

Correlated Random Walk of tuna in arrays of Fish Aggregating Devices: A field-based model from passive acoustic tagging

Géraldine Pérez, Amaël Dupaix, Laurent Dagorn, Jean-Louis Deneubourg, Kim Holland, Sunil Beeharry, Manuela Capello

▶ To cite this version:

Géraldine Pérez, Amaël Dupaix, Laurent Dagorn, Jean-Louis Deneubourg, Kim Holland, et al.. Correlated Random Walk of tuna in arrays of Fish Aggregating Devices: A field-based model from passive acoustic tagging. Ecological Modelling, 2022, 470, pp.110006. 10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2022.110006 . hal-03688126

HAL Id: hal-03688126 https://hal.umontpellier.fr/hal-03688126

Submitted on 17 Jan2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Correlated Random Walk of tuna in arrays of Fish Aggregating Devices: A field-based model from passive acoustic tagging

Pérez Géraldine ^{1, *}, Dupaix Amael ¹, Dagorn Laurent ¹, Deneubourg Jean-Louis ², Holland Kim ³, Beeharry Sunil ⁴, Capello Manuela ¹

¹ MARBEC, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, Ifremer, IRD, Sète, France

² Unit of Social Ecology, Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Bruxelles, Belgium

³ Hawai'i Institute of Marine Biology at University of Hawai'i, Kane'ohe, Hawai'i, United States of America

⁴ Ministry of Ocean Economy, Marine Resources, Fisheries and Shipping, Mauritius

* Corresponding author : Géraldine Pérez, email address : geraldine.perez@ntymail.com

Abstract :

For centuries fishers have exploited the propensity for tuna to associate with floating objects, yet the reasons and mechanisms behind this behavior remain unclear. The number of man-made floating objects (FADs. Fish Aggregating Devices) undergone a dramatic increase in recent decades, with the development of industrial tuna purse seine fishing. However, current knowledge does not allow for the evaluation of the consequences of this increase on the ecology of tuna. Here, we developed a model of tuna movements in an array of FADs, using passive acoustic tagging data. The model was built using four behavioral rules: (1) when no FAD is perceived, tuna exhibit a random search behavior, (2) individuals can orient directly to a FAD when they perceive it (within a given orientation radius), (3) the associative dynamics of tuna follow a daily rhythm and (4) Continuous Residence Time (CRTs - time spend at FAD by tuna) are independent from previous Continuous Absent Time (CATs- time between two consecutive CRTs). The model is based on only four parameters: swimming speed, path sinuosity, orientation distance and a loss term to account for natural and fishing mortality events. The model was calibrated on 70±10 cm yellowfin tuna (Thunnus albacares), acoustically tagged in two different networks of anchored FADs (Oahu, Hawaii, U.S.A. and Mauritius) with different FAD densities. Our results show that the model can reproduce the time tuna spent traveling between FADs (i.e., time away from the FADs), as well as the total time spent by the fish in the FAD array (total residence time) at both study sites. The parameter sets that best reproduce the experimental data correspond to a steering radius between 2 and 5 km, a sinuosity (correlated random walk parameter) between 0.9 and 0.995 and mortality rates between 1 and 3% per day. This model, thus parameterized, could be used in future studies to predict tuna movements in arrays of different FAD densities and thus provide scientific advice for their management. The same approach can be used for modeling the movements of marine and terrestrial animals detected near aggregation sites.

Highlights

► First model to reproduce tuna movements in an array of Fish Aggregating Device. ► Calibration of the model parameters using passive acoustic telemetry data. ► This model can be used to evaluate the impact of increasing numbers of aggregation sites on the movement behavior of animals.

Keywords : Correlated Random Walk, Tropical tuna, Spatial model, Fish Aggregating Device, Acoustic tagging, Survival curve, Tuna motion, Residency

47 1. Introduction

48 With more than 5.3 million tonnes caught in 2019 (ISSF, 2021) tropical tuna constitutes one of the 49 major harvested fish species. Currently, yellowfin tuna (*Thunnus albacares*), bigeye tuna (*T. obesus*) 50 and skipjack (Katsuwonus pelamis) represent almost 95% of the global tuna catches (ISSF, 2021). 51 Tropical tunas display an associative behavior with floating objects, forming large multi-specific 52 aggregations around them. The reasons why tuna associate with floating objects are still unknown. 53 Two main hypotheses are widely accepted: (1) the meeting-point hypothesis (Dagorn & Fréon 1999, 54 Fréon & Dagorn, 2000) and (2) the indicator-log hypothesis (Hall, 1992). The meeting-point 55 hypothesis posits that floating objects act as meeting-points, where tuna gather to form bigger schools. 56 The indicator-log hypothesis posits that natural floating objects, such as logs, are more numerous in 57 productive areas, as they concentrate in river months, estuaries and frontal structures. Following this 58 hypothesis, tuna could use floating objects as indicators of productive areas.

59 Fishers have used this associative behavior to their advantage for centuries (Dempster & Taquet, 60 2004) and, more recently, have deployed human-made floating objects, called Fish Aggregating 61 Device (FAD), to increase their catches. In the open ocean, drifting FADs are primarily used by 62 industrial purse seine fleets, while, in coastal areas, anchored FADs are used by artisanal and semi-63 industrial fisheries (Dagorn et al. 2013b; Dempster & Taquet, 2004; Scott & Lopez, 2014). About 64 37% of the tropical tuna catches (all fishing gears) are made by purse seiners on drifting FADs, 65 ranging between 32% to 51% depending of the ocean (Dagorn et al. 2013b; Murua et al. 2021). The 66 number of FADs has drastically increased in the three past decades, with more than 100,000 FADs deployed globally, each year (Scott & Lopez, 2014), although precise numbers are difficult to obtain. 67

68 This increase raised concerns over possible impacts on tuna populations, because FADs increase the 69 vulnerability of tunas to capture but also because increasing the number of floating objects (Dagorn et al. 2013b) could affect their ecology. Marsac et al. (2000), were the first to suggest that FADs could 70 71 act as an ecological trap for tunas. Following the indicator-log hypothesis, FADs could mislead tuna 72 if they are deployed or drift into biologically poor areas and if tuna do not differentiate between 73 natural and man-made objects. Therefore, tuna could remain associated with FADs even if their 74 surrounding environment is detrimental to their fitness (Marsac et al. 2000). However, current 75 knowledge does not allow for the assessment of the effects of increasing FAD densities on tuna ecology, even when the environment (other than floating objects) remains constant. 76

77 Acoustic telemetry has been widely used to monitor tuna movements and behavior within FAD arrays. 78 With this technology, acoustically tagged fish (i.e., fish equipped by an acoustic tag) can be either 79 actively tracked or detected by a set of fixed acoustic receivers. In the former case, known as active 80 tracking, the recorded path of the receiver, which is considered as a proxy of the animal path, 81 generally corresponds to short periods of time (few days at most) (Girard et al. 2004; Girard et al. 82 2007). In the latter case, known as *passive acoustic telemetry*, a time series of acoustic detections is 83 recorded within the array of receivers (Dagorn et al. 2007; Tolotti et al. 2020). The acoustic receivers 84 are generally placed in proximity of aggregation/attraction sites (FADs in this case), where it is more 85 likely to detect the tagged individuals. Passive acoustic telemetry has the advantage to cover longer period of time (up to several months or even more than a year, depending on the tag battery life and 86 87 the fish residency within the array). However, the time series of acoustic detections recorded at 88 aggregation sites cannot be easily translated into movement rules.

