Surfacing and vertical behaviour of Atlantic bluefin tuna (*Thunnus thynnus*) in the Mediterranean Sea: implications for aerial surveys

Bauer Robert Klaus ^{1, *}, Forget Fabien ¹, Fromentin Jean-Marc ², Capello Manuela ¹, Grabowski Jonathan ¹

¹ IRD, MARBEC, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, Ifremer, IRD, Se`te, France ² IRD, MARBEC, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, Ifremer, IRD, Se`te, France

* Corresponding author : Robert Klaus Bauer, email address : rbauer@gmx.com

Abstract :

Atlantic bluefin tuna (Thunnus thynnus) (ABFT) frequently engage in surface basking and foraging behaviour that makes them detectable from afar. This behaviour is utilized for the development of fisheries-independent abundance indices based on aerial surveys, although changes in the surface-feeding dynamics of ABFT are not yet accounted for. We investigated the daytime surfacing behaviour of ABFT at different temporal and vertical resolutions based on 24 individuals (117–158 cm fork length), tagged with pop-up archival tags in the Gulf of Lion, NW-Mediterranean Sea between 2015 and 2016. The results suggest that ABFT remain usually <2 min continuously within the visible surface (0–1 m) during daytime. ABFT presence in the 0–1 and 0–20m layers varied over time and between individuals but showed a seasonal decline towards autumn with the breakdown of thermal stratification. Furthermore, the rate of surfacing events was highly correlated with the time spent in the 0–20m layer. Geolocation estimates confirm a strong site fidelity of ABFT during the aerial survey period (August– October) in the Gulf of Lion. Our results support the choice of the survey region and period, but related indices should account for the seasonality of ABFT surface behaviour [i.e. the time spent in the 0–20m layer.

Keywords : abundance index, archival tags, surface availability, thermal stratification, vertical behaviour

44Introduction

45Atlantic bluefin tuna Thunnus thynnus (ABFT) are a highly migratory, opportunistic predators 46that can forage throughout the water column to depths greater than 1000 m. Despite their 47 physiological capabilities, ABFT prefer the epipelagic zone, where they frequently feed on 48schools of small epipelagic fish such as sardines and anchovies (Lutcavage and Kraus, 1997; 49Fromentin and Powers, 2005; Bauer et al., 2017). This behavior facilitates the detection of 50tuna schools from afar and led to the use of spotter planes in tuna purse-seine fisheries 51(Farrugio, 1977; Basson and Farley, 2014). Like fisherman, scientists also exploit the fact that 52ABFT are visible at the surface by conducting scientific aerial surveys to count tuna schools 53 with the objective of obtaining a fisheries-independent abundance index. Several aerial 54 surveys are conducted in different regions worldwide, such as in Australia on southern 55bluefin tuna (Thunnus maccoyii; Eveson et al., 2018) as well as on ABFT in the northwestern 56Mediterranean sea (Bauer et al., 2015a; Fromentin, 2003). Since variations in the vertical 57behaviour (i.e. changes in the "surface availability") of tunas can significantly affect the 58number of schools observed at the sea surface (Bauer et al., 2015b), accounting for this 59variability is a key step to provide a robust abundance index. 60

61Several studies have sought to determine the factors driving the vertical behaviour of bluefin 62tuna (Walli et al., 2009; Galuardi and Lutcavage, 2012; Marcek et al., 2016; Bauer et al., 632017, Eveson et al., 2018). Archival tagging data from the Atlantic Ocean have demonstrated 64that the vertical behaviour of ABFT is influenced by the thermal stratification of the water 65column (Brill et al., 2002; Walli et al., 2009; Galuardi and Lutcavage, 2012). Similar 66relationships were demonstrated in other oceans for Southern and Pacific Bluefin tuna 67(Kitagawa et al., 2007; Eveson et al., 2018). Recently, 24h-depth frequency data from tagging 68studies conducted in the Gulf of Lion (northwestern Mediterranean Sea) showed that ABFT 69mature ABFT (124–255 cm fork length vs 110-135 cm length at maturity Fromentin and 70Powers, 2005; Farley and Ohshimo, 2018) gradually moved from surface layers to deeper 71 waters as winter approached and the waters became less stratified (Bauer et al., 2017). 72These results confirmed the suitability of the aerial survey period (late summer-autumn) in 73this region to maximize the chances of observing ABFT schools at the sea surface. However, 74one of the main limitations of this study was the low resolution of the available data sets, 75mainly consisting of 24h presence rates in predefined depth layers that impeded a fine-scale 76analysis of the vertical behavior of ABFT and its drivers. Using high-resolution depth data 77(five individuals, 179-227 cm fork length) and a recovered Mk10 tag (160 cm fork length), 78Bauer et al. (2017) identified an inversion in the diel vertical behaviour in the Gulf of Lion 79area where aerial surveys were conducted, with higher presence rates between 0-10 m 80during the day in summer and during the night in winter. However, the significance of this 81depth layer for surfacing behavior remained unclear and the resolution of the available data 82was insufficient to provide an adequate estimate of the proportion of time spent in the 83visible surface layer (0-1m; surface availability), as a proxy of feeding behavior and the 84duration of surfacing events.

