

This is the author-created version of the following work:

Cresswell, B.J., Galbraith, G.F., Harrison, H.B., McCormick, M.I., and Jones, G.P, (2023) Coral reef pinnacles act as ecological magnets for the abundance, diversity and biomass of predatory fishes. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 717 pp. 143-156.

Access to this file is available from: https://researchonline.jcu.edu.au/80429/

© Inter-Research 2023.

Please refer to the original source for the final version of this work: <u>https://doi.org/10.3354/meps14377</u>

1	Coral reef pinnacles act as ecological magnets for the abundance, diversity and biomass of
2	predatory fishes
3	
4	Cresswell, B.J.* ^{1,2} , Galbraith, G.F ^{1,2} ., Harrison, H.B. ^{2,3} , McCormick, M.I. ⁴ , and Jones, G.P. ^{1,2}
5	
6	¹ Marine Biology and Aquaculture, College of Science and Engineering, and
7	² ARC Centre of Excellence for Coral Reef Studies, James Cook University, Townsville,
8	Queensland 4811, Australia
9	³ School of Biological Sciences, Life Sciences Building, University of Bristol, Bristol, BS8 1TQ,
10	UK
11	⁴ Coastal Marine Field Station, School of Science, University of Waikato, Tauranga, 3110, New
12	Zealand
13	
14	* Corresponding author: benjamin.cresswell@jcu.edu.au
15	
16	
17	Abstract
18	Predation is a key ecological process regulating the structure and diversity of biological
19	communities, yet predators do not exist homogeneously in nature. Coral reefs possess diverse
20	assemblages of predatory fishes, the distribution and abundance of which is well documented for
21	coastal and emergent reefs. However, for remote, isolated and submerged reefs, such as those found
22	on pinnacles and seamounts, our understanding of predatory fish communities is limited. These
23	features are ubiquitous in the world's oceans and frequently targeted by fishers for their presumed
24	fish aggregation properties. Here we describe communities of predatory fishes on a series of
25	pinnacle reefs and contrast these to regional coastal and offshore emergent reefs. Pinnacles
26	supported 2-4x higher abundance, biomass and diversity of predatory fishes compared to emergent

reefs. They also supported unique communities, with 32 out of the 63 predator species in our study
found only on pinnacle reefs. For species found on all three reef types, all were most abundant on
pinnacles and the 6 taxa driving differences in community structure were most abundant on
pinnacles. Together our results show predatory fishes are strongly attracted to pinnacles, although
the mechanisms are still unclear. Prioritising the selection of these small ecological magnets in
conservation planning would be an effective approach to target the protection of regional reef fish
biodiversity.

34

35 Keywords

- 36 Pinnacle reefs, predatory fishes, ecological magnets, biodiversity, community ecology
- 37

38 1. INTRODUCTION

Predation is one of the most important processes influencing the diversity and structure of 39 ecological communities (Sih et al. 1985, Kerfoot & Sih 1987, Chase et al. 2002, Barbosa & 40 41 Castellanos 2005). The presence of predators can limit the possibility of single-species monopolies 42 in prey assemblages, promoting species diversity at lower trophic levels (Paine 1966, Menge & 43 Sutherland 1976). On coral reefs, predation plays a major role in limiting prey population sizes and determining the structure of diverse fish assemblages (Carr, Anderson and Hixon, 2002; Hixon and 44 Webster, 2002; Hixon and Jones, 2005 and reviews in Hixon, 1991 and 2015). Mechanisms by 45 which this occurs may be directly via mortality or injury, or indirectly, where the presence of 46 47 predators influences the condition (e.g. fecundity, growth) or behaviour of prey species (Beukers & Jones 1998, Bauman et al. 2019). Decreases in predation pressure typically benefit a small number 48 49 of prey species, with a consequent reduction in overall diversity (Caley 1993) and when removed 50 from coral reefs, the loss of important predator species has been shown to impact ecosystem structure and function (Dulvy et al. 2004, Rosenblatt et al. 2013, Boaden & Kingsford 2015). This 51 is of pressing concern as human exploitation of the world's oceans has resulted in substantial 52 declines in predatory fish abundance of up to 90 % (Myers & Worm 2003). 53

54

55 Notable examples of overexploitation include the overfishing of large groupers throughout the Indo-Pacific region (Sadovy de Mitcheson et al. 2013) and reef associated sharks globally (Rizzari 56 57 et al. 2014, MacNeil et al. 2020, Dulvy et al. 2021). Even in isolated offshore reefs (e.g. Pacific 58 Remote Islands Marine National Monument) significant declines in the abundance of predatory fish 59 assemblages have been documented either due to exploitation or large scale disturbances (Knapp et al. 2011, Jacobs et al. 2021). In the absence of exploitation however, predatory fish are an abundant 60 61 and diverse component of coral reef fish fauna (Sandin et al. 2008, Lester et al. 2009, Friedlander et al. 2010, Rizzari et al. 2014). The abundance and distribution of predatory fish vary across coral 62 reef seascapes and are linked to a number of factors, including habitat type (Espinoza et al. 2014, 63

64 Hall & Kingsford 2021), depth (Osuka et al. 2022) and topographic complexity (Gratwicke & Speight 2005, Lingo & Szedlmayer 2006, Rogers et al. 2014). Habitat complexity is also important, 65 not only in attracting predators, but in mediating their impact on prey assemblages (Hixon & Beets 66 1993, Beukers & Jones 1998, Almany 2004). However, our present knowledge of predatory reef 67 68 fishes and the mechanisms that govern their abundance and distribution are largely based on studies 69 from shallow coastal reefs. Understanding predator assemblages across the spectrum of connected habitats and reef types they occupy is a key step in elucidating the ecology of these organisms and 70 predicting future responses to anthropogenic pressures across whole coral reef seascapes. 71

72

73 One type of understudied coral reef habitat includes submerged features, such as pinnacles and seamounts. These structures are defined as "isolated elevations of the sea floor, over which the 74 depth of water is relatively shallow but sufficient for navigation and have shallowest points below 75 76 10-20 m" (IHO 2008, Galbraith et al. 2021). Despite being ubiquitous in the world's oceans, seamounts and pinnacles are poorly described within coral reef seascapes and yet may provide 77 substantial quantities of physical habitat for coral associated organisms (Harris et al. 2013, Moore et 78 al. 2017). Coral reef habitat on pinnacles and seamounts differs in form and structure from 79 commonly accepted models of coral reefs, with these reefs lacking traditionally described 80 81 geomorphological zones such as a reef flat or lagoon (Goreau 1959, Done 1982, Roberts et al. 2015, Galbraith et al. 2021). Instead, coral reef habitat on these structures is exposed to the pelagic 82 environment on all sides, essentially composed entirely of reef crest and slope. Estimates of global 83 numbers of seamount-type features range from 100,000 to 25 million (Wessel et al. 2010) and coral 84 85 reefs can form networks of habitat patches on the summits of pinnacles and seamounts in tropical 86 oceans. Examples of such networks include the seamounts of the Coral Sea between Australia and 87 New Caledonia (Ceccarelli et al. 2013), the Vittória-Trindade chain off the coast of Brazil (Guabiroba et al. 2022) and seamounts of the Hawaiian Archipelago (Sinniger et al. 2013). Yet 88 despite this habitat potential, relatively few studies have been conducted on seamount and pinnacle 89

reefs globally. A literature search found that of the 36,789 papers on coral reefs published since
1965, only 204 of these included the term "seamount", and 81 included the term "pinnacle" (Web
of Science core collection search conducted 12 April 2022. Search terms: "Coral reef" only; "Coral
reef" AND "Seamount"; "Coral reef" AND "Pinnacle". Date range: 1965 – 2022. Results available
at https://github.com/bjcresswell/KimbePreds).

95

Like seamounts, pinnacles typically possess small summits with sheer sides descending to 96 substantial depths through the mesophotic and into the aphotic zone (Galbraith et al. 2021). This 97 abrupt topography exposes much of the benthos to open ocean currents, resulting in strong and 98 99 variable local hydrodynamics, characterised by powerful upwelling and complex eddies (Lavelle & Mohn 2010, Rowden et al. 2010, Galbraith et al. 2022). Such conditions may provide an ideal 100 101 setting for seasonal aggregations of predators around seamounts and pinnacles (Klimley et al. 102 2005). Recent work has shown that coral reef predator fishes on both pinnacle and atoll reefs may be overwhelmingly sustained by food-webs with pathways originating in offshore pelagic sources, 103 104 resulting in high abundance and biomass of predators where this occurs (Morato et al. 2010, Fontes et al. 2014, Leitner et al. 2021, Skinner et al. 2021). Pinnacle reefs have also been shown to support 105 highly diverse communities, despite the relatively small surface area available for coral reef 106 107 organisms on their summits (Galbraith et al. 2021). These assemblages typically contain taxa also found in coastal reefs as well as unique species, not normally encountered on nearshore or emergent 108 reef systems and thus pinnacles may be important in both sustaining unique biodiversity as well as 109 110 providing refuges for a variety of coral reef taxa. However, to date, there have been no studies that 111 focus on the abundance, diversity, biomass and structure of communities of predatory fishes on coral reef pinnacles. 112

113

The present study describes communities of predatory fishes on a series of submerged pinnacle
reefs in a low latitude coral reef system, Kimbe Bay, Papua New Guinea. Recent work from this

116	region examined whole fish communities on these reefs and found them to support abundant and	
117	diverse fish assemblages (Galbraith et al. 2021). However, these patterns have not been explored	
118	specifically for predatory fishes, which were the conspicuous species driving overall community	
119	differences. The principle aim of the study was therefore to describe predatory fish communities of	n
120	the pinnacle reefs and to compare and contrast these with two shallow water reef types, common in	1
121	the region: isolated offshore reefs and nearshore fringing reefs. We asked the following questions:	
122	1. Do pinnacle reefs support greater numbers of predators? We hypothesised that predatory	
123	fish abundance (density or number of individuals per unit area) would be higher on sites	
124	farther removed from terrestrial disturbance and with access to higher pelagic trophic	
125	subsidies.	
126	2. Do trends in biomass match trends in abundance? If predatory fish assemblages are similar	
127	across reef types, then patterns in biomass should be similar to patterns in abundance.	
128	3. Which reef types support the greatest diversity of predatory fishes? Patterns in biomass and	l
129	abundance may be driven by large numbers of relatively few taxa and may therefore be	
130	decoupled from patterns in diversity.	
131	4. Does the composition of predatory fish assemblages vary among reef types? If levels of	
132	overall diversity are similar across reef types, species composition may also be similar	
133	across reef types.	
134		
135	2. MATERIALS AND METHODS	
136	2.1. Study site and survey design	
137	This study was conducted in Kimbe Bay, West New Britain Province, Papua New Guinea. This	
138	large tropical embayment is located in the Southern Bismarck Sea in the south-east of the Coral	

139 Triangle (5°30'S, 150°05'E, Fig. 1a) and possesses a range of coral reef habitat types, including the

140 three selected for this study: tracts of emergent nearshore reefs, emergent offshore reefs, and

submerged pinnacle reefs. We surveyed four reefs per habitat type over two survey periods – in
October 2018 and again in March 2019 – 12 reefs in total (Fig. 1b).