89 Previous passive acoustic telemetry studies conducted in anchored FAD arrays quantified the amount 90 of time that tuna spend associated with these floating objects (residence times), as well as the time 91 they spend traveling between two objects (absence times) (Dagorn et al. 2007; Govinden et al., 2013; 92 Robert et al., 2013; Rodriguez-Tress et al., 2017). These studies highlighted the variability of such 93 durations according to both the size of the tagged individuals (Robert et al., 2013) as well as the 94 species (Rodriguez-Tress et al., 2017). Recently, Pérez et al. (2020) compared the residence and 95 absence times recorded for individual tuna tagged within different FAD arrays, demonstrating that 96 tuna spend less time traveling between FADs and more time in association as FAD density increases. 97 Passive and active acoustic telemetry studies have also shown a diel rhythm in the associative 98 behavior of tunas, with close association occurring mostly during the daytime while regular 99 excursions away from the FAD are undertaken at night (Holland et al. 1990; Marsac & Cayré, 1998; 100 Dagorn, et al. 2000; Forget et al., 2015; Tolotti et al., 2020). Furthermore, active tracking studies 101 allowed the fine-scale movements of tagged individuals in arrays of FADs to be investigated. Using 102 acoustic telemetry data from actively tracked yellowfin tuna in anchored FAD arrays in the Pacific

and Indian oceans, Girard et al. (2004) found that tuna adopt a random search behavior until they
perceive a FAD, then orient towards the device at distances ranging between 4 to 17 km.

Recently, Pérez et al. (2020), used a simple random walk model to assess whether the observed trends 105 106 in behavioural indices, obtained from passive acoustic tagging data across increasing FAD densities, 107 could result from the random-search component in tuna behaviour suggested in previous experiments 108 (Girard et al. 2004). While this simple model was able to explain the observed trends of shorter 109 absence times for increasing FAD densities, it could not quantitatively predict their durations, since 110 it did not account for the oriented movements (Girard et al. 2004) or for the diel pattern in tuna 111 behavior (Marsac & Cayré, 1998; Forget et al., 2015). Correlated Random Walk (CRW) models are 112 frequently used to reconstruct animal paths from active tracking data (e.g. Girard et al. 2004; 113 Patterson et al. 2009; McClintock et al. 2012; Cramer et al. 2021), as well as to simulate their 114 movements (Byers, 2001; Carita et al. 2012; Ahearn et al. 2017; Cramer et al. 2021). These models 115 are used because, unlike a simple random walk, they account for the tendency of animals to go 116 forward. A CRW model is thus a better choice than a simple random walk for animals with bilateral 117 symmetry such as tuna. On the other hand, despite the large availability of passive acoustic telemetry 118 data for tuna and their large temporal coverage, this data has not been used so far to construct this 119 type of models, due to the discrete nature of the data (acoustic detections) recorded both in time and 120 space.

The aim of this study was to develop a data-based model of tuna movements in an array of FADs, which can reproduce the motion of tuna from one FAD association to another detected through passive acoustic telemetry. Such model constitutes the first step to predict the effects of increasing FAD numbers on tuna behavior and ecology. The model was calibrated using passive acoustic telemetry data collected at two study sites (Mauritius, see Rodriguez-Tress et al. 2017, and Oahu, Hawaii, U.S.A., see Dagorn et al. 2007; Robert et al. 2013) with different FAD densities (Pérez et al. 2020).

- 128
- 129

130 2. Materials & Methods

131 **2.1. Field data**

Passive acoustic telemetry data were used to characterize tuna movements in FAD arrays. This technology is based on the transmission of an acoustic signal between an acoustic transmitter (or tag) implanted in a tuna and acoustic receivers (or hydrophones) installed at specific study sites. The identification of the tagged fish is possible when the fish is located close to the receivers, within a given detection range. Passive acoustic tagging data were collected in two anchored FAD arrays, one around the island of Mauritius (Rodriguez-Tress et al. 2017) in the Western Indian Ocean, and the 138 other around the island of Oahu (Robert et al. 2013), within the Hawaiian archipelago in the Central 139 Pacific Ocean (Fig. 1). These anchored FAD arrays differ in their inter-FAD distances, with the 140 Mauritian array having shorter nearest and next-nearest neighboring distances than the Hawaiian 141 array (Pérez et al., 2020). The Mauritian array consisted of 9 FADs with 7 equipped with acoustic 142 receivers, and the Hawaiian array comprised 13 FADs, all of which were equipped with acoustic 143 receivers (see Dagorn et al. 2007; Rodriguez-Tress et al. 2017 for specifications of acoustic receivers). 144 In both arrays, FADs were moored in depths of between 1000 and 2500 m. The design of FADs was 145 similar within the same array, but differed slightly between arrays.



146

Fig. 1: Anchored FAD arrays of Mauritius (left) and Oahu (right). Positions of the anchored FADs
are represented by a black dot when equipped with an acoustic receiver, and by a black cross
otherwise.

150

151 Since previous studies outlined species and size-dependent variability in the associative behavior of tuna at FADs (Robert et al. 2013; Rodriguez-Tress et al. 2017; Pérez et al., 2020), this study focused 152 153 on a single species (yellowfin tuna) and size of ~ 70 cm fork length (fork length range: 60-80 cm), 154 named YFT-70, which was common to both study sites. For the Mauritian array, due to the short 155 duration of the experiment (Rodriguez-Tress et al. 2017), the data recorded during the first 38 days 156 was considered, resulting in the smallest observation time. For the Hawaiian array, where the 157 experiment lasted more than one year, only the initial 120 days after tagging were considered because 158 95% of the time between the first and the last detection at a FAD lasted less than 120 days (Robert et 159 al. 2013). As a result, the field data consisted of 14 YFT-70 tagged in the Mauritian array and 56 YFT-160 70 individuals in the Hawaiian array (Table 1). Details on the tagging procedures can be found in 161 Rodriguez-Tress et al. (2017) for the Mauritian array and in Robert et al. (2013) for the Hawaiian 162 array.

Table 1: Number of yellowfin tuna of ~70 cm tagged (N_{tuna}), total number of CRTs (excluding the first CRT, NCRT) and total number of CAT_{diff} (NCAT_{diff}) recorded in the Mauritian and the Hawaiian array.

	Hawaii	Mauritius
N _{tuna}	56	14
NCRT	111	29
NCATdiff	59	19

165 **2.2. Residence and absence times in the FAD array**

166 Acoustic telemetry data were processed to obtain information on durations of presence at and absence from instrumented FADs displayed by tagged tuna, following the procedure described in Capello et 167 168 al. (2015). This procedure translates the discrete time series of acoustic detections into continuous 169 bouts of time. It relies on the definition of a maximum blanking period (MBP), i.e., a maximum 170 temporal separation between two subsequent acoustic detections at the same FAD (or receiver), where 171 fish is still considered to be associated. The definition of a MBP not only allows to account for small data gaps related to detection issues and sonic collisions (Forget et al. 2015), but also for fish 172 173 excursions out of the detection range of the receiver. In the case of tropical tuna, a MBP value of 24h 174 was chosen, in order to account for the regular diel excursions that tuna perform out of the FAD at nighttime (Holland et al. 1990; Marsac & Cayré, 1998; Dagorn et al. 2000; Forget et al. 2015). 175 176 Following this procedure, the Continuous Residence Times (CRTs) (Ohta & Kakuma 2005; Dagorn 177 et al. 2007; Capello et al. 2015), corresponded to continuous bouts of time spent at the same FAD 178 without any day-scale absence (>24h). Conversely, the time spent away from FADs were defined as 179 Continuous Absence Times (CAT) (Govinden et al. 2013; Capello et al. 2015). Absence times related to movements between two different FADs were referred to as CAT_{diff} (Pérez et al. 2020). Finally, for 180 181 each individual, the sum of all recorded CRTs and CATs corresponded to the Total Residence Time 182 (TRT), namely the time between the first and the last detection recorded in the FAD array (Fig. 2).

