

Spawning aggregation of blacktail snapper (*Lutjanus fulvus*) in an Okinawan coral reef: lunar-phase periodicity of aggregation formation, seasonal consistency in fish spatial distribution, and fish size and age frequency in the aggregation site

メタデータ	言語: English 出版者: 公開日: 2025-02-06 キーワード (Ja): キーワード (En): Spawning aggregation; Snapper; <i>Lutjanus fulvus</i> ; Marine protected area; Okinawan coral reef 作成者: 名波, 敦 メールアドレス: 所属:
URL	https://fra.repo.nii.ac.jp/records/2013222

1 **Spawning aggregation of blacktail snapper (*Lutjanus fulvus*) in an Okinawan coral**
2 **reef: lunar-phase periodicity of aggregation formation, seasonal consistency in fish**
3 **spatial distribution, and fish size and age frequency in the aggregation site**

4

5 Atsushi Nanami

6

7 Yaeyama Field Station, Coastal and Inland Fisheries Ecosystem Division, Environment
8 and Fisheries Applied Techniques Research Department, Fisheries Technology Institute,
9 Japan Fisheries Research and Education Agency, Fukai-Ota 148, Ishigaki, Okinawa
10 907-0451, Japan

11

12 Correspondence Author

13 Atsushi Nanami

14

15 Email address: nanami_atsushi71@fra.go.jp

16

17 ORCID: 0000-0001-6601-1990

18

19

20

21

22

23 **Abstract** Snappers (family Lutjanidae) are main fishery target species and some fish
24 species in this family form spawning aggregations on coral reefs. This study aimed to
25 clarify the ecological characteristics of fish aggregation of *Lutjanus fulvus*: 1)
26 lunar-phase periodicity of aggregation formation, 2) seasonal consistency of the
27 aggregation site, 3) differences in fish density between inside and outside the
28 aggregation site, 4) gonad development of fish individuals inside the aggregation site, 5)
29 frequency distribution of size and age of fish individuals at the aggregation site, and 6)
30 to determine if the aggregation is a spawning aggregation. Time-lapse still photography
31 and data plotted with a correlogram revealed that fish aggregations were observed only
32 around the 20th day of the moon. Underwater observations revealed greater fish density
33 (42 - 2042 individuals per 600 m × 5 m) between April and September. Plotting
34 fine-scale fish spatial distributions revealed consistent spatial patterns from May to
35 September. The fish density inside the aggregation site was about 7960.5-fold greater
36 than that outside the aggregation site. Most females inside the aggregation site had
37 hydrated eggs. The average fork length and age of fish individuals inside the
38 aggregation site were 241.8 mm and 12.2 years for males and 247.8 mm and 13.4 years
39 for females, respectively. This study revealed that the aggregation of *L. fulvus* on an
40 Okinawan coral reef could be regarded as spawning aggregation. The results can
41 provide insights into the precise setting position of marine protected area to effectively
42 protect the spawning ground of *L. fulvus*.

43

44 **Keywords** Spawning aggregation • Snapper • *Lutjanus fulvus* • Marine protected area •

45 Okinawan coral reef

46

47 **Statements and Declarations**

48 **Competing interests** The author declares that there are no competing financial interests
49 or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this
50 paper.

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67 **Introduction**

68 Fish exhibit diverse reproductive behaviors in coral reefs (Thresher 1984) and some
69 species form aggregations with greater densities during specific seasons and lunar
70 phases at particular sites (Nemeth 2009). These are known as spawning aggregations
71 (Sadovy de Mitcheson and Colin 2012). Spawning aggregations are defined as the
72 gathering of conspecific individuals at specific sites during a specific period (Domeier
73 2012). Spawning aggregations have two types: resident and transient spawning
74 aggregations (Domeier and Colin 1997; Claydon 2004). Resident spawning
75 aggregations predominantly consist of smaller-sized species (e.g., parrotfishes,
76 surgeonfishes and wrasses) that form daily aggregations with shorter migration
77 distances (within a few kilometers) and shorter durations of the spawning event (several
78 hours). By contrast, transient spawning aggregations consist of larger-sized species and
79 some fishery target species (e.g., emperorfishes, groupers and snappers) that form
80 monthly or annual aggregations with longer migration distances (several to
81 several-hundreds of kilometers) and longer durations of the spawning event (several
82 days to several weeks) (Nemeth 2009; Sadovy de Mitcheson and Colin 2012).

83 These fish species that form transient spawning aggregations are top predators,
84 and control the population size of marine organisms at lower trophic levels (Graham et
85 al. 2003). Considering that the patterns of transient spawning aggregation formation are
86 spatially and temporally predictable, such spawning aggregations have a great
87 possibility of over exploitation (Samoilys 1997; Rhodes and Tupper 2008; Sadovy de
88 Mitcheson et al. 2008; Sadovy de Mitcheson and Erisman 2012). Thus, the spawning

89 aggregations of these fishery target species should be protected (Beets and Friedlander
90 1999; Linderman et al. 2000; Sala et al. 2001; Nemeth 2005; Sadovy and Domeier
91 2005; Russell et al. 2012).

