

# JCU ePrints

This file is part of the following reference:

**Hobbs, Jean-Paul A. (2011) *Reef fishes on isolated islands: community structure, endemism and extinction*. PhD thesis, James Cook University.**

Access to this file is available from:

<http://eprints.jcu.edu.au/17932>

**REEF FISHES ON ISOLATED ISLANDS:  
COMMUNITY STRUCTURE, ENDEMISM AND  
EXTINCTION**

PhD thesis submitted by  
Jean-Paul A. Hobbs (BSc Hons)  
in April 2011

For the degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
School of Marine and Tropical Biology  
James Cook University  
Townsville, Queensland, Australia

## STATEMENT OF ACCESS

I, the undersigned, the author of this thesis, understand that James Cook University will make this thesis available for use within the University Library and, *via* the Australian Digital Thesis network, for use elsewhere. I understand that, as an unpublished work, this thesis has significant protection under the Copyright Act.

All users consulting this thesis will have to sign the following statement:

In consulting this thesis, I agree not to copy or closely paraphrase it in whole or in part without the written consent of the author, and to make proper public written acknowledgement for any assistance, which I have obtained from it.

Beyond this, I do not wish to place any restriction on access to this work.

13/04/2011

Signature

Date

# **STATEMENT OF SOURCES**

## **DECLARATION**

I declare that this thesis is my own work and has not been submitted in any form for another degree or diploma at any university or other institution of tertiary education. Information derived from the published or unpublished work of others has been acknowledged in the text and a list of references is given.

13/04/2011

Signature

Date

## DECLARATION ON ETHICS

The research presented and reported in this thesis was conducted within the guidelines for research ethics outlined in the *National Statement on Ethics Conduct in Research Involving Human* (1999), the *Joint NHMRC/AVCC Statement and Guidelines on Research Practice* (1997), the *James Cook University Policy on Experimentation Ethics. Standard Practices and Guidelines* (2001), and the *James Cook University Statement and Guidelines on Research Practice* (2001). The proposed research methodology received clearance from the James Cook University Experimentation Ethics Review Committee (approval number A976), Parks Australia North, and the Western Australia Department of Fisheries.

13/04/2011

.....

Signature

Date

## STATEMENT ON THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF OTHERS

The chapters of this thesis are also manuscripts that have been published, submitted or are in preparation for submission. Several researchers have made contributions to these manuscripts and it is necessary to recognise their contributions.

Chapter 2 is a manuscript currently in review at Journal of Biogeography and is co-authored by G.P. Jones, P.L. Munday, S.R. Connolly and M. Srinivasan. Field data for this manuscript came from surveys performed by GPJ, PLM and MS. The construction, description and implementation of the null model analyses in this manuscript were done by SRC. G.R. Allen kindly provided the Indonesia species list used in the analyses. All authors provided intellectual input into this manuscript.

Chapter 3 is now published as: Hobbs, J-P.A., Frisch A.J., Allen, G.R., and van Herwerden, L. (2009) Marine hybrid hotspot at Indo-Pacific biogeographic border. *Biology Letters* 5:258-261. For this publication, AJF provided funding and helped design the study. GRA provided information on hybrids from previous field surveys and LvH provided molecular data. All authors provided intellectual input.

Chapter 4 involves regression tree analysis, which I learnt through the assistance of Maya Srinivasan. This manuscript is being prepared for journal submission and GPJ, PLM and MS have provided comments.

Chapter 5 has been published as: Hobbs, J-P.A., Jones, G.P. and Munday P.L. (2010) Rarity and extinction risk in coral reef angelfishes on isolated islands: interrelationships among abundance, geographic range size and specialization. *Coral Reefs* 29:1-11. All authors provided intellectual input.

Chapter 6 is a molecular study and the manuscript is nearing submission. Adrian McMahon and Stephen Kolomyjec were employed to do some laboratory work and obtain DNA sequences for some of the samples used in this study. Comments have been provided by D. Jerry, LvH, GPJ and PLM.

I was supported by an Australian Postgraduate Award Scholarship and a Nancy Vernon Rankine write-up award from James Cook University (JCU). Funding for this study came from a JCU Competitive Research Incentive Grant to GPJ, PLM and DJ and an Envirofund Australia Natural Heritage Trust grant to J-PAH. Significant in-kind and logistical support was provided by Parks Australia. Fieldwork assistance was provided by J. Gilligan, J. Hender, J. Neilson and C. McDonald.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank all the people that have assisted me over the years with this PhD and I am particularly grateful to the people mentioned below. I sincerely apologise to anyone that I have forgotten to mention, and I hope that I have thanked you along the way.

