

This is a repository copy of *Depth and habitat are important drivers of abundance for predatory reef fish off Pemba Island, Tanzania.*

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/184538/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Osuka, Kennedy orcid.org/0000-0001-7940-5411, Stewart, Bryce Donald orcid.org/0000-0001-5103-5041, Samoily, Melita et al. (5 more authors) (2022) Depth and habitat are important drivers of abundance for predatory reef fish off Pemba Island, Tanzania. *Marine Environmental Research*. 105587. ISSN 0141-1136

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marenvres.2022.105571>

Reuse

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND) licence. This licence only allows you to download this work and share it with others as long as you credit the authors, but you can't change the article in any way or use it commercially. More information and the full terms of the licence here: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

1 **Depth and habitat are important drivers of abundance for predatory**
2 **reef fish off Pemba Island, Tanzania**

3
4 Authors: Kennedy E. Osuka^{1,2}, Bryce D. Stewart¹, Melita Samoily², Colin J. McClean¹, Peter
5 Musembi², Saleh Yahya³, Ali R. Hamad⁴ and James Mbugua²

6 Affiliations

7 ¹ Department of Environment and Geography, University of York, Heslington, York, YO10 5NG,

8 United Kingdom

9 ² Coastal Oceans Research and Development – Indian Ocean (CORDIO East Africa). 9 Kibaki

10 Flats P.O. Box 10135-80101, Mombasa, Kenya

11 ³Institute of Marine Sciences, University of Dar es Salaam, Zanzibar, Tanzania

12 ⁴ Department of Fisheries Development, Zanzibar-Tanzania

13
14 * Corresponding author.

15 E-mail address: koe503@york.ac.uk (K.E. Osuka).

16

Accepted Manuscript

17 **Abstract**

18 Coral reefs across the world face significant threats from fishing and climate change, which
19 tends to be most acute in shallower waters. This is the case off Pemba Island, Tanzania, yet
20 the effects of these anthropogenic stressors on the distribution and abundance of
21 economically and ecologically important predatory reef fish, including how they vary with
22 depth and habitat type, is poorly understood. Thus, we deployed 79 baited remote
23 underwater video stations (BRUVs) in variable water depths and habitats off Pemba Island,
24 and modelled the effects of depth and habitat on abundance of predatory reef fish. Predatory
25 reef fish types/taxa were significantly predicted by depth and habitat types. Habitats in
26 relatively deeper waters and dominated by hard and soft corals hosted high species richness
27 and abundance of predatory reef fish types/taxa compared to mixed sandy and rubble
28 habitats. The findings add to the growing evidence that deep waters around coral reefs are
29 important habitats for predatory reef fish. Thus, careful management, through effective area
30 and species protection measures, are needed to prevent further depletion of predatory reef-
31 associated populations and conservation of this biologically important area.

32
33 Keywords: Coral reefs, depth refugia, habitat effects, predation, movement behaviour,
34 fisheries, conservation
35

36 Introduction

37 Coral reef predatory fishes - fish that feed on other fish or marine animals - have profound
38 economic and ecological importance (Moberg and Folke, 1999; Hammerschlag *et al.*, 2019).
39 They are an important source of animal protein and contribute significantly to the livelihoods
40 of more than 20 million people living in close proximity to the eastern African coast (Bell *et al.*,
41 2016). Their large body size makes them desirable and a relatively easy target, but the late
42 maturation and longevity of many species makes them more susceptible to overfishing (de
43 Mitcheson *et al.*, 2020). Fishing pressure on large reef predators has increased significantly in
44 recent decades, causing major declines in many areas around the world (Worm *et al.*, 2013).
45 Overfishing of predatory fish populations can have severe ecological impacts as it often
46 destabilizes food webs leading to community-wide impacts (Bascompte *et al.*, 2005; Worm *et al.*,
47 2013; Hussey *et al.*, 2014; Sandin and Zgliczynski, 2015). Reef predators structure reef fish
48 communities by directly exerting top-down control of prey organisms (Stewart and Jones,
49 2001; Baum and Worm, 2009), and indirectly by influencing the behavior of prey assemblages
50 while searching for food (Hixon, 2015; Rasher *et al.*, 2017) or when resting and mating as part
51 of their life history (Green *et al.*, 2015). The role of predatory fishes is therefore multi-faceted,
52 extending from the oceans to the coastal communities.

53
54 Predatory fish show preferences for particular habitat types such as forereef ledges
55 (Papastamatiou *et al.*, 2009), outer atolls and shelf areas (Cappo *et al.*, 2007; Skinner *et al.*,
56 2020) that are associated with abrupt changes in depth. Such habitats are characterised by
57 increased depth that can provide refuge to a wide variety of reef predator populations (Tyler
58 *et al.*, 2009; Stefanoudis *et al.*, 2019). These outer deeper reef habitats or contiguous to deep
59 are nutrient rich hence attract a high abundance of schooling planktivorous species, which are
60 an important food item for the highly mobile predators (Wyatt *et al.*, 2013). Thus, abundance,
61 biomass and diversity of predators often increases from shallower lagoon reefs to deeper
62 seaward reefs (Jennings *et al.*, 1996; Pinheiro *et al.*, 2016). Shallower areas are more
63 vulnerable to climate-induced coral bleaching (Graham *et al.*, 2013; Obura *et al.*, 2017), which
64 can lead to coral mortality and loss of structural complexity. This in turn can cause declines in
65 the prey that predatory reef fish generally consume (Hempson *et al.*, 2017). Recovery of such
66 reefs after bleaching is generally greatest where reefs are structurally complex and in deeper
67 waters (Graham *et al.*, 2015). However, the cover of live coral also declines below a certain
68 depth, due to light limitation (Kahng *et al.*, 2019; Osuka *et al.*, 2021a). Interactions between
69 different predator types (e.g., schooling transient and resident predators) with habitat types
70 and their associated depths remains unclear (Hixon, 2015). Fishing pressure is usually highest

71 in shallow coral reef areas and can amplify the depth-predator pattern (Tyler *et al.*, 2009).
72 Increasing water depth is anticipated to have positive and negative relationships with
73 abundance of fish predators and fishing pressure, respectively (Tyler *et al.*, 2009; Pinheiro *et*
74 *al.*, 2016; Stefanoudis *et al.*, 2019). Therefore, the depth distribution of predatory reef fish
75 will be governed by the combined influences of habitat structure, food availability and fishing
76 disturbance, and how they interact with one another.

77
78 One area that is thought to support high numbers of predatory coral reef fish, but that is also
79 under pressure from fishing, is the Pemba channel off the coast of Tanzania. The western
80 margins of Pemba Island neighbors a deep channel that averages 300 m and reaches a
81 maximum of 800 m, making the Island a true oceanic Island (Semba *et al.*, 2019). The shallow
82 (<20 m) marine areas of Pemba Island have highly variable coral reef conditions, with some in
83 healthy states with a high cover of hard coral, while others are in degraded states with low
84 hard coral cover (Grimsditch *et al.*, 2009). Reefs with low coral cover have been linked to
85 destructive fishing activities particularly dynamite fishing (Grimsditch *et al.*, 2009; Wells *et al.*,
86 2010; Slade and Kalangahe, 2015). The mesophotic reef areas (30-150 m) are characterised
87 by ledges, and oceanic steep outer reef slopes forming “staircase” walls in some locations
88 (Osuka *et al.*, 2021a). These seafloor features, together with a deep channel and the
89 remoteness of the island, makes Pemba Island a potential hotspot for large reef predators.
90 Yet, little is understood of the influence of depth and habitat on fish predators in this area.

91
92 The Pemba Island fishery is mainly artisanal involving the use of traditional gears (e.g. gillnets,
93 hook and line) and introduced gears (e.g. small purse seines) to target coral associated fish
94 (Rehren *et al.*, 2020). Evidence of overfishing has been reported at several sites. Indeed, a
95 study conducted a decade ago in waters <21 m recorded no sharks, implying high rates of
96 overfishing (Grimsditch *et al.*, 2009). Similarly, other large predatory taxa like groupers and
97 snappers were either rare or of small size. In recent times, surveys on apex predators in
98 Tanzanian waters (western margins of Pemba Channel) suggest that shark populations are
99 “functionally extinct” (MacNeil *et al.*, 2020). Further, biomass projections of commercial
100 species including large reef-associated predators in the Tanzanian Exclusive Economic Zone
101 predict declines of up to 56-69% under increased fishing scenarios by the end of the 21st
102 Century (Wilson *et al.*, 2021). The decline in large reef-associated predator stocks is
103 considered a key driver motivating fishers’ migration to other distant fishing grounds as far as
104 Mozambique and Kenya, where depletion of fish stocks has been reported in the host fishing
105 grounds (Wanyonyi *et al.*, 2016).

106
107 Sampling of coral reef fish communities in areas that are inaccessible or challenging for SCUBA
108 divers was traditionally done with traps or nets (Collin, 1990; Bacheler et al., 2017). However,
109 an increasingly popular method is the use of baited remote underwater videos (BRUVs).
110 BRUVs are considered a non-invasive and non-destructive technique, which has been applied
111 to assess occurrences of larger and more mobile species (Harvey *et al.*, 2012; White *et al.*,
112 2013). The method has been widely applied over extensive geographic areas, depth ranges
113 and habitats (Harvey *et al.*, 2013; MacNeil *et al.*, 2020). Surveys with BRUVs ensure fish are
114 not disturbed by divers, species are likely attracted from larger areas by the bait, and a
115 permanent record is produced. Use of BRUVS enhances species ID and allows more detailed
116 analysis of the surrounding habitats and more importantly can be deployed much deeper than
117 SCUBA (Harvey *et al.*, 2012).

118
119 Coral reef communities show clear spatial patterns that vary across a range of fine-scale local
120 habitat conditions (Karisa et al., 2020). The outer reefs of Pemba Island have been little
121 surveyed to date, likely due to logistical challenges associated with sampling deeper reefs with
122 standard SCUBA underwater visual censuses. Indeed, previous ecological fish surveys
123 conducted in Pemba Island were restricted to depths <21m and conducted either on SCUBA
124 (e.g., Daniels et al., 2003; Grimsditch et al., 2009) or snorkel (e.g., Jones et al., 2019). The
125 results from these studies lacked consensus on the diversity of reef predators. Therefore, we
126 considered that BRUVs would be ideal for providing a more complete picture of the predatory
127 reef fish community in this area.

128
129 This study aimed to examine key environmental characteristics that may be driving the
130 abundance, distribution and diversity of predatory reef fish populations around Pemba Island.
131 We hypothesized that predatory reef fish would be more confined to deeper than shallower
132 reefs and would show significant relationships with healthy habitats dominated by hard
133 corals. Further, habitat type (e.g., live coral vs rubble) were expected to be stronger predictors
134 of the occurrence, abundance and diversity of resident predatory species (i.e., those showing
135 strong association with the reef structure), rather than transient species (i.e., schooling and
136 epipelagic species).