85

86Higher-resolution depth time series data is required to identify and explain changes of 87 juvenile ABFT presence visible surface layer (0-1m; surface availability) and thus the related 88 variability in the number of schools observed during subsequent aerial surveys. Like other 89 near-coastal areas of high biological productivity, the Gulf of Lion has been identified as a 90 key nursery ground for ABFT (Royer *et al.*, 2004; Druon *et al.*, 2011), where large quantities

91of maturing and adolescent ABFT (length at maturity is 110-135 cm; Fromentin and Powers, 922005; Farley and Ohshimo, 2018) are seen at the surface. Mature ABFT are also present in 93the area but less abundant and not participating in the surface foraging (Bauer *et al.*, 2015a). 94Former tagging experiments in this region only yielded (few high-resolution) vertical 95behavior data of mature ABFT (> 160 cm fork length) due to the physical constraints of 96tagging with early pop-up archival tag models (Fromentin and Lopuszanski, 2014; Bauer *et* 97*al.*, 2015a; Bauer *et al.*, 2017). Accordingly, the horizontal movements and vertical dynamics 98of maturing and adolescent individuals, which constitute the majority of the tuna schools 99spotted by plane surveys, remain unknown. Filling this knowledge gap is a crucial step to 100characterize the surface availability of juveniles and improve abundance indices of ABFT 101from aerial surveys in the Gulf of Lion.

102In the Atlantic Ocean, ABFT is managed by the International Commission for the 103Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT). The regulatory measures adopted by ICCAT in the 1042000's for the ABFT rebuilding plan have introduced extensive changes in the spatio-105temporal patterns of the ABFT fisheries, thus significantly affecting the fisheries-dependent 106indices traditionally employed for the assessment of the eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean 107bluefin tuna stock (ICCAT, 2013; Fromentin *et al.*, 2014). Consequently, the ABFT stock 108assessment require alternative abundance indices based on fisheries-independent data, as 109well as reliable methods for estimating the degree of confidence of such indices. In this 110respect, aerial surveys of ABFT schools, coupled to novel assessment methodologies, are 111now considered vital alternatives to fisheries-based abundance estimates (Walli *et al.*, 2009; 112Bonhommeau *et al.*, 2010).

113In this study, we investigated the surfacing behavior of ABFT (117–158 cm fork length) based 114on high-resolution electronic tagging data collected during the aerial survey season in the 115Gulf of Lion (northwestern Mediterranean Sea). Our objectives were to i) quantify and 116compare potential indicators of juvenile ABFT daytime surfacing behavior based on different 117temporal resolutions and depth layers ii) identify related temporal patterns, iii) characterize 118the environmental factors that can drive these patterns, and iv) address the relevance of 119these indicators for the design and correction of ABFT aerial surveys. 120

121 Material and Methods

122Tag programming

123To study ABFT behavior, we used miniPATs, pop-up satellite archival tags by Wildlife 124Computers (https://wildlifecomputers.com). These tags can record depth and temperature 125time series (denoted below as DepthTS and TempTS, respectively) at a temporal resolution 126of 3 to 5 s (depending on the predefined deployment duration) and a vertical resolution of 1270.5 m. Based on this data, the tag calculates and stores additional data products such as PAT-128style Depth-Temperature profiles (PDT), time at depth data (TAD), time at temperature (TAT; 129Wildlife Computers, 2016). After pop-up, the tags transmit user-defined data products and 130subsets from the recorded data sets. All our tags were configured to transmit the following 131data products: daily light curves, DepthTS and PDT. In order to maximize data coverage of 132the transmitted datasets, we decreased the temporal resolution of the DepthTS and PDT 133data after the first tagging campaign in 2015 from 150 s to 600 s and 6h to 24h, respectively 134(Table 1). For both years, deployment durations were set to 150 and 90 days during spring 135(April–May) and summer (August-September), respectively, in order to cover the aerial 136survey period in the Gulf of Lion (August–October).

137

138Electronic tagging

139Electronic tagging operations were conducted during two periods: August-September 2015 140and April-September 2016. Tagging trips were conducted during these specific temporal 141windows in order to target ABFT in the study area.

142

143Tunas were caught on rod and reel using bait and artificial lures on board sport fishing 144vessels. Captured ABFT were carefully landed onto a wet vinyl mat, where their eyes were 145 immediately covered with a wet cloth and their gills continuously irrigated by placing a hose 146pumping seawater in the fish's mouth. The hook was then removed and the fork length 147 measured. Only ABFT individuals in good condition (e.g. without any previous injuries) with a 148preferred fork length between 110 and 160 cm were tagged. The miniPATs (Wildlife 149Computers, https://wildlifecomputers.com) were rigged with a 12 cm stainless steel cable 150and a large Domeier anchor. The tags were inserted at the base of the second dorsal fin, 151between the pterygiophores using a stainless steel applicator. A keeper strap was used to 152 immobilize the tag by placing an additional plastic anchor, approximately 20 cm toward the 153caudal end of the first anchor. Prior to use, tethers, tag applicators and anchors were 154 disinfected with a 8% povidone-iodine solution (Betadine). After tagging, the fish were 155 released head first back into the sea and the deployment location and time noted. A social 156media campaign (https://www.facebook.com/marine.biologging) was initiated after the 1572016 tagging campaign to increase the chance of tag recovery. 158

159Data analysis

160Geolocation estimates

161The tagging data was automatically uploaded to the Wildlife Computers Data Portal 162(http://my.wildlifecomputers.com/data/). For all tags, geolocations were processed using 163Wildlife Computer GPE3 algorithm, which is available on the data portal (Wildlife Computers, 1642015). This algorithm is based on a gridded hidden Markov model which incorporates light 165 level and Sea Surface Temperature (SST) data of the tags as well as SST (NOAA Optimum 166Interpolation SST V2 High Resolution; http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd) and bathymetry 167 reference data (NOAA ETOP01 global relief model, Bedrock version; Amante and Eakins, 1682009). Additional model inputs included the tag deployment and pop-up locations/times as 169 well as an estimate of the typical traveling speed of the tagged animal. For the tag pop-up 170location, we used the first ARGOS location estimates transmitted (class 1–3, (Service Argos, 1712005). By contrast, transmitted and (when available) recovered DepthTS data were used to 172estimate the tags' time of release (last DepthTS time record prior to pop-up and 173transmission start). Different traveling speeds (2.1, 3.1 and 4.1 km h⁻¹) were tested, in 174accordance with available literature values (Wardle et al., 1989; Lutcavage et al., 2000). The 175selection of the optimal speed was done based on a model score produced by the GPE3 176software, with higher AIC scores indicating better fits to the observed data. Model outputs 177 included maximum likelihood tracks as well as the different likelihood areas (50, 80, 95 and 17899%) for the animal position (Wildlife Computers, 2015). The maximum likelihood tracks 179were used to assess the residency of ABFT in the study region and their habitat utilization 180based on kernel densities that were generated with the kde2d-function of the "MASS" R-181package (Venables & Ripley, 2002). 182