Firstly, I appreciate all the time my supervisors and JCU staff members have spent providing valuable guidance and feedback. I thank my primary supervisors Geoff Jones and Philip Munday who were instrumental in my development as an independent researcher. Thanks to Lynne van Herwerden and Dean Jerry for all their help and patience with the genetics components. I also thank Maya Srinivasan and Sean Connolly for their dedicated assistance with statistical analyses and feedback on chapters. I am grateful for the valuable insights gained through discussions and advice from Howard Choat and I thank Gerry Allen for his knowledge and information on fishes of Christmas and Cocos Islands and unpublished data on fishes of Indonesia.

For assistance with molecular laboratory procedures and statistical analyses, I thank Selma Klanten, Peter Cowman, Adrian McMahon, Stephen Kolomyjec and David Jones. I would have been lost in the world of genetics without this help. Thanks to Janelle Eagle and Martial Depczynski for advice on microhabitat assessments and gut content analysis. I thank Ashley Frisch for all his valuable help in various aspects of this PhD.

For financial assistance I acknowledge the support of James Cook University and Envirofund Australia, Natural Heritage Trust. I was supported by an Australian Postgraduate Award Scholarship and also thank Mike Kingsford for providing me with the Nancy Vernon Rankine write-up award.

I would like to mention a special thanks to everyone that has helped with me with the fieldwork. There are limited people and resources at remote locations like Christmas and Cocos Islands, and this study was only made possible through the help and generosity of members of the Christmas and Cocos Islands communities. A huge thanks to all those people that gave up their time to assist, or lent me boats, fuel, equipment or gave me a meal or place to stay. I will never forget your generosity. I would like to thank all the Parks Australia staff over the years for their tremendous support of this research. The support from Alistair Graham in the early days, and more recently Marjorie Gant and Mike Misso has greatly benefited not only my research, but a greater understanding of the marine biodiversity of these Islands. I am forever grateful for the encouragement and never-ending help of Max Orchard and his offsiders Azmi Yon and Eddly Johari. Thanks to the Christmas Divers for all their help, particularly Linda Cash. A HUGE thanks to Hama and Lin (and now Leila and Lumi) of Wet 'n' Dry Adventures who have gone out of their way to help me in so many ways over the years.

I would like to thank the whole Cocos Islands community, and unfortunately there is not enough space mention everyone. Thanks particularly to John Cluniess-Ross, Geoff Christie and Karen and Dieter of Cocos Dive for all their logistical support. I am also

very grateful to the Cocos Island Malay community who welcomed me in and taught me so much about their culture, the Islands and their extensive knowledge of where to find (and how to eat) every marine species at the Islands. Terima kasih banyak banyak. Special thanks to all my Cocos Malay mates, especially Hisham Macrae (Pak Imannia) and his family for all their help and amazing hospitality.

Finally, thanks to all the friends at uni and in the field that have made this journey fun. Thanks to J. Gilligan, J. Hender, J. Neilson, C. McDonald for their assistance and adventurous nature in the field. And thanks to all those people who have been involved in the various side projects and trips to far-flung destinations. I will never forget those adventures and the discoveries we have made. It is through those experiences that I have learnt that, for me, the quest of exploring the unknown and making new discoveries is the best (and most exciting) part of science.

# ABSTRACT

Ecology strives to identify the processes determining species diversity, species composition and population abundance. Island communities have served as the natural laboratories for the development and testing of ecological theories. Islands also provide the opportunity to determine whether there are differences in the ecological processes that structure mainland and isolated communities. To date, most of the theory and empirical studies of island communities have focused on terrestrial organisms. However, islands can be equally instructive about the mechanisms favouring the presence, absence and abundance of marine species. Therefore, the aim of this thesis is to determine whether the processes structuring terrestrial island communities apply in the marine environment. Ecological hypotheses spanning the fields of biogeography through to conservation biology are tested using reef fish communities at the remote Christmas Island and the Cocos (Keeling) Islands in the tropical eastern Indian Ocean.