137

138 **Materials and methods**

139 *Study site*

140 The survey was conducted on the outer reefs of the western margins of Pemba Island (Figure
141 1). Reefs selected for sampling corresponded in part with previous surveys conducted in the

142 Greater Pemba Channel within the Pemba Community Conservation Area (PECCA) using
143 SCUBA (Grimsditch *et al.*, 2009; Gudka *et al.*, *in prep*) and autonomous underwater vehicles -
144 AUV (Osuka *et al.*, 2021a). Sites were chosen to be representative of different reef habitats
145 and on the basis of depth (5-47 m) using a real-time depth echo sounder (Figure 1). Stations
146 were largely fore reefs on the western margins of Pemba Island spanning from reefs in the
147 north to the south (Figure 1). The BRUV stations occurring in continuous reef and separated
148 to the next set of stations by a reef pass were pooled together to form a 'sector'. This resulted
149 in three sectors conveniently named as north, central and south. The north and central sectors
150 were separated by a deep channel called the Fundo Gap (Figure 1). Similarly, the central and
151 south sectors were separated by a channel north of Misali Island (Figure 1). The survey was
152 conducted in November 2019 over a five-day period during daytime hours.


153

154 Each sampling involved deployment of a mono-BRUV unit consisting of a video GoPro Hero4
155 camera Silver fixed on a stainless-steel frame, which was attached to a 1.65 m conduit pipe in
156 the field of view of the camera (Appendix 1). A meshed bait bag was mounted on the pipe and
157 filled with bait of ca. 1 kg composed of oily fish from the families Scombridae and Carangidae.
158 The bait was cut into small pieces, which was filled into the bait bags. The BRUV unit was tied
159 with a rope to the top of the frame to facilitate deployment and a buoy on the other end to
160 enable detection and retrieval.

161

162 Each BRUV system was assembled and deployed following the Standard Operating Procedure
163 described in Langlois *et al.* (2020). The first BRUV unit was deployed close to preset GPS
164 coordinates while subsequent deployments were done approximately 500 m away but along
165 the reef. This distance was selected to minimize the chances of the same fish individuals being
166 documented on neighboring BRUV deployments. If there was insufficient reef in an area to
167 allow this spacing, re-sampling was done at an interval of ~ 250 m but on a different day. The
168 deployment points were geo-referenced using a handheld Global Positioning System (GPS).
169 The time of deployment, depth, visibility, cloud cover, tidal state, currents and GPS readings
170 were recorded during the deployment. Each BRUV unit was retrieved after at least 1-hour of
171 recording.

172



173
 174 Figure 1: Map showing location of 79 baited remote underwater video (BRUV) stations in
 175 Pemba Island deployed in three sectors north, central and south.

176
 177
 178 *Video footage processing*

179 After the BRUV unit was retrieved, visibility, field of view, profile and percentage cover of
 180 habitat/substrate types (hard coral, soft coral, sea fans, halimeda, sponges, fleshy and turf
 181 algae, rubble and sand) was visually estimated for each video recording. Fish species

182 identification from the video footage focused solely on predatory fish from 14 families at
183 normal play speed. These were: Aulostomidae (trumpetfish), Carangidae (jacks),
184 Carcharhinidae (sharks), Congridae (conger eels), Dasyatidae (whiptail stingrays), Haemulidae
185 (sweetlips), Fistulariidae (cornetfish), Lethrinidae (emperors), Lutjanidae (snappers),
186 Muraenidae (moray eels), Myliobatidae (eagle rays), Scombridae (mackerel), Epinephelidae
187 (groupers), and Sphyaerinidae (barracuda) (Appendix 2). Wherever video footage of
188 individuals was unclear the genus or family was used. Two researchers (KO, PM) reviewed
189 species identification to ensure accuracy. Species identification was done using Lieske and
190 Myers, (1994) and Taquet and Diringer, (2012) and confirmed using Eschmeyer's Catalog of
191 Fishes (Fricke et al., 2021). Species observed were classified according to their association
192 with the reef as either resident or transient (Hixon, 2015; Froese and Pauly, 2020). Resident
193 predators were species showing strong association with the reef structure or seafloor such as
194 groupers, snappers, emperors, sweetlips and eels. Transient predators were fast swimming,
195 schooling and epipelagic species, such as sharks, barracuda, jacks and mackerel (Appendix 2).
196 The conservation status of each species was derived from the International Union for
197 Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Red List website (IUCN, 2021).

198 199 *Data analysis*

200 The maximum number of individuals (MaxN) of each species of predatory reef fish observed
201 at one time from each video with a recording time of 1-hour was quantified. These data were
202 used to derive a summary of the number of individuals and species per reef sector, and a
203 rarefaction curve based on the cumulative number of BRUV deployments (Hammer et al.,
204 2001).

205
206 Nonmetric multidimensional scaling (nMDS) based on Bray–Curtis similarity (Clarke and
207 Warwick 2001), was performed on square root transformed MaxN data (Supplementary
208 material Figure S1) to graphically assess patterns in abundance of reef predators across the
209 three geographic sectors. A one-way SIMPER analysis was used to identify species that
210 contributed the most towards dissimilarity of the sectors.

211
212 Principal components analysis (PCA) was applied to benthic variables to determine key
213 variables contributing greatest to the variation. The loading of the first component was used
214 to differentiate BRUVs stations into two major habitat types: hard coral and soft coral *versus*
215 sand and rubble. An ordinary least squares regression of the first component loadings and
216 depth was thereafter conducted to determine the relationship of habitat variables with depth.

217

218 Three predictor variables of fish abundance: sector, habitat and depths were modeled (Table
219 1) using zero-inflated Poisson (ZIP) model. Generalised linear model (GLM) and zero-inflated
220 Poisson (ZIP) model outputs were first compared using Vuong Non-Nested Hypothesis Test-
221 Statistic (Vuong, 1989; Long and Long, 1997). The test showed ZIP was better than the
222 standard Poisson model. Therefore, ZIP was fitted to MaxN data on pooled predators, resident
223 predators, transient predators, species richness, fish family and species. The ZIP model had
224 two parts: a Poisson regression model to model fish count (MaxN) using predictor variables
225 of Depth and Habitat; and the logit model for predicting the probability of excess zeros in
226 random variables of Sector. The logit model provided the basis for uncovering the excessive
227 absence of reef predators in a sector, an indication of overfishing. To help with the
228 interpretation of the results we assessed the interaction effects between depth and habitat
229 type using GLM.

230

231

232

Table 1. Predictors used in the analysis of predatory fish taxa

Predictor	Abbreviation	Data type	Description
Habitat	Hab	Categorical	Two major habitat-types identified from PCA i.e. Sand and Rubble (SA_RU) and Hard coral and Soft coral (HC_SC).
Sector	Sec	Categorical	Three sectors separated by reef passes i.e. North, Central and South
Depth	Dep	Continuous	Station depth in metres

233

234

235

Results

236

Predatory reef fish abundance and taxonomic richness

237


238 A total of 5,767 individuals from 71 species and 14 families were recorded, with 83% of the
239 species occurring in depths > 20 m (Appendix 2). Overall, a majority (89%) of the species
240 sampled were in the Least Concern category under the IUCN Red List of species. Only two
241 species (< 3% of the total) the sky emperor *Lethrinus mahsena* and honeycomb stingray
242 *Himantura uarnak*, were classified as Endangered. Vulnerable species accounted for 4% and
243 included the silvertip shark *Carcharhinus albimarginatus*, spotted eagle ray *Aetobatus*
244 *ocellatus*, brown-marbled grouper *Epinephelus fuscoguttatus*, while only one Near
Threatened species, the narrow-barred Spanish mackerel *Scomberomorus commerson* was

245 observed. Two species assessed as Data Deficient were also recorded – Indian mackerel
246 *Rastrelliger kanagurta* and Kuhl's maskray *Neotrygon kuhlii*.

247

248 The species rarefaction curve of the cumulative number of BRUV deployments showed that
249 the curve was flattening suggesting that the predatory reef fish community had been
250 relatively well sampled overall (Figure 2). However, the southern sector was least sampled
251 yielding fewer species compared to the northern and central sectors. The total number of
252 species encountered in the northern and central sectors were 54 and 42 species, respectively,
253 compared to six in the southern sector.

254




255

256 Figure 2: Species rarefaction curve with their 95% confidence interval separated by sectors:
257 north - red, central - green, south - blue and all sectors - black.

258

259 The mean fish abundance (MaxN) showed no significant differences across the sectors
260 (ANOVA, $F = 0.494$; $p = 0.612$), although relatively higher values were found in the northern
261 (8.87 ± 1.49 (se)) and central (9.90 ± 2.98 (se)) sectors compared to the southern sector (5.11
262 ± 3.30 (se)). Proportion of zero counts for species encountered during the survey across three
263 sectors showed predators were more encountered in the north than the central and the south

264 (Figure 3). Resident predators were more encountered in the north and central sectors while
265 transient predators occurred more in the north sector (Figure 3).



266
267 Figure 3: Proportion of zero counts (light shadings) across three sectors for all predators (a),
268 resident predators (b), and transient predators (c). The widths of the bars show the number
269 of BRUVS per sector North n = 39, Central n = 31 and South n = 9.

270
271

272 *Predator community structure*

273 SIMPER analysis revealed that dissimilarity in predatory reef fish between the sectors was
 274 generally high (> 90%). The greatest dissimilarity was between North and South (Average
 275 dissimilarity = 96.2%) driven by snubnose pompano *Trachinotus blochii*, small-toothed jobfish
 276 *Aphareus furca*, green jobfish *Aprion virescens* and Chinese trumpetfish *Aulostomous*
 277 *chinensis* (Table 2).

278

279 Table 2: Results of one-way SIMPER analyses of species contributing more than 5% of the
 280 dissimilarity in abundance (%) in the three sectors of Pemba Island – North, Central and South.

281 Species are classified according to their association with the reef as either resident (R) or
 282 transient (T).

Species	Average abundance		Average dissimilarity	Contribution (%)
Average dissimilarity = 93.2				
	North	Central		
<i>Aprion virescens</i> (T)	1.3	0.1	8.6	9.3
<i>Aulostomous chinensis</i> (T)	0.6	0.5	6.7	7.2
<i>Lethrinus olivaceus</i> (R)	0.3	0.8	6.3	6.8
<i>Aphareus furca</i> (T)	0.8	0.4	5.9	6.4
<i>Cephalopholis argus</i> (R)	0.2	0.7	5.0	5.4
Average dissimilarity = 94.5				
	South	Central		
<i>Aphareus furca</i> (T)	1.1	0.4	14.5	15.3
<i>Trachinotus blochii</i> (T)	3.3	0.0	13.3	14.1
<i>Aulostomous chinensis</i> (T)	0.1	0.5	6.4	6.8
<i>Cephalopholis argus</i> (R)	0.0	0.7	6.2	6.6
<i>Lethrinus olivaceus</i> (R)	0.0	0.8	5.8	6.1
Average dissimilarity = 96.2				
	North	South		
<i>Trachinotus blochii</i> (T)	0.0	3.3	12.5	13.0
<i>Aphareus furca</i> (T)	0.8	1.1	12.3	12.8
<i>Aprion virescens</i> (T)	1.3	0.0	10.4	10.8
<i>Aulostomous chinensis</i> (T)	0.6	0.1	7.4	7.7

283

284


285 *Description of benthic structure*

286 On the face value, the cover of benthic variables showed minimal differences between the
287 north and central sectors, but together they differed from the southern sector that had high
288 cover of sand (52%) and fleshy algae (20%) (Supplementary material Figure S2). Hard and soft
289 coral cover averaged around 19% and 9% respectively in the north and central sectors. Overall,
290 sand was dominant in all sectors, although the percent cover was 21% and 30% in central and
291 northern sectors respectively. The cover of rubble was 15%, 10% and 4% in north, central and
292 south sectors respectively.