92 Snappers (family Lutjanidae) are primary fishery target species and are top
93 predators on coral reefs (Allen 1985; Polovina and Ralston 1987; Nanami and Shimose
94 2013; Taylor et al. 2018). Some snapper species form transient spawning aggregations
95 (Sadovy de Mitcheson and Colin 2012; Nanami 2023). In previous studies, ecological
96 aspects of the spawning aggregations of snappers, such as temporal periodicity of
97 spawning aggregation formation (Kadison et al. 2006; Biggs and Nemeth 2014, 2016;
98 Cimino et al. 2018; Nanami, 2023), location of aggregation site (Claro and Lindeman
99 2003; Heyman and Kjerfve 2008; Malafaia et al. 2021), spawning migration movements
100 (Farmer and Ault 2011; Feeley et al. 2018), and spawning behavior (Carter and Perrine
101 1994; Heyman et al. 2005; Sadovy de Mitcheson et al.; 2012, Sakaue et al. 2016), have
102 been examined.

103 The blacktail snapper *Lutjanus fulvus* is a fishery target species on coral reefs
104 (Akita et al. 2016) and a spawning aggregation of this species has been reported from
105 Palau (Sadovy de Mitcheson et al. 2012). In the Okinawan region, the main spawning
106 season of *L. fulvus* occurs between April and October in the Yaeyama Islands (Shimose
107 and Nanami 2014). However, the spawning sites of *L. fulvus* have not yet been found
108 there. Recently, a *L. fulvus* aggregation was found on an Okinawan coral reef (Fig. 1,
109 Video S1) suggesting that this aggregation may be a transient spawning aggregation. If
110 so, this fish aggregation should be appropriately protected because this species is a

111 target species in commercial fisheries in Okinawa (Shimose and Nanami 2014). Thus,
112 the precise ecological characteristics of the aggregation of this species should be
113 identified so that effective, science-based management can occur.

114 This study aimed to examine the ecological characteristics of this *L. fulvus*
115 aggregation. In particular, this study aimed to clarify: 1) lunar-phase periodicity of fish
116 aggregation formation, 2) spatial consistency of the location of fish aggregation at the
117 aggregation site, 3) difference in fish density between inside and outside the aggregation
118 site, 4) gonad development of fish individuals inside the aggregation site, 5) size and
119 age frequency distribution of fish at the aggregation site, as well as 6) to determine
120 whether the aggregation of this species was spawning aggregation. This study is the first
121 to examine the aggregation of this species on an Okinawan coral reef, thus providing a
122 more comprehensive understanding of the spawning aggregation behavior of snappers.

123

124 **Materials and Methods**

125 Study site

126 This study was conducted at the Sekisei Lagoon in the Yaeyama Islands, Okinawa,
127 Japan (Figs. 1a, 1b). An aggregation of *L. fulvus* was recently found in the study area
128 (Fig. 1c). At present, the study site is not protected during the spawning periods of the
129 species (Shimose and Nanami, 2014). Thus, the precise location is not shown because
130 showing the precise location might cause over-exploitation of this aggregation.

131

132 Time-lapse still photography

133 To examine lunar-related periodicity in aggregation formation, stationary cameras
134 (Pentax WG-1 and WG-10) in waterproof cases, set to record images during 1-h
135 intervals, were deployed on the sea floor within the aggregation site.

136 In a preliminary survey, one camera was deployed within the aggregation site
137 between August and September 2021 (August 9 - 16, August 24 - 30 and September 20
138 - 25) to roughly obtain the location of the fish aggregation and the lunar-phase
139 periodicity of aggregation formation (Table S1). After the preliminary survey, one
140 camera was deployed for 93 days (first survey, between June 23 and September 23,
141 2023; Table S2) and again for 73 days (second survey, between April 25 and July 6;
142 Tables S3). The duration of the camera's battery was about 3 weeks. Thus, one camera
143 was initially set to run for about 3 weeks and then replaced with another camera as the
144 first camera's battery expired. This procedure was continued during the study period.
145 After collecting the camera, the presence or absence of fish aggregation on still images
146 was recorded in the laboratory. In this procedure, fish images were categorized into four
147 types: (1) no individuals, (2) single individual, (3) multiple individuals (2 - 5
148 individuals) and (4) aggregation (≥ 6 individuals). A total of 24 still images were taken
149 per day. These images recorded the presence of variable numbers of fish because of fish
150 movement around the camera each day. Thus, the still image that showed the largest
151 number of fish was used to indicate total abundance for a focal day.