Like small isolated terrestrial communities, the reef fish communities at Christmas and Cocos Islands were found to be species poor and contained a distinct taxonomic composition with an over-representation of species with high dispersal potential. Despite low species richness, there was no evidence of density compensation, with population densities on the islands similar to species-rich neighbouring mainland assemblages. In contrast to terrestrial communities, species at the edge of their range did not have lower abundance than species at the centre of their range, and endemic species had substantially higher abundance than widespread species. Overall, the observed patterns conform to predictions from terrestrial ecological hypotheses, indicating that similar processes are important in determining species richness and community

composition in marine and terrestrial communities on isolated islands. However, observed patterns in abundance did not conform to expectations from terrestrial theory, and this appears to be due to the different life histories of marine and terrestrial species.

Local environmental factors can also be important in structuring reef fish communities; however, few studies have examined their role on oceanic reefs. Regression tree analysis of angelfish and butterflyfish communities revealed that large physical gradients (island location, exposure, depth, habitat complexity) are more important than small-scale biotic factors (live coral cover, algal cover and habitat diversity) in determining the community structure of reef fishes at these oceanic islands.

Christmas and Cocos Islands are also situated on the Indo-Pacific biogeographic border, and in the terrestrial environment, biogeographic borders represent important areas for hybridisation. Eleven hybrid coral-reef fishes (across six families) were identified at the islands: the most recorded hybrids of any marine location. In most cases, at least one of the parent species is rare ( $< 3$  individuals per  $3000 \text{ m}^2$ ), suggesting that hybridisation has occurred due to a scarcity of conspecific partners. The Islands also represent a marine suture zone because many of the hybrids have arisen through interbreeding between Indian and Pacific Ocean species. For these species, it appears that past climate changes allowed species to diverge in allopatry, while recent conditions have facilitated contact and subsequent hybridisation at this biogeographic border.

Isolated islands often contain a high proportion of endemic species, which suffer high rates of extinction because of an association among three traits that threaten species persistence: small geographic range size, low abundance and ecological specialisation. This study found that endemic angelfishes at Christmas and Cocos Islands did not

conform to these interrelationships. Endemic angelfishes were 50-80 times more abundant than widespread species and were not more specialised than widespread congeners. High abundance and lack of specialisation by endemic reef fishes may compensate for the extinction risk posed by having an extremely small geographic range.

Endemic species, and isolated populations of widespread species, are also at risk of extinction because they tend to have low genetic diversity. Examination of angelfish mtDNA revealed that the endemic *C. jocularis* exhibit high haplotype ( $h > 0.98$ ) and nucleotide diversity (Christmas  $\pi\% = 3.63$ , Cocos  $\pi\% = 9.99$ ). The isolated populations of widespread angelfishes (*C. bispinosa* and *C. flavicauda*) present at Christmas Island also had high haplotype ( $h > 0.99$ ) and nucleotide diversity ( $\pi\% = 2.81$  and  $\pi\% = 5.78\%$ , respectively). The genetic diversity of all three study species are among the highest reported for marine fishes and may have been caused by high abundance, relict populations, multiple clades and rapid mutation rate. High genetic diversity should reduce extinction risk in these species because it increases their evolutionary potential to adapt to the changing environmental conditions that are forecasted for coral reefs.

In summary, this study tested the generality of terrestrially-derived ecological relationships related to island communities. Some of these ecological hypotheses were found to apply to marine communities, whereas others did not. New hypotheses have been proposed to explain why marine communities do not always conform to these ecological generalisations. By combining field, laboratory and molecular studies with datasets constructed from the literature, this study has provided a thorough examination of the ecology of reef fishes on isolated islands and advances our understanding of marine ecology.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Statements.....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>Acknowledgements.....</b>	<b>vii</b>
<b>Abstract.....</b>	<b>x</b>
<b>List of Tables.....</b>	<b>xv</b>
<b>List of Figures.....</b>	<b>xvi</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1: General Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CHAPTER 2: Biogeography and the structure of coral reef fish communities on isolated islands</b>	
2.1 Abstract.....	12
2.2 Introduction.....	14
2.3 Methods.....	19
2.4 Results.....	29
2.5 Discussion.....	41
<b>CHAPTER 3: Marine hybrid hotspot at Indo-Pacific biogeographic border</b>	
3.1 Abstract.....	48
3.2 Introduction.....	49
3.3 Methods.....	52
3.4 Results.....	54
3.5 Discussion.....	58
<b>CHAPTER 4: Physical factors determine community structure of coral reef fishes on oceanic islands</b>	
4.1 Abstract.....	61