184Environmental data

183

185Three major indicators for the thermal-structure of the water column were estimated using 186the sensor data of the miniPATs: daily thermocline depth, thermocline gradient as well as 187the thermal stratification index, following the approach used by Bauer *et al.* (2015c) 188implemented in the R-package "RchivalTag" (Bauer, 2018). To do so, PAT-style Depth-189Temperature profiles (PDT) or, when available, recovered Depth-Temperature time series 190data were used (See Supplementary material for detailed description). A comparative 191analysis on the accuracy of the three indicators obtained from PDT and Depth-Temperature 192time series data from the recovered tags (Figure S1) revealed that the stratification index 193was particularly robust for days when the tagged individuals vertical profile was \geq 88 m. We 194therefore estimated the stratification index from PDT profiles, or (if available) recovered 195Depth-Temperature time series data, that met this requirement in the subsequent analyses. 196Missing values in the time series of the stratification index were estimated by applying an 197exact cubic regression spline, using the function "spline" of the standard R-package "stats" 198(Forsythe *et al.*, 1977, R Core Team, 2017).

200Vertical behavior

201The analysis of ABFT vertical behavior focused on daytime DepthTS data from the Gulf of 202Lion region that is most relevant for the aerial surveys (Bauer *et al.*, 2015a), see Figure 1. For 203this purpose, we selected only DepthTS data recorded between the time of sunrise and 204sunset, whose corresponding daily position estimates were located within 3–6°E and 41.5–20544°N. To account for temporal and regional changes in the timing of sunrise and sunset 206during the deployment periods, we estimated the timing of both events per day and tag by 207applying the function "get_DayTimeLimits" of the R-package "RchivalTag" (Bauer, 2018). 2080nly complete daily DepthTS (i.e. DepthTS without any transmission gaps during daytime) 209were considered in the subsequent analyses. For the physically recovered tags, the entire 210DepthTS recorded at resolutions of 3 to 5 s within the study region could be used for the 211analysis.

212

213Since we obtained DepthTS data in different resolutions (high-resolution data for the 214recovered tags and 600 s resolution DepthTS for all the remaining tags), the analysis of 215vertical behavior of ABFT was structured over two different temporal scales. First, we 216characterized the vertical behavior of ABFT through the combined 600 s DepthTS datasets 217from the unrecovered (but transmitted) DepthTS data as well as the recovered tagging data, 218the latter being resampled at 600 s to ensure homogeneity among datasets. Then, a fine-219scale analysis was conducted from the high-resolution recovered tags, considering a 220common resolution of 15 s, by subsampling the 3-5 s resolution data for all the recovered 221tags. Finally, using the recovered tags, we studied the relation between the fine-scale 222behavior characterized at a resolution of 15 s and the occupation of the water column 223obtained at 600 s resolution.

224

225

226Vertical behavior - all tags (600 s resolution)

228We analyzed the monthly daytime presence rate of ABFT at different depths based on the 229merged data sets of 2015 and 2016. We estimated the monthly average proportion of time 230that ABFT spent within different depth bins (0, 10, 20, 50, 200, 300, 400, 600, 1000 and 231>1000 m) during daytime as well as its standard deviation from the related daily data of each 232individual. The temporal evolution of daytime presence in the 0-20m layer (named Near-233Surface Layer, NSL) was further analyzed based on the daily average of individual daytime 234presence rates in the 0-20m layer (named Near-Surface Layer, NSL). Daily presence rates 235were estimated for each tagged individual considering the percentage of vertical positions 236located within the NSL layer during daytime. Daily presences rates were averaged and their 237standard deviation estimated over different individuals present during the same day in the 238study region. The same analysis was conducted for the 0-10m layer, see the Supplementary 239Material.

240

241Fine-scale vertical behavior - recovered tags (15 s and 600 s resolution)

242

243The fine-scale analysis of vertical behavior of ABFT focused on the time spent in the 0-1 m 244layer, termed visible surface layer (VSL), as a proxy for surface availability. We therefore 245estimated daily presence rates of ABFT in the VSL with the same procedure as used to 246estimate daily average presence rates in the NSL (see 2.2.3.1). We then calculated the 247continuous bouts of time spent by each individual within a given depth layer. This approach 248has been used to estimate residence and absence times for acoustically tagged individuals 249around instrumented sites (Robert *et al.*, 2013; Capello *et al.*, 2015). Each time an ABFT 250individual was present within the same depth layer, its continuous residence time (CRT) was 251incremented by an amount of time corresponding to the temporal resolution of the data. By 252contrast, if ABFT moved out of the layer, the respective CRTs ended. Following this 253definition, the CRTs recorded for the Visible Surface Layer (VSL, 0-1m), named CRT_{VSL}, were 254estimated.