152 A correlogram was applied to examine the statistical significance in the
153 periodicity of fish aggregation formation. The first (93 days between June 23 and
154 September 23, 2023) and the second (73 days between April 25 and July 6, 2024)

155 surveys were analyzed separately. In the analysis, the aforementioned three types of fish
156 images (no individuals, single individual, and multiple individuals) and another type of
157 fish image (aggregation) were assigned 0 and 1, respectively. Then, a correlogram was
158 produced using the R statistical computing package (function “acf”: R core team, 2023).
159 The statistical significance of the auto-correlation coefficient was examined by using a
160 95% confidence interval (CI), which is calculated as follows:

$$161 \quad 95\% \text{ CI} = 1.96 / \sqrt{T}$$

162 where T is the number of observations.

163 Significance of the auto-correlation coefficient was determined by the equation:

$$164 \quad |p_k| > 95\% \text{ CI} = 1.96 / \sqrt{T}$$

165 where p_k is the value of the auto-correlation coefficient at the k th time lag, and $|p_k|$ is the
166 absolute value of p_k . If $|p_k|$ is greater than the 95% CI, then the auto-correlation at the
167 k th time lag was significant. The T value was 93 and 73 for the first and second surveys,
168 respectively. Thus, the 95% CI was calculated as $1.96 / \sqrt{93} = 0.203$ and $1.96 / \sqrt{73}$
169 $= 0.23$ for the first and second surveys, respectively.

170

171 Monthly variations in the fish density at the aggregation site

172 Daytime underwater observations using SCUBA were conducted to clarify the monthly
173 variation in the fish density at the aggregation site. As the main spawning season of the
174 species was between April and October (Shimose and Nanami, 2014), a line transect
175 (600 m × 5 m) was set to cover the main aggregation site between March 2022 (one
176 month before the expected spawning period) and November 2022 (one month after the

177 expected spawning period). Time-lapse camera photography revealed that the peak fish
178 density was found around the 20th day of the moon (see Results). Thus, the observation
179 days were adjusted to be carried out around the 20th day of the moon (Table S4).

180 The number of individuals on the 600 m × 5 m line transect was counted
181 every 1 minute. During the observations, a portable GPS receiver (GARMIN GPSMAP
182 64csx) in a waterproof case was attached to a buoy, and the buoy was towed. In addition,
183 a water-proof watch was carried to record the observation time. The time displayed on
184 the watch was synchronized with the time on the GPS receiver. Thus, the course and
185 distance of the tracks were obtained. The fish count data was one per minute at the end
186 of the minute. The water depth range at which the underwater observations were
187 conducted was approximately 10 - 15 m.

188

189 Spatial consistency of the location of fish aggregation

190 To examine the spatial consistency of location of fish aggregation, the 600 m × 5 m line
191 transect was divided into 1-min sub-transects (average distance ± standard deviation =
192 21.5 ± 3.5 m). After obtaining the number of fish individuals and the distance for the
193 1-min sub-transect, the number of individuals was converted to density (20 m × 5 m) for
194 each 1-min sub-transect. The fish density on the 1-min sub-transect was individually
195 plotted by a bubble plot along the entire line transect.

196 Monthly fish aggregations were observed between April and September (see
197 Results). For each month, the fine-scale spatial variation in fish density was shown as
198 frequency data (histogram). The probability densities of the histograms were analyzed

199 with the R statistical computing package (function “density”: R core team, 2023). In
200 addition, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was applied to test the significant difference in
201 fine-scale spatial variation in fish density among the six months. For multiple
202 comparisons among 15 pairs, the Bonferroni correction was applied ($p = 0.05/15 =$
203 0.0033).

204

205 Histological observation of ovarian development

206 The presence of females bearing mature, hydrated eggs while at the aggregation site
207 provides evidence of spawning aggregation formation at that site (Domeier 2012;
208 Sadovy de Mitcheson and Colin 2012). To examine the occurrence of female fish with
209 matured eggs, individual fish were speared at the conclusion of daily observations. The
210 fork length (FL), whole body weight and gonad weight were measured in the laboratory.

211 The gonadosomatic index (GSI) was calculated as follows:

$$212 \quad \text{GSI} = \text{gonad weight (g)} / [\text{whole body weight (g)} - \text{gonad weight (g)}] \times 100$$

213 For each individual, a small piece of gonad (about 1 cm length \times 1 cm width \times 1 cm
214 height) was preserved in 20% buffered formalin over 48 h and then kept in 70% ethanol
215 baths (50 ml per one sample). Embedded pieces of gonads were sectioned and stained
216 with Mayer’s hematoxylin–eosin prior to histological observations. The developmental
217 stages of the ovaries were observed under a microscope and categorized following Ohta
218 and Ebisawa (2015) and Ohta et al. (2017). Oocytes showing the migration nuclear
219 stage, pre-maturation stage, and maturation stage were defined as hydrated in
220 accordance with the categorizations.