293
294 The first component (PC1) of the PCA explained 51.53% of variation in habitat composition
295 (Figure 4), showing positive correlation with the cover of sand ($r = 0.82$) and rubble ($r = 0.13$),
296 and negative correlations with the cover of hard corals ($r = -0.48$) and soft corals ($r = -0.27$).
297 The second PCA explained an additional 19.12% and was positively correlated to sand (0.41)
298 and hard coral (0.39) and negatively correlated to rubble (-0.81). Linear regression of PC1
299 loadings and depth showed sites with high cover of sand and rubble to be in deeper areas
300 compared to those with high cover of hard corals and soft corals depth ($R^2 = 0.13$; $p < 0.001$;
301 Figure 5)


302

Accepted Manuscript



303
 304
 305
 306
 307

Figure 4: Principal component analysis plot showing the loadings of stations on the first and second principal components and bi-plots of the benthic variables. North, central and south sectors represented by blue, black and red dots.



308

309 Figure 5: Relationship between first principal component (PC1) habitat loadings and depth.

310 Sites with negative loadings were correlated with high cover of hard and soft coral while

311 those with positive loadings were correlated with sand and rubble cover.

312

313 *Influence of depth and habitat types*

314 Species richness and the abundance of all predators (cumulative MaxN) and resident

315 predators were significantly ($p < 0.05$) influenced by depth and habitat type, with higher counts

316 in deeper than in shallower areas as well as in coral habitats than in sandy and rubble habitats

317 (Supplementary material Table S1). The zero-inflation model showed resident predators had

318 significantly excess zeros in the south in comparison to the central sector, while transient


319 predators had significantly excess zeros in the central in comparison to the north sector (Table

320 3a-b). GLM results showed significant interaction between habitat type and depth for all

321 predators, resident and transient predators (Figure 6). In sandy and rubble habitats, every

322 10m increase in depth was associated with an average increase in abundance of 0.3, 0.3 and
 323 0.2 individuals for all predators, resident and transient predators respectively.

324
 325



326
 327

328 Figure 6: Simple-slope plots of the interaction between depth and habitat type (Hab) in
 329 predicting four aggregate abundance metrics. Habitat is represented by Hard coral and Soft
 330 coral (HC_SC) and Sand and Rubble (SA_RU). All trend lines indicate significant relationships
 331 and asterisks indicate significant interaction with '***' = <0.001, '**' = <0.01, '*' = <0.05.

332
 333
 334
 335
 336
 337
 338

339 Table 3: Estimated coefficients of zero-inflation model (ZIP) and their standard errors (S.E.) for
 340 resident and transient predators and three species. Significant codes: '****' = <0.001, '***' =
 341 <0.01, '**' = <0.05. Sec = sector. Reference group for Sec was the Central sector.


	Estimate	Coefficients	S.E
a) Resident predators	Intercept*	-0.92	0.40
	Sec_North	-0.07	0.55
	Sec_South**	2.98	2.63
b) Transient predators	Intercept	-0.46	0.37
	Sec_North*	-1.47	0.61
	Sec_South	-0.24	0.80
c) Species			
<i>Lethrinus harak</i>	Intercept**	2.80	1.05
	Sec_North**	-3.19	1.22
	Sec_South	15.17	5797.15
<i>L. rubrioperculatus</i>	Intercept*	1.47	0.80
	Sec_North*	-0.43	0.95
	Sec_South	15.89	2183.26
<i>Aprion virescens</i>	Intercept****	2.07	0.62
	Sec_North**	-2.08	0.73
	Sec_South	16.33	3994.54

342
 343
 344 The predictor variables showed significant influence on four families (Figure 7; Supplementary
 345 material Table S2). The abundance of Haemulidae and Lethrinidae showed significant positive
 346 relationships with increasing depth, while only Aulostomidae displayed significant negative
 347 relationships. Other families particularly Carcharhinidae, Dasyatidae, Fistulariidae,
 348 Muraenidae, Myliobatidae, Epinephalidae and Sphyreridae exhibited non-significant
 349 relationships. Abundance of Lutjanidae was greater in hard and soft coral habitats compared
 350 to sandy and rubble habitats. A contrast observation was found for Carangidae showing higher
 351 abundance in sandy and rubble than hard and soft coral habitats.

352
 353 The GLM with interaction effects showed significant interaction between habitat type and
 354 depth for Lethrinidae, Lutjanidae, Haemulidae, Fistulariidae and Scombridae (Figure 7). Every

355 10m increase in depth within hard coral and soft coral habitats was associated with an average
 356 increase in abundance of 0.6, 0.1 and 0.1 individuals for Lethrinidae, Haemulidae and
 357 Fistulariidae respectively. In sandy and rubble habitats, every increase in depth was associated
 358 with an average increase in abundance of 0.7 and 0.4 individuals for every 10 m for Lutjanidae
 359 and Scombridae respectively.

360
 361




362
 363 Figure 7: Simple-slope plots of the interaction between depth and habitat type (Hab) in
 364 predicting abundance of three resident predator fish families (a-c) and four transient predator
 365 fish families (d-g). Habitat is represented by hard coral and soft coral (HC_SC) and sand and
 366 rubble (SA_RU). All trend lines indicate significant relationships and asterisks indicate
 367 significant interaction with '***' = <0.001, '**' = <0.01, '*' = <0.05.

368
 369

370 The abundance of *Trachinotus blochii* and spotcheek emperor *Lethrinus rubrioperculatus*
 371 increased with increased depth, while for *Aulostomous chinensis*, bluefin trevally *Caranx*
 372 *melampygus* and Indian mackerel *Rastrelliger kanagaruta* it decreased with depth (Figure 8;

373 Supplementary material Table S3). The abundance of thumbprint emperor *Lethrinus harak*
 374 and *Aprion virescens* was higher in hard and soft coral habitats compared to sandy and rubble
 375 habitats. This was different for *Aphareus furca* and *Rastrelliger kanagurta*, which had greater
 376 abundance in sandy and rubble habitats than hard and soft coral habitats. The zero inflated
 377 models showed that excess zeros occurred in central in comparison to the northern sectors
 378 for three species: *Lethrinus harak*, *Lethrinus rubrioperculatus* and *Aprion virescens* (Table 3c).
 379 GLM results showed significant interaction between habitat type and depth for *Lethrinus*
 380 *olivaceus* (Figure 8), with every 10 m increase in depth within hard coral and soft coral habitats
 381 being associated with an average increase in abundance of 1.3 individuals.

382
 383
 384



385
 386 Figure 8: Simple-slope plots of the interaction between depth and habitat type (Hab) in
 387 predicting fish abundance of three resident predator species (a-c) and six transient predator
 388 species. Habitat is represented by hard coral and soft coral (HC_SC) and sand and rubble
 389 (SA_RU). All trend lines indicate significant relationships and asterisks indicate significant
 390 interaction with '***' = <0.001, '**' = <0.01, '*' = <0.05.

391

392 Discussion

393 *General observations and novelty of the study*

394 Predatory reef fish have excessively been targeted around the world and latest studies show
395 that many of these species are increasingly becoming absent in regions such as the western
396 Indian Ocean (WIO) (de Mitcheson *et al.*, 2020; MacNeil *et al.*, 2020). The present study, one
397 of the first reef surveys to sample the west coast of Pemba Island, showed 83% of the 71
398 predator species encountered were present in depths greater than 20 m. This provides strong
399 evidence of the importance of deeper waters for predatory reef fish. Habitat types were also
400 found to influence abundance of predatory fish types in varying ways. Thus, habitat and depth
401 have a profound influence on predator abundance, although these factors often interact
402 (Pineiro *et al.*, 2016; Skinner *et al.*, 2020). In our study, the abundance of all reef-associated
403 predators in the shallow areas was high in the hard and soft coral habitats, but in relatively
404 deeper areas of up to 47m, high levels of abundance were seen in the sandy and rubble
405 habitats. While the interaction between depth and habitat may indicate fishing effects on
406 predatory reef fishes (Tyler, *et al.*, 2009), a more plausible ecological cause of the observed
407 pattern is changing habitat use of fishes with depth, for example due to ontogenetic shifts
408 (Green *et al.*, 2015; Nash *et al.*, 2015). This imply that shallow coral reefs areas in relatively
409 healthy state play an important role in hosting predatory fishes. However, ontogenetic shifts
410 coupled with the high fishing pressure that is prevalent in shallow areas such as around Pemba
411 Island (Grimsditch *et al.*, 2009) appears to be leading to a shift in the distribution of predatory
412 fishes into the deep areas where sandy habitats dominate. This study therefore provides both
413 a valuable baseline for the study area, and findings that are likely to be of wider interest to
414 coastal communities and managers in coral reef areas around the world.

415

416 *Transient and resident predators -habitat and depth associations*

417 The abundance of predatory reef types with different movement behaviours (transient *versus*
418 resident) was influenced by habitat types and depth in a non-random manner (Hixon, 2015;
419 Filous *et al.*, 2017; Paxton *et al.*, 2020). Resident predators presented strong positive
420 relationships with hard and soft coral habitat and increasing depth. This habitat association
421 was expected since resident predators show high degrees of site fidelity and are usually
422 confined to 'home' reefs', which offer both shelter and food resources (Stewart and Jones,
423 2001; Dance *et al.*, 2011). Contrastingly, transient predators are highly mobile epipelagic
424 species that generally show the weakest relationships with coral habitat types, except when
425 the abundance of target prey species is above certain thresholds or the habitat is structurally
426 complex with an extensive vertical relief (Paxton *et al.*, 2020). Interestingly, the depth effect
427 was observed in all habitat types for resident predators but only in sandy and rubble habitats

428 for transient predators. This suggests preferences of particular habitat and depth by different
429 types of predatory fish, which could in turn be targeted by local fisheries (Tyler, et al., 2009;
430 Bongaerts et al., 2010). Certainly, predatory reef fish are attracted to areas of high prey fish
431 density that tend to occur in areas of live coral and high structural complexity (Stewart and
432 Jones 2001; Chong-Seng et al., 2012). Therefore, the influence of habitat and depth on the
433 abundance of reef fish was clearer in resident predators but more complex for transient
434 predators.

