, Carlos G. Determining methods of underwater visual census for

811   estimating the abundance of coral reef fishes. Environmental Biology of Fishes.

812   2000; 57. doi:10.1023/A:1007679109359

813   40.   Letourneur Y. Length-weight Relationship of Some Marine Fish Species in

814   Réunion Island, Indian Ocean. Naga. 1998. pp. 37–39.

815   41.   Kulbicki M, Guillemot N, Amand M. A general approach to length-weight

816   relationships for New Caledonian lagoon fishes. Cybium. 2005; 29: 235–252.

817   42.   Froese R, Pauly D. FishBase. 2011. Available from: http://www.fishbase.org..

818   43.   Lincoln Smith M. Improving multispecies rocky reef fish census by counting

819   different groups of species using different procedures. Environmental Biology of

820   Fishes. 1989; 26: 29–37.

821   44.   Green AL, Bellwood DR. Monitoring Functional Groups of Herbivorous Reef

822   Fishes as Indicators of Coral Reef Resilience A practical guide for coral reef

823   managers in the Asia Pacific region. IUCN; 2009.

824   45.   Samoilys, M. Randriamanantsoa B. Reef fishes of northeast Madagascar. In: Obura,

825   D., Di Carlo, G., Rabearisoa A and TO, editor. A Rapid Marine Biodiversity

826   Assessment of the Coral Reefs of Northeast Madagascar. Conservation

827   International/ CORDIO/The John D. & Catherie T. Macarthur Foundation; 2011.

828   pp. 29–39.

829   46.   Dray S, Dufour AB. The ade4 package: implementing the duality diagram for

830   ecologists. Journal of statistical software. 2007; 22: 1–20.

831   47.   R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna,

832   Austria; 2014.

833   48.   Whitaker D, Christman M. Clustsig: similarity profile analysis. R package version;

834   2010.

835   49.   Oksanen J. The vegan Package. R. 2005; 1–71.

836   50.   Clarke KR, Ainsworth M. A method of linking multivariate commnuity structure to

837   environmental variables. Marine Ecology Progress Series. 1993; 92: 205–219.

838   51.   Winterbottom R, Anderson R. C. Fishes of the Chagos Archipelago. Ecology of the

839   Chagos Archipelago. London: Linnean Society; 1999. pp. 101–117.

840   52.   MacNeil MA, Graham NAJ, Cinner JE, Wilson SK, Williams ID, Maina J, et al.

841   Predicting climate-driven regime shifts versus rebound potential in coral reefs.

842   Nature. 2015; 520: 341–344.

843   53.   Wilson SK, Graham NAJ, Pratchett MS, Jones GP, Polunin NVC. Multiple

844   disturbances and the global degradation of coral reefs: are reef fishes at risk or

845   resilient? Global Change Biology. 2006; 12: 2220–2234. doi:10.1111/j.1365-

846   2486.2006.01252.x

847   54.   Jones GP, Syms C. Disturbance, habitat structure and the ecology of fishes on coral

848   reefs. Austral Ecology. 1998; 23: 287–297. doi:10.1111/j.1442-

849   9993.1998.tb00733.x

850   55. Jones GP, McCormick MI, Srinivasan M, Eagle J-V. Coral decline threatens fish

851   biodiversity in marine reserves. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences

852   USA 2004; 101: 8251–3. doi:10.1073/pnas.0401277101

853   56. Pratchett M, Munday P, Wilson S, Graham N, Cinner J, Bellwood D, et al. Effects

854   Of climate-Induced coral bleaching on coral-reef fishes - Ecological And Economic

855   Consequences. Oceanography and Marine Biology 2008; 251–296.

856   doi:10.1201/9781420065756.ch6

857   57. Ateweberhan M, McClanahan TR, Graham NAJ, Sheppard CRC. Episodic

858   heterogeneous decline and recovery of coral cover in the Indian Ocean. Coral

859   Reefs. 2011; 30: 739–752. doi:10.1007/s00338-011-0775-x

860   58. Moir Clark J, Duff H, Pearce J, Mees C. Update on the catch and bycatch

861   composition of illegal fishing in the British Indian Ocean Territory (BIOT) and a

862   summary of abandoned and lost fishing gear. 2015; Marine Resource Assessment

863   Group (UK) report to the Indian Ocean Tuna Commission. OTC–2015–WPEB11–

864   48. 10pp. Davies TE, Beanjara N, Tregenza T. A socio-economic perspective on

865   gear-based management in an artisanal fishery in south-west Madagascar. Fisheries

866   Management and Ecology. 2009; 16: 279–289.

867   59. Chabanet P, Bigot L, Nicet JB, Durville P, Massé L, Mulochau T, et al. Coral reef

868   monitoring in the Iles Eparses, Mozambique Channel (2011-2013). Acta Oecol.