221

222 Fish density comparison between outside and inside the aggregation site

223 Spawning aggregation is defined as the fish aggregation with at least fourfold greater

224 density at the aggregation site than that outside the aggregation site (Domeier 2012). To

225 verify that the aggregation under study fitted this definition, the number of fish

226 individuals was counted at 69 study sites outside the aggregation site between June and

227 December 2016 (Fig. S1). A 20-min underwater survey with a portable GPS receiver

228 was conducted at each site (for details of the method, see Nanami 2020). By using the

229 20-min fish count data and measured distance, fish density per $600\text{ m} \times 5\text{ m}$ was

230 estimated. The estimated fish densities among the 69 sites were averaged and regarded

231 as the average fish density outside the aggregation site. Then, the fish density outside

232 the aggregation site was compared with that inside aggregation site between April and

233 September, during which fish aggregations were observed.

234

235 Fish length and age frequency distributions

236 Histograms of the FL frequency were plotted for each sampling month. To clarify the

237 age frequency distribution of fish at the aggregation site, the ages of the fish sampled

238 were examined by analysis of sagittal otoliths (for details of the method, see Nanami

239 2023). In short, one otolith was embedded in epoxy resin and transversely sectioned

240 into 0.5-mm-thick sections. The sectioned otoliths on a glass slide were observed under

241 a microscope with $4\times$ magnification, and the number of opaque rings on each otolith

242 was counted. The number of opaque rings can be considered as age (year) as Shimose

243 and Nanami (2014) revealed that each opaque ring was formed annually.

244 The probability densities of the FL and age frequencies of males and females
245 were analyzed with the R statistical package (function “density”: R core team, 2023).
246 Significant differences in the FL and age between males and females were examined by
247 using the Mann-Whitney U-test.

248

249 **Results**

250 Time-lapse still photography

251 The first survey (93-day observation) revealed that fish aggregations were found
252 consecutively over a period of 4 or 5 days between the 17th and 23rd days of the moon
253 (Fig 2a). The correlogram revealed significantly positive auto-correlation coefficients
254 when time lags were 28 - 33 days and 60 - 62 days (Fig. 3a). The second survey
255 (73-days observation) revealed that fish aggregations were found consecutively 6 days
256 between the 16th and 22nd days of the moon (Fig 2b). The correlogram revealed
257 significantly positive auto-correlation coefficients when time lags were 27 - 32 days and
258 58 - 59 days (Fig. 3b). Overall, the fish aggregations were found during several
259 consecutive days between the 16th and 23rd days of the moon, and the fish aggregation
260 formations were observed about every 30 days.

261

262 Seasonal variations in the number of individuals and reproductive activity

263 On the 600 m × 5 m transect, one individual was found in March, and 42 individuals
264 was found in April. Over 1500 individuals were found between May and September

265 when the water temperature exceeded 26°C (Fig. 4a). The number of individuals ranged
266 from 1576 (July) to 2042 (August). One individual was found in October and November,
267 although the water temperature exceeded 26°C in the two months.

268 The GSI values of females that were caught at the aggregation site ranged
269 from 1.21 to 15.34 (average \pm standard deviation = 5.31 ± 2.42 ; Fig. 4b). About 68.3%
270 of individuals (28 out of 41) had hydrated stage oocytes (Fig. 4c, Table S5).

271

272 Fine-scale spatial variations in fish density at the aggregation site

273 Fine-scale spatial distributions revealed relatively consistent spatial patterns during the
274 six months (April - September) (Fig. 5a). Although most cases showed that fish
275 densities within the 20 m \times 5 m area were generally less than 20 individuals, over 100
276 individuals (i.e., over one individual per 1 m \times 1 m area) were found within some 20 m
277 \times 5 m areas from May to September (Fig. 5b). The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test with
278 Bonferroni correction revealed no significant differences in the frequency distribution
279 of fish density among the five months (May-September, $p > 0.05$ for all comparisons).
280 By contrast, the frequency distribution of fish density in April was significantly smaller
281 than the other five months ($p < 0.0033$ for all comparisons).

282

283 Fish density outside and inside the aggregation site

284 The fish density per 600 m \times 5 m area outside the aggregation sites ranged from 0 to
285 3.81 individuals. The fish density inside the aggregation site was 221.1 to 10747.4-fold
286 (average = 7960.5-fold) greater than that outside the aggregation site (Table 1).

287

288 Fork length and age of fish individuals inside aggregation site

289 The FL of most individuals ranged from 220.0 to 269.5 mm for both males and females
290 (Figs. 6a, 6b). Although the average size of males (average FL \pm standard deviation =
291 241.8 ± 13.1 mm) was slightly smaller than that of females (247.8 ± 13.7 mm), no
292 significant difference in FL composition was found between males and females
293 (Mann-Whitney U-test, $p > 0.05$).

294 Although the average age of males (average age \pm standard deviation = $12.2 \pm$
295 4.7 years) was slightly younger than females (13.4 ± 5.0 years) (Figs. 6c, 6d), no
296 significant difference in age composition was found between males and females
297 (Mann-Whitney U-test, $p > 0.05$).