143

144 Nearshore reef sites were all located within 5 km of the mainland on a network of fringing reef 145 structures, which have shallow (~0-10 m) tops and extend along the length of the bay's shoreline. 146 Offshore sites were also located on reefs with shallow tops, however these were all in remote locations (between 9 and 25 km from the nearest landmass). These reefs rise from a deep geologic 147 structure that encircles the outer portion of the bay (c.300m deep, GEBCO Compilation Group, 148 2019). The centre of this structure drops to ~600m in the middle of the bay (Fig. 1c) and on the 149 150 northern seaward side drops >1000m to the South Bismarck Plate shelf. The pinnacle reefs in this study also rise from this structure but have summits at depths of 15-30 m. In order to standardise 151 our survey-depth, all transects were therefore conducted on reef slopes between 20-30m and similar 152 153 gradient slopes were selected on all reef types to account for reef slope aspect, which is known to affect coral reef fish assemblages (Jankowski et al. 2015, Moore et al. 2017, Oakley-Cogan et al. 154 2020). Fishing pressure is also known to reduce numbers of predator fishes on coral reefs (Jackson 155 et al. 2017) and nearshore reefs in Kimbe Bay may experience substantial fishing pressure from 156 nearby human populations. To account for this potential confounding effect, all four nearshore 157 survey sites in this study were situated on reefs included in a locally managed marine area (LMMA) 158 scheme, which prohibits fishing and gleaning (sensu Chapman 1987) on these reefs. Similarly, we 159 used remote offshore reefs in order to incorporate sites which experience similar levels of isolation 160 161 as the pinnacles (and thus distance from coastal fishing pressure), but with structural characteristics 162 more similar to nearshore, fringing reef systems.

163

164 **2.2. Data collection**

High-definition stereo-video surveys were conducted along 30 x 5m (150m²) belt transects within
the 20-30m depth band. Pinnacle reefs are exposed to the pelagic environment on all sides, so on

175	2.3. Transect video processing
174	
173	first diver when 30m was reached and also ensured at least 5m separation between transect.
172	elevation of 0.5m above the reef. A second diver followed with a transect tape and indicated to the
171	cameras was used to record each survey (Goetze et al. 2019), with the diver maintaining an
170	https://www.seagis.com.au/, electronic supplementary material Fig. S1) with two GoPro Hero-4
169	(i.e., 10 per reef, 120 transects total). A diver-operated stereo-video-system (SVS, SeaGIS,
168	to control for reef exposure. For each reef, 5 transects were conducted during each survey period
167	nearshore and offshore reefs, surveys were conducted only on exposed, windward slopes, in order

Fish transect videos were analysed using the software EventMeasure Stereo (SeaGIS), which uses camera geometric calibration to provide a known field-of-view (2.5m either side of the transect, 5m total) and allows accurate length measurements to be made. Every individual fish that entered the lower two-thirds of the screen was identified to species based on Allen et al. (2003), counted and a fork-length measurement made. Only individuals that were readily observable within these parameters were recorded. From all recorded fish observations, occurrences of predators were extracted.

183

184 **2.4.** Selection of predator taxa

Individual observations of fishes were considered predators on the following bases: Firstly, we 185 186 included all species belonging to any of the following nine families of known predatory fishes: 187 Serranidae (groupers, Subfamily Epinephelinae only), Carangidae (jacks and trevallies), 188 Carcharhinidae (Requiem sharks), Scombridae (tunas and mackerels), Lutjanidae (snappers), 189 Lethrinidae (emperors), Cirrhitidae (hawkfishes), Haemulidae (grunts/sweetlips), Sphyraenidae 190 (barracudas). In addition, other species were also selected that met the following three criteria extracted from FishBase (Froese and Pauly, 2022): feeding guild = piscivore, trophic level ≥ 3.7 , 191 and max length (for species) \geq 30cm. This resulted in the inclusion of a further six species in the 192

193 analysis: Epibulus insidiator (sling-jaw wrasse, piscivore, trophic level 4.01, max length 54cm), 194 Myripristis botche (blacktip soldierfish, piscivore, trophic level 4, max length 30cm), Oxychelinus digramma (cheeklined wrasse, piscivore, trophic level 3.7, max length 40cm), Platax teira (teira 195 batfish, piscivore, trophic level 3.95, max length 70cm), Priacanthus hamrur (lunar tailed bigeye, 196 197 piscivore, trophic level 3.82, 45cm), Sargocentron spiniferum (sabre squirrelfish, piscivore, trophic level 3.80, 51cm). Finally, one generalist carnivore with a high-trophic level and very large 198 maximum length was also included in the study: Cheilinus undulatus (humphead wrasse, trophic 199 level 3.99, 229cm max length). In total 63 taxa from 13 families, from the wider Kimbe Bay fish 200 201 community were included as predators in all subsequent analyses (see SI Table). A number of 202 predator taxa that are known to exist in the region were not included (e.g. Gymnothorax spp.) as 203 these were not recorded on any transect in our study.

- 204
- 205 **2.5.** Quantifying the effect of reef type

All analyses were performed in R version 4.0.3 (R Core Team, 2020). All data exploration and 206 graphic production was conducted using base R, the *tidyverse* family of R packages (Wickham et al. 207 208 2019) and arsenal (Heinzen et al., 2021). Generalised linear mixed effects models (GLMMs) were constructed using the package glmmTMB (Brooks et al. 2017a) to measure the effect of reef type on 209 210 the abundance, biomass and diversity of predatory reef fishes. GLMM diagnostics were performed using the DHARMa package (Hartig 2022) to assess the assumptions of the model including 211 homogeneity of variance, dispersion and outliers, and additional checks for zero inflation. Model 212 213 selection was informed from the Akaike Information Criterion using the AIC function in base R. 214 Tukey post-hoc pairwise contrasts and 95% confidence intervals in estimated marginal means were calculated using the package emmeans (Lenth 2021) and are reported as either a contrast size (in the 215 216 measurement units) or ratio between reef types. Fully reproducible code and data are available at: https://github.com/bjcresswell/KimbePreds. 217

219 2.6. Abundance and biomass

Animal abundance (or, strictly speaking, density when measured as numbers per unit of area) was
extracted from the video as numbers of individual predator fishes observed per transect (N.150m⁻²).
From the recorded fork-lengths, biomass for each individual fish observation was calculated using
the length-weight equation:

- 224
- 225

 $W = aL^b$

226

where L represents fish fork length (cm), W is weight in grams and a and b are species-specific
constants obtained from FishBase (Froese & Pauly 2022) using the R package *rfishbase* (Boettiger
et al. 2012). Transect biomass totals were then calculated as kg.150m⁻².

230

231 Variation in predator fish abundance and biomass across reef types was assessed using GLMMs, with reef type as the fixed effect and individual reef in each survey period as the random effect to 232 233 account for temporal and site-specific variation in the presence of predators. Prior work in our study system has reported large variation in whole fish assemblages across the seascape, with some reefs 234 supporting very small numbers of fishes (Galbraith et al. 2021). In order to model predator 235 236 abundance and biomass as a proportion of this, abundance and biomass of whole fish assemblages were included in both models as a log offset term (Zuur et al. 2008, Brooks et al. 2017b). For 237 238 abundance a negative binomial residual distribution was selected for the final model and for 239 biomass a Tweedie distribution was selected, both with log-link functions.

240

241 2.7. Diversity

Shannon-Wiener index was used to quantify diversity (H.150m⁻²) since it accounts for both the
number and evenness of species present while being sensitive to the presence of rare taxa (33
species in our study had total bay-wide observations of 4 or less). Species richness was considered

as a diversity metric but not included as it does not account for evenness of distribution. Simpson's
index was also considered but not included for the related reason that it penalises rarity and
attributes any survey with 0 observations a score of 1 (21 of the 120 transects across our study had 0
observations of predatory fishes). Differences in diversity were assessed using GLMMs with the
same fixed and random effect as above. A Tweedie distribution was selected for the final model.

250

251 2.8. Assemblage composition

In total, 21 transects from offshore and nearshore reefs contained no observations of predators so an 252 analytical approach that is robust to large numbers of zero observations was required. The package 253 254 mvabund (Wang et al., 2020) was therefore used to assess multivariate differences in predator assemblage composition between reef types. The manyglm function of this package was used to fit 255 a multivariate generalised linear model (GLM). As the underlying data were count data, both 256 257 Poisson and negative binomial distributions were tested for fit. Model diagnostics were conducted using the functions plot.manyglm (to produce residual vs fit- and QQ- plots) and meanvar.plot (to 258 check mean-variance relationships). Model fits were also compared using Akaike Information 259 Criterion using the AIC function in base R. The negative binomial model was selected for pairwise 260 multivariate comparisons, which was conducted using the anova.manyglm function. 261

262

It is not possible to include random effects in manyglm, however reef site was accounted for as a
random factor in the model by using probability integral transform (PIT) residual bootstrapping

265 (aka PIT-trap resampling, (Warton et al. 2017)) in the package *permute* (Simpson, 2019).

Multivariate models from *mvabund* produce likelihood ratio test (LRT) statistics and corresponding permutation P values, both for multivariate pairwise comparisons (*i.e.*, between reef types) and for univariate scoring of species' contributions to overall differences. The latter were drawn from the model by including the term p.uni = 'adjusted', which corrects P values to control the family wise error rate across species, using a resampling-based multiple testing procedure (Westfall et al. 1993).