869   2015; 1–11. Samoilys MA, Osuka K, Maina GW, Obura DO. Artisanal fisheries on

870   Kenya's coral reefs: Decadal trends reveal management needs. Fisheries Research.

871   2017; 186: 177–191. doi:10.1016/j.fishres.2016.07.025

872   60. Wilson SK, Bellwood DR, Choat JH, Furnas MJ. Detritus in the epilithic algal

873   matrix and its use by coral reef fishes. Oceanography and Marine Biology Annual

874   Review. 2003; 41: 279–309.

875   61.   Bellwood DR, Goatley CHR, Brandl SJ, Bellwood O. Fifty million years of

876   herbivory on coral reefs: fossils, fish and functional innovations. Proceedings of the

877   Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 2014; 281: 20133046–20133046.

878   doi:10.1098/rspb.2013.3046

879   62.   Bellwood DR, Goatley CHR, Bellwood O. The evolution of fishes and corals on

880   reefs: Form, function and interdependence. Biological Reviews. 2017; 92: 878–901.

881   doi:10.1111/brv.12259

882   63.   Choat JH, Clements KD. Vertebrate herbivores in marine and terrestrial

883   environments: a nutritional ecology perspective. Annual Review of Ecology and

884   Systematics. 1998; 29: 375–403.

885   64.   Choat JH, Clements KD, Robbins WD. The trophic status of herbivorous fishes on

886   coral reefs. I: dietary analyses. Marine Biology. 2002; 140: 613–623.

887   65.   Heenan A, Hoey AS, Williams GJ, Williams ID. Natural bounds on herbivorous

888   coral reef fishes. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 2016;

889   283: 20161716. doi:10.1098/rspb.2016.1716

890   66.   Lieske E, Myers R. Coral Reef Fishes. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton Academic

891   Press; 1996.

892   67.   Cole A, Pratchett M, Jones G. Diversity and functional importance of coral-feeding

893   fishes on tropical coral reefs. Fish and Fisheries. 2008; 9: 286–307.

894   doi:10.1111/j.1467-2979.2008.00290.x

895   68.   Reese ES. Reef fishes as indicators of conditions on coral reefs. Proceedings of the

896   colloquium on global aspects of coral reefs. Miami; 1993. pp. 59–65.

897   69.   Hobson E.S. Trophic relationships of fishes specialised to feed on zooplankters

898   above coral reefs. In: Sale PF, editor. The Ecology of Fishes on Coral Reefs.

899   Academic Press Inc.; 1991. pp. 69–95.

900 70. Friedman ST, Price SA, Hoey AS, Wainwright PC. Ecomorphological convergence

901   in planktivorous surgeonfishes. Journal of Evolutionary Biology. 2016; 29: 965–

902   978. doi:10.1111/jeb.12837

903 71. Hoey AS, Bellwood DR. Cross-shelf variation in the role of parrotfishes on the

904   Great Barrier Reef. Coral Reefs. 2008; 27: 37–47. doi:10.1007/s00338-007-0287-x

905 72. Nash KL, Graham NAJ, Januchowski-Hartley FA, Bellwood DR. Influence of

906   habitat condition and competition on foraging behaviour of parrotfishes. Marine

907   Ecology Progress Series. 2012; 457: 113–124. doi:10.3354/meps09742

908 73. Clements KD, German DP, Piche J, Tribollet A, Choat JH. Integrating ecological

909   roles and trophic diversification on coral reefs: Multiple lines of evidence identify

910   parrotfishes as microphages. Biological Journal Linnaean Society. 2016; 120: 729–

911   751. doi:10.1111/bij.12914

912 74. Burkepile DE, Hay ME. Herbivore species richness and feeding complementarity

913   affect community structure and function on a coral reef. Proceedings National

914   Academy Sciencs USA. 2008; 105: 16201–16206. doi:10.1073/pnas.0801946105

915 75. Hughes TP, Baird AH, Bellwood DR, Card M, Connolly SR, Folke C, et al.