298

299 **Discussion**

300 Verification of the spawning aggregation of *Lutjanus fulvus*

301 Although a spawning aggregation of *L. fulvus* has already been reported from Palau
302 (Sadovy de Mitcheson et al. 2012; Cimino et al. 2018), a spawning aggregation of this
303 species has not been reported from Okinawan coral reefs, Japan. Thus, this study was
304 the first attempt to examine whether fish aggregations of the species in an Okinawan
305 coral reef can be regarded as spawning aggregation. This study demonstrated that: (1)
306 repeated aggregation formation is spatially and temporally predictable (particular site
307 and days of the moon), (2) the fish density inside the aggregation site was over fourfold
308 greater than that outside the aggregation site, and (3) most females inside the

309 aggregation site had hydrated eggs, indicating that the aggregation formation is for
310 reproduction. Thus, the aggregation of *L. fulvus* can be regarded as spawning
311 aggregation based on the definition of Domeier (2012).

312 In Palau, Cimino et al. (2018) reported that the aggregation of *L. fulvus* at
313 daytime may be pre-spawning aggregation, although the aggregation was formed for
314 reproduction. Considering that the actual spawning behavior has not been observed yet
315 in daytime observations, the aggregation site in this study site might also be the
316 pre-spawning aggregation site. Another possibility is that spawning occurred at
317 nighttime, since this study revealed the presence of hydrated eggs in females collected
318 from the aggregation site.

319 Nevertheless, the location and timing the aggregation formation were spatially
320 and temporally predictable, and a number of fish individuals gathered in the site. In
321 particular, over 100 fish individuals per 20×5 m area (one individuals per $1 \text{ m} \times 1 \text{ m}$
322 area) were observed at some places within the aggregation site. Thus, the aggregation
323 site should be effectively protected to avoid overexploitation of this species.

324

325 Spawning season and spawning day

326 Based upon data from commercial catches, Shimose and Nanami (2014) estimated that
327 the main spawning season of *L. fulvus* is between April and October with a peak
328 between June and September. By contrast, this study revealed that the main aggregation
329 of the species was observed between May and September, although a small-scale
330 aggregation (42 individuals) was found in April. Only one individual was found in

331 October, which was consistent with the observations made in non-spawning months
332 (March and November). Most females inside the aggregation site during April and
333 September showed developed or matured oocytes (migration nuclear stage,
334 pre-maturation stage and maturation stage). Therefore, it is suggested that the main
335 spawning season at the aggregation site was between April and September.

336 Fish aggregations were only found on several consecutive days around the
337 20th day of the moon. In addition, Shimose and Nanami (2014) have reported that the
338 “spawned phase” of the ovary, which had postovulatory follicles, was observed between
339 18th and 23rd days of the moon based upon their analysis of data from commercial
340 catch samples. Thus, spawning likely occurs around the 20th day of the moon. By
341 contrast, fish aggregations of the species were found during 1 day before and 4 days
342 after the full moon in Palau (Cimino et al. 2018), which was several days earlier than
343 that in Okinawa. This difference might be a geographical variation in reproductive
344 activity between the two regions.

345 Water temperature is a primary factor influencing gonad development of
346 marine fishes (Wang et al. 2010). This study revealed that the reproductive activity of *L.*
347 *fulvus* likely occurs when the water temperature exceeded 26°C. In addition, the decline
348 in temperature at the beginning of September might be a factor reducing ovarian
349 development. This trend is consistent with the cubera snapper (*Lutjanus cyanopterus*) in
350 the Caribbean (Heyman et al. 2005; Motta et al. 2022), as well as the checkered snapper
351 (*L. decussatus*) and the blackspot snapper (*L. fulviflamma*) in Okinawa (Nanami 2023),
352 demonstrating that increased water temperature is a factor controlling the spawning

353 aggregation formation of lutjanid species in coral reefs.

354

355 Size and age frequency of fish individuals at the aggregation site

356 The main FL range of commercial catch individuals was 210-280 mm and 220-290 mm
357 for males and females, respectively (Shimose and Nanami 2014), whereas that of
358 individuals at the aggregation site was 220.0-259.5 mm and 220.0-279.5 mm for males
359 and females, respectively. A similar trend was also found for age frequency. The
360 maximum age of commercial catch individuals was respectively 29 and 34 for males
361 and females, respectively (Shimose and Nanami 2014), whereas that of individuals at
362 the aggregation site was 23 and 24 for male and female, respectively. These results
363 indicate that most individuals forming the spawning aggregation were slightly smaller
364 and younger.

365

366 **Conclusions**

367 This study revealed that the aggregation of *L. fulvus* on an Okinawan coral reef could be
368 regarded as spawning aggregation. This finding can be explained by the fact that fish
369 aggregation formation with greater density repeatedly occurred, and such formation was
370 spatially and temporally predictable. In addition, the presence of hydrated eggs in
371 females within the aggregation site was confirmed. Although a spawning aggregation of
372 *L. fulvus* has already been reported in Palau, almost no ecological information about a
373 spawning aggregation of this species has been reported in an Okinawan coral reef. Thus,
374 this study is the first to document the existence of a spawning aggregation of *L. fulvus*

375 within the Okinawan region. As this species is a fishery target species in the study
376 region, the results of this study can be applied to determine the precise location for the
377 creation of a marine protected area for the effective protection of the spawning
378 aggregation site and the species that uses it.