272	Differences in assemblage composition across reef types were visualised using a non-metric
273	multidimensional scaling in the package vegan (Oksanen et al. 2022). A constant fraction (0.001)
274	was added to all species observations, to allow the inclusion of transects with zero predator
275	observations. Species scores were overlaid for taxa identified as significantly driving differences in
276	the multivariate model and alpha and beta diversity were visualised using the package ggvenn (Yan,
277	2021). Differences in abundance for taxa significantly driving assemblage composition were
278	visualised in point and line plots using ggplot2 (Wickham et al. 2019).

280 **3. RESULTS**

In total, 2,560 predatory fishes representing 63 different taxa from 13 families were observed over 120 transects on 12 reefs in Kimbe Bay. From these data, we explored the effect of reef type (submerged pinnacle reefs, offshore emergent reefs, and nearshore emergent reefs) on the abundance, biomass and diversity of predatory reef fishes, and investigate patterns of community composition across these habitats.

286

287 3.1 Abundance, biomass and diversity

The GLMMs provided evidence that pinnacle reefs supported a greater abundance, biomass and
diversity of predatory fishes, though the strength of the effect of reef type depended on the
indicator.

291

Mean predator numbers were significantly higher on pinnacles than on both nearshore and offshore
reefs, while there was no observable difference in predator abundance between offshore and
nearshore reefs (Fig. 2a and d, electronic supplementary material Table S1). On average, pinnacles
supported 16.6 predators.150m⁻² (95% CI [7.9-25.3]), compared to 5.4 predators.150m⁻² (95% CI
[2.4-8.4]) for offshore reefs, and 5 predators.150m⁻² (95% CI [1.9-8.1]) for nearshore reefs.

297

298 Mean predator biomass also differed between reef types, with pinnacle reefs supporting 27

299 kg.150m⁻² (95% CI [17.2-36.8]) compared to 7.1 kg.150⁻² on nearshore reef types (95% CI [3.2-

300 11]) and 19.9 kg.150⁻² on offshore reef types (95% CI [7.3-32.5]). The greater biomass on pinnacle

301 reefs compared to nearshore reefs was significant (biomass contrast ratio 3.8:1 (95% CI [1.73-

8.37]), though the differences in biomass between pinnacles and offshore, or offshore and nearshore

303 were not statistically significant (Fig. 2b and e, electronic supplementary material Table S2).

Similar patterns were found in the diversity of predatory reef fishes (Fig. 2c and f, electronic
supplementary material Table S3), where mean Shannon diversity (H) ranged from 0.27 to 1.24
150m⁻² among reef types. Pinnacles supported a greater diversity of predatory fishes than offshore
reefs (H contrast ratio: 2.48:1, 95% CI [1.42-4.34]) and nearshore reefs (H contrast ratio: 4.54:1,
95% CI [2.30-8.98], Fig. 2c and f). Offshore reefs, also had higher average diversity levels than
nearshore reefs, although the magnitude of this effect was less than for pinnacle to other reefs (H
contrast ratio: 1.83:1, 95% CI [0.85-3.93]).

312

313 3.2. Assemblage composition

314 Of the 63 predator fish taxa observed during this study, 53 (84%) were observed on pinnacle reefs and just six species were shared by all three reef-types (Fig. 3b). These were Carangoides bajad, 315 Cephalopholis microprion, Lutjanus biguttatus, Lutjanus gibbus, Macolor macularis, Plectropomus 316 317 oligacanthus and all were most abundant on pinnacle reefs (Table 1). Pinnacles also had the largest number of unique species (32), while nearshore and offshore reefs had 4 and 2 unique species, 318 respectively (Fig. 3b, electronic supplementary material Table S4). Ten taxa were not observed on 319 pinnacles and the multivariate GLM identified significant differences in community composition 320 between reef types (total multivariate LRT = 507, df = 119, p = 0.02), with the biggest pairwise 321 difference being between pinnacle and nearshore reefs (LRT = 339, p = 0.001, Table 2). 322

323

324 The multivariate GLM also identified six species significantly driving these differences in

325 community composition: *Sphyraena qenie* (LRT 31.07, *p* = 0.02), *Caranx sexfasciatus* (LRT 32.01,

326 p = 0.02), Macolor macularis (LRT 58.08, p = 0.02), Caranx melampygus (LRT 35.33, p = 0.02),

327 *Lutjanus gibbus* (LRT 23.61, p = 0.045) and *Cephalopholis cyanostigma* (LRT 22.14, p = 0.045).

328 These taxa were all most abundant on pinnacle reefs, with the two Caranx species and Sphyraena

329 *genie* entirely absent from any survey on nearshore or offshore emergent reefs. The two lutjanid

taxa were present across all reef types although *Macolor macularis* was c.4-100 times more

331 abundant on pinnacle reefs than the other two reef types while Lutjanus gibbus was 5-10 times 332 more abundant. The serranid, Cephalopholis cyanostigma was not observed at all on nearshore reefs and while relatively rare on both other reef types, was nearly 50% more abundant on pinnacles than 333 offshore reefs (Table 2, Fig. 4). This broad pattern was also followed at family-level, with the 334 335 pinnacle reefs supporting 6 predator families with representatives not found on the other two reef 336 types. This included the only observations of reef sharks, *Carcharhinus amblyrhynchos*, of which there were just six observed on two of the pinnacles (electronic supplementary material Table S4). 337 Members of the nocturnal families Holocentridae and Priacanthidae were also only observed on one 338 pinnacle, Bradford Shoals. Neither nearshore nor offshore reefs had families not observed on 339 340 pinnacle reefs. The multivariate visualisation identified the same pattern, with substantial separation of communities across reef types and species scores for the 6 significant taxa strongly aligning with 341 342 the first NMDS axis (Fig. 3a).

343

344 4. DISCUSSION

Our results highlight a strong effect of reef type on the abundance, biomass and diversity of 345 predatory fishes in Kimbe Bay, Papua New Guinea and suggest that pinnacle reefs are particularly 346 important in driving these patterns. Pinnacle reefs support significantly (2-4x) more abundant and 347 diverse assemblages with higher biomass densities than nearby coastal and offshore emergent reef 348 types. Predator assemblages were also distinct on pinnacles compared to those of emergent reef 349 350 habitats, with over 50% of the taxa recorded across our study being observed only on pinnacle 351 reefs. Similar accumulations of diversity and biomass have been reported for broader fish 352 assemblages on the pinnacles used in this study (Galbraith et al. 2021) and for predator taxa on pinnacles and seamounts across the wider Indo-Pacific (Letessier et al. 2019). Overall, this suggests 353 354 offshore pinnacle reefs are biodiversity "hotspots" for a range of species, including predatory fishes that are either resident on, or are attracted to and aggregate around these unique structures. Given 355 the multiple lines of evidence emerging for these effects, we propose pinnacle reefs may function as 356

"ecological magnets", concentrating both biota and associated ecological interactions across
multiple trophic levels into small focal points, with the capacity to sustain large numbers of
predators. The obvious conservation value of these habitats, in combination with small individual
area and high potential for exploitation, highlights the need to incorporate pinnacle reefs into future
management plans, with reducing fishing pressure and other human impacts a high priority.

362

While patterns in abundance, biomass and diversity among reef types were similar, the drivers of 363 these may be different. The significant contrast in overall abundance (on average over three times 364 greater on pinnacle reefs) was in part due to substantial schools of barracuda (Sphvraena sp.) and 365 366 trevally (Caranx spp.), neither of which were observed at nearshore or offshore emergent reefs. This was particularly noticeable at one pinnacle site (Bradford Shoals, electronic supplementary 367 368 material Fig. S2) where schools of several hundred S. genie markedly influenced overall abundance 369 and biomass patterns. For these and other similar species, pinnacles may be acting as sites of daily aggregations, with pelagic foraging potentially occurring elsewhere at night, although anecdotal 370 evidence suggests that these two taxa may also be nocturnally active in the immediate vicinity of 371 the pinnacles (Pers. obs., 2019). Other species of predatory fishes on pinnacles may be less likely to 372 make substantial movements away from these structures, which are isolated from other coral reef 373 374 habitat by many kilometres of distance and hundreds of meters depth of water. Despite this isolation, patterns of distribution and abundance were consistent across the whole predator 375 376 assemblage: 19 out of the 20 most commonly observed species in our study were more abundant on pinnacles than the other two reef types. Most of these were lutianids and serranids, likely to have 377 378 stronger habitat associations and smaller home ranges compared to the carangids and sphyraenids in this study, particularly when found on pinnacle reef summits (Afonso et al. 2016). Inclusion or 379 380 exclusion of nocturnal species may also influence overall patterns in a study like this, however overall numbers of such taxa were in single digits and unlikely to alter the patterns we observed. 381

383 Differences in predator biomass were similar to abundance. However, while pinnacles had the most 384 overall biomass, there was also a two-fold difference between offshore and nearshore reef types. The fact that the differences in biomass between pinnacles and offshore reefs were less striking than 385 differences in abundance might be attributed to the high levels of diversity on the pinnacles, where 386 387 there were numerous smaller-bodied lutjanid and serranid species, either absent or less abundant on 388 offshore reefs (e.g., Pinjalo spp. and Cephalopholis spp.). Such species may have been truly absent on offshore reefs or may have been more cryptic in these habitats compared to pinnacles and thus 389 less likely to be detected during our surveys. As species are accumulated in survey counts, there is 390 an increasing chance that these will be because of smaller, rarer and more cryptic taxa, rather than 391 392 common or large-bodied species. As a consequence for the predator assemblages in our study, high abundance, combined with high diversity may actually translate to relatively lower observed 393 394 biomass. A complementary explanation is that large-bodied predators, more commonly found on 395 the pinnacles may skew biomass estimates on these structures, although numbers of sharks 396 observed across the entire study were low.