916   Climate Change, Human Impacts, and the Resilience of Coral Reefs. Science. 2003;

917   301: 929–933. doi:10.1126/science.1085046

918 76. Anthony KRN, Marshall PA, Abdulla A, Beeden R, Bergh C, Black R, et al.

919   Operationalizing resilience for adaptive coral reef management under global

920   environmental change. Global Change Biology. 2015; 21: 48–61.

921   doi:10.1111/gcb.12700

922 77. Jackson JBC, Donovan MK, Cramer KL, Lam K L. Status and trends of Caribbean

923   coral reefs: 1970–2012. Gland; 2014.

924   78.   Edwards CB, Friedlander AM, Green AG, Hardt MJ, Sala E, Sweatman HP, et al.

925   Global assessment of the status of coral reef herbivorous fishes: evidence for

926   fishing effects. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences.

927   2014; 281: 20131835. doi:10.1098/rspb.2013.1835

928
929

930

CORDIO
East Africa

coastal oceans research and
development
indian ocean

P.O. Box 24562,
Nairobi 00502, Kenya
Mobile : +254
721498713/+447393622355
Email:
melita.samoilys@gmail.com
www.cordioea.net

14ᵗʰ November 2017

Dr Heather Patterson
Scientific Editor,
PLOS ONE

Dear Dr Patterson

Thank you for the second review of our paper: *Patterns in reef fish assemblages: insights from the Chagos Archipelago*.

We have addressed the comments from the two reviewers and your editorial comments in the revised manuscript. In making our revisions we have addressed your concerns that the conclusions of the study are overstated, there is a general lack of clarity in the paper and the points raised can be dealt with in a re-write, particularly in the Discussion. We also provide a response to each comment raised by the reviewers below.

We trust that the manuscript now meets Plos One's publication criteria.

Yours sincerely

[signature]

Dr Melita Samoilys
Director

Authors' Response to Editor and Reviewers

Please Note: the Line numbers refer to the marked up revision version of the ms.

Editor's editorial comments

All the editorial corrections have been made on the revised manuscript, or have been addressed during the revisions made as outlined in the tables below, with one exception:

Line 546: Awkward, should be 'but also feeds on.....'
The sentence has been revised differently as the point being made is that *A. nigrofuscus* feeds on epilithic algae while *Scarus niger* does not, though both are feeding on the same sort of substrate. The revised text clarifies this better (Line 677). The point is further explained later under "feeding complimentarity" (Lines 686-687).

1

Reviewer #3:

Reviewer's comment	Authors' response
the hypothesis (Line 68-72) states that since there is no fishing pressure, the fish assemblages should reflect bottom-up drivers. I understand that they see humans as the top-down force here, but in a system where the natural (fish) predator population is intact, it is likely that these organisms would in fact have a stronger top-down influence than in fished systems. Thus, the premise of this hypothesis needs a stronger justification.	Agreed. Text changed in Lines 80-81 to acknowledge the inputs from natural top-down control of fish populations through predation.
The authors state that there may be some poaching in this reserve area, although the presumption is that it is 'minimal' (line 404) due to lack of human residents here. Yet later (line 470), it is stated that it is likely there is some poaching from afar. It would be helpful to know how well patrolled the area is, and if poaching incidents have been observed, if any of the studied reef areas are more vulnerable.	The BIOT MPA is patrolled by the BIOT Patrol Vessel (BPV). Due to the illegal nature of poaching activity within BIOT, and the difficulties in detection and monitoring, it is challenging to make definitive statements regarding its prevalence. The most detailed and up to date data are available in a Clark et al. 2015 MRAG report entitled "Update on the catch and bycatch composition of illegal fishing in the British Indian Ocean Territory (BIOT) and a summary of abandoned and lost fishing gear." Between one and twelve vessels have been detained annually on suspicion of illegal fishing activities between 1996 and 2015. The mean catch per vessel detained from 2006 to 2015 was 2,558 kg or 386 individuals. Sharks were present on 91% of vessels and formed 60% of total catch numbers and 80% of total weight. Thus it can be clearly observed that a range of shark species are the main group targeted by illegal fishing activity. As to whether any of the studied reef areas are more vulnerable, a map of the locations of vessel detentions within the MRAG report suggests that poaching effort is spread evenly across the Archipelago, with the possible exception that vessels do not appear to venture close to Diego Garcia, likely due to US navy presence. The text has been changed to incorporate this briefly (Line 547-550).
It is stated that massive bleaching occurred 15 yrs prior (line 439) & that recovery occurred (line 441) -if site-specific data could be obtained from the Sheppard et al 2012 study, this would allow a much stronger argument for bottom up forcing, as it is stated that fish assemblages were previously homogenous. Varying levels of coral recovery coincided with changes in	This is a valuable point, however there are two main issues which we see with attempting to obtain and analyses data from the Sheppard et al 2012 publication. The data referred to in Sheppard et al 2012 were obtained using eye-estimates of coral cover within quadrats, which is different from the video transect technique used in the present study, so comparability is not clear. There is also an issue in that the specific sites are not the same in the present study and the 2012 study, which would further jeopardize the ability to carry out such an analysis.