379

380 **Author contribution** Atsushi Nanami conceptualized and designed the study and
381 conducted all formal analysis, data curation and writing.

382

383 **Data availability** The datasets generated during and/or analyzed during the current
384 study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

385

386 **Funding** This study was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 23K05360.

387

388 **Ethical approval** This study was conducted by field observations. Fish were sampled
389 by spearfishing and euthanized immediately to minimize suffering. The Okinawa
390 Prefectural Government fisheries coordination regulation No. 37 approved the sampling
391 procedure, which permits capture the marine fishes on Okinawan coral reefs for
392 scientific purposes.

393

394 **Field studies** All data was obtained only by field observations, which do not require a
395 field permit in Okinawa.

396

397 **Conflict of interest** The author declares no competing interests.

398

399 **Acknowledgements**

400 I express my grateful thanks to M Sunagawa and S Sunagawa for piloting the research
401 boat YAEYAMA, K Aramoto, M Yoshida, F Nakamura and K Ohishi for their
402 assistance in the field, K Nema for assistance in the laboratory, and the staff of
403 Yaeyama Field Station, Fisheries Technology Institute for support during the present
404 study. The International Coral Reef Research and Monitoring Center provided the aerial
405 photograph of the Yaeyama Islands used here. Water temperature data were provided by
406 the Japan Meteorological Agency. Both were very much appreciated. Constructive
407 comments from two anonymous reviewers were much appreciated. The present study
408 complies with current laws in Japan.

409

410 **References**

- 411 Akita Y, Ohta I, Ebisawa A, Uehara M (2016) Estimation of the fish catches of
412 coastal species of the Yaeyama Islands. *Fauna Ryukyuana* 3:113–127
- 413 Allen GR (1985) FAO species catalogue Vol 6: snappers of the world. An annotated
414 and illustrated catalogue of lutjanid species known to date. FAO Rome, p 208
- 415 Beets J, Friedlander A (1999) Evaluation of a conservation strategy: a spawning
416 aggregation closure for red hind, *Epinephelus guttatus*, in the U.S. Virgin
417 Islands. *Environ Biol Fish* 55:91-98
- 418 Biggs C, Nemeth RS (2014) Timing, size, and duration of a dog (*Lutjanus jocu*) and

419 cubera snapper (*Lutjanus cyanopterus*) spawning aggregation in the U.S.
420 Virgin Islands. Proc 67th Gulf Caribbean Fish Inst 67:240-245

421 Biggs CR, Nemeth RS (2016) Spatial and temporal movement patterns of two snapper
422 species at a multi-species spawning aggregation. Mar Ecol Prog Ser
423 558:129-142

424 Carter J, Perrine D (1994) A spawning aggregation of dog snapper, *Lutjanus jocu*
425 (Pisces: Lutjanidae) in Belize, central America. Bull Mar Sci 55:228-234

426 Cimino M, Colin P, Schramek T, Lindfield S, Domeier M, Terrill E (2018)
427 Oceanographic, acoustic, and remote approaches reveal the spatio-temporal
428 dynamics of blackfin snapper at an aggregation site in Palau. Mar Ecol Prog
429 Ser 601:185-201

430 Claro R, Lindeman KC (2003) Spawning aggregation sites of snappers and grouper
431 species (Lutjanidae and Serranidae) on the insular shelf of Cuba. Gulf
432 Caribbean Res14:91-106

433 Claydon J (2004) Spawning aggregations of coral reef fishes: characteristics,
434 hypotheses, threats and management. Ocean Mar Biol Annu Rev 42:265-302

435 Domeier ML (2012) Revisiting spawning aggregations: definitions and challenges. In:
436 Sadovy de Mitcheson Y, Colin PL (eds) Reef fish spawning aggregations:
437 biology, research and management. Fish and Fisheries Series 35, Berlin,
438 Springer Verlag, pp 1-20

439 Domeier ML, Colin PL (1997) Tropical reef fish spawning aggregations: defined and
440 reviewed. Bull Mar Sci 60:698-726

441 Farmer NA, Ault JS (2011) Grouper and snapper movements and habitat use in Dry
442 Tortugas, Florida. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser* 433:169-184

443 Feeley MW, Morley D, Acosta A, Barbera P, Hunt J, Switzer T, Burton M (2018)
444 Spawning migration movements of mutton snapper in Tortugas, Florida:
445 spatial dynamics within a marine reserve network. *Fish Res* 204:209-223

446 Graham NAJ, Evans RD, Russ GR (2003) The effects of marine reserve protection on
447 the trophic relationships of reef fishes on the Great Barrier Reef. *Environ*
448 *Conser* 30:200-208

449 Heyman WD, Kjerfve B, Graham RT, Rhodes KL, Garbutt L (2005) Spawning
450 aggregations of *Lutjanus cyanopterus* (Cuvier) on the Belize Barrier Reef
451 over a 6 years period. *J Fish Biol* 67:83-101