435

436 Incorporation of depth and habitat information into management strategies for resident and
437 transient predatory fish is likely to benefit the fisheries of Pemba Island. This will certainly
438 require information comparing the effects of depth and habitat in fished areas versus un-
439 fished areas. Indeed, such information is critical in selecting management measures geared
440 towards promoting the attainment and maintenance of thresholds of prey and predatory fish
441 densities (McClanahan et al., 2011; Hill et al., 2020). To ensure the sustainability of predatory
442 reef fish in areas like Pemba Island, where human population is growing (NBS 2018) and
443 fishing effort is increasing (Jacquet and Zeller, 2007; Rehren et al., 2020), it will be important
444 to manage both the fisheries and protect the habitats that their prey fish rely upon.

445

446 *Species driving the pattern*

447 We found three to six key species within the resident and transient predator types were the
448 most responsible for the patterns in the habitat and depth relationships. Within the resident
449 predators, significant interaction between habitat and depth was only apparent in longface
450 emperor, *Lethrinus olivaceus*, highlighting increased abundance in deeper areas but more so
451 for those individuals occurring in sandy and rubble habitats. A positive depth effect was
452 evident in spotcheek emperor, *Lethrinus rubrioperculatus*, while coral habitat effects were
453 detected in thumbprint emperor, *Lethrinus harak*. In general, emperors are linked to sandy
454 habitats where they feed by hunting less mobile prey (Kulbicki et al., 2005). Spotcheek
455 emperors prefer outer reef slopes in waters greater than 10 m (Sommer et al., 1996; Fricke et
456 al., 2011) thus it was not surprising that their abundance increased with increasing depth.
457 Similar studies in the Maldives have shown coral habitats to host more thumbprint emperors
458 (Skinner *et al.*, 2020). The species move either in small schools or solitary and can traverse
459 different habitats including shallow sandy and hard coral habitats (Carpenter and Allen, 1989).
460 We therefore postulate that emperor species respond to habitat and depth effects in varying
461 ways.

462

463 We observed habitat and depth effects with no interaction effects within the transient
464 predators. Green jobfish, *Aprion virescens*, showed significant association with hard coral and
465 soft coral in contrast to small-toothed jobfish *Aphareus furca*, which were more affiliated to
466 sandy and rubble habitats. The opposing patterns in these closely related species is likely
467 related to their biology and movement patterns. The adults of green job fish inhabit seaward
468 reefs, while those of small-toothed jobfish prefer inshore coral and sandy habitats (Anderson
469 and Allen, 2001). Positive depth effects were evident in snubnose pompano, *Trachinotus*
470 *blochii*, while negative relationships with depth were found for Chinese trumpetfish,
471 *Aulostomous chinensis*, and schooling species of bluefin trevally, *Caranx melampygus*, and
472 Indian mackerel, *Rastrelliger kanagurta*. These associations are coherent with ontogenetic
473 shifts and feeding behaviour that involve various depths and habitat types (Green *et al.*, 2015;
474 Nash *et al.*, 2015). For example, the juveniles of snubnose pompano occur in shallow sandy
475 habitats and later move to adjacent relatively deeper coral reef habitats as they grow (Fischer
476 *et al.*, 1990). This suggests the individuals surveyed in sandy habitats were all sub-adults.
477 Chinese trumpetfish utilise multiple habitat types such as seagrass lagoons, coral and rocky
478 reefs in the shallow areas and caves reaching 200 m in the deep areas (Bowen *et al.*, 2001;
479 McGratten and Pollom, 2015). The species is not fished which makes it ubiquitous in shallow
480 water depths. Bluefin trevally and Indian mackerel are mobile predators and often hunt in
481 shallow waters (Sancho, 2000), where their food items are generally most abundant, and they
482 may exhibit high residency in such depths (Filous *et al.*, 2017). Taken together, these findings
483 indicate that schooling transient predator species are least dependent on healthy coral
484 habitat types and therefore, less likely to be affected by changes in habitat conditions.

485

486 *Family patterns*

487 Resident fish families like Haemulidae and Lethrinidae increased in abundance with increasing
488 depth, particularly in hard and soft coral habitats. This finding may be explained by the idea
489 that during the day, coral heads on the reef offer shelter to nocturnal species. For example,
490 at night haemulids forage on diets composed of small fish, invertebrates and dead animals in
491 seagrass beds but during the day shift to coral associated habitats to escape predation from
492 meso-predators (Burkepile and Hay, 2008). A contrasting result was found for Lutjanidae.
493 While Lutjanidae also rest during the day in reef ledges and feed during the night (Nagelkerken
494 *et al.*, 2000), it is possible that the pattern observed was due to the bait plume from our BRUVs
495 (Harvey *et al.*, 2012; Espinoza *et al.*, 2014) attracting them during the day (Bacheler *et al.*,
496 2021) and especially in the open sandy and rubble habitats.

497

498 A non-significant influence of habitat type and depth was found on resident predators of the
499 subfamily Epinephelinae. This could reflect high abundance or diversity within this group,
500 which can influence the ability to detect relationships (Gerrodette, 1987). Nonetheless, the
501 non-significant results are in contrast to a previous study in the Maldives that showed deep
502 outer reefs had greater abundance of Epinephelinae than shallow lagoonal reefs (Skinner *et*
503 *al.*, 2020). However, the depth preferences of different species within the Epinephelinae
504 (Froese and Pauly, 2020), could be masking the relationships with depth.

505

506 Among the transient predators, there was evidence of habitat effects for the family
507 Carangidae and interaction effects for Scombridae and Fistularidae. Fish belonging to the
508 families Carangidae and Scombridae generally move in schools, often at speed, and therefore
509 can quickly respond to temporal and spatial fluctuations in prey fish density (Stewart and
510 Jones, 2001). As for Fistularidae, members of this family are generalist, usually very broad
511 ranging inhabiting shallow reef habitats to sandy habitats in depths reaching up to 100 m
512 (Watson and Sandknop, 1996).

513

514 *The north, central and south differences*

515 Coral reefs in the western Indian Ocean have shown declines in coral cover due to climate
516 change causing coral bleaching and subsequent coral mortality, and are predicted to decrease
517 further (Obura *et al.*, 2017; McClanahan *et al.*, 2020). Critically, healthy coral habitats are
518 essential for different groups of predatory fish. Therefore, future habitat loss through
519 destructive fishing activities like dynamite fishing, which has previously been reported in
520 Pemba Island (Slade and Kalangahe, 2015), will adversely affect the abundance of predatory
521 species. Dynamite fishing and bleaching damage create accumulation of rubble, which could
522 hamper recruitment and re-growth of coral. The cover of rubble can be used to disentangle
523 these effects, particularly if one driver like dynamite fishing is localised and the other like
524 bleaching is widespread. In our study the cover of rubble was relatively high in the north (15%)
525 and central (10%) sectors compared to the south (4%). However, the low cover in the south is
526 potentially due to artefacts of sampling, which was hindered by logistical constraints of rough
527 sea conditions. Alternatively, the differences between the north and south sectors could be
528 due to effects of historical dynamite fishing (Slade and Kalangahe, 2015).

529

530 Excessive absence of predators is an indication of widespread overfishing (Myers and Worms,
531 2003). The relatively high proportion of zero counts in the southern and central reef sectors
532 of Pemba Island may therefore indicate overfishing, particularly for emperor reef species:
533 *Lethrinus harak*, and *L. rubrioperculatus*. Previous studies in the southern sector (i.e., Misali
534 Island) point to relatively healthy habitats and fish diversity but a disproportionately
535 decreased abundance and diversity of large reef-associated predators (Grimsditch et al., 2009;
536 Jones et al., 2019; Osuka *et al.*, 2021a). Indeed, in 2017, estimates of species richness drawn
537 from six families: Carangidae, Epinephelinae, Lethrinidae, Lutjanidae, Carcharhinidae and
538 Sphyrnaeidae at Misali stood at 15 species, down from 46 species in 2004 (Daniels et al., 2004;
539 Jones et al., 2019). In combination these studies suggest overfishing may have worsened in
540 recent decades.

541
542 The central sector was the only sector where Vulnerable (silvertip shark, *Carcharhinus*
543 *albimarginatus*, brown-marbled grouper, *Epinephelus fuscoguttatus*) IUCN Red Listed species
544 were recorded. Also recorded in the central and southern sectors was the Vulnerable spotted
545 eagle ray *Aetobatus ocellatus*. The appearance of these species in the central sector could be
546 an indication of relatively high habitat quality (Harborne et al., 2011), which is critical in
547 maintaining the remaining populations of threatened species (Root 1998; Friedlander et al.,
548 2007). While there were no clear differences in live hard coral cover, a proxy of habitat quality,
549 between central and northern sectors, it is important to highlight the presence of a
550 continuous forereef area in the central sector, making the area ideal for reef predators like
551 sharks and groupers (Papastamatiou et al., 2018; Skinner et al., 2020). Further, the sector's
552 isolation from the main island through an extensive inner reef likely results in lower fishing
553 pressure and implies that future species and area protection measures would certainly be
554 beneficial.

555
556 *Using BRUVs to survey predatory coral reef fish*

557 This study joins a growing number illustrating the utility of BRUVs for gaining unique insights
558 into coral reef fish communities across a range of depths and environments. However, it is
559 appropriate to recognize limitations of the method. Our study deployed mono-BRUVs and
560 thus it was not possible to estimate fish size and subsequently fish biomass (Bernard et al.,
561 2014; Langlois et al., 2020). Fish size is an important indicator used to determine reef
562 productivity (Shin et al., 2005; Osuka et al., 2021b). Thus, application of mono-BRUVS has the
563 tendency of missing the opportunity to derive reef-associated variables like biomass and

564 productivity, which would be possible when stereo-BRUVS are applied (Langlois et al., 2020).
565 That said, mono-BRUVS compared to stereo-BRUVS are: easy to assemble as they do not
566 require calibration of the stereo-video streams that enable accurate measurement of length
567 and range (Boutros et al., 2015), relatively cheaper in cost due to use of one camera per BRUV
568 unit and not necessarily requiring specialised software to annotate and measure fish from
569 stereo-video (Gomes-Pereira et al., 2016). An important, but unanswered, question is how
570 biomass of reef-associated predators would change across the sectors. Despite the limitation
571 of mono-BRUVS, we are confident that the central sector had a higher biomass than the other
572 sectors. This is due to the presence of large-sized reef predators including sharks, rays,
573 groupers and trevally in that area. The rarefaction curves showed that our BRUVs surveys
574 were reasonably adequate to estimate the species richness of predatory reef fish of the outer
575 reefs of Pemba Island. However, the asymptote of the curve had not yet been fully reached
576 suggesting that the observed species richness was somewhat underestimated. As such, it is
577 possible that our sampling might have missed observing some of the rarer, cryptic and more
578 wary reef predators (Asher et al., 2017; Skinner et al., 2020).