management in this area, so there is a chance to look more deeply into these drivers if earlier data could be utilized.	
In the paragraph beginning on line 486 the authors discuss feeding of 2 types of *Acanthurus*. Line 493 needs clarification on whether these species feed in sandy areas, or just on the detritus overlying dead coral substrate. This is important for the comment on line 500 - if they are feeding in sand patches, it is unlikely that these species have any impact on macroalgae growth.	The text has been changed (Line 599-600) to clarify that these species feed on soft sediment on dead coral substrate, as well as sand, and therefore may impact macroalgal growth.
The sentence on Line 503-505 needs to be re-written - detritivory seems tacked on, making a broad statement.	Agreed. The lines 609-615 have been re-written to clarify the statements on detritivory.
Line 526 - it sounds like there is a suggestion that coral mortality leads to increase in zooplankton. Please provide references to substantiate this link.	This was not intended at all, and is not a correct interpretation. The sentence states there are apparently two different pathways (line 654) for the higher acanthurid densities at GCB: higher zooplankton for the planktivorous acanthurids (e.g. *Naso* spp.) and dead coral for the detritivorous acanthurids (ring tail *Acanthurus* spp. and *Ctenochaetus*). We have revised this sentence to spell this out more clearly.
Lines 528-530 state that the bottom-up processes only act on the lowest trophic levels - if this is the case, it undermines the bottom-up conclusion.	The sentence at 528-530 does not specifically state "that the bottom-up processes only act on the lowest trophic levels". It states that "the density and biomass of the piscivore and omnivore trophic groups, species that represent important target fishery species [23,39], were not significantly correlated with fish assemblage patterns across the archipelago, suggesting that benthic differences did not affect these higher trophic level taxa." To improve this text to avoid the reviewer's interpretation we have added the word "directly" (Line 659). We recognize that piscivores and omnivores are affected by bottom up processes through their prey which are in turn affected directly by bottom up benthic condition.
Line 532- provide a reference to support the link between the previous coral mortality and climate change so that this is a stronger statement rather than a presumption.	The following reference has been added (Line 662) and replaces an earlier paper by Sheppard for reference no. 22. Sheppard, C. R. C., A. Harris, and A. L. S. Sheppard. "Archipelago-wide coral recovery patterns since 1998 in the Chagos Archipelago, central Indian Ocean." *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 362 (2008): 109-117.
Line 535: The authors seem to set up a straw man, aggregating fish	The functional groups used are quite finely divided (12 functional groups) rather than broad scale, and are