452 Kadison E, Nemeth RS, Herzlieb S, Blondeau J (2006) Temporal and spatial
453 dynamics of *Lutjanus cyanopterus* (Pisces: Lutjanidae) and *L. jocu* spawning
454 aggregations in the United States Virgin Islands. *Rev Biol Tro* 54:69-78

455 Linderman KC, Pugliese RP, Waugh GT, Ault JS (2000) Developmental patterns
456 within multispecies reef fishery: management applications for essential fish
457 habitats and protected areas. *Bull Mar Sci* 66:929-956

458 Malafaia PN, França AR, Olavo G (2021) Spawning aggregation sites of the cubera
459 snapper, *Lutjanus cyanopterus*, on the continental shelf of Bahia state,
460 Northeastern Brazil. *Fish Res* 242:106037

461 Motta F, Freitas MO, Rolim FA, Abilhoa V, Filho GHP (2022) Direct evidence of a
462 spawning aggregation of cubera snapper (*Lutjanus cyanopterus*) in

463 southeastern Brazil and its management implications. *Fisheries Research*
464 252:106339

465 Nanami A (2020) Spatial distribution and feeding substrate of butterflyfishes (family
466 Chaetodontidae) on an Okinawan coral reef. *PeerJ* 8:e9666

467 Nanami A (2023) Spawning aggregations of checkered snapper (*Lutjanus decussatus*)
468 and blackspot snapper (*L. fulviflamma*): seasonality, lunar-phase periodicity
469 and spatial distribution within spawning ground. *PeerJ* 11:e15991

470 Nanami A, Shimose T (2013) Interspecific difference in prey items in relation to
471 morphological characteristics among four lutjanid species (*Lutjanus*
472 *decussatus*, *L. fulviflamma*, *L. fulvus* and *L. gibbus*). *Environ Biol Fish*
473 96:591-602

474 Nemeth RS (2005) Population characteristics of a recovering US Virgin Islands red
475 hind spawning aggregation following protection. *Mar Ecol Prog Ser*
476 286:81-97

477 Nemeth RS (2009) Dynamics of reef fish and decapod crustacean spawning
478 aggregations: underlying mechanisms, habitat linkages, and trophic
479 interactions. In: Nagelkerken I (ed) *Ecological connectivity among tropical*
480 *coastal ecosystems*. Springer Verlag, pp 73-134

481 Ohta I, Akita Y, Uehara M, Ebisawa A (2017) Age-based demography and
482 reproductive biology of three *Epinephelus* groupers, *E. polyphekadion*, *E.*
483 *tauvina*, and *E. howlandi* (Serranidae), inhabiting coral reefs in Okinawa.
484 *Environ Biol Fish* 100:1451-1467

485 Ohta I, Ebisawa A (2015) Reproductive biology and spawning aggregation fishing of
486 the white-streaked grouper, *Epinephelus ongus*, associated with seasonal and
487 lunar cycles. *Environ Biol Fish* 98:1555-1570

488 Polovina JJ, Ralston S (1987) Tropical snappers and groupers: biology and fisheries
489 management. Westview Boulder

490 R Core Team (2023) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
491 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
492 URL <https://www.R-project.org/>.

493 Rhodes KL, Tupper MH (2008) The vulnerability of reproductively active squaretail
494 coral grouper (*Plectropomus areolatus*) to fishing. *Fish Bull* 106:194-203.

495 Russell MW, Luckhurst BE, Lindeman KC (2012) Management of spawning
496 aggregations. In: Sadovy de Mitcheson Y, Colin PL (eds) Reef fish spawning
497 aggregations: biology, research and management. Fish and Fisheries Series 35,
498 Springer Verlag, pp 371-404

499 Sadovy Y, Domeier M (2005) Are aggregation-fisheries sustainable? Reef fish
500 fisheries as a case study. *Coral Reefs* 24:254-262

501 Sadovy de Mitcheson Y, Colin PL (2012) Reef fish spawning aggregations: biology,
502 research and management. Fish and Fisheries Series 35. Berlin,
503 Springer Verlag

504 Sadovy de Mitcheson Y, Colin PL, Sakaue J (2012) *Lutjanus fulvus* – blacktail
505 snapper with notes on other species of Atlantic and Indo-Pacific snappers
506 (*Lutjanidae*). In: Sadovy de Mitcheson Y, Colin PL (eds) Reef fish spawning

507 aggregations: biology, research and management. Fish and Fisheries Series 35,
508 Berlin, Springer Verlag, pp 458-468

509 Sadovy de Mitcheson Y, Cornish A, Domeier M, Colin PL, Russell M, Lindeman
510 KC (2008) A global baseline for spawning aggregations of reef fishes.
511 Conserv Biol 22:1233-1244

512 Sadovy de Mitcheson Y, Erisman B (2012) Fishery and biological implications of
513 fishing spawning aggregations, and the social and economic importance of
514 aggregating fishes. In: Sadovy de Mitcheson Y, Colin PL (eds) Reef fish
515 spawning aggregations: biology, research and management. Fish and Fisheries
516 Series 35, Berlin, Springer Verlag, pp 225-284