183

184 2.3. Model

The model was built upon four behavioral rules, based on the current knowledge of the associative behavior of tuna at FADs (Fig. 3): (1) Tuna display a random search behavior between two FAD associations (Girard et al. 2004; Pérez et al. 2020), (2) at a certain distance from FADs tuna show oriented movements towards FADs (Girard et al. 2004), (3) the tuna association dynamics follows a diel rhythm (Holland et al. 1990; Marsac & Cayré 1998; Dagorn et al. 2000; Forget et al. 2015; Tolotti et al., 2020; Govinden et al. 2021), and (4) CRTs were independent from previous CATs (Robert etal. 2013).

192 As tuna, like most animals, have a tendency to move forward, the random-search movements were 193 simulated using a Correlated Random Walk model (Kareiva & Shigesada, 1983; Carita et al. 2000; 194 Codling et al. 2008; Ahearn et al. 2017). These models are based on a Markov process where 195 consecutive changes in the animal's consecutive direction are correlated. For each time step Δt , the 196 position of an individual at time t depends on its previous position at time t- Δt and the turning angle 197 α , defining the change in direction relative to the previous time step. Turning angles were randomly 198 sampled from a normal distribution defined in the range $[-\pi; \pi]$, with zero mean and standard deviation 199 σ following the method of Bovet & Benhamou (1988), using the scipy.stats.truncnorm python 200 function. Standard deviation $\sigma = 0$ correspond to straight trajectories whereas in the limit $\sigma \rightarrow \infty$ the model converges to a simple random walk. In the following, σ was expressed in terms of the 201 202 coefficient of sinuosity (c) according to the relationship, $\sigma = \sqrt{(-2\ln(c))}$ with c $\in [0,1]$ (Bovet & Benhamou, 1988; Benhamou 2004). The limit $c \rightarrow 0$ corresponds to a simple random walk (highest 203 204 sinuosity) whereas increasing c decreases the sinuosity, with straight trajectories for c=1. A total of 9 205 coefficients of sinuosity were tested, ranging between 0.2 and 0.9999 (Table 2). Fig. 4 illustrates the 206 distribution of turning angles and an example of a tuna trajectory for each coefficient of sinuosity 207 tested.

	Parameters	Values					
	Tested parameters						
v	Speed (m/s)	0.7, 1.4					
m	Rate of mortality (%/day)	0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5					
Ro	Orientation radius (km)	0, 2, 5, 10, 15, 20					
c	Coefficient of sinuosity	0.2, 0.7, 0.9, 0.97, 0.99, 0.995, 0.997, 0,999, 0.9999					
Fixed parameters							
Δt	Time step (s)	100					
Ν	No. of simulated individuals	1000					
Т	Total duration (day)	38 (Mauritius), 120 (Hawaii)					

209	Table 2: Model	parameters that	gives the 64	8 sets of para	imeters tested
-----	----------------	-----------------	--------------	----------------	----------------

210 In order to account for the orientation behavior of tuna towards FADs, different values of the 211 orientation radius were tested (Fig. 4, Table 2 and Supplementary Information 1). Each time a tuna enters within this radius, its path changes to a straight trajectory oriented towards the FAD location. 212 213 If the tuna was located within the orientation radius of multiple FADs, a FAD was randomly selected between them using a uniform distribution. A total of six orientation radii were tested, ranging 214 215 between 0 (no orientation) to 20 km, see Table 2. The diel rhythm in the associative behavior of tunas 216 was accounted for by defining two behavioral modes ("daytime" and "nighttime") with a periodicity 217 of 24 hours each. During the 12 hours of "daytime" tuna displayed an orientation behavior towards 218 FADs (if located within the orientation radius). Conversely, during the 12 hours of "nighttime" tuna 219 did not exhibit a long-range attraction to FADs (no oriented behavior within the orientation radius) 220 and therefore followed a simple CRW dynamic. In both "daytime" and "nighttime" behavioral modes 221 a tuna was, however, considered to be associated with a FAD when it was located within 500 m of it. 222 This value is in accordance with both the observations of tuna when they were associated with FADs 223 (see Josse et al. 2000; Moreno et al. 2007), and the detection range of acoustic tags used in telemetry 224 studies around instrumented FADs (see Forget et al. 2015).

225 The model did not represent the association time of tuna at FADs (CRT), but these durations were 226 needed to compare the model with the field data. Therefore, the CRTs recorded from field data were 227 used as a model input. Each time a tuna reaches a FAD (i.e., it was located within 500 m of it), a CRT 228 value was randomly sampled from the actual CRT data of the corresponding array and the simulated 229 individuals do not move away from the FAD during the entire duration of the CRT. The CRTs recorded 230 from field data in each array are shown in the Supplementary Information 2. Once this time has 231 elapsed, individuals could leave the FAD in a random direction sampled from a uniform distribution 232 between $[-\pi; \pi]$. To avoid immediate returns, during the 24 hours following the end of a CRT, fish 233 was not affected by the association radius (R_o) of the FAD of departure. Similarly, returns due to tuna re-entering the detection range within 24 hours (which were already taken into account in the 234 235 CRT duration) were neglected. For this purpose, each time a CAT_{return} of less than 24 hours was recorded after a CRT, this movement was discarded and the simulation time was reset to the end of 236 237 the last CRT recorded (Fig. 3). This procedure ensured that CRT durations were consistent with field 238 data. Since the CRTs recorded immediately after tagging were significantly longer than the other 239 CRTs in the Hawaii field experiments and slightly longer in the Mauritius field data, (see 240 Supplementary Information 2) they were not considered in the above procedure. Accordingly, the 241 first CRT were also subtracted from the TRT to ensure data consistency.

Finally, a mortality rate (*m*) was considered to account for natural and fishing mortality events that may cause the interruption of the acoustic detections for some tagged individuals. For this purpose, a Monte Carlo algorithm was applied where, for each individual and at each time step, a random number 245 ε was sampled from a uniform distribution in the interval [0,1] and compared with the corresponding 246 mortality rate using a Bernoulli test. A death was accepted for $\varepsilon < m^*T$. The constant T depends on 247 the time step Δt and on the temporal units of the mortality rate. Different mortality rates were tested, ranging between 0 and 5% per day (Table 2). For a mortality rate expressed in days⁻¹ and Δt in 248 249 seconds, $T = \Delta t/(3600 \times 24)$. The upper bound of 5% per day was estimated from survival analyses of 250 field data (see Supplementary Information 3). TRTs values therefore depended on both the CRW 251 dynamics (which affects the number of tuna associations, thus the time at which the last FAD 252 detections occur) and the mortality rates (Fig. 2).



Fig. 2: Schematic diagram of behavioral sequences and Total Residence Time (TRT) definition. The tuna #1 presents a TRT ending at the end of the last Continuous Residence Time (CRT), recorded before the end of the experiment (indicated by a C-shape). The tuna #2 presents a TRT ending during a CRT because the experiment stopped, while the tuna was associated. CAT corresponds to Continuous Absence Times.

266

267 The model was run in a continuous unbounded space, centered around the actual FAD arrays of 268 Mauritius and Hawaii. The topography of each island was considered using data from the R package 269 "rworldmap" (South 2011). Each time simulated individuals were at risk of crossing island 270 boundaries, the distribution of turning angles α was sub-sampled in order to avoid the island.