579
580 The addition of Misali Island (see Figure 1) as a study site would be informative, as this area is
581 known to support high coral cover (Grimsditch et al., 2009) and a potential hotspot for
582 mesophotic coral ecosystem composed of corals, algae, invertebrate and fish (Osuka et al.,
583 2021a). Thus, in future it would be useful to extend the reef studies using BRUVs by examining
584 predators at Misali Island. But perhaps research using stereo-BRUVs (Langlois et al., 2020)
585 complemented by transect based approaches such as mini-ROV (remote operated vehicle)
586 would provide further insight into spatial and depth related variations in predatory reef fish
587 biomass. Of particular relevance would be the mid-water stereo BRUVs (Santana-Garcon et
588 al., 2014), which may be appropriate for the outer reefs with ledges and walls that make it
589 difficult for BRUV units to settle. Future work especially in the outer reefs of Pemba Island
590 would also benefit from application of complementary coral reef survey methods able to
591 survey shallow and mesophotic depths (e.g., AUVs, Osuka et al., 2021a). AUVs have the ability
592 to follow a pre-determined track, map deep areas down to 500 m and beyond, and collect
593 high-resolution data including photos and videos of both the water column and benthic
594 community. Such an effort would provide a much comprehensive insight into the drivers of
595 the diversity, distribution, density and biomass of higher trophic level predatory reef fish in
596 the area.

597

598 Predatory reef fish populations are facing immense pressures worldwide, leading to alarming
599 losses in abundance and diversity. The present study has shed light on the abundance and
600 distribution of predatory reef fish populations off the under-researched oceanic island of
601 Pemba Island. Clearly, different types of predators are discordantly predicted by depth and
602 habitat type with three to six key species within the resident and transient predator categories
603 being responsible for the patterns we observed. Habitats dominated by hard and soft corals,
604 and in relatively deeper waters, hosted high species richness and abundance of reef-
605 associated predators. Our findings add to the growing evidence that deep waters around coral
606 reefs provide important habitats for fish predators and corals. Thus, careful management,
607 through effective area and species protection measures, are needed to prevent further
608 impending reductions in their populations.

609

610 **Acknowledgements**

611 This work was funded by the Sustainable Oceans, Livelihoods, and food Security Through
612 Increased Capacity in Ecosystem research in the Western Indian Ocean (SOLSTICE-WIO)
613 Programme (www.solstice-wio.org), a collaborative project funded through the UK Global
614 Challenges Research Fund (GCRF) under NERC grant NE/ P021050/1. KEO acknowledges
615 additional support from Norwegian agency for development cooperation (Norad), Perivoli
616 Philanthropy and Dev Joory for funding this work as part of his PhD research. We are grateful
617 to Phil Platts for his critical review of an early draft.

618

619

620 Appendix 1: Image of a BRUV unit being deployed off the coast of Pemba Island.



621
622
623
624

625 Appendix 2: Species list and their behaviour, IUCN Red List Categories and minimum and maximum depths sampled. EN = Endangered; VU = Vulnerable; NT
626 = Near Threatened; LC = Least Concern; DD = Data Deficient.
627

Family	Species	Predator type	Reference (in FishBase)	IUCN Red List Category	Min depth (m)	Max depth (m)
Carcharhinidae	<i>Carcharhinus albimarginatus</i> (Rüppell, 1837)	Transient	Compagno, 1984	VU	39.0	39.0
Carcharhinidae	<i>Carcharhinus</i> sp	Transient	Compagno, 1984	VU	10.0	40.0
Dasyatidae	<i>Neotrygon kuhlii</i> (Muller & Henle 1841)	Resident	Michael, 1993	DD	23.0	23.0
Dasyatidae	<i>Himantura uarnak</i> (Gmelin 1789)	Resident	Compagno et al., 1989	EN	40.0	40.0
Myliobatidae	<i>Aetobatus ocellatus</i> (Kuhl 1823)	Transient	Kapoor et al., 2002	VU	20.0	22.0
Muraenidae	<i>Gymnothorax buroensis</i> (Bleeker 1857)	Resident	Lieske and Myers, 1994	LC	22.0	28.0
Muraenidae	<i>Gymnothorax eurostus</i> (Abbott 1860)	Resident	Mundy, 2005	LC	23.0	23.0
Muraenidae	<i>Gymnothorax favagineus</i> Bloch & Schneider 1801	Resident	Lieske and Myers, 1994	LC	16.0	40.0
Muraenidae	<i>Gymnothorax fimbriatus</i> (Bennett 1832)	Resident	Kuiter, 1998	LC	35.0	35.0
Muraenidae	<i>Gymnothorax flavimarginatus</i> (Rüppell 1830)	Resident	Mundy, 2005	LC	10.0	15.0
Muraenidae	<i>Gymnothorax javanicus</i> (Bleeker 1859)	Resident	Mundy, 2005	LC	10.0	45.0
Muraenidae	<i>Gymnothorax meleagris</i> (Shaw 1795)	Resident	Mundy, 2005	LC	10.0	23.0
Muraenidae	<i>Gymnothorax nudivomer</i> (Günther 1867)	Resident	Mundy, 2005	LC	40.0	40.0
Muraenidae	<i>Gymnothorax undulatus</i> (Lacepède 1803)	Resident	Mundy, 2005	LC	25.0	25.0
Muraenidae	<i>Gymnothorax griseus</i> (Lacepède 1803)	Resident	Sommer et al., 1996	LC	10.0	21.0
Congridae	<i>Heteroconger hassi</i> (Klausewitz & Eibl-Eibesfeldt 1959)	Resident	Bacchet et al., 2006	LC	20.0	32.0
Aulostomidae	<i>Aulostomus chinensis</i> (Linnaeus, 1766)	Transient	Mundy, 2005	LC	5.8	35.0
Echeneidae	<i>Echeneis naucrates</i> Linnaeus 1758	Transient	Smith, 1997	LC	11.0	20.0

Fistulariidae	<i>Fistularia commersonii</i> Ruppell 1838	Transient	Mundy, 2005	LC	7.0	28.0
Epinephelinae	<i>Aethaloperca rogae</i> (Fabricius 1775)	Resident	Kuiter and Tonzuka 2001	LC	7.0	32.0
Epinephelinae	<i>Cephalopholis argus</i> Schneider 1801	Resident	Mundy, 2005	LC	5.8	32.0
Epinephelinae	<i>Cephalopholis cyanostigma</i> (Valenciennes 1828)	Resident	Lieske and Myers, 1994	LC	20.0	20.0
Epinephelinae	<i>Cephalopholis boenak</i> (Bloch 1790)	Resident	Kuiter and Tonzuka 2001	LC	10.0	40.0
Epinephelinae	<i>Epinephelus caeruleopunctatus</i> (Bloch 1790)	Resident	Craig et al., 2011	LC	23.0	23.0
Epinephelinae	<i>Epinephelus fuscoguttatus</i> (Forsskal 1775)	Resident	Lieske and Myers, 1994	VU	32.0	32.0
Epinephelinae	<i>Epinephelus</i> sp.	Resident	Lieske and Myers, 1994	LC	25.0	39.0
Epinephelinae	<i>Epinephelus tukula</i> Morgans 1959	Resident	Kuiter and Tonzuka 2001	LC	47.0	47.0
Epinephelinae	<i>Plectropomus laevis</i> (Lacepede 1801)	Resident	Kailola et al., 1993	LC	23.0	23.0
Epinephelinae	<i>Variola albimarginata</i> Baissac 1953	Resident	Lieske and Myers, 1994	LC	10.0	45.0
Epinephelinae	<i>Variola louti</i> (Fabricius 1775)	Resident	Lieske and Myers, 1994	LC	15.0	28.0
Carangidae	<i>Carangoides dinema</i> Bleeker, 1851	Transient	Allen and Erdmann 2012	LC	25.0	25.0
Carangidae	<i>Carangoides ferdau</i> (Forsskal, 1775)	Transient	Sommer et al., 1996	LC	12.0	40.0
Carangidae	<i>Carangoides fulvoguttatus</i> (Forsskal, 1775)	Transient	Sommer et al., 1996	LC	40.0	40.0
Carangidae	<i>Carangoides gymnostethus</i> (Cuvier, 1833)	Transient	Lieske and Myers, 1994	LC	28.0	28.0
Carangidae	<i>Carangoides orthogrammus</i> (Jordan & Gilbert, 1882)	Transient	Mundy, 2005	LC	10.0	40.0
Carangidae	<i>Carangoides</i> sp.	Transient	Mundy, 2005	LC	21.0	45.0
Carangidae	<i>Caranx ignobilis</i> (Forsskal, 1775)	Transient	Mundy, 2005	LC	10.0	15.0
Carangidae	<i>Caranx melampygus</i> Cuvier, 1833	Transient	Mundy, 2005	LC	10.0	22.0
Carangidae	<i>Caranx sexfasciatus</i> Quoy & Gaimard, 1825	Transient	Mundy, 2005	LC	5.8	40.0
Carangidae	<i>Caranx</i> sp	Transient	Mundy, 2005	LC	17.0	22.0
Carangidae	<i>Caranx tille</i> Cuvier, 1833	Transient	Paxton et al, 1989	LC	8.0	35.0