into broad trophic groups, and then using the failure of those broad groups to show clear trends to say we need to look more fine-scale. There are many excellent studies, some of which are cited, that have clearly shown that within-trophic group differences can be strong and important - this is re-stated line 562, so I wonder why the attempt at over-simplification was even made. The authors again caution against doing what they themselves did in line 600. There are great opportunities with this dataset for a deeper exploration.	based on widely used guidance for using fishes as indicators of coral reef resilience (Green & Bellwood 2009), and refined for the Indian Ocean specific groupings (Samoilys & Randriamanantsoa 2011). Many studies have used far more broadly defined functional groups; for example, Graham, Nicholas AJ, et al. "Lag effects in the impacts of mass coral bleaching on coral reef fish, fisheries, and ecosystems." *Conservation biology* 21.5 (2007): 1291-1300, utilised five groups in their assessment of fish and coral benthos interactions within the Seychelles.
	So an exploration of the utility of the "best currently available" fish functional groups for the Indian Ocean within this dataset from the Chagos Archipelago, where such an analysis has not previously been carried out, is in the opinion of the authors, a valuable and logical methodology to incorporate into the study. Deeper exploration which extends beyond functional groupings has also been carried out within the study, in the BIO-BIO analysis, which utilised each individual species, and multiple permutations of species-level groupings to come to its findings. Some comparison between the two approaches is therefore valid.
Lines 563-566: it is mentioned that parrotfish populations declined (though not via fishing). Support that what you found was a decline, rather than increases (presumably these data can be compared to the pre-bleaching study?). And once again, the potential for even 1 big poaching event to have a big impact cannot be ignored.	We do not state that parrotfish declined in our study. Our study is one point in time and therefore we can only compare and discuss differences between sites across the archipelago, not differences over time. The point being made here is that the difference in parrotfish population densities between atolls was very large and this cannot be assigned to fishing. Parrotfishes have not been fished in Chagos, except perhaps minimally by the recreational fishery in Diego Garcia. They are not a commercial target and therefore poaching is not an issue. This point is made clear in the section on the effects of fishing where the commercial Mauritian fishery that used to operate targeted just two families of reef fishes – grouper and snapper.
Lines 584-588 state that the parrotfish are bottom-up controlled, but I still am not convinced by the correlative nature of this study that this is the case. Using these same results, one could easily argue that the parrotfish have been influential in determining coral recovery trajectories in this region, so are a top-down force.	We stand by this statement that our results "suggest that parrotfish are bottom-up controlled", because the significance testing in our results was done on the basis of permutation testing not just on the existence of a correlation between datasets. We agree that parrotfish may be/are influential in determining coral recovery trajectories, our statements do not contradict this, but we cannot test this with our data at one point in time. But we have now added some text to include this point (Line 727-729).
Line 600: clarify whether the assumption of fishing as a driver of parrotfish is meant to be just for Chagos or everywhere.	Sentence changed to include "elsewhere" (Line 749).

Reviewer #4:

Reviewer's comment	Authors' response
You state that abiotic and biotic factors are assessed, when really the data are just on the benthic habitat and fish associations. Line 67 - what abiotic factors were considered in this study - none is my understanding	Agreed, since the testing of exposure and reef geomorphology type were limited and inconclusive due to limited sample size. Line 77 revised to read "largely biotic factors". Exposure and reef geomorphology type were tested and the results of significant differences in exposure cannot be interpreted further due to limited replication.
You state that one of the main aims was to look at size structure, but this is not assessed at all. Line 76 - where is the size structure component to this study then?	Fish size is incorporated into biomass estimates (the latter derived from fish size using species' length-weight relationships). We have changed "size" to "biomass" eg Line 92.
you say upfront in the discussion that the major differences in the fish assemblage you describe are due to environmental conditions and climate change - there is nothing to support this statement based on the results currently.	We have re-worded and expanded the statement originally at 402 (now Line 457-458) to qualify that environmental drivers and climate change are reflected in the reef's benthic composition.
Line 57 top-down control can also be mediated by predation by larger fishes, not just fishing.	The text has been changed to clarify this point in Line 80-81.
Especially worrisome is the huge noise around the large bodied planktivores, which then becomes one of your main results you discuss. It looks to me like you just happened upon a large school, so making inferences on the GCB being really plankton rich is not very compelling. It is also counter to what I would expect, surely the island with oceanic sides would have greater plankton resources available, with cool deeper water bringing food in? This warrants a bit more discussion, or checking of the raw data, to see if it is just a couple of large school sitings that are causing this result.	The reefs that were surveyed on the western side of Great Chagos Bank are on forereefs and terraces off the islands. Most of GCB is a vast, largely sunken, atoll and it is extensive compared to the other atolls of the archipelago which are more discreet and isolated. We would counter that it is not that surprising that plankton might be richer here. Since there are no published results on plankton in Chagos these discussions are somewhat conjectural and we do not believe merit a major emphasis in the paper. We do not feel it is a "main result". Nevertheless, the planktivores were one of 3 significant trophic groups out of 12 in the analyses and therefore warrant some discussion. The higher planktivorous densities at GCB are not explained by 1-2 very large schools. For example, *Naso brevirostris* and *Melichthys* spp. were highly abundant at Three Brothers reef on GCB, with *Melichthys* spp. also very abundant at the forereef at Diego, whereas *Naso hexacanthus* was highly abundant at Egmont Inner reef on GCB, but also at one site at Peros Banhos atoll. In contrast *Naso vlamingii* was highly abundant at some sites in all three atoll groups, though the highest density was at a GCB site. Importantly, we maintain that while the dataset is