271 A total of 1000 individuals were considered in each FAD array, for each combination of model 272 parameters. For each individual, the simulations started at one of the FADs of tagging, in order to 273 reproduce the experimental design as accurately as possible. The probability to start at a given FAD 274 was obtained considering the number of tuna tagged at the FAD, relative to the total number of tuna 275 tagged in the field experiment (see Supplementary Information 4). Two different swimming speeds 276 were tested: 0.7 and 1.4 m/s, corresponding to one and two body-lengths per second respectively (see 277 swimming speeds in Girard et al. 2004 and tagging studies used in this study: Robert et al. 2013 and Rodriguez-Tress et al. 2017). Time steps (Δt) lasted 100 s and each resulted in individual fish 278 279 movements of 70 and 140 m depending on the speed.

- 280 A summary of all model parameters can be found in Table 2. All the simulations were performed
- using the Python 3 programming language (Python Software Foundation, version 3.8.5).



Fig. 3: Flow-Chart diagram illustrating the model algorithm. CRW denotes Correlated Random
Walk, R₀ corresponds to the orientation radius, dist corresponds to the distance between the tuna and

the closest Fish Aggregating Device (FAD) and the value t_{end} takes into account the death of tuna as well as the end of the emerimentation

285 well as the end of the experimentation.



Fig. 4: Example of tuna path trajectories according to the coefficient of sinuosity (c; rows) and the orientation radius (R_o , columns) tested for the Hawaiian array. The first column shows the distribution of turning angles (α in radians) for each coefficient of sinuosity tested. The orientation radii are represented by red circles centered around each FAD and the case Ro=0 is not represented. For the Mauritian array, see Supplementary Information 2.

293 2.4. Comparison between simulated and field data

294 Since the model aimed at fitting the time that tuna spent between two FAD associations (CAT_{diff}), the 295 comparison between the model and the field data focused on this metric. However, the distribution of 296 CAT_{diff} also depends on the total time spent in the FAD array (i.e. longer CAT_{diff} can only be observed 297 for longer TRT). As such, the comparison between the model and the field data was performed for 298 both metrics. For this purpose, CAT_{diff} and TRT were obtained from the simulated data using the same 299 procedures applied to the field data. The selection of model parameters which best fitted the field data 300 was made using a survival analysis, by comparing the theoretical survival curves of the TRT and the 301 CAT_{diff} with those obtained from field data, through a bootstrap method. Experimental survival curves 302 S(t) were constructed (Capello et al. 2015), which represented the proportion of events (TRT or 303 CAT_{diff}) longer than a given duration t. For each set of parameters the survival curve of the field data 304 was compared 1000 times with a sub-sample of the same size as the field data, *i.e.* 56 individuals for 305 Hawaii and 14 for Mauritius (Table 1), randomly sampled from the 1000 simulated individuals. For 306 each of the bootstrap sample, survival curves obtained from the simulated and field data were 307 compared using Cox proportional hazards regressions. The statistical significance of the model was 308 assessed using the p-value from a logrank test, which tested the null hypothesis of identical hazards 309 between the model and the field data. For each survival curve (TRT and CAT_{diff}) and FAD array 310 (Mauritius and Hawaii), the percentage of retained bootstrap tests was calculated, corresponding to 311 the number of bootstrap tests showing p-values>0.05 over the 1000 tests performed. Finally, each set 312 of parameters was assigned the lower percentage of retained bootstraps estimated over survival curves 313 (TRT and CAT_{diff}) and FAD arrays (Hawaii and Mauritius).

The Cox proportional hazards regressions and logrank tests were performed using the R software (R Core Team 2018 version 3.4.4) with the function "coxph" in the "survival" package version 3.1-8 (Therneau & Grambsch 2000).

- 317
- 318
- 319
- 320
- 321
- 322
- 323
- 324
- 325

327 **3. Results**

A total of 648 sets of parameters were tested (Table 2), of which 7 appeared to best fit both the CAT_{diff} and TRT recorded in the Mauritian and Hawaiian arrays considering a percentage of retained bootstrap tests $\geq 85\%$ (Table 3 and Supplementary Information 5). That is, over the 1000 tests performed for each set of parameters, 7 sets were not statistically different from the field data in more than 85% of the tests performed on both survival curves (TRT and CAT_{diff}) and FAD arrays (Mauritius and Hawaii). Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 present the CAT_{diff} and TRT survival curves for each FAD array, for the two sets of parameters performing the best.

Table 3: Set of retained model parameters for which more that 85% of the bootstrap tests fit the field data. .

v (m/s)	<i>m</i> (%/day)	R ₀ (km)	c	Retained Bootstraps (%)
0.7	2	5	0.99	91.5
1.4	2	2	0.97	90.7
1.4	3	2	0.9	89.8
0.7	2	5	0.995	89.7
1.4	4	2	0.9	89.4
1.4	2	2	0.9	87.5
0.7	3	5	0.99	86.6



Fig. 5.: Comparison of survival curves obtained from field data(black) and from the 1000 bootstrap samples (gray) for a speed $v=0.7 \text{ m s}^{-1}$, a mortality m=2%, a orientation radius $R_0=5 \text{ km}$ and a coefficient of sinuosity c=0.99 (with % retained bootstrap = 91.5%, see Table 3). The first row corresponds to the survival curves of CAT_{diff} (A and B) and the second row to the TRT (C and D). The first column denotes the Hawaiian FAD array (A and C) and the second column the Mauritian array (B and D). The red line corresponds to the theoretical curve (exp(-mt)) representing the upper bound of TRT.

- 343
- 344
- 345
- 346
- 347
- 51
- 348



Fig. 6: Comparison of survival curves obtained from field data(black) and from the 1000 bootstrap samples (gray) for a speed $v=1.4 \text{ m s}^{-1}$, a mortality m=2%, a orientation radius $R_o=2 \text{ km}$ and a coefficient of sinuosity c=0.97 (with % retained bootstrap = 90.7%, see Table 3). The first row corresponds to the survival curves of CAT_{diff} (A and B) and the second row to the TRT (C and D). The first column denotes the Hawaiian FAD array (A and C) and the second column the Mauritian array (B and D). The red line corresponds to the theoretical curve (exp(-mt)) representing the upper bound of TRT.

The complete results of the bootstrap test are available in Supplementary Information 6. Any speed values between the tested ones (0.7 and 1.4 m/s) will reflected the field behavior (Fig. 7 and Supplementary Information 7). In the same way, all values of the mortality rate can be retained. However, null mortalities (m=0), showed poorer bootstrap results (higher percentage of retained bootraps of 62.2%, see Fig. 7, Supplementary Information 6 and 7). Similarly, mortality rates of 5%

363 and 1% did not appear among the 7 best fits (Table 3). However, combinations of parameters exist 364 with high percentages of retained bootstraps (83.5% for m=5%/day and 80.1% for m=1%/day, see Fig. 7, Supplementary Information 6 and 7). On the opposite, orientation radii of 2 and 5 km clearly 365 stand out (Fig. 7 and Supplementary Information 7)), all the other values having a percentage of 366 retained bootstraps below 55% (Fig. 7, Supplementary Information 6) and even below 20% for 367 368 orientation radii of 15 and 20 km (Fig. 7, Supplementary Information 6). Finally, the coefficients of 369 sinuosity (c) performing the best range from 0.9 to 0.995 (all with a percentage of retained bootstraps 370 above 80%, Fig. 7, Supplementary Information 6 and 7). Coefficients of c=0.2, 0.999 and 0.9999 371 showed poorer results (percentage of retained bootstraps respectively 37.2%, 51.3% and 7%, see Fig. 7, Supplementary Information 6 and 7). 372





Fig. 7: Heatmap of the percentage of retained bootstraps that fit the field data for each set of model parameters. Rows corresponds to the tested speeds (v), columns denote the mortality rates (m). Tested values of the orientation radius (R_0) are shown in the x-axis and tested coefficients of sinuosity (c) in the y-axis.