Carangidae	<i>Trachinotus blochii</i> (Lacepède, 1801)	Transient	Fischer et al., 1990	LC	11.0	40.0
Lutjanidae	<i>Macolor niger</i> (Forsskal 1775)	Resident	Lieske and Myers, 1994	LC	10.0	27.0
Lutjanidae	<i>Aphareus furca</i> (Lacepède 1801)	Transient	Mundy, 2005	LC	6.0	43.0
Lutjanidae	<i>Aprion virescens</i> Valenciennes 1830	Transient	Mundy, 2005	LC	7.0	47.0
Lutjanidae	<i>Lutjanus bohar</i> (Fabricius 1775)	Transient	Sommer et al., 1996	LC	10.0	40.0
Lutjanidae	<i>Lutjanus gibbus</i> (Forsskal 1775)	Resident	Kuiter and Tonzuka 2001	LC	23.0	25.0
Lutjanidae	<i>Lutjanus kasmira</i> (Fabricius 1775)	Resident	Mundy, 2005	LC	10.0	16.0
Lutjanidae	<i>Lutjanus monostigma</i> (Cuvier 1828)	Resident	Allen, 1985	LC	16.0	16.0
Lutjanidae	<i>Lutjanus quinquelineatus</i> (Bloch 1790)	Resident	Allen, 1985	LC	16.0	16.0
Lutjanidae	<i>Lutjanus rivulatus</i> (Cuvier 1828)	Resident	Sommer et al., 1996	LC	10.0	10.0
Lutjanidae	<i>Lutjanus russellii</i> (Bleeker 1849)	Resident	Sommer et al., 1996	LC	40.0	40.0
Lutjanidae	<i>Lutjanus vitta</i> (Quoy & Gaimard 1824)	Resident	Allen, 1985	LC	40.0	40.0
Haemulidae	<i>Plectorhinchus gaterinus</i> Fabricius 1775	Resident	Bianchi, 1985	LC	22.0	25.0
Haemulidae	<i>Plectorhinchus vittatus</i> (Linnaeus 1758)	Resident	Sommer et al., 1996	LC	23.0	23.0
Lethrinidae	<i>Lethrinus erythropterus</i> Valenciennes 1830	Resident	Carpenter and Allen, 1989	LC	40.0	40.0
Lethrinidae	<i>Lethrinus harak</i> (Fabricius 1775)	Resident	Carpenter and Allen, 1989	LC	7.0	28.0
Lethrinidae	<i>Lethrinus mahsena</i> (Fabricius 1775)	Resident	Sommer et al., 1996	EN	25.0	25.0
Lethrinidae	<i>Lethrinus microdon</i> Valenciennes 1830	Resident	Sommer et al., 1996	LC	14.0	14.0
Lethrinidae	<i>Lethrinus nebulosus</i> (Forsskal 1775)	Resident	Carpenter and Allen, 1989	LC	28.0	28.0
Lethrinidae	<i>Lethrinus obsoletus</i> (Forsskal 1775)	Resident	Carpenter and Allen, 1989	LC	7.0	7.0
Lethrinidae	<i>Lethrinus olivaceus</i> Valenciennes 1830	Resident	Sommer et al., 1996	LC	10.0	45.0
Lethrinidae	<i>Lethrinus rubrioperculatus</i> Sato 1978	Resident	Sommer et al., 1996	LC	7.0	45.0
Lethrinidae	<i>Lethrinus sp</i>	Resident	Sommer et al., 1996	LC	25.0	25.0

Lethrinidae	<i>Lethrinus xanthochilus</i> Klunzinger 1870	Resident	Carpenter and Allen, 1989	LC	22.0	35.0
Lethrinidae	<i>Monotaxis grandoculis</i> (Forsskal 1775)	Resident	Carpenter and Allen, 1989	LC	11.0	40.0
Sphyraenidae	<i>Sphyraena barracuda</i> (Edwards 1771)	Transient	De Sylva, 1990	LC	40.0	40.0
Sphyraenidae	<i>Sphyraena forsteri</i> Cuvier 1829	Transient	Senou, 2001	LC	15.0	15.0
Scombridae	<i>Gymnosarda unicolor</i> (Rüppell 1836)	Transient	Collette and Nauen, 1983	LC	15.0	25.0
Scombridae	<i>Rastrelliger kanagurta</i> (Cuvier 1816)	Transient	Collette and Nauen, 1983	DD	10.0	40.0
Scombridae	<i>Scomberomorus commerson</i> (Lacepède 1800)	Transient	Collette and Nauen, 1983	NT	12.0	12.0

628

Accepted Manuscript

- 629 **References**
- 630 Allen, G.R., 1985. FAO Species Catalogue. Vol. 6. Snappers of the world. An annotated and
631 illustrated catalogue of lutjanid species known to date. FAO Fish. Synop. 125(6):208 p.
632 Rome: FAO.
- 633 Allen, G.R. and M.V. Erdmann, 2012. Reef fishes of the East Indies. Perth, Australia:
634 University of Hawai'i Press, Volumes I-III. Tropical Reef Research.
- 635 Anderson, W.D. Jr. and Allen, G.R., 2001. Lutjanidae. Jobfishes. In: Carpenter K.E. and Niem
636 V. (eds.) *FAO species identification guide for fishery purposes. The living marine resources of
637 the Western Central Pacific. Vol. 5. Bony fishes part 3 (Menidae to Pomacentridae)*. FAO,
638 Rome. p. 2840-2918.
- 639 Asher, J., Williams, I.D. and Harvey, E.S., 2017. An assessment of mobile predator
640 populations along shallow and mesophotic depth gradients in the Hawaiian
641 Archipelago. *Scientific reports*, 7(1), pp.1-18.
- 642 Bacchet, P., T. Zysman and Y. Lefèvre, 2006. Guide des poissons de Tahiti et ses îles. Tahiti
643 (Polynésie Française): Editions Au Vent des Îles. 608 p.
- 644 Bacheler, N.M., Gerald, N.R., Burton, M.L., Muñoz, R.C. and Kellison, G.T., 2017. Comparing
645 relative abundance, lengths, and habitat of temperate reef fishes using simultaneous
646 underwater visual census, video, and trap sampling. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 574,
647 141-155.
- 648 Bacheler, N.M., Runde, B.J., Shertzer, K.W., Buckel, J.A. and Rudershausen, P.J., 2021. Fine
649 scale behavior of red snapper (*Lutjanus campechanus*) around bait: approach distances, bait
650 plume dynamics, and effective fishing area. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic
651 Sciences*, (ja).
- 652 Baum, J. K. and Worm, B., 2009. Cascading top-down effects of changing oceanic predator
653 abundances. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 78(4), pp. 699–714.
- 654 Bascompte, J., Melián, C.J. and Sala, E., 2005. Interaction strength combinations and the
655 overfishing of a marine food web. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 102(15),
656 pp. 5443–5447.
- 657 Bell, J., Cheung, W., De Silva, S., Gasalla, M., Frusher, S., Hobday, A., Lam, V., Lehodey, P.,
658 Pecl, G., Samoilys, M. and Senina, I., 2016. Impacts and effects of ocean warming on the
659 contributions of fisheries and aquaculture to food security. In: Laffoley D, Baxter JM (eds),
660 *Explaining ocean warming: causes, scale, effects and consequences*. Gland, Switzerland:
661 International Union for the Conservation of Nature.
- 662 Bernard, A.T., Götz, A., Parker, D., Heyns, E.R., Halse, S.J., Riddin, N.A., Smith, M.K., Paterson,
663 A.W., Winker, H., Fullwood, L. and Langlois, T.J., 2014. New possibilities for research on reef
664 fish across the continental shelf of South Africa. *South African Journal of Science*, 110(9-10),
665 pp.01-05.
- 666 Beukers-Stewart, B.D., Beukers-Stewart, J.S. and Jones, G.P., 2011. Behavioural and
667 developmental responses of predatory coral reef fish to variation in the abundance of prey.
668 *Coral Reefs* 30:855–864.
- 669 Bianchi, G., 1985. FAO species identification sheets for fishery purposes. Field guide to the
670 commercial marine and brackish-water species of Tanzania. Prepared and published with
671 the support of TCP/URT/4406 and FAO (FIRM) Regular Programme. FAO, Rome. 199 p.
- 672 Bongaerts, P., Ridgway, T., Sampayo, E.M. and Hoegh-Guldberg, O., 2010. Assessing the
673 'deep reef refugia' hypothesis: focus on Caribbean reefs. *Coral Reefs* 29, 309–327.
- 674 Bowen, B.W., Bass, A.L., Rocha, L.A., Grant, W.S. and Robertson, D.R., 2001. Phylogeography
675 of the trumpetfishes (*Aulostomus*): ring species complex on a global scale. *Evolution*, 55(5),
676 pp.1029-1039.
- 677 Burkepile, D.E. and Hay, M.E., 2008. Coral Reefs. *Encyclopedia of Ecology* Pages 784-796

678 Cappelletti, M., De'ath, G. and Speare, P., 2007. Inter-reef vertebrate communities of the Great
679 Barrier Reef Marine Park determined by baited remote underwater video stations. *Marine*
680 *Ecology Progress Series*, 350, pp. 209–221.

681 Boutros, N., Shortis, M.R. and Harvey, E.S. 2015. A comparison of calibration methods and
682 system configurations of underwater stereo-video systems for applications in marine
683 ecology. *Limnology and Oceanography: Methods*, 13, 224–236.

684 Carpenter, K.E. and Allen, G.R. 1989. *FAO Species Catalogue. Vol. 9. Emperor fishes and*
685 *large-eye breams of the world (family Lethrinidae). An annotated and illustrated catalogue*
686 *of lethrinid species known to date.* FAO Fish. Synop. 125(9):118 p. Rome: FAO.

687 Chong-Seng, K. M., Mannering, T. D., Pratchett, M. S., Bellwood, D. R. and Graham, N.A.,
688 2012. The influence of coral reef benthic condition on associated fish assemblages. *PLoS*
689 *One*, 7(8), e42167.

690 Clarke, K.R. and Warwick, R.M., 2001. Change in marine communities: an approach to
691 statistical analysis and interpretation (2nd edn). Plymouth, UK: PRIMER-E.

692 Collette, B.B. and C.E. Nauen, 1983. *FAO Species Catalogue. Vol. 2. Scombrids of the world.*
693 *An annotated and illustrated catalogue of tunas, mackerels, bonitos and related species*
694 *known to date.* Rome: FAO. FAO Fish. Synop. 125(2):137 p.

695 Collins, M.R., 1990. A comparison of three fish trap designs. *Fish Res* 9:325–332

696 Compagno, L.J.V., 1984. *FAO Species Catalogue. Vol. 4. Sharks of the world. An annotated*
697 *and illustrated catalogue of shark species known to date. Part 2 - Carcharhiniformes.* FAO
698 Fish. Synop. 125(4/2):251-655. Rome: FAO

699 Compagno, L.J.V., D.A. Ebert and M.J. Smale, 1989. *Guide to the sharks and rays of southern*
700 *Africa.* New Holland (Publ.) Ltd., London. 158 p.

701 Craig, M., Y.J.S. de Mitcheson and P.C. Heemstra, 2011. *Groupers of the world: a field and*
702 *market guide.* North America: CRC Press/Taylor and Francis Group. 356 p.

703 Dance, M.A., Patterson III, W.F. and Addis, D.T., 2011. Fish community and trophic structure
704 at artificial reef sites in the northeastern Gulf of Mexico. *Bulletin of Marine Science*, 87(3),
705 pp. 301–324.

706 Daniels C., Fanning E. and Redding D., 2003. Marine resource management for Misali Island:
707 preliminary analysis by Frontier-Tanzania. *West Indian Ocean J Mar Sci.* 2:85–93.

708 de Mitcheson, Y.J.S., Linardich, C., Barreiros, J.P., Ralph, G.M., Aguilar-Perera, A., Afonso, P.,
709 Erismann, B.E., Pollard, D.A., Fennessy, S.T., Bertocini, A.A. and Nair, R.J., 2020. Valuable but
710 vulnerable: Over-fishing and under-management continue to threaten groupers so what
711 now?. *Marine Policy*, 116, p.103909.

712 De Sylva, D.P., 1990. Sphyraenidae. p. 860-864. In J.C. Quero, J.C. Hureau, C. Karrer, A. Post
713 and L. Saldanha (eds.) *Check-list of the fishes of the eastern tropical Atlantic (CLOFETA).*
714 *JNICT, Lisbon; SEI, Paris; and UNESCO, Paris. Vol. 2*

715 Espinoza, M., Cappelletti, M., Heupel, M.R., Tobin, A.J. and Simpfendorfer, C.A., 2014.
716 Quantifying shark distribution patterns and species-habitat associations: implications of
717 marine park zoning. *PLoS one*, 9(9), p.e106885.