	small and variances are high, typical of UVC surveys of reef fishes, particularly those that school, which include many of the planktivorous species counted here, the statistical tests (random permutation tests having first tested for spatial autocorrelation) were robust. Therefore, the significant differences are likely real and not spurious.
The focus you make of using the Chagos as a benchmark for other Indian Ocean reefs - it would be useful to know how the estimates of biomass compare.	Text added at Lines 587-592 to make this point clearly.
How is terrace and fore reef combined classified? and how does it differ from just from forereef. It would be beneficial to add the exposed or protected classification to Table S1, as well as the number of surveys performed at each site.	Terrace is a substantial shallow sloping area. The forereef is a more steeply sloping area. A characteristic feature of the atolls is a terrace that then gives way to a forereef as opposed to fringing continental reefs which tend to have just forereefs. However, at two islands at GCB there was no terrace. The exposed or protected classification is inherent in whether a site is a lagoon site or not. All non-lagoon sites are exposed, therefore, we feel adding an additional classification is unnecessary. One survey (consisting of multiple transects of both fish and benthos, as outlined in the methods) was performed at each of the sites.
To quickly allow for comparisons across Fig1 and 2, I suggest you use the same color coding on the map as you've used in the dissimilarity plots	Good suggestion, Fig.1 has been changed.
Fig 2 legend - what does significant fish species assemblages mean? The figure legend could be more informative.	The legend for Fig 2 has now been changed to be more informative (lines 298 and 786)
Line 219 - reference for VIF < 10 being acceptably low for colinearity. I thought 3 was a widely accepted threshold.	There are no universally accepted thresholds for an acceptable VIF level. Less than 2.5/3 is one level, less than 10 is another level. Certainly greater than 15 or 20 is unacceptably high. Whilst widely referred to in a variety of publications the original reference for the <10 level is: Chatterjee, S., A. S. Hadi, and B. Price. 2000. Regression analysis by example. John Wiley and Sons, New York, New York, USA.
Line 389 - Siganus argenteus Siganus canaliculatus - is this just due to not surveying the right habitat? Or encountering of their large schools?	The point being made here is that the lack of siganids should not be interpreted to mean that there are no siganids in Chagos. We have re-worded the text to make this clearer (Lines 445-446). Aspects of habitat and school size are valid but exploring these factors is beyond the scope of our dataset.
Line 402 - there is no information presented in this ms on the environmental conditions at Chagos, or across the reefs surveyed, or any	We partly agree with this comment – certainly no temporal data are presented. We have re-worded and expanded the statement (now Line 457-472) to qualify that environmental drivers and climate

temporal component to this work, so it seems a large leap to take this descriptive study that nicely differentiates between reefs in one location at one point in time, to making inferences on the drivers of these differences.	change are reflected in the reef's benthic composition.
Line 404 - the inference that generally fishing effort is low or minimal impact is counter to the statement below on the grouper fishery, as well as illegal fishing, as well at the recreational fishery. It would be a relatively easy thing to separate out targeted and non targeted species to compare biomass/abundance in areas where the recreational fishery is operating, and this could substantiate the focus you have made on fishing effects in the discussion.	The "focus on fishing effects in the discussion" is not a major element of the study because the study was not designed with the intention of examining fishing effects, and therefore the data are inadequate for examining any fishing effects around Diego Garcia. We cover potential fishing effects in the discussion to make as clear as possible what are the deviations from the assumption of minimal fishing impact within the Chagos Archipelago and its MPA. Further, the information on possible illegal fishing from India is purely anecdotal. We mentioned it to illustrate some uncertainty over the unfished status of Chagos. On the basis of this reviewer's comment the text has been revised to remove the anecdotal report from India as it adds confusion, and have made it clear that fishing effects cannot be tested with the current dataset. (Lines 528-529, 554-556).
Line 449 - I tend to disagree with this follow on assumption that if acanthurids are more abundant where their food is, where their food resources are high is because of coral mortality. These species can thrive in areas which are continually disturbed, where coral never becomes dominant, or recruits never get established, such as a crustose coralline algal dominant reef crest which is in the surf impact zone. This limits their utility as an indicator species and also the framing oversimplifies the view of what a coral reef ecosystem is, ignoring their naturally very variable status. I think you could just deal with this with a bit more careful wording in this paragraph.	This interpretation was not intended at all, and is not correct. The sentence states there are apparently two different pathways for the higher acanthurid densities at GCB: higher zooplankton for the planktivorous acanthurids (e.g. some *Naso* spp.) and dead coral for the detritivorous acanthurids (ring tail *Acanthurus* spp. and *Ctenochaetus*). We have edited this sentence to spell this out more clearly (Line 658).