397

Diversity patterns across reef types were again similar, with the pinnacles supporting c. 2-5 times 398 more predator fish diversity than offshore or nearshore reefs respectively. Strong species-habitat 399 linkages behind this trend are likely due to the presence of a range of unique or enhanced beneficial 400 resources available on pinnacles. These may take the form of food, shelter, navigation or mating 401 opportunities, each operating at different strengths across taxa and for specific life-history events or 402 403 phases. The actual structure of pinnacles may also promote two other ecological phenomena that 404 could enhance biodiversity: Firstly, pinnacle summits are small, which means their occupants must live in close proximity. Such proximity may increase competition, in turn promoting strong 405 406 resource partitioning and high levels of assemblage diversity, or alternatively may promote positive species interactions between predator species that enhance prey detection and capture (Auster et al. 407 2013, 2019, Campanella et al. 2019). Secondly, the "conical" shape of pinnacle summits means that 408

409 a large amount of reef surface area is in contact with, and influenced by surrounding ocean water, 410 increasing the potential for edge effects on these habitats. Edge effects can promote diversity (Bellaver et al. 2023), particularly for small, isolated habitat patches (Ting & Shaolin 2008). 411 Potential implications of high predator diversity on wider communities on pinnacles seem obvious: 412 413 prey species must avoid a larger variety of predator taxa ("diffuse predation" sensu Hixon 1991). That whole fish assemblages on pinnacles are also the most diverse within Kimbe Bay (Galbraith et 414 al., 2021) supports the concept of predation together with competition as interacting regulators of 415 diversity at lower trophic levels, at least in our study system. 416

417

418 Differences in diversity were also reflected in the important differences in community composition between reef types. While this can be mainly attributed to variability in abundance of just six 419 species identified by the multivariate GLM, only six other taxa were shared by all three reef types 420 421 and, despite being relatively small, pinnacles possessed 32 unique species. However, the pinnacles also supported all but 10 out of the 63 taxa observed in this study. This number is reduced to 4 422 when offshore reefs are included, suggesting that the isolation and depth of both offshore and 423 pinnacle reefs collectively provide a valuable potential source of biodiversity refugia and, if used as 424 spawning locations, an important larval resupply source for other reefs in the area. This may be 425 particularly important for predatory fish populations and communities on shallow, nearshore reefs, 426 which may be particularly impacted by localised anthropogenic disturbances such as overfishing, 427 pollution and coastal development. Spatial differences in assemblage structure also have 428 429 implications for overall seascape connectivity and diversity: organisms with restricted distributions 430 (less than 10% of taxa were recorded on all three reef types) are less able to utilise the spectrum of otherwise available habitats in the course of their existence. Any local threat to such a taxon would 431 432 directly translate to a seascape effect. Further, while gamma diversity may be high across our study system, correspondingly high levels of beta diversity may actually decrease functional redundancy 433

434 among predators at a local scale and therefore in predation as an ecosystem process, a pattern

435 observed in other trophic guilds of coral reef fishes (Bellwood et al. 2003).

436

Differences in benthic habitat, quality and complexity, as well as frequency and intensity of 437 438 disturbances, are known drivers of diversity and abundance on coral reefs. However, recent work on the same reefs used in this study found no effect of variation in benthic composition on broad fish 439 community structure (Galbraith et al. 2021). Rugosity, the number and size of holes, crevices and 440 overhangs and reef aspect are additional benthic structural complexity measures which have been 441 linked to reef-scale variability of fish communities, including predators (Hixon 2015, Agudo-442 443 Adriani et al. 2019). Alternatively, more detailed measures of habitat complexity and quality may therefore be needed to elucidate the relationships between fish communities and the types of reef 444 445 habitat in our study system. Furthermore, site quality, prey availability and the presence of 446 conspecifics are potential covariates and may confound the perceived effect of relatively simple 447 habitat metrics such as total coral cover. Direct links between predatory fishes and benthic systems are likely more ambiguous over time and space (e.g. diurnal foraging behaviour (Papastamatiou et 448 al., 2015; Williams et al., 2018)). Clearly, further study is warranted on dietary pathways and 449 predation pressure to better understand links between predator fishes and benthic trophodynamics in 450 451 these systems.

452

Movement of water at all scales is also a known driver of community ecology in coastal systems (Young et al. 2021) and seamounts or pinnacles (Klimley et al. 2005, Campanella et al. 2021, Bridges et al. 2022). Recent work in our study system has demonstrated the importance of hydrodynamic forces in shaping wider biological communities (Galbraith et al. 2022) where pinnacles are characterised by strong ocean currents leading to localised upwelling and complex eddies. These same hydrodynamics may be particularly important for predator species: fishers and divers have long utilised local knowledge of currents, eddies and other water movement to inform

460 where and when to seek out aggregations of charismatic predator species (Richert et al. 2017). Precisely what benefit such currents may provide to predatory fishes is yet to be described (but see 461 Fisher et al., 2018), however a growing body of work suggests that reef food webs that are exposed 462 to allochthonous pelagic nutrient inputs may receive a substantial benefit from these. A recent study 463 464 in the Maldives demonstrated that, for a number of coral reef predator taxa, trophic pathways with 465 offshore pelagic origins are far more important in diets than local, reef-based sources (Skinner et al. 2021). These pathways may sustain wider fish productivity, even on degraded reefs (Morais & 466 Bellwood 2019). Given that mobile predators themselves may act as vectors of nutrients from the 467 wider pelagic environment onto coral reefs (Williams et al. 2018), where reefs host large numbers 468 469 of these predator taxa, such nutrient inputs may be particularly important. Despite this, these inputs to coral reefs are often referred to as "pelagic subsidies" or "contributions" to "nutrient cycling" 470 471 (Papastamatiou et al. 2015, Morais & Bellwood 2019), but if these paradigms hold across a wide 472 biogeographic area, the term "pelagic dominated sources" may be more appropriate.

473

Predator assemblages on coastal reefs of the region may be affected by extensive local agricultural 474 activity and associated terrestrial runoff, which is known to promote high algal cover and 475 smothering of the benthos with sediment (Beger & Possingham 2008). Both of these processes are 476 characteristic of reef degradation and are potential drivers of altered fish communities (Fabricius 477 2005). Habitat degradation by coral bleaching events has also affected the reefs of Kimbe Bay over 478 the past two decades (Jones et al. 2004) and recovery of reef communities from these bleaching 479 events has varied, with reefs farther offshore showing greater ability to recover compared to those 480 481 closer to terrestrial stressors (e.g., sedimentation from runoff) (Munday 2004). Relationships between benthic habitat dynamics and fish community structure can vary as a product of seascape 482 483 position and temporal stochastic environmental change (Tsai et al. 2022).

485 Another explanation for low levels of abundance, diversity and biomass observed on nearshore reefs is the possibility of direct anthropogenic disturbance. The most obvious example of such 486 disturbance is that of increased fishing pressure closer to shore. If present, the expected effect of 487 this would be decreased numbers of certain fishery target species, but is less likely to account for 488 489 the absence of over two-thirds of the taxa across our study (41 of 63 species) on coastal reefs. 490 Additionally, we took steps to control for fishing pressure by using only nearshore reefs that are protected under the locally managed marine area scheme, established in 2007. This program is 491 widely regarded to be effective and the local community are effectively engaged in enforcing 492 493 protection on these reefs (Green et al. 2009). Conversely, both the pinnacles and offshore reefs may 494 experience some degree of residual protection thanks to their remote and isolated settings. Offshore reefs with emergent crests may be easier to locate for the limited numbers of local fishers with the 495 496 means of accessing these reefs such as power-boats, while the pinnacles can only be located with 497 GPS equipment. Given that both powered vessels and GPS technology are typically unavailable to subsistence and artisanal fishers of the region, fishing pressure alone is unlikely to explain 498 499 differences in predator fish communities between these two reef types. The second form of direct anthropogenic disturbance that may be operating is altered fish behaviour (and thus presence or 500 absence in our surveys) as a result of the presence of divers in the water (Dearden et al. 2010). Such 501 502 an effect may have occurred during our surveys, however it seems likely that this effect would have been similar across reef types, rather than differing between them, and likely affected cryptic taxa 503 504 (Goetze et al. 2019), rather than the large bodied predators that were the focus of this study. In 505 addition, we aimed to use best practice methods for in-water surveys, including the use of a second 506 diver to deploy transect tapes (Dickens et al. 2011).

507

In conclusion, our study reveals distinct patterns in predator fish abundance, diversity and
community structure on pinnacle reefs and raises questions about why and how these habitats
support unique communities of these organisms. Broadly, our results lend weight to international

calls for protecting pinnacle and seamount structures as unique hotspots of biodiversity and 511 512 commercially valuable predatory species (Pitcher et al. 2010, Richert et al. 2017, Watling & Auster 513 2017). Further work is required to better understand these unique systems, their biological communities and broader ecological role in wider coral reef seascapes. From a conservation 514 515 perspective, large predatory fishes are clearly under considerable threat from extreme overfishing throughout the world's oceans (Myers & Worm 2003). Pinnacles represent quintessential 516 "biodiversity hotspots" (sensu Myers, 1988), where a large proportion of the abundance, biomass 517 and diversity of predators is confined to small geographic areas. At an oceanic scale, pinnacles may 518 be mere dots in the wider seascape, but they appear to function as ecological magnets, attracting 519 520 individuals, species and big fish. While in one sense this makes them vulnerable, it also makes it possible to conserve a large proportion of species assemblages in relatively few and small marine 521 protected areas. Such areas however must allow pinnacle reefs to remain unmarked and maximise 522 523 their inherent safeguard against exploitation, namely isolation.

525 Acknowledgments

- 526 We thank and acknowledge the traditional owners of the Tamare-Kilu reefs for granting access to
- 527 research sites in Kimbe Bay. The authors are grateful to the management and staff of Walindi
- 528 Plantation Resort and Mahonia Na Dari Conservation and Research Centre for facilitating this
- 529 research. Thanks also to Murray Logan for advice on multivariate modelling approaches and
- 530 Morgan Pratchett for insight into the manuscript structure. This research was supported by an ARC
- 531 Discovery Grant (DP190103056) to G.P. Jones, which supported a PhD scholarship for B.J.
- 532 Cresswell. We also acknowledge support from the ARC Centre of Excellence for Coral Reef
- 533 Studies (CE140100020).