718 Filous, A., Friedlander, A., Wolfe, B., Stamoulis, K., Scherrer, S., Wong, A., Stone, K. and
719 Sparks, R., 2017. Movement patterns of reef predators in a small isolated marine protected
720 area with implications for resource management. *Marine Biology*, 164(1), pp.1-16.

721 Fischer, W., Sousa, I., Silva, C., de Freitas, A., Poutiers, J.M., Schneider, W., Borges, T.C.,
722 Feral, J.P. and Massinga, A., 1990. *Field guide to commercial marine and brackishwater*
723 *species of Mozambique.* 230.

724 Fricke, R., Eschmeyer, W. N. and van der Laan R., (eds) 2021. *Eschmeyer's Catalog of Fishes:*
725 *Genera, Species, References.*
726 <http://researcharchive.calacademy.org/research/ichthyology/catalog/fishcatmain.asp>

727 Fricke, R., Kulbicki, M. and Wantiez, L., 2011. Checklist of the fishes of New Caledonia, and
728 their distribution in the Southwest Pacific Ocean (Pisces). *Stuttgarter Beiträge zur*
729 *Naturkunde A, Neue Serie, 4*, pp.341-463.

730 Friedlander, A.M., Brown, E. and Monaco, M.E., 2007. Defining reef fish habitat utilization
731 patterns in Hawaii: comparisons between marine protected areas and areas open to fishing.
732 *Marine Ecology Progress Series, 351*, pp.221-233.

733 Frisch, A.J., Ireland, M. and Baker, R., 2014. Trophic ecology of large predatory reef fishes:
734 energy pathways, trophic level, and implications for fisheries in a changing climate. *Marine*
735 *Biology, 161*(1), pp.61-73.

736 Froese, R. and Pauly, D., 2020. FishBase. World Wide Web electronic publication.
737 www.fishbase.org, (06/2020)

738 Gerrodette, T.I.M., 1987. A power analysis for detecting trends. *Ecology*. Wiley Online
739 Library, 68(5), pp. 1364–1372.

740 Gomes-Pereira, J.N., Auger, V., Beisiegel, K., Benjamin, R., Bergmann, M., Bowden, D.,
741 Buhl-Mortensen, P., De Leo, F.C., Dionísio, G., Durden, J.M. and Edwards, L., 2016. Current
742 and future trends in marine image annotation software. *Progress in Oceanography, 149*,
743 pp.106-120.

744 Green, A.L., Maypa, A.P., Almany, G.R., Rhodes, K.L., Weeks, R., Abesamis, R.A., Gleason,
745 M.G., Mumby, P.J. and White, A.T., 2015. Larval dispersal and movement patterns of coral
746 reef fishes, and implications for marine reserve network design. *Biological Reviews, 90*(4),
747 pp.1215-1247.

748 Graham, N.A., Jennings, S., MacNeil, M.A., Mouillot, D. and Wilson, S.K., 2015. Predicting
749 climate-driven regime shifts versus rebound potential in coral reefs. *Nature, 518*(7537),
750 pp.94-97.

751 Grimsditch, G.D., Tاملander, J., Mwaura, J., Zavagli, M., Takata, Y. and Gomez, T. 2009.
752 *Coral reef resilience assessment of the Pemba channel conservation area, Tanzania*. Gland,
753 Switzerland: IUCN. 40pp.

754 Hammer, Ø., Harper, D.A. and Ryan, P.D., 2001. PAST: Paleontological statistics software
755 package for education and data analysis. *Palaeontologia electronica, 4*(1), p.9.

756 Hammerschlag, N., Schmitz, O.J., Flecker, A.S., Lafferty, K.D., Sih, A., Atwood, T.B., Gallagher,
757 A.J., Irschick, D.J., Skubel, R. and Cooke, S.J., 2019. Ecosystem function and services of
758 aquatic predators in the Anthropocene. *Trends in ecology & evolution, 34*(4), pp.369-383.

759 Harborne, A. R., Mumby, P. J., Kennedy, E. V. and Ferrari, R., 2011. Biotic and multi-scale
760 abiotic controls of habitat quality: their effect on coral-reef fishes. *Marine Ecology Progress*
761 *Series, 437*, 201-214.

762 Harvey, E., McLean, D., Frusher, S., Haywood, M., Newman, S.J. and Williams, A., 2013. The
763 use of BRUVs as a tool for assessing marine fisheries and ecosystems: a review of the hurdles
764 and potential. *University of Western Australia, (2010/002)*.

765 Harvey, E.S., Newman, S.J., McLean, D.L., Cappo, M., Meeuwig, J.J. and Skepper, C.L., 2012.
766 Comparison of the relative efficiencies of stereo-BRUVs and traps for sampling tropical
767 continental shelf demersal fishes. *Fisheries Research, 125*, pp.108-120.

768 Hempson, T.N., Graham, N.A., MacNeil, M.A., Williamson, D.H., Jones, G.P. and Almany,
769 G.R., 2017. Coral reef mesopredators switch prey, shortening food chains, in response to
770 habitat degradation. *Ecology and Evolution, 7*(8), pp.2626-2635.

771 Hill, S.L., Hinke, J., Bertrand, S., Fritz, L., Furness, R.W., Ianelli, J.N., Murphy, M., Oliveros-
772 Ramos, R., Pichegru, L., Sharp, R. and Stillman, R.A., 2020. Reference points for predators
773 will progress ecosystem-based management of fisheries. *Fish and Fisheries, 21*(2), pp.368-
774 378.

775 Hixon, M.A., 2015. Predation: piscivory and the ecology of coral-reef fishes. In: Mora C. (Ed.)
776 *Ecology of fishes on coral reefs*. Cambridge University Press Cambridge, UK, pp. 41–53.

777 Hussey, N.E., MacNeil, M.A., McMeans, B.C., Olin, J.A., Dudley, S.F., Cliff, G., Wintner, S.P.,
778 Fennessy, S.T. and Fisk, A.T., 2014. Rescaling the trophic structure of marine food webs.
779 *Ecology letters*, 17(2), pp.239-250.

780 IUCN (2021). The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2021-1.
781 <https://www.iucnredlist.org>

782 Jacquet, J. L. and Zeller, D. 2007. Putting the 'United' in the United Republic of Tanzania:
783 Reconstructing marine fisheries catches'. Putting the 'United' in the United Republic of
784 Tanzania: Reconstructing marine fisheries catches. In: Zeller D. and Pauly D., (Ed)
785 *Reconstruction of marine fisheries catches for key countries and regions (1950-2005)*
786 *Fisheries Centre Research Reports 15(2) Fisheries Centre*, University of British Columbia.

787 Jennings, S., Boullé, D.P. and Polunin, N.V.C., 1996. Habitat correlates of the distribution and
788 biomass of Seychelles' reef fishes. *Environmental Biology of fishes*. Springer, 46(1), pp. 15–
789 25.

790 Jones, S.T., Levine, A. and Jiddawi, N.S., 2019. Effective co-management and long-term reef
791 fish recovery from severe coral bleaching: Insights from Misali Island, PECCA,
792 Tanzania. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 178, 104843.

793 Kahng, S.E., Akkaynak, D., Shlesinger, T., Hochberg, E.J., Wiedenmann, J., Tamir, R. and
794 Tchernov, D., 2019. Light, temperature, photosynthesis, heterotrophy, and the lower depth
795 limits of mesophotic coral ecosystems. In: Loya, Y., Puglise, K.A. and Bridge, T.C.L. (Eds.),
796 *Mesophotic Coral Ecosystems*. Springer, Cham, pp. 801–828.

797 Kailola, P.J., M.J. Williams, P.C. Stewart, R.E. Reichelt, A. McNee and C. Grieve, 1993.
798 Australian fisheries resources. Bureau of Resource Sciences, Canberra, Australia. 422 p.

799 Kapoor, D., R. Dayal and A.G. Ponniah, 2002. Fish biodiversity of India. National Bureau of
800 Fish Genetic Resources Lucknow, India. 775 p

801 Karisa, J. F., Obura, D. O. and Chen, C.A., 2020. Spatial heterogeneity of coral reef benthic
802 communities in Kenya. *PloS one*. 15(8), p. e0237397.

803 Kuitert, R.H., 1998. Photo guide to fishes of the Maldives. Atoll Editions, Victoria, Australia.
804 257 p.

805 Kuitert, R.H. and T. Tonzuka, 2001. Pictorial guide to Indonesian reef fishes. Part 1. Eels-
806 Snappers, Muraenidae - Lutjanidae. Zoonetics, Australia. 1-302.

807 Kulbicki, M., Bozec, Y.M., Labrosse, P., Letourneur, Y., Mou-Tham, G. and Wantiez, L., 2005.
808 Diet composition of carnivorous fishes from coral reef lagoons of New Caledonia. *Aquatic*
809 *Living Resources*, 18(3), pp.231-250.

810 Langlois, T., Goetze, J., Bond, T., Monk, J., Abesamis, R.A., Asher, J., Barrett, N., Bernard,
811 A.T., Bouchet, P.J., Birt, M.J., Cappo, M. et al., 2020. A field and video annotation guide for
812 baited remote underwater stereo-video surveys of demersal fish assemblages. *Methods in*
813 *Ecology and Evolution*, 11(11), pp.1401-1409.

814 Lieske, E. and Myers, R., 1994. *Collins Pocket Guide. Coral reef fishes. Indo-Pacific &*
815 *Caribbean including the Red Sea*. Harper Collins Publishers, 400 p.

816 Long, J.S. and Long, J.S., 1997. *Regression models for categorical and limited dependent*
817 *variables*. Sage.

818 MacNeil, M.A., Chapman, D.D., Heupel, M., Simpfendorfer, C.A., Heithaus, M., Meekan, M.,
819 Harvey, E., Goetze, J., Kiszka, J., Bond, M.E. and Currey-Randall, L.M., 2020. Global status and
820 conservation potential of reef sharks. *Nature*, 583(7818), pp.801-806.

821 McClanahan, T.R., Graham, N.A., MacNeil, M.A., Muthiga, N.A., Cinner, J.E., Bruggemann,
822 J.H. and Wilson, S.K., 2011. Critical thresholds and tangible targets for ecosystem-based
823 management of coral reef fisheries. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,
824 108(41), pp.17230-17233.

825 McClanahan, T.R., Maina, J.M., Darling, E.S., Guillaume, M.M., Muthiga, N.A., D'agata, S.,
826 Leblond, J., Arthur, R., Jupiter, S.D., Wilson, S.K. and Mangubhai, S., 2020. Large geographic
827 variability in the resistance of corals to thermal stress. *Global Ecology and Biogeography*,
828 29(12), pp.2229-2247.