255

256Since the surface availability of individual ABFT could differ to that of tuna schools, we aimed 257at calculating the continuous residence time of tuna schools in the visible surface layer 258(called CRT_{VSL}^{school}) as a proxy of the school visibility from an airplane. A feeding tuna school 259can be interpreted as the sum of feeding individuals, both tagged and non-tagged. In such an 260event, single individuals may dive below the VSL while others remain inside so that the 261entire school remains visible for a longer period than the tagged individual. To account for 262this, we considered that if a tagged individual was present in the VSL, with time gaps smaller 263than $\Delta t = 1$ min, the school was still visible at the surface and its CRT_{VSL}^{school} incremented. 264Conversely, if the tagged individuals left the VSL layer for a time interval larger than Δt , the 265duration of the respective CRT_{VSL}^{school} is ended. The idea of adding a time gap Δt is similar to 266the concept of Maximum Blanking Period (MBP, Capello et al. 2015), where brief absences, 267below a given threshold (the MBP), are not accounted in the CRT estimates, namely the 268school is considered to still be present in this layer.

269

270Given that both high-resolution data from recovered tags and transmitted lower-resolution 271data were available, we tested how the time series data at high resolution (15 s) translates 272into lower resolution data sets (600 s). We therefore considered, for each position of a 273recovered tag in the 0-1m layer at time *t*, two random vertical positions at time *t*- α and *t*- α + 274600 s, with α being a random number sampled over the set of discrete values {15s, 30s, 45

275s,..., 600s}. We then drew the cumulative curve on the frequency of these vertical positions 276to obtain the occupation rates of different depths within the 600 s interval around the 277surfacing events of ABFT. Moreover, we estimated the CRTs in the Near-Surface Layer 278(CRT_{NSL}, 0-20 m) and the Deep Layer (CRT_{DL}, >20 m) based on the subsampled 600 s 279recovered-tag data sets. Figure 2 provides a schematic view of the different CRTs used to 280characterize to the vertical behavior of ABFT and Table S1 resumes the resolution used to 281estimate the CRTs for each layer.

282

283The similarity between CRTs of different layers was tested per month using the Kruskall-284Wallis test of comparison, using the "kruskal.test" of the R-package "stats" (R Core Team, 2852017). Finally, Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated using the 286function "cor" of the R-package "stats" (R Core Team, 2017) to investigate the correlation 287between the number of surfacing events (i.e., the number of CRT_{VSL}) and the time spent in 288the 0-20m layer (i.e., the duration of the CRT_{NSL}).

289

290Results

291 Tagging data

292A total of 24 tags were deployed between 2015 and 2016 mainly maturing and adolescent 293ABFT (117–158 cm fork length; Table 1). Only 8 of the 24 tags remained attached to the fish 294until the end of their intended deployment period (90-150 days). Actual deployment 295durations ranged from 2 to 151 days with an average of 50.8 days ± 40.2 SD (Figure 3). Three 296tags from 2016 had deployment durations of less than one week (#15P0983, #15P0985, 297#15P0986) due to hardware failure. In addition, two tags (#14P0821 and #14P0825) from the 2982015 tagging trip provided only 1–4 days of complete DepthTS data, despite rather short 299deployment durations of 44–51 days, due to the specific tag configuration applied. DepthTS 300data from these 5 tags was not used in the subsequent analyses. Out of the 24 deployed 301tags, seven were physically recovered (Table 1), providing the complete archived time series 302data at a resolution of 3–5 s. Nineteen tags provided more than 7 days of complete DepthTS 303data (i.e. without transmission gaps) (Tables 1 and S2).

304

305**Residency in the Gulf of Lion**

306The tracks obtained using a speed of 4.1 km h⁻¹ in the GPE3 model performed generally 307better than the 2.1 and 3.1 km h⁻¹ models, both on transmitted and recovered datasets 308(Table S3). Only tag 15P0983 showed a better performance of the 2.1 km h⁻¹ model. Based 309on the maximum likelihood tracks, the study zone encompassed the high density area of the 310tags' geolocations (Figure 4) corresponding to 63.5% of all tag gelocations recorded during 311both years (Figures 3 and S2). Fish tagged since August in 2016 showed a higher residency in 312the study area than those tagged during the same period in 2015, accounting 80.5% (\pm 21.0 313SD) vs 51.8% (\pm 37.4 SD) on average, respectively. In fact, 13 of 14 ABFT tagged during 314August 2016 spent > 50% and 5 of them 100% of the time in the Gulf of Lion. In contrast, 315only 2 out of the 6 ABFT tagged in 2015 showed a similar preference and remained the 316entire deployment period of their tag (45-46 days) in the Gulf of Lions. All four ABFT tagged 317during the spring season (end of April 2016) left the Gulf of Lion shortly after tagging for at 318least one month. Only two of these fish kept their tag until mid-September (the intended 319end of deployment) and returned twice to the Gulf of Lion during this period (Figures 3 and 320S2). No tagged tuna left the Mediterranean Sea towards the Atlantic and only one fish left 321the western Mediterranean during the study (Figures 4 and Figure S2). This fish (#14P0823) 322was tagged during spring 2016 and ultimately moved to the Eastern Mediterranean basin, 323where the tag surfaced between Malta and Libya.