4.2	Introduction.....	63
4.3	Methods.....	69
4.4	Results.....	74
4.5	Discussion.....	91

**CHAPTER 5:     Rarity and extinction risk in coral reef angelfishes on isolated islands: interrelationships among abundance, geographic range size and specialisation**

5.1	Abstract.....	101
5.2	Introduction.....	102
5.3	Methods.....	106
5.4	Results.....	114
5.5	Discussion.....	127

**CHAPTER 6:     High genetic diversity in isolated populations of endemic and widespread coral reef angelfishes (genus: *Centropyge*)**

6.1	Abstract.....	133
6.2	Introduction.....	135
6.3	Methods.....	138
6.4	Results.....	141
6.5	Discussion.....	146

**CHAPTER 7:     General Discussion.....** 153

**REFERENCES.....** 169

## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table 2.1</b>	Under- and over-represented families in the reef fish communities of Christmas Island and the Cocos Islands when compared to the Indonesian reef fish community.....	32
<b>Table 2.2</b>	Comparisons of abundance between edge and mid-range species at Christmas Island and the Cocos Islands.....	39
<b>Table 3.1</b>	The occurrence of parent species and hybrids at Christmas (CI) and Cocos Islands (CKI).....	56
<b>Table 4.1</b>	Summary of the splits in the multivariate regression tree for angelfishes showing the contribution of each species to the variation explained by each split.....	83
<b>Table 4.2</b>	Summary of the splits in the multivariate regression tree for the 12 most common butterflyfishes showing the contribution of each species to the variation explained by each split.....	86
<b>Table 4.3</b>	Summary of the splits in the multivariate regression tree for the 16 rare butterflyfishes showing the contribution of each species to the variation explained by each split.....	89
<b>Table 4.4</b>	Summary of the relative importance of each of the six factors in explaining variation in species richness, total abundance, and the species composition/relative abundance of angelfishes and butterflyfishes at Christmas Island and the Cocos Islands. ....	90
<b>Table 5.1</b>	Ten substrate microhabitats used by angelfishes at Christmas Island.....	110
<b>Table 5.2</b>	Six diet categories used to classify food types consumed by angelfishes at Christmas Island.....	111
<b>Table 6.1</b>	Genetic diversity measures for the endemic <i>Centropyge jocular</i> from Christmas and Cocos Islands, and for the widespread species <i>C. bispinosa</i> and <i>C. flavicauda</i> from Christmas Island.....	143

---

## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>Figure 2.1</b>	(a) Species richness and (b) species – area relationship ( $y = 0.14x + 2.49$ , $R^2 = 0.71$ ) for shallow reef fishes at locations across the Indian Ocean and Indonesian region.....	30
<b>Figure 2.2</b>	Comparison of observed and expected taxonomic composition of reef fish communities at (a) Christmas Island and (b) the Cocos Islands.....	35
<b>Figure 2.3</b>	Goodness of fit of the null model of taxonomic composition for (a) Christmas Island and (b) Cocos Islands.....	36
<b>Figure 2.4</b>	Null model test of mean pelagic larval durations (PLDs) of reef fishes at (a) Christmas Island and (b) the Cocos Islands.....	37
<b>Figure 2.5</b>	The mean density (per $300\text{m}^2 \pm \text{SE}$ ) of endemic (black bars) and widespread (white bars) angelfishes from surveys at 20 m depth at Christmas Island and the Cocos Islands. b) The mean density (per $60\text{m}^2 \pm \text{SE}$ ) of endemic (black bars) and widespread (white bars) damselfishes from surveys at 5 m depth at Christmas Island.....	40
<b>Figure 3.1</b>	Christmas and Cocos Islands (represented by stars) represent a tropical marine suture zone located in the eastern Indian Ocean on the Indo-Pacific marine biogeographic border. ....	51
<b>Figure 3.2</b>	Christmas and Cocos Islands constitute a marine suture zone where (a) Indian Ocean ( <i>Centropyge eibli</i> ) and (b) Pacific Ocean species ( <i>C. flavissima</i> ) come into contact and interbreed to produce hybrids (c). Heterospecific breeding pairs (d) of <i>Chaetodon guttatissimus</i> (Indian Ocean - bottom) and <i>Ch. punctatofasciatus</i> (Pacific Ocean - top) produce hybrids (e). Heterospecific breeding pair of Indian ( <i>Ch. trifasciatus</i> – bottom) and Pacific Ocean ( <i>Ch. lunulatus</i> – top) butterflyfishes (f).....	55
<b>Figure 4.1</b>	Position of the survey sites located on the outer reef drop-offs around a) Christmas Island and b) the Cocos Islands.....	71
<b>Figure 4.2</b>	The mean density per $250\text{m}^2 (\pm \text{SE})$ of angelfishes at a) Christmas Island and b) Cocos Islands.....	75
<b>Figure 4.3</b>	The mean density per $250\text{m}^2 (\pm \text{SE})$ of butterflyfishes at a) Christmas Island and b) Cocos Islands.....	76