378

379 **4. Discussion**

The study of animal behavior made considerable progress in the last decades, thanks to the development of electronic tagging and camera trapping technologies (Swann & Perkins, 2014; Hughey et al. 2018). However, characterizing the movement of animals in their own environment still remains a challenging task, particularly in marine environments, where GPS technologies can rarely 384 be used. Here, through the use a field-based modeling approach and passive acoustic telemetry data, we provide, for the first time, a method for describing the movement behavior of tunas in FAD arrays. 385 The model is built upon four main behavioral components, based on the state-of-the-art knowledge 386 387 of the associative dynamics of tunas at FADs: random walk dynamics, orientation capabilities, diel 388 behavior and a lack in correlation between the duration of consecutive CRTs and CATs. A relatively 389 small number of parameters drive the model's properties: swimming speed, path sinuosity, orientation 390 radius and mortality rate. Despite the model's structural simplicity and the reduced number of 391 parameters, it was able to reproduce both of the investigated movement metrics (time between two 392 FAD associations and total time spent in the array) in two different FAD arrays.

393 The four parameters tested can be related to the physiological capabilities and condition of tuna, as 394 well as their environment (including the FADs, other tuna and non-tuna species present in the array). 395 The two swimming speeds tested (corresponding to the 0.7 and 1.4 m/s) stem from previous studies 396 showing that swimming speed typically range between 1 and 2 body lengths per second (Girard et 397 al., 2004; Dagorn et al. 2013b). In contrast, despite previous evidences of a random walk behavior in 398 tuna movements between FADs (Girard et al. 2004; Pérez et al. 2020), no empirical studies have 399 estimated the sinuosity of a tuna path in a FAD array. As a consequence, large ranges of sinuosity 400 were considered. The results show that, while both speed values could be retained by the simulations, 401 only a limited subset of sinuosity coefficients emerged. The majority of sinuosity coefficients that 402 were retained indicated a rather skewed distribution of turning angles (Fig. 3, Table 3). Lower 403 sinuosity coefficients were mostly found for the highest swimming speed (Table 3). This is to be 404 expected considering that for a given average distance traveled during a correlated random walk, 405 higher speeds imply lower sinuosity coefficients and vice-versa (Hall 1977; Kareiva & Shigesada 406 1983; Marsh & Jones 1988). Hence, the values of the sinuosity coefficient (c) retained are valid 407 considering the chosen time step ($\Delta t=100$ s). It is likely that the tuna movement characteristics (speed 408 and sinuosity) also depend on the fine-scale environmental characteristics within the FAD array, such 409 as the type and distribution of prey, or the physiological conditions of the tuna itself. In future, the 410 consideration of a range of swimming speeds and path sinuosity, as opposed to single values, could 411 provide a more realistic picture of tuna movements. However, the range of values used in this study 412 provides an initial set of movement characteristics that are compatible with field observations, thus 413 contributing to the poorly understood dynamics of tuna in a FAD array.

The mortality rate (which accounts for both natural and fishing mortality) is primarily influenced by risks associated with fishing activity, natural predation and disease. A previous study using conventional tags from the Hawaii Tuna Tagging Project (HTTP) showed a natural mortality rate of 0.36% per day and a fishing mortality of 0.67 % per day for yellowfin tuna larger than 56 cm (Adam et al. 2003). As such, the global mortality rates estimated through our simulations appear to be higher 419 than previous findings. This difference could be due to a specific mortality in each study site and 420 period considered. Indeed, even if in both cases the Hawaiian archipelago was considered, these 421 studies concern different islands and study periods, for which the fishing pressure might differ as well 422 as the natural mortality.

423 Acoustic telemetry data do not allow for the direct estimation of mortality rate, but do provide 424 information on the time at which an individual is no longer detected by receivers deployed on FADs. 425 Generally, a lack of acoustic detections indicates that tuna have either left the FAD array or died. 426 Movement dynamics of tuna can explain the first potential causes for a lack of detection. Within the 427 model, the propensity of an individual to depart from the array is directly linked to the sinuosity of 428 its path, its swimming speed and its orientation radius. For instance, large path sinuosity (resulting 429 from small values of the sinuosity coefficient c) primarily leads to movements close to the FAD of 430 departure and little or no detections at the other FADs. Conversely, small path sinuosity (form high 431 values of the coefficient of sinuosity c) generally results in individuals rapidly leaving the array (Fig. 432 3 and Supplementary Information 1). In this way, the model provides direct information on the rate 433 at which tuna are lost from FAD arrays. Fitting the model to the field data allows for differentiation 434 between loss through randomness of movement and loss due to mortality (Table 2 and Supplementary Information 3). As such this field-based movement model could provide a new and alternative 435 436 methodology for estimating the mortality rates of tuna in a FAD array.

In the model, the orientation radius represents the distance from which tunas are able to orient 437 438 themselves towards FADs them, while on the field tuna could be able to perceive FADs before 439 orienting themselves toward them. No data is available on the distance at which tunas perceive FADs, 440 but tuna movements provide input on the distance at which tunas start to orient themselves toward 441 FADs. Therefore, the FAD perception radius was not considered in this study. This distance naturally 442 depends on the tuna's ability to perceive its surrounding environment, as well as on the physical 443 characteristics of the area. Given the large distances from which tuna can orient themselves towards 444 FADs, highlighted in previous studies (Girard et al. 2004), as well as those found in this study, the 445 use of visual cues as explanatory factors can be discarded. As sound can travel great distances 446 underwater, the perception of acoustic stimuli could be a valid hypothesis for explaining the ability 447 of tunas to orient towards FADs from such large distances. Environmental characteristics may impact 448 the propagation of sounds between FADs and tunas and influence how strong these sound stimuli are. 449 The physical characteristics of the water mass are known to affect the propagation of sound waves 450 (Lee et al. 2017; Siddiqui & Dong 2019). Furthermore, the topology of the FAD array and its location 451 relative to the coastline could also affect underwater sound propagation. As sounds may be produced by the FAD structures themselves, they can vary depending on the materials used and the design of 452 453 each structure, which often differ among FAD arrays. Although FAD design has not been identified

454 as influencing the attractiveness of FADs (Fréon & Dagorn 2000), it may impact their detectability. 455 Tunas may also perceive the presence of a FAD through the emission of noise generated by the fish aggregation itself. In such a situation the intensity of the noise could be dependent on the quantity of 456 fish present, but also on the types of species and their activities. Considering these multiple potential 457 458 sources of environmental variability, the distance at which tuna are able to perceive FADs (orientation 459 radius) is likely to vary both within and between FAD arrays. No single value of the orientation radius 460 can exist, but rather a distribution of these distances with a subset of values for which the probability 461 of being located in the environment is greatest. A general model that describes the movements of tuna 462 in different FAD arrays with the same parameters, such as the one developed in this study, provides 463 a subset of the most probable orientation distances. However, it is likely that a distribution of 464 orientation distances could be more realistic and for a particular FAD, the orientation radius could 465 have its own dynamics according to local environmental conditions.