324

325Vertical behavior from all tags

326Monthly presence rates in the water column

327The proportion of time spent by ABFT at different depth strata showed a clear temporal 328trend (Figure 5). The occupation the 0-10m depths increased from spring (April) to summer 329(July), remained stable during July-September and then decreased in autumn (October), 330attaining the lowest values in November. The occupation of the depths between 10 and 20 331m was less pronounced and did not show clear temporal changes, whereas the depths below 33220 m showed an opposite trend relative to the 0-10m, with the time at depth first 333decreasing from spring to summer, then increasing from summer to autumn. 334

335Time series of daily presence rates in the NSL

336For both 2015 and 2016, the daily presence rates of ABFT in the NSL (0-20 m) attained 337maximum values (>90%) during the summer (July-September) and showed a sharp decrease 338between September and October (Figure 6), in parallel with the decline of the thermal 339stratification index. The sensitivity analysis with a more restrictive NSL (0-10m) revealed a 340similar trend and relationship to the thermal destratification (Figure S3). 341

342Fine-scale vertical behavior from recovered tags

343Six of the seven recovered tags were present in the study zone during the period August-344October (Figure 2). We therefore focused the high-resolution data analyses on this dataset 345during both study years, 2015 and 2016.

346

347Surface availability: presence rates and duration of residency in the VSL

348The daily presence rates of the seven recovered tags within the 0-1 m layer (VSL) showed 349during both years a high variability over time and between individuals, generally ranging 350between 0 and 60% apart from few extreme values (>80%) attained during August of both 351years (Figure 7). Presence rates in the VSL decreased from summer to autumn, in parallel 352with the decline of the thermal stratification index. This simultaneous decline was 353particularly visible in October 2016, when the presence rates and thermal stratification index 354both dropped abruptly.

355

356The average time spent continuously in the 0-1m layer (CRT_{VSL}) ranged between 1 and 2 357minutes (Table 2). Although, there was no clear temporal trend (Figure 8), pairwise Kruskall-358Wallis tests demonstrated significant differences in the average CRT_{VSL} between months and 359years (p<0.05), except for September and October in 2016. Similarly, daily average durations 360of CRT_{VSL} demonstrated a high temporal variability for both years and no clear temporal 361trends (Figure S4).

363The estimated time that ABFT schools spent continuously at the surface (CRT_{VSL}^{School}), ranged 364between 3 and 6 minutes during all months of the study period (Table 2). Overall, the 365duration of CRT_{VSL}^{School} were longer than that of CRT_{VSL} , indicating that subsequent surfacing 366events occurred. The Kruskall Wallis test of comparison on the monthly CRT_{VSL}^{School} 367demonstrated that there were significant (p<0.05) differences between years and months 368(except for August and October in 2015), but no clear temporal trends were found (Figures 8 369and S4).

370

371Presence at other depth layers recorded at lower resolutions

372The analysis of ABFT presence in the VSL relative to that of other depth layers revealed that 373>90% of all depth records within a temporal window of 600 s around individual surfacing 374events were located between 0–20 m (Figure 9).

375

376During both years, the time spent continuously in the 0-20 m layer (CRT_{NSL}) was significantly 377different over different months (Kruskall-Wallis test, p<0.05), except for August and 378September in 2015 (Figure 10 and Table 2). In 2015, the average CRT_{NSL} ranged between 1.9 379hours (September) and 0.5 hours (October). In 2016, the average CRT_{NSL} values ranged 380between 2.6 (August) and 0.9 hour (October). A decreasing temporal trend in CRT_{NSL} towards 381October was particularly clear in 2016, both on a monthly and daily basis (Figures 10 and S5). 382The average residence times in the Deep Layer (> 20 m, CRT_{DL}) showed opposite trends to 383that of the NSL. Accordingly, the CRT_{DL} increased towards October, accounting 0.9 and 1.1 384hours in 2015 and 2016, respectively (Table 2, Figures 10 and S5). Minimum monthly average 385values of 0.3 and 0.4 hours for the CRT_{DL} were recorded during September (2015) and 386August (2016), resptectively. Pairwise Kruskall-Wallis tests demonstrated significant 387differences in the average CRT_{DL} between months and years (p<0.05), except for August and 388September in 2015 and 2016.

389

390The sensitivity analysis with a more restrictive NSL (0-10m) and therefore larger DL (>10m) 391revealed similar trends in the average residence times (Table S4, Figures S6-7) and test 392results of monthly comparisons, although absolute estimates were of a smaller magnitude. 393

394Correlation between subsequent CRTs, surface events and time spent in the 0-20m layer

395Subsequent CRTs were weakly correlated irrespective of the reference layer and showed no 396apparent relationship. Accordingly, Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficients of 397subsequent CRTs in the VSL accounted 0.28 and 0.31 for individual tunas and tuna schools, 398respectively. Similarly, the correlation coefficients of subsequent CRTs in the NSL and DL 399accounted for 0.16 and 0.19 respectively.

400

401By contrast, CRT durations of individual tunas in the NSL were highly correlated to the 402number of surface events (Figure 11, S8). On a monthly basis, correlation coefficients 403between the daily CRT_{NSL} durations of the recovered tags and the respective number of 404surface events accounted for 0.81, 0.69 and 0.89, from August to October, respectively. The 405corresponding data of the tuna schools showed a constant increase in the linear correlation 406between the CRT durations in the NSL and number of school surface events from August to 407October, accounting for 0.68, 0.85 and 0.93.

408

410Discussion

411In this study, we investigated the site fidelity and vertical behavior of maturing and 412adolescent ABFT in the Gulf of Lion. In comparison to previous electronic tagging studies 413conducted in the same region (Fromentin and Lopuszanski, 2014), our study focused on 414smaller individuals (FL < 160 cm). The ABFT individual size ranges considered in this study 415(117-158 cm FL) are commonly found in the study region and are thus highly relevant for 416aerial surveys. However, so far there was no knowledge on their vertical behavior and site 417fidelity.

418

419This study demonstrated that the majority of the tagged tuna spent a large proportion of 420time within the Gulf of Lion, where they were tagged, in particular during the aerial survey 421season (August—October). This result is consistent with what was previously found for 422mature ABFT individuals (Fromentin and Lopuszanski, 2014). The consistency of the site 423fidelity of ABFT along different size ranges and years is highly relevant for the robustness of 424the abundance indices obtained through aerial surveys. Namely, our results indicate that 425variabilities in the size distribution of ABFT individuals will not affect the indices.