- Afonso P, Abecasis D, Santos RS, Fontes J (2016) Contrasting movements and residency of two
 serranids in a small Macaronesian MPA. Fish Res 177:59–70.
- 538 Agudo-Adriani EA, Cappelletto J, Cavada-Blanco F, Cróquer A (2019) Structural Complexity and
- 539Benthic Cover Explain Reef-Scale Variability of Fish Assemblages in Los Roques National
- 540 Park, Venezuela. Front Mar Sci 6:1–12.
- Almany GR (2004) Differential effects of habitat complexity, predators and competitors on
 abundance of juvenile and adult coral reef fishes. Oecologia 141:105–113.
- 543 Auster PJ, Cortés J, Alvarado JJ, Beita-Jiménez A (2019) Coordinated hunting behaviors of mixed-

544 species groups of piscivores and associated species at isla del Coco National Park (Eastern

- 545 Tropical Pacific). Neotrop Ichthyol 17:1–12.
- Auster PJ, Kracker L, Price V, Heupel E, McFall G, Grenda D (2013) Behavior webs of piscivores
 at subtropical live-bottom reefs. Bull Mar Sci 89:377–396.
- 548 Barbosa P, Castellanos I (2005) Ecology of predator-prey interactions. Oxford University Press,
 549 Oxord.
- 550Bauman AG, Seah JCL, Januchowski-Hartley FA, Hoey AS, Fong J, Todd PA (2019) Fear effects
- associated with predator presence and habitat structure interact to alter herbivory on coral
 reefs. Biol Lett 15:20190409.
- Beger M, Possingham HP (2008) Environmental factors that influence the distribution of coral reef
 fishes: Modeling occurrence data for broad-scale conservation and management. Mar Ecol
- 555 Prog Ser 361:1–13.
- 556 Bellaver J, Romanowski HP, Richter A, Iserhard CA (2023) Living on the edge: The use of fruit-
- 557 feeding butterflies to evaluate edge effect on subtropical assemblages. Austral Ecol 48:217–
- 558 232.
- Bellwood DR, Hoey AS, Choat JH (2003) Limited functional redundancy in high diversity systems:
 Resilience and ecosystem function on coral reefs. Ecol Lett 6:281–285.

- Beukers JS, Jones GP (1998) Habitat complexity modifies the impact of piscivores on a coral reef
 fish population. Oecologia 114:50–59.
- Boaden AE, Kingsford MJ (2015) Predators drive community structure in coral reef fish
 assemblages. Ecosphere 6:1–33.
- 565 Bridges AEH, Barnes DKA, Bell JB, Ross RE, Howell KL (2022) Depth and latitudinal gradients

of diversity in seamount benthic communities. J Biogeogr:1–12.

- 567 Brock RE (1982) A critique of the visual census method for assessing coral reef fish populations.
 568 Bull Mar Sci 32:269–276.
- 569 Brooks ME, Kristensen K, van Benthem KJ, Magnusson A, Berg CW, Nielsen A, Skaug HJ,
- 570 Mächler M, Bolker BM (2017a) GlmmTMB balances speed and flexibility among packages
- 571 for zero-inflated generalized linear mixed modeling. R J 9:378–400.
- Brooks ME, Kristensen K, Benthem KJ van, Magnusson A, Berg CW, Nielsen A, Skaug HJ,
 Mächler M, Bolker BM (2017b) Modeling zero-inflated count data with glmmTMB.
- 574 bioRxiv:132753.
- 575 Caldwell ZR, Zgliczynski BJ, Williams GJ, Sandin SA (2016) Reef fish survey techniques:

576 Assessing the potential for standardizing methodologies. PLoS One 11:1–14.

- 577 Caley MJ (1993) Predation, recruitment and the dynamics of communities of coral-reef fishes. Mar
 578 Biol 117:33–43.
- 579 Campanella F, Auster PJ, Christopher Taylor J, Muñoz RC (2019) Dynamics of predator-prey
- habitat use and behavioral interactions over diel periods at sub-tropical reefs. PLoS One 14:1–
 22.
- 582 Campanella F, Collins MA, Young EF, Laptikhovsky V, Whomersley P, van der Kooij J (2021)
- 583 First Insight of Meso- and Bentho-Pelagic Fish Dynamics Around Remote Seamounts in the584 South Atlantic Ocean. Front Mar Sci 8:663278.
- 585 Carr MH, Anderson TW, Hixon MA (2002) Biodiversity, population regulation, and the stability of
- 586 coral-reef fish communities. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 99:11241–11245.

587 Ceccarelli DM, McKinnon AD, Andréfouët S, Allain V, Young J, Gledhill DC, Flynn A, Bax NJ,

588 Beaman R, Borsa P, Brinkman R, Bustamante RH, Campbell R, Cappo M, Cravatte S,

- 589 D'Agata S, Dichmont CM, Dunstan PK, Dupouy C, Edgar G, Farman R, Furnas M, Garrigue
- 590 C, Hutton T, Kulbicki M, Letourneur Y, Lindsay D, Menkes C, Mouillot D, Parravicini V,
- 591 Payri C, Pelletier B, Richer de Forges B, Ridgway K, Rodier M, Samadi S, Schoeman D,
- 592 Skewes T, Swearer S, Vigliola L, Wantiez L, Williams A, Williams A, Richardson AJ (2013)
- 593 The Coral Sea: Physical Environment, Ecosystem Status and Biodiversity Assets. In: *Advances*594 *in Marine Biology*. p 213–290
- 595 Chapman MD (1987) Women's Fishing in Oceania. Hum Ecol 15:267–288.
- 596 Chase JM, Abrams PA, Grover JP, Diehl S, Chesson P, Holt RD, Richards SA, Nisbet RM, Case TJ
- 597 (2002) The interaction between predation and competition. Ecol Lett 5:302–315.
- Dearden P, Theberge M, Yasué M (2010) Using underwater cameras to assess the effects of
 snorkeler and SCUBA diver presence on coral reef fish abundance, family richness, and
 species composition. Environ Monit Assess 163:531–538.
- Dickens LC, Goatley CHR, Tanner JK, Bellwood DR (2011) Quantifying relative diver effects in
 underwater visual censuses. PLoS One 6:6–8.
- 603 Done TJ (1982) Coral zonation: its nature and significance. Perspect Coral Reefs:107–147.
- Dulvy NK, Freckleton RP, Polunin NVC (2004) Coral reef cascades and the indirect effects of
 predator removal by exploitation. Ecol Lett 7:410–416.
- 606 Dulvy NK, Pacoureau N, Rigby CL, Pollom RA, Jabado RW, Ebert DA, Finucci B, Pollock CM,
- 607 Cheok J, Derrick DH, Herman KB, Sherman CS, VanderWright WJ, Lawson JM, Walls RHL,
- 608 Carlson JK, Charvet P, Bineesh KK, Fernando D, Ralph GM, Matsushiba JH, Hilton-Taylor C,
- 609 Fordham S V., Simpfendorfer CA (2021) Overfishing drives over one-third of all sharks and
- 610 rays toward a global extinction crisis. Curr Biol 31:4773-4787.e8.
- 611 Espinoza M, Cappo M, Heupel MR, Tobin AJ, Simpfendorfer CA (2014) Quantifying Shark
- 612 Distribution Patterns and Species-Habitat Associations: Implications of Marine Park Zoning.

613 PLoS One 9:e106885.

- Fabricius KE (2005) Effects of terrestrial runoff on the ecology of corals and coral reefs: Review
 and synthesis. Mar Pollut Bull 50:125–146.
- 616 Fisher EE, Choat JH, McCormick MI, Cappo M (2018) Relative influence of environmental factors
- on the timing and occurrence of multi-species coral reef fish aggregations. PLoS One 13:1–23.
- Fontes J, Schmiing M, Afonso P (2014) Permanent aggregations of a pelagic predator at shallow
 seamounts. Mar Biol 161:1349–1360.
- 620 Friedlander AM, Sandin SA, DeMartini EE, Sala E (2010) Spatial patterns of the structure of reef
- fish assemblages at a pristine atoll in the central Pacific. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 410:219–231.
- 622 Froese R, Pauly D (2022) FishBase
- 623 Galbraith GF, Cresswell BJ, McCormick MI, Bridge TC, Jones GP (2022) Contrasting
- hydrodynamic regimes of submerged pinnacle and emergent coral reefs. PLoS One17:e0273092.
- 626 Galbraith GF, Cresswell BJ, McCormick MI, Bridge TC, Jones GP (2021) High diversity,
- abundance and distinct fish assemblages on submerged coral reef pinnacles compared to
 shallow emergent reefs. Coral Reefs 40:335–354.
- 629 GEBCO Compilation Group (2019) GEBCO 2019 Grid (no date)
- 630 Goetze JS, Bond T, McLean DL, Saunders BJ, Langlois TJ, Lindfield S, Fullwood LAF, Driessen
- D, Shedrawi G, Harvey ES (2019) A field and video analysis guide for diver operated stereovideo. Methods Ecol Evol 10:1083–1090.
- 633 Goreau TF (1959) The Ecology of Jamaican Coral Reefs I. Species Composition and Zonation.
 634 Ecology 40:67–90.
- Gratwicke B, Speight MR (2005) The relationship between fish species richness, abundance and
 habitat complexity in a range of shallow tropical marine habitats. J Fish Biol 66:650–667.
- 637 Green A, Smith SE, Lipsett-Moore G, Groves C, Peterson N, Sheppard S, Lokani P, Hamilton R,
- Almany J, Aitsi J, Bualia L (2009) Designing a resilient network of marine protected areas for