<b>Figure 4.4</b>	Univariate regression trees of variation in species richness of a) angelfishes and b) butterflyfishes from Christmas Island and the Cocos Islands.....	79
<b>Figure 4.5</b>	Univariate regression trees of variation in total abundance of a) angelfishes and b) butterflyfishes from Christmas Island and the Cocos Islands.....	80
<b>Figure 4.6</b>	Multivariate regression tree of variation in the species composition and frequency of occurrence of angelfishes at Christmas Island (CI) and the Cocos Islands (CKI).....	82
<b>Figure 4.7</b>	Multivariate regression tree of variation in the species composition and relative abundance of 12 common butterflyfishes at Christmas Island (CI) and the Cocos Islands (CKI).....	85
<b>Figure 4.8</b>	Multivariate regression tree of variation in the species composition and relative abundance of 16 rare butterflyfishes at Christmas Island (CI) and the Cocos Islands (CKI).....	88
<b>Figure 5.1</b>	The mean density (per 300m <sup>2</sup> ± SE) of endemic and widespread pygmy angelfishes (genus: <i>Centropyge</i> ) at a) Christmas Island and b) the Cocos Islands.....	115
<b>Figure 5.2</b>	The relationship between geographic range size (km <sup>2</sup> ) and resource use for pygmy angelfishes at Christmas Island. Resource use includes: a) depth range (mean deviation), b) microhabitat use (Shannon-Weiner index), and c) diet (Shannon-Weiner index).....	117
<b>Figure 5.3</b>	The relationship between mean density (per 300m <sup>2</sup> ± SE) and resource use for pygmy angelfishes at Christmas Island. Resource use includes: a) depth range (mean deviation), b) microhabitat use (Shannon-Weiner index), and c) diet (Shannon-Weiner index).....	119
<b>Figure 5.4</b>	The mean depth (m ± SE) of water inhabited by endemic (black bars) and widespread (white bars) pygmy angelfishes at Christmas Island.....	122
<b>Figure 5.5</b>	A canonical discriminant analysis (CDA) of microhabitat use of pygmy angelfishes at Christmas Island.....	123
<b>Figure 5.6</b>	A canonical discriminant analysis (CDA) of the diets of pygmy angelfishes at Christmas Island.....	124
<b>Figure 5.7</b>	A Venn diagram illustrating the number of pygmy angelfishes that have multiple threats of extinction associated with small range size (< 2000 km <sup>2</sup> ), low abundance (< 3 individuals per 300 m <sup>2</sup> ) and specialisation	

(depth range mean deviation < 3.5, or microhabitat use index < 0.5, or diet index < 0.35).....126

**Figure 6.1** a) Outgroup rooted phylogram based on 436 bp control region mtDNA sequences from 85 *C. jocularis* individuals (44 from Christmas Island and 41 from the Cocos Islands). The NJ, MP, ML support values are displayed at each node. b) Minimum spanning tree of *C. jocularis* haplotypes. Black filled circles are Christmas Island individuals and unfilled circles are individuals from the Cocos Islands. The size of the circle indicates the relative frequency of each haplotype (smallest circle = 1 individual, largest circle = 6 individuals). Bars indicate the number of substitutions between haplotypes, with thin bars = 1 substitution, medium bars = 5 substitutions, and thick bars = 10 substitutions. c) Mismatch distribution of pairwise sequence differences for *C. jocularis* and the expected distribution under an expansion model.....144

**Figure 6.2** a) Minimum spanning tree for haplotypes of widespread species a) *Centropyge bispinosa* (n=24), and b) *C. flavicauda* (n=28) collected from Christmas Island.....145