426The analysis of the monthly time at depth profiles demonstrated a strong seasonal pattern in 427the ABFT vertical behavior, consistent with the findings of previous multi-year PSAT tagging 428studies conducted on larger individuals (Bauer et al., 2017). The optimized deployment 429 periods and transmission settings chosen allowed us to obtain complete depth time series 430and allowed the characterization of the vertical behavior of multiple individuals on a daily 431 basis. In this respect, the temporal evolution of daily presence rates of ABFT in the Near 432Surface Layer (NSL, 0-20m) showed a seasonal trend that followed the thermal 433 destratification of the water column, with high presence rates in the summer, where tuna 434spent up to 80-90% of the time in 0-20 m layer. Remarkably, the daily presence rates in the 435NSL showed a high variability, even among consecutive days. Moreover, large daily standard 436 deviations were estimated over different individuals, thus revealing a high variability in the 437ABFT vertical behavior, both at the intra and inter-individual level. Such variability may be 438 related to local environmental conditions, local availability of prey, or to the physiology of 439ABFT themselves. Marcek et al. (2016), showed that juvenile ABFT in the west-Atlantic 440Ocean apparently spent more time below the thermocline with increasing lunar 441 illumination during night-time, but not during daytime. It is further noteworthy to recall 442that surface presence of ABFT is composed of various behavioral types, including foraging 443behavior and horizontal migrations (Lutcavage and Kraus, 1997). Future studies could explain 444our findings through the use of new-generation tags that can measure the physiology and 445vertical behavior of tagged individuals at the same time.

446Remarkably, during aerial surveys conducted over consecutive weeks or even days, it is not 447uncommon to encounter a similar degree of variability in the number of tuna schools 448spotted by the plane. In this respect, the high degree of inter-individual and temporal 449variability found in this study suggests that changes in the visibility conditions due to the sea 450state (i.e. waves vs flat surface) constitute only one of the components of the system's 451variability.

452

453From the 24 tags deployed, seven (29.1%) tags were recovered. The high resolution of the 454depth sensors of the tags (vertical resolution: 0.5 m; accuracy +/- 1%) and the high

455temporal resolution of the recovered tags (<5 s) allowed the first in-depth analysis of ABFT 456vertical behavior in the study region. For this purpose, surfacing events, identified through 457the presence of recovered tags in the visible surface layer (0-1 m, VSL), were taken as a 458proxy for surface feeding. Our results showed that despite a high variability over time and 459between individuals, the presence in the VSL clearly dropped during October, following 460the decline of the thermal stratification index from summer to autumn. On the other 461hand, monthly and daily averaged continuous residence times (CRTs) in the VSL showed no 462such trend or seasonality. On average, CRTs of individual ABFT and tuna schools in the VSL 463lasted 1-2 minutes for all months, which is comparable with what was expected from 464boat-based observations of surfacing ABFT during tagging trips. School-related CRTs in the 465VSL were longer than that of individuals (3-6 min), indicating that subsequent surfacing 466events occurred.

467The analysis of the high-resolution DepthTS data of the recovered tags allowed us to link 468different temporal and spatial scales. First, it demonstrated that 90% of the vertical 469 positions sampled within a temporal window of 10 min around individual surfacing events 470were located within 0-20 m. Furthermore, we show a high correlation between the 471number of surfacing events (i.e., the number of CRT_{VSL}) and the residence times in the 0-20 472 m layer, (CRT_{NSL}). The latter showed a decreasing trend in duration between summer and 473 autumn. A similar decline was observed in the combined daily presence rates in the NSL of 474all tags and the thermal destratification of the water column. As such, the decrease in the 475surface availability of tuna from summer to autumn can be explained by means of 476 residency in the 0-20m layer (that affect the number of surfacing events) rather than by 477the continuous times spent in the 0-1m layer. This implies that the time spent within this 478 layer can provide a good proxy for the presence rates in the VSL. Moreover, lower-479 resolution depth time series obtained from transmitted data can already provide sufficient 480 information to evaluate the actual surface availability of ABFT in the region. These results 481strengthen previous findings by Bauer et al. (2017) on ABFT and Eveson et al. (2018) on 482SBFT that used the time spent in the NSL as a proxy for the surface availability.

483Accordingly, the apparent absence in temporal trends in the CRT_{VSL} (0-1m) likely means 484that the presence of ABFT at the visible surface corresponds to instantaneous events, 485probably related to foraging activity. On the other hand, the temporal trends observed for 486the CRTs in the NSL (0-20m) and DL (>20m) may reflect the existence of two behavioral 487states ("near the surface" and "deep"), associated with two different feeding strategies of 488tuna, foraging at the surface and deeper as indicated earlier by Bauer *et al.* (2017). These 489behavioral states may be triggered by the seasonal oceanographic conditions that can 490affect the presence of forage at the surface (Saraux *et al.*, 2014).

491Similarly it is important to consider the habitat use and function when relating surface 492presence and surface feeding activity. In nursery areas such as the Gulf of Lion and the Great 493Australian Bight, juvenile tuna schools are almost exclusively detected during surface 494foraging events while conducting aerial surveys (Bauer *et al.*, 2015a; Eveson *et al.*, 2018). In 495such areas, surface presence and feeding activity are therefore linked. By contrast in some 496regions, such as the "Tuna Alley" in the Great Bahama Banks (Lutcavage and Kraus, 1997), large 497adults are migrating at the surface presumed to be on their northerly migration and not 498actively engaged in feeding as ABFT in the Gulf of Lion (Bauer *et al.*, 2015a). Therefore, in other 499regions the relationship between surface activity and behavior should be investigated 500further to identify those factors driving surface behavior in those other regions. Other 501sensors incorporated into PSATs, such as accelerometers and sonars, could help to 502distinguish the different behaviours of ABFT and identify feeding events during surface 503presence periods (Jorgensen *et al.*, 2015; Lawson *et al.*, 2015). Such an application would 504further facilitate the quantification of surface feeding events and their duration.