466 A previous study by Girard et al. (2004) determined orientation radii between 4 and 17 km, with a 467 mode around 10 km. This study was based on 14 yellowfin tuna (YFT) from 47 cm to 167 cm FL, 468 that were acoustically tracked in different FAD arrays (Holland et al., 1990; Marsac & Cayré, 1998; 469 Brill et al. 1999; Dagorn et al. 2000) and included the specie-size category considered in our 470 simulations (YFT of ~70 cm). These 14 individuals were actively tracked over short durations, 471 between 12 and 86 hours (due to the constraints of active tracking) rather than passively monitored as in our study. The radii found in our 7 sets of parameters (5 km and 2 km in one set) are similar to 472 473 the lower range of the orientation distances (4-17 km) found by Girard et al. (2004). The longer 474 orientation distances identified in that study could be attributed to the inclusion of only long paths 475 (more than 7 km away from the FADs) in their analysis. Furthermore, the authors considered that the 476 longest orientation distances (e.g. > 15 km) could be the result of tuna patrolling along the coast, thus 477 using some bathymetric information rather than signals from FADs. As such, the distances found by Girard et al. (2004) may represent maximum orientation distances, while the average could be shorter, 478 479 and more similar to the values we found (2-5 km).

480 Finally, it is important to note that the two studies considered different datasets collected in different 481 regions, and possible inter-FAD array variability in the orientation radius cannot be excluded. It is 482 important to stress that the retention of the model parameters was very conservative: only those valid 483 for both metrics (TRT and CATdiff) and FAD arrays were kept. In doing so, possible local variability 484 in tuna behavior (for example, a different orientation radius depending on the study site) were 485 excluded. This choice was made to obtaining the minimal, and most general model, that could 486 reproduce the observations. Considering a threshold of 85% for the percentage of retained bootstraps provides 7 sets of parameter values over the 648 tested. These values (radius of orientation ranging 487 488 between 2-5 km, coefficient of sinuosity between 0.9 and 0.995, mortality rates between 2 and 3%)

489 provide the main characteristics of tuna movements in FAD arrays. To avoid any scaling issue, the 490 same data treatment was applied to both field and simulated data sets. Therefore, the model can be 491 considered to correctly reproduce the tuna movements between FADs at the dayscale, i.e., the scale 492 related to a maximum blanking period of 24h (Capello et al. 2015), which was used to process the 493 acoustic data. Further studies, across a greater number of study sites, could provide insight into how 494 these model parameters could vary between FAD arrays. Similarly, it would be of interest to consider 495 how this model, fitted for YFT-70, is able to describe the behavior of other tuna species and sizes. 496 This model could also be used for other non-tuna species that associate with FADs and in particular 497 vulnerable species such as the silky sharks (Carcharhinus falciformis).

498

As this model aimed to simulate tuna movements in FAD arrays, the time tuna spent associated with FADs (CRT) was not simulated and the experimental CRT distribution was used as an input of the model. Further model developments, which consider social interactions at FADs (Robert et al. 2014; Pérez et al. 2020), may allow the CRT durations within different FAD arrays to also be integrated into the model. This integration of CRTs into the model would involve adding social interactions between individuals and behavioral rules of social retention at the FAD that follow the meeting point hypothesis (Dagorn & Fréon 1999, Fréon & Dagorn, 2000, Robert et al. 2014).

506

507 **5. Conclusion**

508 Building on current knowledge of the associative behavior tuna at FADs from acoustic telemetry data, 509 our model is the first to reproduce the movement behavior of tunas in a FAD array. A total of 7 sets 510 of parameters (Table 3) were able to reproduce, with a high confidence, the movements of yellowfin 511 tuna (fork length 70 cm) in two different FAD arrays, suggesting the model is robust. Future model 512 improvements could consider distributions of speeds, sinuosity, detection radii and mortality rates 513 (rather than fixed values) which may provide a better reflection of the variability induced by the local 514 environment and the physiological conditions of the tuna themselves.

This model can be used on all species that display associative behavior with floating object. This 515 516 includes species such as dolphinfish (Coryphaena hippurus) or the vulnerable silky shark (Carcharhinus falciformis). When combined with acoustic telemetry data, the model can provide an 517 518 alternative method for determining the mortality rate of tuna and other associated species in a FAD 519 array. Given the difficulty in assessing natural and fishing mortality for wild marine species, this 520 novel approach could be of interest for the stock assessment community. Moreover, the model could 521 be used to predict how increasing numbers of FADs affect the ecology of tunas ecology, both in terms 522 of the time spent away from FADs and the total time spent in a FAD array. This study offers a new 523 tool to provide science-based advice for the management of FAD fisheries, since the more time fish 524 spend associated, the more vulnerable these individuals are to the fishery. Scenarios could be extended to drifting FADs in open ocean areas, as both anchored and drifting FADs alter the environment in a 525 similar way (Dagorn et al. 2010). While acoustic telemetry experiments have successfully 526 527 characterized residence times at drifting FADs (Govinden et al. 2010; Forget et al. 2015), measuring 528 in situ absence times of tunas within drifting FAD arrays is a major research challenge and these 529 parameters are key for the development of robust FAD management plans by Tuna Regional Fisheries 530 Management Organisations (RFMOs). Our model provides a method for estimate these parameters 531 in the absence of data from acoustically tagged tuna in drifting FAD arrays.

532 Finally, the same approach can be used to study the movement behavior of other marine and terrestrial 533 species that manifest an associative behavior with aggregating sites, and for which presence/absence data are recorded at these sites. For instance, our model could be used to study the movements of 534 535 terrestrial animals who show associative behaviors with waterholes (Zvidzai et al. 2013; O'Farrill et al. 2014) detected through camera traps (Swann & Perkins, 2014; Hughey et al. 2018.). More 536 generally, this method could be used even without any associative behavior at specific sites, as long 537 538 as the study site is equipped with regularly spaced and sufficiently numerous receivers where 539 individuals can be identified.

540

541 Data Availibity Statement

542 Simulations were performed with the model FAT albaCoRaW v1.3. All scripts and data used in this

- 543 study are available on GitHub (<u>https://github.com/adupaix/FAT_albaCoRaW</u>, doi:
- 544 10.5281/zenodo.5834056.).
- 545

546 Acknowledgements

547 The authors would like to acknowledge the two anonymous reviewers for their extensive and 548 constructive feedback.

549

550 Funding

551 This project was co-funded by the ANR project BLUEMED (ANR-14-ACHN-0002), "Observatoire 552 des Ecosystèmes Pélagiques Tropicaux exploités" (Ob7) from IRD/MARBEC and by the 553 International Pole-and-line Foundation (IPNLF).