We agree entirely with this reviewer that coral reefs are naturally very variable, hence the difficulty in assigning drivers to differences in fish assemblages. |
| Line 535 - Explain this sentence further. Significant in what? Line 537 - more informative to what? | Text has been revised to explain the two sentences, Line 670-672. |
| Line 564 - As a general comment, that applies throughout - your reports of biomass per hectare should also include the standard deviations, which | Where biomass is reported in the results text and figures (eg Fig. 3) we provide error terms. We do not feel we need to clutter the Discussion with error terms, particularly when discussing biomass, we |

for S.niger are rather enormous. Did you encounter a couple of large schools?I'm concerned you are making inferences from a behavioural event that leads to inflated mean estimates to imply that that number of fish is generalizable per hectare in that location. I agree with the point, parrotfish biomass can vary widely independent of fishing effects, but I think the extreme range more likely reflects a limited sample size, or an encounter with a large school.	tend to refer to a range or a maximum, e.g. > 3,000 kg/ha. The concern that UVC estimates of reef fish populations can be biased by 1-2 large schools is valid. We selected a standard fish UVC method based on 5 replicate 50x5m transects per site after Samoilys and Carlos 2000 which tested a variety of UVC methods weighing up their relative accuracy and precision, and found that scarinae were well estimated by this method. Further, while the dataset is small and variances are high, typical of UVC surveys of reef fishes, random permutation tests having first tested for spatial autocorrelation) were robust, accomodating the variances and still found significant differences. We therefore maintain these are valid. Regarding schooling behavior of parrotfishes and one-off events eg for *Scarus niger*. The mean biomass of this species was consistently high across reefs in Peros Banhos and Salomon atolls, ranging from 102 to 181 kg/ha except for PB Ilse de la Passe where the biomass was slightly lower at 67 kg/ha. In contrast the biomass at the other atolls ranged from 3 to 38 kg/ha with zero at DG lagoon. The PB and Salomon biomass estimates are based on a total of 7 sites with 5 replicate transects per site. The variances are high (see table S4) but the statistical tests detected differences.
Line 584 and Line 594 - It is difficult to infer anything about bottom-up control from this observational data on the habitat characteristics of where these species are most abundant.	We are not clear exactly what the reviewer means by this comment. The habitat characteristics were quantified (benthic surveys, see Methods) and are not therefore "observational". The statement regarding bottom-up control, originally at 584 (now Line 729-731) reflects our interpretation of the significant permutation tests of the benthic data (Table 2, Fig. 5) and the ordination analysis on species' density (Fig.6, Table 3).
Line 586 - Yes, apart from you found no differences between herbivore trophic groups (Line 535) - you've uncovered species specific patterns not evident at the functional group level.	We have removed the reference to the Heenan et al. paper here (Line 733). The Heenan paper (recommended by a previous reviewer) is excellent but requires too much text to explain its significance here, so we edited the citation to it in the conclusions (Line 759-760).
Line 591 - You have stated previously that there has been an grouper fishery at Chagos and and likely there is some illegal take going on, as well as a recreational fishery. It seems more appropriate to say minimal fishing impact, rather than total absence	Text amended, Line 737.
Line 604 - drivers or mechanisms?	Drivers. We mean drivers of the populations of parrotfishes and surgeonfishes. Sentence has been edited (Line 757).