505

506The apparent relation between a decline in the thermal stratification and different ABFT 507surface presence indicators has strong implications for ABFT aerial surveys, conducted in the 508same study area since 2000 (Bauer et al., 2015a). Derived ABFT abundance estimates are 509currently not corrected by their surface availability. Such a correction is of overall 510 importance since a large fraction of survey repetitions is being conducted during the 511 destratification period. In case of cetaceans, this is usually done by applying average (CRT) 512durations of surfacing and submergence (Bauer et al., 2015b). Similar approaches that 513account for the time spent by ABFT in the visible surface and its possible temporal and 514 inter-individual variability should be incorporated in the derivation of the abundance 515 indices for ABFT based on aerial surveys data. In this respect, further research directions 516 could explore the use of empirical models, that incorporate the vertical behavior of 517ABFT schools based on the vertical dynamics found herein and provide the number of 518schools spotted at the sea surface along the aerial surveys transects. These models 519 would allow evaluating the sensitivity and robustness of the abundance indices with 520 respect to the inter-individual, daily and seasonal variability found herein. Moreover, 521they could allow testing the effectiveness of different aerial survey sampling strategies 522(transect characteristics; number of surveys, temporal spread of the surveys). Finally, 523 these models would allow standardizing the derived abundance indices accounting for 524 the seasonal effects. In this respect, our results, in conjunction with external data on the 525thermal stratification in the Gulf of Lion (i.e. from future deployments of oceanographic 526data buoys or validated ocean models; Hu et al., 2009) will further help us to address these 527 effects in upcoming or even past survey years.

528

529Acknowledgements

530

531We thank the crews of the Cyngali and Roussillon Fishing fishing vessels for their 532cooperation during the tagging cruises. The study was part of the BLUEMED project 533funded by the French National Research Agency (ANR; Project-ID ANR-14-ACHN-0002).

534

535

536**References**

537

538Amante, C., and Eakins, B. W. 2009. ETOPO1 1 Arc-Minute Global Relief Model: 539Procedures, Data Sources and Analysis. NOAA Technical Memorandum NESDIS 540NGDC-24. 19 pp.

542Basson, M., and Farley, J. H. 2014. A standardised abundance index from commercial 543spotting data of southern bluefin tuna (*Thunnus maccoyii*): Random effects to the 544rescue. PLoS ONE, 9:e116245.

545

546Bauer, R. 2018. RchivalTag: Analyzing Archival Tagging Data. R package version 0.0.8. 547https://cran.r-project.org/package=RchivalTag.

548

549Bauer, R. 2019. oceanmap: A Plotting Toolbox for 2D Oceanographic Data. R 550package version 0.1.0.1. https://cran.r-project.org/package=oceanmap.

551 552

553Bauer, R., Fromentin, J.-M., Demarcq, H., and Bonhommeau S. 2017. Habitat 554use, vertical and horizontal behaviour of Atlantic bluefin tuna (*Thunnus thynnus*) in 555the Northwestern Mediterranean Sea in relation to oceanographic conditions. 556Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 141:248-261.

557

558Bauer, R. K., Bonhommeau, S., Brisset, B., and Fromentin, J.-M. 2015a. Aerial 559surveys to monitor bluefin tuna abundance and track efficiency of management 560measures. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 534:221–234.

561Bauer, R. K., Fromentin, J.-M., Demarcq, H., Brisset, B., and Bonhommeau, S. 2015b. 562Co-occurrence and habitat use of fin whales, striped dolphins and Atlantic bluefin 563tuna in the Northwestern Mediterranean Sea. PLoS ONE 10:e0139218.

564

565Bauer, R. K., Forget, F., and Fromentin, JM. 2015c. Optimizing PAT data 566transmission: Assessing the accuracy of temperature summary data to 567estimate environmental conditions. Fisheries Oceanography, 24:533–539.

568Bonhommeau, S., Farrugio, H., Poisson, F., and Fromentin, J.-M. 2010. Aerial surveys of 569bluefin tuna in the western Mediterranean Sea: retrospective, prospective, perspectives. 570Collective Volume of Scientific Papers ICCAT, 65(SCRS/2009/142): 801-811.

571Brill, R., Lutcavage, M., Metzer, G., and Bushnell, P. 2002. Horizontal and vertical 572movements of juvenile bluefin tuna (*Thunnus thynnus*, in relation to oceanographic 573conditions of the western North Atlantic, determined with ultrasonic. Fishery 574Bulletin, 100:155–167.

575Capello, M., Robert, M., Soria, M., Potin, G., Itano, D., Holland, K., and 576Deneubourg, J. L. et al. 2015. A methodological framework to estimate the site 577fidelity of tagged animals using passive acoustic telemetry. PLoS ONE, 10:1–19.

578

579Druon, J. N., Fromentin, J. M., Aulanier, F. and Heikkonen, J. 2011. Potential feeding and 580spawning habitats of Atlantic bluefin tuna in the Mediterranean Sea. Marine Ecology 581Progress Series, 439:223-240. 582

583Eveson, J. P., Patterson, T. A., Hartog, J. R., Evans, K. 2018. Modelling surfacing 584behaviour of southern bluefin tuna in the Great Australian Bight. Deep-Sea 585Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 157–158:179-189.