554

555 Authors' contributions

- 556 SB, KH and LD collected the raw data in the field. GP developed the model, with major contribution
- of AD and MC. GP analysed the data and wrote the paper with major contribution of MC, LD, JLD
- and AD. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

560 Bibliography

- Adam, M. S., Sibert, J., Itano, D., & Holland, K. (2003). Dynamics of bigeye (Thunnus obesus) and
 yellowfin (T. albacares) tuna in Hawaii's pelagic fisheries: Analysis of tagging data with a bulk
 transfer model incorporating size-specific attrition. *Fishery Bulletin*, 101(2), 215–228.
- Ahearn, S. C., Dodge, S., Simcharoen, A., Xavier, G., & Smith, J. L. D. (2017). A context-sensitive
 correlated random walk: a new simulation model for movement. *International Journal of Geographical Information Science*, *31*(5), 867–883.
- 567 https://doi.org/10.1080/13658816.2016.1224887
- Benhamou, S. (2004). How to reliably estimate the tortuosity of an animal's path: Straightness,
 sinuosity, or fractal dimension? *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 229(2), 209–220.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2004.03.016
- 571 Bovet, P., & Benhamou, S. (1988). Spatial analysis of animals' movements using a correlated
 572 random walk model. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, *131*(4), 419–433.
 573 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5193(88)80038-9
- Brill, R. W., Block, B. A., Boggs, C. H., Bigelow, K. A., Freund, E. V, & Marcinek, D. J. (1999).
 Horizontal movments and depth distribution of large adult yellowfin tuna (Thunnus albacares)
 near the Hawaiian Islands, recorded using ultrasonic telemetry: implications for hte
 physiological ecology of pelagic fishes. *Marine Biology*, *133*, 395–408.
 https://doi.org/10.1007/s002270050478
- 579 Byers, J. A. (2001). Correlated random walk equations of animal dispersal resolved by simulation.
 580 *Ecology*, 82(6), 1680–1690. https://doi.org/10.1890/0012581 9658(2001)082[1680:CRWEOA]2.0.CO;2
- 582 Capello, M., Robert, M., Soria, M., Potin, G., Itano, D., Holland, K., ... Dagorn, L. (2015). A
 583 methodological framework to estimate the site fidelity of tagged animals using passive
 584 acoustic telemetry. *PLoS ONE*, *10*(8), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0134002
- 585 Carita M., B., James A., S., & S.N., L. (2000). Caribou movement as a correlated random walk.
 586 *Oecologia*, *123*, 364–374.
- Castro, J., Santiago, J., & Santana-Ortega, T. (2002). A general theory on fish aggregation to
 floating objects: An alternative to the meeting point hypothesis. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*, 11, 255–277. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1020302414472
- Codling, E. A., Plank, M. J., & Benhamou, S. (2008). Random walk models in biology. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 5(25), 813–834. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2008.0014
- 592 Cramer, A., Katz, S., Kogan, C., & Lindholm, J. (2021). Distinguishing residency behavior from
 593 random movements using passive acoustic telemetry. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 672,
 594 73–87. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps13760
- 595 Dagorn, L., & Fréon, P. (1999). Tropical tuna associated with floating objects: a simulation study of
 596 the meeting point hypothesis. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 56(6),
 597 984–993. https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfas-56-6-984

- Dagorn, L., Holland, K. N., Restrepo, V., & Moreno, G. (2013a). Is it good or bad to fish with
 FADs? What are the real impacts of the use of drifting FADs on pelagic marine ecosystems?
 Fish and Fisheries, 14(3), 391–415. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-2979.2012.00478.x
- Dagorn, L., Bez, N., Fauvel, T., & Walker, E. (2013b). How much do fish aggregating devices
 (FADs) modify the floating object environment in the ocean? *Fisheries Oceanography*, 22(3),
 147–153. https://doi.org/10.1111/fog.12014
- Dagorn, L., Holland, K. N., & Filmalter, J. D. (2010). Are drifting FADs essential for testing the
 ecological trap hypothesis? *Fisheries Research*, *106*(1), 60–63.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2010.07.002

Dagorn, L., Holland, K. N., & Itano, D. (2007). Behavior of yellowfin (Thunnus albacares) and
bigeye (T. obesus) tuna in a network of fish aggregating devices (FADs). *Marine Biology*, *151*(2), 595–606. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-006-0511-1

Dagorn, L., Holland, K. N., Restrepo, V., & Moreno, G. (2013). Is it good or bad to fish with FADs?
What are the real impacts of the use of drifting FADs on pelagic marine ecosystems? *Fish and Fisheries*, 14(3), 391–415. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-2979.2012.00478.x

Dagorn, L., Josse, E., Bach, P., & Bertrand, A. (2000). Modeling tuna behaviour near floating
objects: From individuals to aggregations. *Aquatic Living Resources*, *13*(4), 203–211.
https://doi.org/10.1016/S0990-7440(00)01065-2

Dempster, T., & Taquet, M. (2004). Fish aggregation device (FAD) research: Gaps in current
knowledge and future directions for ecological studies. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*, *14*(1), 21–42. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11160-004-3151-x

- Elzhov T.V., Mullen K. M., Spiess, A-N., & Bolker, B. (2016). minpack.lm: R Interface to the
 Levenberg-Marquardt Nonlinear Least-Squares Algorithm Found in MINPACK, Plus
 Support for Bounds. R package version 1.2-1. https://CRAN.Rproject.org/package=minpack.lm
- 623 Forget, F., Capello, M., Filmalter, J. D., Govinden, R., Soria, M., Cowley, P. D., & Dagorn, L.
- 624 (2015). Behaviour and vulnerability of target and non-target species at drifting fish aggregating
- 625 devices (FADs) in the tropical tuna purse seine fishery determined by acoustic telemetry.
- 626 *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 72(9), 1398–1405.
- 627 https://doi.org/10.1139/cjfas-2014-0458
- Fréon, P., & Dagorn, L. (2000). Review of fish associative behaviour: Toward a generalisation of
 the meeting point hypothesis. *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries*, 10(2), 183–207.
 https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016666108540

Girard, C., Benhamou, S., & Dagorn, L. (2004). FAD: Fish Aggregating Device or Fish Attracting
Device? A new analysis of yellowfin tuna movements around floating objects. *Animal Behaviour*, 67(2), 319–326. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2003.07.007

- Girard, C., Dagorn, L., Taquet, M., Aumeeruddy, R., Peignon, C., & Benhamou, S. (2007). Homing
 abilities of dolphinfish (Coryphaena hippurus) displaced from fish aggregating devices (FADs)
 determined using ultrasonic telemetry . Aquatic Living Resources, 321(2007), 313–321.
- 637 https://doi.org/10.1051/alr:2008005

- Govinden, R., Capello, M., Forget, F., Filmalter, J. D., & Dagorn, L. (2021). Behavior of skipjack
 (*Katsuwonus pelamis*), yellowfin (*Thunnus albacares*), and bigeye (*T. obsesus*) tunas
 associated with drifting fish aggregating devices (dFADs) in the Indian Ocean, assessed
 through acoustic telemetry. *Fisheries Oceanography*. https://doi.org/10.1111/fog.12536
- 642 Govinden, R., Dagorn, L., Soria, M., & Filmalter, J. (2010). Behaviour of Tuna associated with
 643 Drifting Fish Aggregating Devices (FADs) in the Mozambique Channel, 1–22.
- Govinden, R., Jauhary, R., Filmalter, J. D., Forget, F., Soria, M., Adam, M. S., & Dagorn, L. (2013).
 Movement behaviour of skipjack (Katsuwonus pelamis) and yellowfin (Thunnus albacares)
 tuna at anchored fish aggregating devices (FADs) in the Maldives, investigated by acoustic
 telemetry. *Aquatic Living Resources*, 26(1), 69–77. https://doi.org/10.1051/alr/2012022
- Hall, R. L. (1977). Amoeboid Movement as a Correlated Walk. *Journal of Mathematical Biology*, *4*,
 327–335. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077546311406307
- Hall, M. A. (1992). The association of tunas with floating objects and dolphins in the Eastern
- 651 Pacific ocean: VII. Some hypotheses on the mechanisms governing the association of tunas
- with floating objects and dolphins. *Backgound Document for the International Workshop on*
- 653 the Ecology and Fisheries for Tunas Associated with Floating Objects, February 11-13 1992,
- 654 *La Jolla, CA, January*, 6.
- Holland, K. N., Brill, R. W., & Chang, R. K. C. (1990). Horizontal and vertical movements of
 yellowfin and bigeye tuna associated with fish aggregating devices. *Fishery Bulletin*, 88(3),
 493–507.
- Hughey, L. F., Hein, A. M., Strandburg-Peshkin, A., & Jensen, F. H. (2018). Challenges and
 solutions for studying collective animal behaviour in the wild. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *373*(1746), 1–13.
 https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2017.0005
- Josse, E., Dagorn, L., & Bertrand, A. (2000). Typology and behaviour of tuna aggregations around
 fish aggregating devices from acoustic surveys in French Polynesia. *Aquatic Living Resources*, *13*(4), 183–192. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0990-7440(00)00051-6
- Kareiva, P. M., & Shigesada, N. (1983). Analyzing Insect Movement as a Correlated Random Walk.
 Oecologia, 56(2), 234–238.
- Lee, K. M., Ballard, M. S., McNeese, A. R., & Wilson, P. S. (2017). Sound speed and attenuation
 measurements within a seagrass meadow from the water column into the seabed. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 141(4), 402–406. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4979302
- Marsac, F., & Cayré, P. (1998). Telemetry 'applied to behaviour analysis of yellowfin tuna
 (Thunnus albacares, Bonnaterre, 1788) movements in a network of fish aggregating devices. *Hydrobiologia*, (May 1998), 155–171. https://doi.org/10.1023/A
- Marsac, F., Fonteneau, A., & Ménard, F. (2000). Drifting FADs used in tuna fisheries: an ecological
 trap? *Biologie and Behaviour of Pelagic Fish Aggreagtions*, 537–552.
- Marsh, L. M., & Jones, R. E. (1988). The form and consequences of random walk movement
 models. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, *133*(1), 113–131. https://doi.org/10.1016/S00225193(88)80028-6