517 Sakaue J, Akino H, Endo M, Ida H, Asahida T (2016) Temporal and spatial site
518 sharing during spawning in snappers *Symphoricichthys spilurus* and *Lutjanus*
519 *bohar* (Pisces: Perciformes: Lutjanidae) in waters around Peleliu Island,
520 Palau. Zool Stu 55:44

521 Sala E, Ballesteros E, Starr RM (2001) Rapid decline of Nassau grouper spawning
522 aggregations in Belize: fishery management and conservation needs. Fisheries
523 26:23-30

524 Samoilys MA (1997) Periodicity of spawning aggregations of coral trout
525 *Plectropomus leopardus* (Pisces: Serranidae) on the northern Great Barrier
526 Reef. Mar Ecol Prog Ser 160:149-159

527 Shimose T, Nanami A (2014) Age, growth, and reproductive biology of blacktail
528 snapper, *Lutjanus fulvus*, around Yaeyama Islands, Okinawa, Japan.

529 Ichthyol Res 61:322-331

530 Taylor BM, Oyafuso ZS, Pardee CB, Ochavillo D, Newman SJ (2018) Comparative
531 demography of commercially-harvested snappers and an emperor from
532 American Samoa. PeerJ 6:e5069

533 Thresher RE (1984) Reproduction in reef fishes. Neptune City, New Jersey: T.F.H.
534 Publications

535 Wang N, Teletchea F, Kestemont P, Milla S, Fontaine P (2010) Photothermal control
536 of the reproductive cycle in temperate fishes. Rev Aquaculture 2:209-222

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551 **Figure captions**

552 **Fig. 1.** Location of the Yaeyama Islands (a), study site (b), and fish aggregations of
553 *Lutjanus fulvus* (c). Aerial photograph in (b) was provided by the International Coral
554 Reef Research and Monitoring Center.

555

556 **Fig. 2.** Daily plotting of the presence/absence fish aggregations recorded by a stationary
557 time-lapse camera during the first survey (a) and second survey (b). Fish images were
558 categorized into four types: (1) no individuals, (2) single individual, (3) multiple
559 individuals (2 - 5 individuals) and (4) aggregation (≥ 6 individuals). Lunar phases are
560 abbreviated as follows: FM, full-moon; LQM, last-quarter moon; NM, new moon; FQM,
561 first-quarter moon. The numbers above the sky-blue dots represent the day of the moon.

562

563 **Fig. 3.** Correlogram showing the auto-correlation coefficient with time lag, which
564 examines the periodicity in fish aggregation formation at a particular time lag for the
565 first survey (a) and second survey (b). Blue horizontal lines represent 95% confidence
566 interval of the auto-correlation coefficient.

567

568 **Fig. 4.** Monthly changes in the number of fish individuals on the 600 m \times 5 m line
569 transect (a), gonadosomatic index of female inside the aggregation site (b), and oocyte
570 developmental stage for *Lutjanus fulvus* (c). In (a), daily changes in with seawater
571 temperature were also plotted. In (b), horizontal black bars represent the average values,
572 and the numbers beside the sky-blue dots represent the maximum and minimum values

573 of gonadosomatic index. In (c), the oocyte developmental stage was abbreviated as
574 follows: TYS, tertiary yolk stage; MN, migration nuclear stage; PMA, pre-maturation
575 stage; MA, maturation. Seawater temperature data in (a) were provided by the Japan
576 Meteorological Agency
577 ([https://www/data.jma.go.jp/kaiyou/data/db/kaiyo/series/emgam/txt/area708.txt](https://www.data.jma.go.jp/kaiyou/data/db/kaiyo/series/emgam/txt/area708.txt)).

578

579 **Fig. 5.** Spatial distribution of *Lutjanus fulvus* on the 600 m × 5 m line transect in the
580 aggregation site (a) and frequency of the fine-scale fish density (number of individuals
581 in the 20 m × 5 m area) (b). The 600 m × 5 m line transect was divided into 1-min
582 sub-transects. In (a), fish data are shown as bubble plots and each bubble represents the
583 fine-scale fish density (number of individuals in the 20 m × 5 m area) on each 1-min
584 sub-transect. Cross marks represent the absence of fish individuals in the sub-transect.
585 Red stars represent the deployment location of the stationary camera. In (b), dotted lines
586 represent the probability density function.

587

588 **Fig. 6.** Fork length and age frequency of *Lutjanus fulvus* individuals that were captured
589 at the aggregation site. Dotted lines represent the probability density function. *: among
590 the 32 individuals in (a), the age of one individual could not be measured because of the
591 difficulty in counting the number of opaque rings in the otolith. Thus, the sample size
592 was 31 in (c). **: among the 41 individuals in (b), the age of two individuals could not
593 be measured because of the difficulty in counting the number of opaque rings on otolith.
594 Thus, the sample size was 39 in (d).