- 639 Kimbe Bay, Papua New Guinea. Oryx 43:488–498.
- 640 Guabiroba HC, Rocha LA, Joyeux JC, Pimentel CR, Teixeira JB, Macieira RM, Gasparini JL,
- 641 Francini-Filho RB, Andrades R, Mazzei E, Simon T, Sissini M, Costa TJF, Pinheiro HT
- 642 (2022) Coralline Hills: high complexity reef habitats on seamount summits of the Vitória-
- Trindade Chain. Coral Reefs 41:1075–1086.
- Hall AE, Kingsford MJ (2021) Habitat type and complexity drive fish assemblages in a tropical
 seascape. J Fish Biol 99:1364–1379.
- 646 Harris PT, Bridge TCL, Beaman RJ, Webster JM, Nichol SL, Brooke BP (2013) Submerged banks
- 647 in the Great Barrier Reef, Australia, greatly increase available coral reef habitat. ICES J Mar
 648 Sci ICES 70:284–293.
- Hartig F (2022) DHARMa: Residual Diagnostics for Hierarchical (Multi-Level / Mixed) Regression
 Models. R package version 0.4.5.
- Hixon M, Jones GP (2005) Competition, predation, and density-dependent mortality in demersal
 marine fishes. Ecology 86:2847–2859.
- Hixon MA (2015) Predation: piscivory and the ecology of coral reef fishes. In: *Ecology of Fishes on Coral Reefs*. p 41–52
- Hixon MA (1991) Predation as a Process Structuring Coral Reef Fish Communities. In: *The Ecology of Fishes on Coral Reefs*. Academic Press, Inc, p 475–508
- Hixon MA, Beets JP (1993) Predation, Prey Refuges, and the Structure of Coral-Reef Fish
 Assemblages. Ecol Monogr 63:77–101.
- Hixon MA, Webster MS (2002) Density Dependence in Marine Fishes: Coral Reef Populations as
 Model Systems. In: *Coral Reef Fishes*. p 303–325
- 661 Jackson JBC, Kirby MX, Berger WH, Karen A, Botsford LW, Bourque BJ, Bradbury RH, Cooke R,
- Estes JA, Hughes TP, Kidwell S, Lange CB, Hunter S, Pandolfi JM, Peterson CH, Steneck RS,
- 663 Tegner MJ, Warner RR, Jackson JBC, Kirby MX, Berger WH, Bjorndal KA, Botsford LW,
- Bourque BJ, Bradbury RH, Cooke R, Erlandson J, Estes JA, Hughes TP, Kidwell S, Lange

- 665 CB, Lenihan HS, Pandolfi JM, Peterson CH, Steneck RS, Tegner MJ, Warner RR (2017)
- 666 Historical Overfishing and the Recent Collapse of Coastal Ecosystems. Science (80-)

667 293:629–638.

- 668 Jacobs KP, Hunter CL, Forsman ZH, Pollock AL, de Souza MR, Toonen RJ (2022) A
- 669 phylogenomic examination of Palmyra Atoll's corallimorpharian invader. Coral Reefs 41:673–

670 685.

- 671 Jankowski MW, Graham NAJ, Jones GP (2015) Depth gradients in diversity, distribution and
- habitat specialisation in coral reef fishes: implications for the depth-refuge hypothesis. Mar
 Ecol Prog Ser 540:203–215.
- 674 Jones GP, McCormick MI, Srinivasan M, Eagle J V. (2004) Coral decline threatens fish
- biodiversity in marine reserves. Proc Natl Acad Sci 101:8251–8253.
- 676 Kerfoot WC, Sih A (1987) Predation: direct and indirect impacts on aquatic communities.
 677 University Press of New England.
- 678 Klimley AP, Richert J, Jorgensen S (2005) The Home of Blue Water Fish. Am Sci 93:42.
- Knapp IS, Godwin LS, Smith JE, Williams CJ, Bell JJ (2011) Records of non-indigenous marine
 species at Palmyra Atoll in the US Line Islands. Mar Biodivers Rec 4:1–7.
- 681 Lavelle JW, Mohn C (2010) Motion, commotion, and biophysical connections at deep ocean
 682 seamounts. Oceanography 23:90–103.
- 683 Leitner A, Friedrich T, Kelley C, Travis S, Partridge D, Powell B, Drazen J (2021) Biogeophysical
- 684 influence of large-scale bathymetric habitat types on mesophotic and upper bathyal demersal
 685 fish assemblages: a Hawaiian case study. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 659:219–236.
- 686 Lenth R (2021) Emmeans: Estimated marginal means, aka leastsquares means. R Packag.
- 687 Lester SE, Halpern BS, Grorud-Colvert K, Lubchenco J, Ruttenberg BI, Gaines SD, Airamé S,
- 688 Warner RR (2009) Biological effects within no-take marine reserves: A global synthesis. Mar
 689 Ecol Prog Ser 384:33–46.
- 690 Letessier TB, Mouillot D, Bouchet PJ, Vigliola L, Fernandes MC, Thompson C, Boussarie G,

- 691 Turner J, Juhel JB, Maire E, Julian Caley M, Koldewey HJ, Friedlander A, Sala E, Meeuwig JJ
- 692 (2019) Remote reefs and seamounts are the last refuges for marine predators across the
- 693 IndoPacific. PLoS Biol 17:1–20.
- Lingo ME, Szedlmayer ST (2006) The influence of habitat complexity on reef fish communities in
 the northeastern Gulf of Mexico. Environ Biol Fishes 76:71–80.
- 696 MacNeil MA, Chapman DD, Heupel M, Simpfendorfer CA, Heithaus M, Meekan M, Harvey E,
- 697 Goetze J, Kiszka J, Bond ME, Currey-Randall LM, Speed CW, Sherman CS, Rees MJ,
- 698 Udyawer V, Flowers KI, Clementi G, Valentin-Albanese J, Gorham T, Adam MS, Ali K, Pina-
- 699 Amargós F, Angulo-Valdés JA, Asher J, Barcia LG, Beaufort O, Benjamin C, Bernard ATF,
- 700 Berumen ML, Bierwagen S, Bonnema E, Bown RMK, Bradley D, Brooks E, Brown JJ, Buddo
- 701 D, Burke P, Cáceres C, Cardeñosa D, Carrier JC, Caselle JE, Charloo V, Claverie T, Clua E,
- 702 Cochran JEM, Cook N, Cramp J, D'Alberto B, de Graaf M, Dornhege M, Estep A, Fanovich
- 703 L, Farabough NF, Fernando D, Flam AL, Floros C, Fourqurean V, Garla R, Gastrich K,
- 704 George L, Graham R, Guttridge T, Hardenstine RS, Heck S, Henderson AC, Hertler H, Hueter
- 705 R, Johnson M, Jupiter S, Kasana D, Kessel ST, Kiilu B, Kirata T, Kuguru B, Kyne F, Langlois
- 706 T, Lédée EJI, Lindfield S, Luna-Acosta A, Maggs J, Manjaji-Matsumoto BM, Marshall A,
- 707 Matich P, McCombs E, McLean D, Meggs L, Moore S, Mukherji S, Murray R, Kaimuddin M,
- 708 Newman SJ, Nogués J, Obota C, O'Shea O, Osuka K, Papastamatiou YP, Perera N, Peterson
- 709 B, Ponzo A, Prasetyo A, Quamar LMS, Quinlan J, Ruiz-Abierno A, Sala E, Samoilys M,
- 710 Schärer-Umpierre M, Schlaff A, Simpson N, Smith ANH, Sparks L, Tanna A, Torres R,
- 711 Travers MJ, van Zinnicq Bergmann M, Vigliola L, Ward J, Watts AM, Wen C, Whitman E,
- 712 Wirsing AJ, Wothke A, Zarza-Gonzâlez E, Cinner JE (2020) Global status and conservation
- potential of reef sharks. Nature 583:801–806.
- Menge BA, Sutherland JP (1976) Species Diversity Gradients: Synthesis of the Roles of Predation,
 Competition, and Temporal Heterogeneity. Am Nat 110:351–369.
- 716 Moore C, Cappo M, Radford B, Heyward A (2017) Submerged oceanic shoals of north Western

- Australia are a major reservoir of marine biodiversity. Coral Reefs 36:719–734.
- 718 Morais RA, Bellwood DR (2019) Pelagic Subsidies Underpin Fish Productivity on a Degraded
- 719 Coral Reef. Curr Biol 29:1521–1527.
- Morato T, Hoyle SD, Allain V, Nicol SJ (2010) Seamounts are hotspots of pelagic biodiversity in
 the open ocean. Proc Natl Acad Sci 107:9707–9711.
- Munday PL (2004) Habitat loss, resource specialization, and extinction on coral reefs. Glob Chang
 Biol 10:1642–1647.
- 724 Myers N (1988) Threatened biotas: 'Hot Spots' in Tropical Torests. Environmentalist 8:187–208.
- Myers RA, Worm B (2003) Rapid worldwide depletion of predatory fish communities. Nature
 423:280–283.
- Oakley-Cogan A, Tebbett SB, Bellwood DR (2020) Habitat zonation on coral reefs: Structural
 complexity, nutritional resources and herbivorous fish distributions. PLoS One 15:1–23.
- 729 Oksanen J, Simpson G, Blanchet F, Kindt R, Legendre P, Minchin P, O'Hara, Solymos P, Stevens
- 730 M, Szoecs E, Wagner H, Barbour M, Bedward M, Bolker B, Borcard D, Carvalho G, Chirico
- 731 M, De Caceres M, Durand S, Evangelista H, FitzJohn R, Friendly M, Furneaux B, Hannigan
- G, Hill M, Lahti L, McGlinn D, Ouellette M, Ribeiro Cunha E, Smith T, Stier A, Ter Braak C,
- 733 Weedon J (2022) Vegan: Community Ecology Package.
- 734 Osuka KE, Stewart BD, Samoilys M, McClean CJ, Musembi P, Yahya S, Hamad AR, Mbugua J
- 735 (2022) Depth and habitat are important drivers of abundance for predatory reef fish off Pemba
 736 Island, Tanzania. Mar Environ Res 175:105587.
- Paine RT (1966) Food Web Complexity and Species Diversity. Am Nat 100:65–75.
- 738 Papastamatiou YP, Meyer CG, Kosaki RK, Wallsgrove NJ, Popp BN (2015) Movements and
- foraging of predators associated with mesophotic coral reefs and their potential for linking
 ecological habitats. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 521:155–170.
- 741 Pitcher TJ, Clark MR, Morato T, Watson R (2010) Seamount fisheries: Do they have a future?
- 742 Oceanography 23:134–144.