678 McClintock, B. T., King, R., Thomas, L., Matthiopoulos, J., McConnell, B. J., & Morales, J. M. 679 (2012). A general discrete-time modeling framework for animal movement using multistate 680 random walks. Ecological Monographs, 82(3), 335-349. https://doi.org/10.1890/11-0326.1 681 Moreno, G., Dagorn, L., Sancho, G., & Itano, D. (2007). Fish behaviour from fishers' knowledge: 682 the case study of tropical tuna around drifting fish aggregating devices (DFADs). Canadian 683 Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 64(11), 1517–1528. https://doi.org/10.1139/f07-113 684 Murua, H., Dagorn, L., Justel-Rubio, A., Moreno, G. and Restrepo, V. (2021). Questions and 685 Answers about FADs and Bycatch (Version 3). ISSF Technical Report 2021-11. International 686 Seafood Sustainability Foundation, Washington, D.C., USA O'Farrill G, Schampaert KG, Ravfield B, Bodin Ö, Calmé S, Sengupta R, Gonzalez A. The potential 687 connectivity of waterhole networks and theeffectiveness of a protected area under various 688 689 drought scenarios. PLoSOne. 2014;9(5).https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0095049 690 Ohta, I., & Kakuma, S. (2005). Periodic behavior and residence time of yellowfin and bigeye tuna 691 associated with fish aggregating devices around Okinawa Islands, as identified with automated 692 listening stations. Marine Biology, 146(3), 581-594. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00227-004-1456-693 Х 694 Palencia, P., Rowcliffe, J. M., Vicente, J., & Acevedo, P. (2021). Assessing the camera trap 695 methodologies used to estimate density of unmarked populations. Journal of Applied Ecology, 58(8), 1583–1592. https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.13913 696 697 Papastamatiou, Y. P., Meyer, C. G., Carvalho, F., Dale, J. J., Hutchinson, M. R., & Holland, K. N. 698 (2013). Telemetry and random-walk models reveal complex patterns of partial migration in a 699 large marine predator. In Ecology (Vol. 94, Issue 11). 700 Patterson, T. A., Basson, M., Bravington, M. V., & Gunn, J. S. (2009). Classifying movement 701 behaviour in relation to environmental conditions using hidden Markov models. Journal of 702 Animal Ecology, 78(6), 1113–1123. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2009.01583.x 703 Pedro G. Lino, LLuis Bentes, David Abecasis, Miguel Neves dos Santos, & Karim Erzini. (2009). 704 Tagging and Tracking of Marine Animals with Electronic Devices (J. L. Nielsen, H. 705 Arrizabalaga, N. Fragoso, A. Hobday, M. Lutcavage, & J. Sibert, Eds.; Vol. 9). Springer 706 Netherlands. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-9640-2 707 Pérez, G., Dagorn, L., Deneubourg, J., Forget, F., Filmalter, J. D., Holland, K., ... Capello, M. 708 (2020). Effects of habitat modifications on the movement behavior of animals : the case study 709 of Fish Aggregating Devices (FADs) and tropical tunas. Movement Ecology, 8(47), 1-10. 710 Robert, M., Dagorn, L., & Deneubourg, J. L. (2014). The aggregation of tuna around floating 711 objects: What could be the underlying social mechanisms? Journal of Theoretical Biology, 712 359(October), 161–170. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtbi.2014.06.010 713 Robert, M., Dagorn, L., Filmalter, J. D., Deneubourg, J. L., Itano, D., & Holland, K. (2013). Intra-714 individual behavioral variability displayed by tuna at fish aggregating devices (FADs). Marine 715 Ecology Progress Series, 484, 239–247. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps10303 716 Rodriguez-Tress, P., Capello, M., Forget, F., Soria, M., Beeharry, S. P., Dussooa, N., & Dagorn, L. 717 (2017). Associative behavior of yellowfin Thunnus albacares, skipjack Katsuwonus pelamis,

- and bigeye tuna T. obesus at anchored fish aggregating devices (FADs) off the coast of
 Mauritius. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 570, 213–222. https://doi.org/10.3354/meps12101
- Romanov, E. V. (2002). By catch in the tuna purse-seine fisheries of the western Indian Ocean.
 Fishery Bulletin, 100(1), 90–105.
- 722 Scott, G. P., & Lopez, J. (2014). The use of FADs in tuna fisheries.
- Siddiqui, S. I., & Dong, H. (2019). Effects of Water Column Variations on Sound Propagation and
 Underwater Acoustic Communications. *Sensors (Basel, Switzerland)*, *19*(9).
 https://doi.org/10.3390/s19092105
- South, A. (2011). rworldmap: A New R package for Mapping Global Data. *The R Journal*, 3(1), 35–
 43.
- Swann, D. E., & Perkins, N. (2014). Camera trapping for animal monitoring and management: a
 review of applications. In *Camera Trapping* (pp. 3–11).
- Taquet, M., Sancho, G., Dagorn, L., Gaertner, J.-C., Itano, D., Aumeeruddy, R., Wendling, B., &
 Peignon, C. (2007). Characterizing fish communities associated with drifting fish aggregating
 devices (FADs) in the Western Indian Ocean using underwater visual surveys. Aquatic Living
 Resources, 21(4), 331–341. https://doi.org/Doi 10.1051/Alr:2008007
- Therneau, T. M., & Grambsch, P. M. (2000). Modeling Survival Data: Extending the Cox Model.
 Springer.
- Tolotti, M. T., Forget, F., Capello, M., Filmalter, J. D., Hutchinson, M., Itano, D., ... Dagorn, L.
 (2020). Association dynamics of tuna and purse seine bycatch species with drifting fish
 aggregating devices (FADs) in the tropical eastern Atlantic Ocean. *Fisheries Research*,
 226(June 2019), 105521. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2020.105521
- Zvidzai M, Murwira A, Caron A, de Garine-Wichatitksy M. Waterhole usepatterns at the
 wildlife/livestock interface in a semi-arid savanna of southern Africa. Int J Dev Sustain.
 2013;2(2):455–71