829 McGratten, K. and Pollom, R., 2015. *Aulostomus chinensis*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened
830 Species 2015: e. T65134886A82934000.

831 Michael, S.W., 1993. Reef sharks and rays of the world. A guide to their identification,
832 behavior, and ecology. Sea Challengers, Monterey, California. 107 p

833 Moberg, F. and Folke, C., 1999. Ecological goods and services of coral reef ecosystems.
834 *Ecological economics*. Elsevier, 29(2), pp. 215–233.

835 Mundy, B.C., 2005. Checklist of the fishes of the Hawaiian Archipelago. Bishop Mus. Bull.
836 Zool. (6):1-704.

837 Myers, R.A. and Worm, B., 2003. Rapid worldwide depletion of predatory fish
838 communities. *Nature*, 423(6937), pp.280-283.

839 Nagelkerken, I., Van der Velde, G., Gorissen, M. W., Meijer, G. J., Van't Hof, T. and Den
840 Hartog, C., 2000. Importance of mangroves, seagrass beds and the shallow coral reef as a
841 nursery for important coral reef fishes, using a visual census technique. *Estuarine, coastal
842 and shelf science*, 51(1), 31-44.

843 Nash, K.L., Welsh, J.Q., Graham, N.A. and Bellwood, D.R., 2015. Home-range allometry in
844 coral reef fishes: comparison to other vertebrates, methodological issues and management
845 implications. *Oecologia*, 177(1), pp.73-83.

846 Nagelkerken, I., Dorenbosch, M., Verberk, W.C.E.P., De La Morinière, E.C. and Van Der Velde,
847 G., 2000. Day-night shifts of fishes between shallow-water biotopes of a Caribbean bay, with
848 emphasis on the nocturnal feeding of Haemulidae and Lutjanidae. *Marine Ecology Progress
849 Series*, 194, pp.55-64.

850 NBS. 2018. Tanzania in Figures 2017 National Bureau of Statistics, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
851 p. 1–105.

852 Obura, D., Gudka, M., Rabi, F.A., Gian, S.B., Bijoux, J., Freed, S., Maharavo, J., Mwaura, J.,
853 Porter, S., Sola, E. and Wickel, J., 2017. *Coral reef status report for the Western Indian Ocean
854 (2017)*. Nairobi Convention, Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network (GCRMN)/International
855 Coral Reef Initiative (ICRI).

856 Osuka, K.E., McClean, C., Stewart, B.D., Bett, B.J., Le Bas, T., Howe, J., Abernethy, C., Yahya,
857 S., Obura, D. and Samoilys, M., 2021a. Characteristics of shallow and mesophotic
858 environments of the Pemba Channel, Tanzania: Implications for management and
859 conservation. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 200, p.105463.

860 Osuka, K.E., Stewart, B.D., Samoilys, M.A., Roche, R.C., Turner, J., McClean, C., 2021b.
861 Protection outcomes for fish trophic groups across a range of management regimes. *Marine
862 Pollution Bulletin*, 173, p.113010.

863 Papastamatiou, Y.P., Lowe, C.G., Caselle, J.E. and Friedlander, A.M., 2009. Scale-dependent
864 effects of habitat on movements and path structure of reef sharks at a predator-dominated
865 atoll. *Ecology*, 90(4), pp.996-1008.

866 Papastamatiou, Y.P., Bodey, T.W., Friedlander, A.M., Lowe, C.G., Bradley, D., Weng, K.,
867 Priestley, V. and Caselle, J.E., 2018. Spatial separation without territoriality in shark
868 communities. *Oikos*, 127(6), pp.767-779.

869 Paxton, J.R., D.F. Hoese, G.R. Allen and J.E. Hanley, 1989. Pisces. Petromyzontidae to
870 Carangidae. Zoological Catalogue of Australia, Vol. 7. Australian Government Publishing
871 Service, Canberra, 665 p.

872 Paxton, A.B., Newton, E.A., Adler, A.M., Van Hoeck, R.V., Iversen Jr, E.S., Taylor, J.C.,
873 Peterson, C.H. and Silliman, B.R., 2020. Artificial habitats host elevated densities of large
874 reef-associated predators. *PloS one*, 15(9), p.e0237374.

875 Pinheiro, H.T., Goodbody-Gringley, G., Jessup, M.E., Shepherd, B., Chequer, A.D. and Rocha,
876 L.A., 2016. Upper and lower mesophotic coral reef fish communities evaluated by
877 underwater visual censuses in two Caribbean locations. *Coral Reefs*, 35(1), pp.139-151.

878 Rasher, D.B., Hoey, A.S. and Hay, M.E., 2017. Cascading predator effects in a Fijian coral reef
879 ecosystem. *Scientific Reports*, 7(1), pp. 1–10.

880 Rehren, J., Samoily, M., Reuter, H., Jiddawi, N. and Wolff, M., 2020. Integrating Resource
881 Perception, Ecological Surveys, and Fisheries Statistics: A Review of the Fisheries in Zanzibar.
882 *Reviews in Fisheries Science & Aquaculture*, pp.1-18.

883 Root, K. V., 1998. Evaluating the effects of habitat quality, connectivity, and catastrophes on
884 a threatened species. *Ecological Applications*, 8(3), 854-865.

885 Sancho, G., 2000. Predatory behaviors of *Caranx melampygus* (Carangidae) feeding on
886 spawning reef fishes: a novel ambushing strategy. *Bulletin of Marine Science*. University of
887 Miami-Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science, 66(2), pp. 487–496.

888 Sandin, S. A. and Zgliczynski, B., 2015. Inverted trophic pyramids. In: Mora, C. (ed.) *Ecology*
889 *of Fishes on Coral Reefs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 247–251.

890 Santana-Garcon, J., Newman, S.J. and Harvey, E.S., 2014. Development and validation of a
891 mid-water baited stereo-video technique for investigating pelagic fish assemblages. *Journal*
892 *of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 452, pp.82-90.

893 Semba, M., Lumpkin, R., Kimirei, I., Shaghude, Y. and Nyandwi, N., 2019. Seasonal and spatial
894 variation of surface current in the Pemba Channel, Tanzania. *PLoS one*, 14(1), p.e0210303.

895 Senou, H., 2001. Sphyraenidae. Barracudas. p. 3685-3697. In K.E. Carpenter and V. Niem
896 (eds.) *FAO species identification guide for fishery purposes. The living marine resources of*
897 *the Western Central Pacific. Vol. 6. Bony fishes part 4 (Labridae to Latimeriidae), estuarine*
898 *crocodiles*. FAO, Rome.

899 Shin, Y.J., Rochet, M.J., Jennings, S., Field, J.G. and Gislason, H., 2005. Using size-based
900 indicators to evaluate the ecosystem effects of fishing. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* 62 (3), 384–396

901 Skinner, C., Mill, A.C., Newman, S.P., Alsagoff, S.N. and Polunin, N.V., 2020. The importance
902 of oceanic atoll lagoons for coral reef predators. *Marine Biology*, 167(2), pp.1-16.

903 Slade, L.M. and Kalangahe, B., 2015. Dynamite fishing in Tanzania. *Marine pollution bulletin*,
904 101(2), pp.491-496.

905 Smith, C.L., 1997. *National Audubon Society field guide to tropical marine fishes of the*
906 *Caribbean, the Gulf of Mexico, Florida, the Bahamas, and Bermuda*. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.,
907 New York. 720 p

908 Sommer, C., Schneider, W. and Poutiers, J. M. 1996. *FAO species identification field guide for*
909 *fishery purposes: The living marine resources of Somalia*.

910 Stefanoudis, P.V., Gress, E., Pitt, J.M., Smith, S.R., Kincaid, T., Rivers, M., Andradi-Brown,
911 D.A., Rowlands, G., Woodall, L.C. and Rogers, A.D., 2019. Depth-dependent structuring of
912 reef fish assemblages from the shallows to the rariphotic zone. *Frontiers in Marine Science*,
913 6, p.307.

914 Stewart, B.D. and Jones, G.P., 2001. Associations between the abundance of piscivorous
915 fishes and their prey on coral reefs: implications for prey-fish mortality. *Marine Biology*,
916 138(2), pp. 383–397.

917 Taquet, M. and Diringer, A., 2012. *Fishes of the Indian Ocean and the Red Sea*. Éditions Quæ
918 RD 1078026 Versailles Cedex, France 707p.

919 Tyler, E.H., Speight, M.R., Henderson, P. and Manica, A., 2009. Evidence for a depth refuge
920 effect in artisanal coral reef fisheries. *Biological Conservation*, 142(3), pp.652-667.

921 Vuong, Q.H., 1989. Likelihood ratio tests for model selection and non-nested hypotheses.
922 *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*. JSTOR, pp. 307–333.

923 Wanyonyi, I.N., Wamukota, A., Tuda, P., Mwakha, V.A and Nguti, L.M., 2016. Migrant fishers
924 of Pemba: Drivers, impacts and mediating factors. *Marine Policy*, 71, pp.242-255.

925 Watson, W. and Sandknop, E.M., 1996. Fistulariidae: cornetfishes. p. 718-723. In Moser, H.G.
926 (ed.) *The early stages of fishes in the California Current Region*. California Cooperative
927 Oceanic Fisheries Investigations (CalCOFI) Atlas No. 33. Allen Press, Inc., Lawrence, Kansas.
928 1505 p.

929 Wells, S., Samoily, M., Makoloweka, S. and Kalombo, H., 2010. Lessons learnt from a
930 collaborative management programme in coastal Tanzania. *Ocean & Coastal Management*,
931 53(4), pp.161-168.

932 White, J., Simpfendorfer, C.A., Tobin, A.J. and Heupel, M.R., 2013. Application of baited
933 remote underwater video surveys to quantify spatial distribution of elasmobranchs at an
934 ecosystem scale. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*, 448, pp.281-288.

935 Wilson, R.J., Sailley, S.F., Jacobs, Z.L., Kamau, J., Mgeleka, S., Okemwa, G.M., Omukoto, J.O.,
936 Osuka, K.E., Samoily, M., Sauer, W., Silas, M.O., Sululu, J.S. and Roberts, M.J., 2021. Large
937 projected reductions in marine fish biomass for Kenya and Tanzania in the absence of
938 climate mitigation. *Ocean & Coastal Management*, 215, p.105921.

939 Worm, B., Davis, B., Kettner, L., Ward-Paige, C.A., Chapman, D., Heithaus, M.R., Kessel, S.T.
940 and Gruber, S.H., 2013. Global catches, exploitation rates, and rebuilding options for sharks.
941 *Marine Policy*, 40, pp.194-204.

942 Wyatt, A.S., Lowe, R.J., Humphries, S. and Waite, A.M., 2013. Particulate nutrient fluxes over
943 a fringing coral reef: Source-sink dynamics inferred from carbon to nitrogen ratios and stable
944 isotopes. *Limnology and Oceanography*, 58(1), pp.409-427.

945

Accepted Manuscript