- 743 Richert JE, Jorgensen SJ, Ketchum JT, Mohajerani L, Klimley PA (2017) The Importance of
- 744 Pinnacles and Seamounts to Pelagic Fishes and Fisheries off the Southern Baja California
- 745 Peninsula. Oceanogr Fish 4:555644.
- Rizzari JR, Frisch AJ, Connolly SR (2014) How robust are estimates of coral reef shark depletion?
 Biol Conserv 176:39–47.
- Roberts TE, Moloney JM, Sweatman HPA, Bridge TCL (2015) Benthic community composition on
 submerged reefs in the central Great Barrier Reef. Coral Reefs 34:569–580.
- Rogers A, Blanchard JL, Mumby PJ (2014) Vulnerability of coral reef fisheries to a loss of
 structural complexity. Curr Biol 24:1000–1005.
- 752 Rosenblatt AE, Heithaus MR, Mather ME, Matich P, Nifong JC, Ripple WJ, Silliman BR (2013)
- 753 The roles of large top predators in coastal ecosystems new insights from long term ecological
 754 research. Oceanography 26:157–167.
- Rowden AA, Dower JF, Schlacher TA, Consalvey M, Clark MR (2010) Paradigms in seamount
 ecology: Fact, fiction and future. Mar Ecol 31:226–241.
- 757 Sadovy de Mitcheson Y, Craig MT, Bertoncini AA, Carpenter KE, Cheung WWL, Choat JH,
- 758 Cornish AS, Fennessy ST, Ferreira BP, Heemstra PC, Liu M, Myers RF, Pollard DA, Rhodes
- 759 KL, Rocha LA, Russell BC, Samoilys MA, Sanciangco J (2013) Fishing groupers towards
- extinction: A global assessment of threats and extinction risks in a billion dollar fishery. Fish
 Fish 14:119–136.
- 762 Sandin SA, Smith JE, DeMartini EE, Dinsdale EA, Donner SD, Friedlander AM, Konotchick T,
- 763 Malay M, Maragos JE, Obura D, Pantos O, Paulay G, Richie M, Rohwer F, Schroeder RE,
- Walsh S, Jackson JBC, Knowlton N, Sala E (2008) Baselines and degradation of coral reefs in
 the Northern Line Islands. PLoS One 3:e1548.
- Sih A, Crowley P, Mcpeek M, Petranka J, Strohmeier K (1985) Predation, Competition, and Prey
 Communities : A Review of Field Experiments. Annu Rev Ecol Syst 16:269–311.
- 768 Sinniger F, Ocaña O V., Baco AR (2013) Diversity of Zoanthids (Anthozoa: Hexacorallia) on

- Hawaiian Seamounts: Description of the Hawaiian Gold Coral and Additional Zoanthids.
 PLoS One 8.
- Skinner C, Mill AC, Fox MD, Newman SP, Zhu Y, Kuhl A, Polunin NVC (2021) Offshore pelagic
 subsidies dominate carbon inputs to coral reef predators. Sci Adv 7:eabf3792.
- 773 Team RC (2020) R: A language and environment for statistical computing.
- Ting Z, Shaolin P (2008) Spatial scale types and measurement of edge effects in ecology. Acta Ecol
 Sin 28:3322–3333.
- Tsai C, Sweatman HPA, Thibaut LM, Connolly SR (2022) Volatility in coral cover erodes niche
 structure , but not diversity , in reef fish assemblages. Sci Adv 8:abm6858.
- 778 Warton DI, Thibaut L, Wang YA (2017) The PIT-trap A "model-free" bootstrap procedure for
- inference about regression models with discrete, multivariate responses. PLoS One 12:1–18.
- Watling L, Auster PJ (2017) Seamounts on the high seas should be managed as vulnerable marine
 ecosystems. Front Mar Sci 4:1–4.
- 782 Wessel P, Sandwell DT, Kim S-S (2010) The Global Seamount Census. Oceanography 23:24–33.
- Westfall PH, Young SS, Wright SP (1993) On Adjusting P-Values for Multiplicity. Biometrics
 49:941–945.
- 785 Wickham H, Averick M, Bryan J, Chang W, McGowan L, François R, Grolemund G, Hayes A,
- Henry L, Hester J, Kuhn M, Pedersen T, Miller E, Bache S, Müller K, Ooms J, Robinson D,
- 787 Seidel D, Spinu V, Takahashi K, Vaughan D, Wilke C, Woo K, Yutani H (2019) Welcome to
 788 the Tidyverse. J Open Source Softw 4:1686.
- 789 Williams JJ, Papastamatiou YP, Caselle JE, Bradley D, Jacoby DMP (2018) Mobile marine
- predators: An understudied source of nutrients to coral reefs in an unfished atoll. Proc R Soc B
 Biol Sci 285:20172456.
- 792 Young MJ, Feyrer F, Stumpner PR, Larwood V, Patton O, Brown LR (2021) Hydrodynamics drive
- 793 pelagic communities and food web structure in a tidal environment. Int Rev Hydrobiol
- 794 106:69–85.

- 795 Zuur AF, Ieno EN, Walker NJ, Saveliev AA, Smith GM (2008) Mixed Effects Models and
- 796Extensions in Ecology with R.

798 Tables

Table 1. Average predator fish abundance (numbers per $150m^{-2} \pm SE$) of the 20 most abundant species in this study. Taxa are sorted based on LRT scores and P values from the

800 multivariate GLM. * denotes taxa significantly contributing to differences in assemblage composition. † denotes taxa encountered across all reef types. †† denotes taxa designated as

801 planktivores, however literatures suggests this is likely combined with piscivory for these species (Allen, 1985)

			Trophic	Mean fish abundance by reef type (n transect ⁻¹)				⁻¹)	Total						
Taxa	Common name	Family	group	F	Pinna	acle	0	ffsho	ore	Ne	earsh	ore	n	LRT	P-val
Macolor macularis †*	Midnight snapper	Lutjanidae	Planktivore††	4.83	±	1.69	1.23	±	0.32	0.05	±	0.03	244	58.08	0.002
Caranx melampygus*	Blue-fin trevally	Carangidae	Piscivore	0.98	±	0.28	0	±	0	0	±	0	39	35.33	0.002
Sphyraena qenie*	Chevron barracuda	Sphyraenidae	Piscivore	31.88	±	23.05	0	±	0	0	±	0	1275	31.07	0.006
Caranx sexfasciatus*	Big-eye trevally	Carangidae	Piscivore	7.55	±	3.5	0	±	0	0	±	0	302	32.01	0.006
Lutjanus gibbus †*	Paddletail snapper	Lutjanidae	Invertivore	1.63	±	0.6	0.28	±	0.13	0.15	±	0.07	82	23.61	0.045
Cephalopholis cyanostigma*	Bluespotted hind	Serranidae	Piscivore	0.48	±	0.17	0.33	±	0.08	0	±	0	32	22.14	0.045
Macolor niger	Black-and-white snapper	Lutjanidae	Planktivore††	1.58	±	1.17	0.05	±	0.05	0	±	0	65	18.26	0.162
Plectropomus oligacanthus \dagger	Highfin coral trout	Serranidae	Piscivore	1.03	±	0.29	0.25	±	0.08	0.1	±	0.06	55	16.46	0.172
Lutjanus bohar	Red bass	Lutjanidae	Piscivore	0.38	±	0.14	0	±	0	0.03	±	0.03	16	17.6	0.172
Cephalopholis miniata	Coral grouper	Serranidae	Piscivore	0.25	±	0.11	0	±	0	0	±	0	10	13.98	0.218
Lutjanus biguttatus †	Two-spot snapper	Lutjanidae	Invertivore	2.95	±	1.3	0.38	±	0.13	0.15	±	0.07	139	12.72	0.245
Cephalopholis urodeta	Darkfin hind	Serranidae	Invertivore	0.45	±	0.43	0	±	0	0	±	0	18	11.17	0.253
Lutjanus monostigma	Onespot snapper	Lutjanidae	Piscivore	0	±	0	0.25	±	0.11	0.08	±	0.04	13	10.14	0.431
Platax teira	Teira spadefish	Ephippidae	Piscivore	0.78	±	0.7	0.05	±	0.03	0	±	0	33	8.28	0.621
Carangoides bajad †	Orange-spotted trevally	Carangidae	Piscivore	0.3	±	0.12	0.03	±	0.03	0.05	±	0.03	15	7.32	0.621
Variola albimarginata	Coronation trout	Serranidae	Piscivore	0.2	±	0.1	0.03	±	0.03	0	±	0	9	8.82	0.621
Pinjalo lewisi	Slender pinjalo	Lutjanidae	Planktivore††	1.3	±	1.16	0	±	0	0	±	0	52	4.49	0.841
Monotaxis heterodon	Redfin emperor	Lethrinidae	Piscivore	0.43	±	0.3	0.03	±	0.03	0	±	0	18	4.46	1
Cephalopholis microprion \dagger	Freckled hind	Serranidae	Piscivore	0.25	±	0.16	0.03	±	0.03	0.08	±	0.04	14	4.22	1
Pinjalo pinjalo	Pinjalo snapper	Lutjanidae	Invertivore	0.33	±	0.33	0	±	0	0	±	0	13	2.22	1

804 Table 2. Pairwise contrasts in assemblage composition across all reef types.

Doimuiso contract	ΙΡΤ	Adjusted				
r an wise contrast	LKI	P-val				
Pinnacle vs Nearshore	338.6074	0.001				
Pinnacle vs Offshore	268.4959	0.001				
Offshore vs Nearshore	87.0182	0.001				

805





808 809

Fig. 1. Study area locations and visual representation of the seascape. (a) Kimbe Bay, situated in
the Bismarck Sea on the north coast of the province of West New Britain, Papua New Guinea, (b)
Focal sites include four nearshore emergent reefs, four offshore emergent reef and four submerged
pinnacles situated throughout Kimbe Bay, (c) Visual representation of the sea floor showing the
three reef types and depth zone (20-30m) surveyed.







Fig. 2. Estimated marginal means (\pm CI 95%) for (**a**) Abundance (numbers. 150m⁻²), (**b**) Biomass

- 819 (kg. 150m⁻²) and (c) diversity (Shannon-Wiener H. 150m⁻²) and pairwise contrasts (\pm CI 95%) ((d),
- 820 (e), (f)). Contrasts with 95% CI. CIs that cross the zero level are considered non-significant. P=
- 821 Pinnacle reef, N= nearshore reef, O= offshore reef. Post-hoc pairwise contrasts: P-O = Pinnacle-
- 822 Offshore, P-N= Pinnacle-Nearshore, O-N=Offshore-Nearshore.



Fig. 3. Differences in assemblage composition across reef types. (a) NMDS with 95% CI ellipses
presented. Species loadings plotted for the six significant taxa identified in the multivariate GLM: *Macolor macularis* (M.m), *Caranx melampygus* (C.m), *Sphyraena qenie* (S.q), *Caranx sexfasciatus*(C.s), *Lutjanus gibbus* (L.g), *Cephalopholis cyanostigma* (C.c). Stress = 0.15. (b) Alpha and beta
diversity (shared and unique taxa) across reef types. Numbers in parentheses are total numbers of
species observed at each reef type.





Fig. 4. Abundance (numbers. $150m^{-2} (\pm CI 95\%)$) of the six major taxa driving significant

835 differences in predator assemblage composition between reef types.

- _ _ _

852 Electronic supplementary information

853

- **854** Table S1. Estimated marginal means of abundance $(n.150m^{-2})$ of predatory fishes across reef types and pairwise contrast
- effect sizes and ratios.

Reef	Abundance				Effect	size	Effect ratio		
type	(N 150m ⁻²)	95% CI	DF	Pairwise contrast	(N 150m ⁻²)	95% CI	(x:1)	95% CI	
Pinnacle	16.6	7.9-25.3	115	Pinnacle - Offshore	11.2	0.2-22.2	3.07	1.23-7.68	
Offshore	5.4	2.4-8.4	115	Pinnacle - Nearshore	11.6	0.5-22.7	3.32	1.26-8.77	
Nearshore	5	1.9-8.1	115	Offshore - Nearshore	0.4	-4.8-5.6	1.08	0.4-2.93	

- 856
- 857

858 Table S2. Estimated marginal means of predatory fish biomass (kg.150m⁻²) across reef types and pairwise contrast effect

sizes and ratios.

Reef	Biomass				Effect	size	Effect ratio		
type	(kg 150m ⁻²)	95% CI	DF	Pairwise contrast	(kg 150m ⁻²)	95% CI	(x:1)	95% CI	
Pinnacle	27	17.2-36.8	114	Pinnacle - Offshore	12.7	-1.2-26.6	1.88	0.95-3.72	
Offshore	14.3	8-20.6	114	Pinnacle - Nearshore	19.9	7.3-32.5	3.8	1.73-8.37	
Nearshore	7.1	3.2-11	114	Offshore - Nearshore	7.2	-1.6-16.1	2.02	0.87-4.69	

860

861

862 Table S3. Estimated marginal means of predatory fish diversity (H. 150m⁻²) across reef types and pairwise contrast effect

sizes and ratios.

Reef	Shannon	diversity			Effec	t size	Effect ratio		
type	(H 150m ⁻²)	95% CI	DF	Pairwise contrast	(H 150m ⁻²)	95% CI	(x:1)	95% CI	
Pinnacle	1.24	0.92-1.56	114	Pinnacle - Offshore	0.74	0.29-1.19	2.48	1.42-4.34	
Offshore	0.5	0.31-0.69	114	Pinnacle - Nearshore	0.97	0.55-1.39	4.54	2.3-8.98	
Nearshore	0.27	0.13-0.41	114	Pairwise contrast(H 1)Pinnacle - Offshore(C)Pinnacle - Nearshore(C)Offshore - Nearshore(C)	0.23	-0.57	1.83	0.85-3.93	

864

866 Table S4. Average predator fish abundance (N $150m^{-2} \pm SE$) of all species observed in this study.

		Mean fish abundance by reef type (N $150m^{-2} \pm SE$)									Study total		
Family	Taxa		Pinnacle		С	ffsh	ore	N	earsh	ore	N		
Carangidae	Carangoides bajad	0.3	±	0.12	0.03	±	0.02	0.05	±	0.03	15		
Carangidae	Caranx ignobilis	0.07	±	0.04	0	±	0	0	±	0	3		
Carangidae	Caranx melampygus	0.98	±	0.28	0	±	0	0	±	0	39		
Carangidae	Caranx sexfasciatus	7.55	±	3.5	0	±	0	0	±	0	302		
Carangidae	Elagatis bipinnulata	0.07	±	0.06	0.05	±	0.03	0	±	0	5		
Carcharhinida	e Carcharhinus amblyrhynchos	0.12	±	0.08	0	±	0	0	±	0	5		
Carcharhinida	e Carcharhinus melanopterus	0.03	±	0.02	0	±	0	0	±	0	1		
Cirrhitidae	Paracirrhites forsteri	0.12	±	0.06	0	±	0	0	±	0	5		
Ephippidae	Platax teira	0.78	±	0.7	0.05	±	0.03	0	±	0	33		
Haemulidae	Plectorhinchus chaetodonoides	0	±	0	0	±	0	0.03	±	0.02	1		
Haemulidae	Plectorhinchus picus	0.03	±	0.02	0	±	0	0	±	0	1		
Holocentridae	Myripristis botche	0.03	±	0.02	0	±	0	0	±	0	1		
Holocentridae	Sargocentron spiniferum	0.1	±	0.08	0	±	0	0	±	0	4		
Labridae	Cheilinus undulatus	0.1	±	0.05	0	±	0	0	±	0	4		
Labridae	Epibulus insidiator	0	±	0	0.03	±	0.02	0	±	0	1		
Labridae	Oxycheilinus digramma	0	±	0	0.07	±	0.06	0.05	±	0.03	5		
Lethrinidae	Gymnocranius grandoculis	0	±	0	0.05	±	0.03	0	±	0	2		
Lethrinidae	Lethrinus erythracanthus	0.07	±	0.06	0	±	0	0	±	0	3		
Lethrinidae	Lethrinus ornatus	0.03	±	0.02	0	±	0	0	±	0	1		
Lethrinidae	Monotaxis grandoculis	0.1	±	0.06	0	±	0	0.05	±	0.03	6		
Lethrinidae	Monotaxis heterodon	0.42	±	0.3	0.03	±	0.02	0	±	0	18		
Lutjanidae	Lutjanus biguttatus	2.95	±	1.3	0.38	±	0.13	0.15	±	0.07	139		
Lutjanidae	Lutjanus bohar	0.38	±	0.14	0	±	0	0.03	±	0.02	16		
Lutjanidae	Lutjanus boutton	0	±	0	0.03	±	0.02	0.03	±	0.02	2		
Lutjanidae	Lutjanus carponotatus	0.05	±	0.05	0	±	0	0.03	±	0.02	3		
Lutjanidae	Lutjanus ehrenbergii	0.07	±	0.04	0	±	0	0.03	±	0.02	4		
Lutjanidae	Lutjanus fulvus	0.03	±	0.02	0	±	0	0	±	0	1		
Lutjanidae	Lutjanus gibbus	1.62	±	0.6	0.28	±	0.13	0.15	±	0.07	82		
Lutjanidae	Lutjanus kasmira	0.17	±	0.09	0	±	0	0	±	0	7		
Lutjanidae	Lutjanus monostigma	0	±	0	0.25	±	0.11	0.07	±	0.04	13		
Lutjanidae	Lutjanus papuensis	0.03	±	0.02	0	±	0	0	±	0	1		
Lutjanidae	Lutjanus rivulatus	0.03	±	0.02	0	±	0	0	±	0	1		
Lutjanidae	Lutjanus russellii	0	±	0	0.03	±	0.02	0.03	±	0.02	2		
Lutjanidae	Lutjanus semicinctus	0	±	0	0	±	0	0.12	±	0.06	5		
Lutjanidae	Macolor macularis	4.82	±	1.69	1.23	±	0.32	0.05	±	0.03	244		
Lutjanidae	Macolor niger	1.57	±	1.17	0.05	±	0.05	0	±	0	65		
Lutjanidae	Pinjalo lewisi	1.3	±	1.16	0	±	0	0	±	0	52		
Lutjanidae	Pinjalo pinjalo	0.32	±	0.32	0	±	0	0	±	0	13		
Priacanthidae	Priacanthus hamrur	0.03	±	0.02	0	±	0	0	±	0	1		

Scombridae	Grammatorcynus bilineatus	0.05	±	0.05	0	±	0	0	±	0	2
Scombridae	Gymnosarda unicolor	0.07	±	0.04	0.05	±	0.03	0	±	0	5
Serranidae	Anyperodon leucogrammicus	0	±	0	0	±	0	0.03	±	0.02	1
Serranidae	Cephalopholis argus	0.15	±	0.07	0	±	0	0.03	±	0.02	7
Serranidae	Cephalopholis cyanostigma	0.48	\pm	0.17	0.32	±	0.07	0	±	0	32
Serranidae	Cephalopholis leopardus	0.05	\pm	0.05	0	±	0	0.05	±	0.05	4
Serranidae	Cephalopholis microprion	0.25	\pm	0.16	0.03	±	0.02	0.07	±	0.04	14
Serranidae	Cephalopholis miniata	0.25	\pm	0.11	0	±	0	0	±	0	10
Serranidae	Cephalopholis sexmaculata	0.03	\pm	0.02	0	±	0	0	±	0	1
Serranidae	Cephalopholis sonnerati	0.03	\pm	0.02	0	±	0	0	±	0	1
Serranidae	Cephalopholis urodeta	0.45	\pm	0.43	0	±	0	0	±	0	18
Serranidae	Diploprion bifasciatum	0	\pm	0	0	±	0	0.05	±	0.03	2
Serranidae	Epinephelus areolatus	0.03	\pm	0.02	0	±	0	0	±	0	1
Serranidae	Epinephelus coeruleopunctatus	0.03	\pm	0.02	0	±	0	0.03	±	0.02	2
Serranidae	Epinephelus fasciatus	0.05	\pm	0.05	0	±	0	0	±	0	2
Serranidae	Epinephelus polyphekadion	0.03	\pm	0.02	0	±	0	0	±	0	1
Serranidae	Epinephelus tauvina	0.03	\pm	0.02	0	±	0	0	±	0	1
Serranidae	Gracila albomarginata	0.05	\pm	0.03	0	±	0	0	±	0	2
Serranidae	Plectropomus laevis	0.03	\pm	0.02	0	±	0	0	±	0	1
Serranidae	Plectropomus leopardus	0.12	\pm	0.05	0	±	0	0	±	0	5
Serranidae	Plectropomus maculatus	0.05	\pm	0.03	0	±	0	0.03	±	0.02	3
Serranidae	Plectropomus oligacanthus	1.02	±	0.29	0.25	±	0.08	0.1	±	0.06	55
Serranidae	Variola albimarginata	0.2	±	0.1	0.03	±	0.02	0	±	0	9
Sphyraenidae	Sphyraena qenie	31.88	±	23.05	0	±	0	0	±	0	1275









873

Fig. S2. Mean abundance, biomass and diversity values (150m⁻²) for individual study sites. Point shape and colour

875 signifies reef types, error bars \pm SE.