586

587Farley J., and Ohshimo S. 2018. Review and insights into the differences in reproductive 588parameter estimates between Eastern and Western Atlantic bluefin tuna stocks. Collective 589Volume of Scientific Papers ICCAT, 75:1472-1493.

590

591Farrugio, H. 1977. Données préliminaires sur la pêche au thon rouge au filet 592tournant en Méditerranée française. Collective Volume of Scientific Papers ICCAT, 5936:245–252.

594

595Forsythe, G. E., Malcolm, M. A., and Moler, C. B. 1977. Computer methods for 596mathematical computations. Prentice-Hall series in automatic computation. 259 597pp. Wiley, Prentice-Hall.

598

599Fromentin, J.-M. 2003. The East Atlantic and Mediterranean bluefin tuna stock 600management: Uncertainties and alternatives. Scientia Marina, 67:51–62.

601

602Fromentin, J.-M., and Powers, J. E. 2005. Atlantic bluefin tuna: population dynamics, ecology, 603fisheries and management. Fish and Fisheries 6: 281–306.

604Fromentin, J.-M., Bonhommeau, S., Arrizabalaga, H., and Kell, L.T. 2014. The spectre of 605uncertainty in management of exploited fish stocks: The illustrative case of Atlantic bluefin 606tuna. Marine Policy, 47(0): 8-14.

607Fromentin, J.-M., and Lopuszanski, D. 2014. Migration, residency, and homing of bluefin tuna 608in the western Mediterranean Sea. ICES Journal of Marine Science 71(3):510–518. 609

610Galuardi, B., and Lutcavage, M. 2012. Dispersal routes and habitat utilization of 611 juvenile Atlantic bluefin tuna, *Thunnus thynnus*, tracked with mini PSAT and 612 archival tags. PLoS ONE, 7:e37829.

613

614Hu, Z., Doglioli, A., Petrenko, A., Marsaleix, P., and Dekeyser, I. 2009. Numerical 615simulations of eddies in the Gulf of Lion. Ocean Modelling, 28:203–208.

616ICCAT. 2013. Report of the 2012 Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Stock Assessment Session. Collective 617Volume of Scientific Papers ICCAT, 69(1): 1-198.

618Jorgensen, S. J., Gleiss, A. C., Kanive, P. E., Chapple, T. K., Anderson, S. D., Ezcurra, 619J.M., and Brandt, W.T. et al. 2015. In the belly of the beast: resolving stomach tag 620data to link temperature, acceleration and feeding in white sharks (*Carcharodon* 621*carcharias*). Animal Biotelemetry, 3:10 pp.

623Kitagawa, T., Kimura, S., Nakata, H., and Yamada, H. 2007. Why do young Pacific 624bluefin tuna repeatedly dive to depths through the thermocline? Fisheries 625Science, 73:98–106.

626

627Lawson, G. L., Hückstädt, L. A., Lavery, A. C., Jaffré, F. M., Wiebe, P. H., Fincke 628J. R., and Crocker, D. E. et al. 2015 Development of an animal-borne "sonar tag" 629for quantifying prey availability: test deployments on northern elephant seals. 630Animal Biotelemetry, 3:22 pp.

631

632Lutcavage, M., and Kraus, S. 1997. Aerial survey of giant bluefin tuna, *Thunnus* 633*thynnus*, in the Great Bahama Bank, Straits of Florida, 1995. Fishery Bulletin, 63495:300–310.

635

636Lutcavage, M. E., Brill, R. W., Skomal, G. B., Chase, B. C., Goldstein, J. L., and Tutein, J. 6372000. Tracking adult North Atlantic bluefin tuna (*Thunnus thynnus*) in the 638northwestern Atlantic using ultrasonic telemetry. Marine Biology, 137:347–358.

639

640Marcek, B. J., Fabrizio, M. C., and Graves, J. E. 2016. Short-term habitat use of 641 juvenile Atlantic bluefin tuna. Marine and Coastal Fisheries, 8:395–403.

642

643R Core Team. 2017. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R 644Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, https://www.r-project.org/.

645

646Robert, M., Dagorn, L., Filmalter, J. D., Deneubourg, J. L., Itano, D., and Holland, K. 6472013. Intra-individual behavioral variability displayed by tuna at fish aggregating 648devices (FADs). Marine Ecology Progress Series, 484:239–247.

649Royer, F., Fromentin, J.-M., and Gaspar, P. 2004. The association between bluefin tuna 650schools and oceanic features in the Western Mediterranean Sea. Marine Ecology Progress 651Series, 269:249-263.

652

653Saraux, C., Fromentin, J.-M., Bigot, J. L., Bourdeix, J. H., Morfin, M., Roos, D., and Van 654Beveren, E., et al., 2014. Spatial structure and distribution of small pelagic fish in the North-655western Mediterranean Sea. PloS One 9, e111211.

656

657Service ARGOS Inc. 2005. Basic Description of the Argos System. 7 pp.

658

659Venables, W. N. & Ripley, B. D. 2002. Modern Applied Statistics with S. Fourth Edition. 660Springer, New York. ISBN 0-387-95457-0

661

662Walli, A., Teo, S. L. H., Boustany, A., Farwell, C. J., Williams, T., Dewar, H., and 663Prince, E. et al. 2009. Seasonal movements, aggregations and diving behavior of

664Atlantic bluefin tuna (*Thunnus thynnus*) revealed with archival tags. PloS ONE 6654:e6151.

666

667Wardle, C. S., Videler, J. J., Arimoto, T., Franco, J.-M., and He, P. 1989. The muscle 668twitch and the maximum swimming speed. Jorunal of Fish Biology, 35:129–137.

669

670Wildlife Computers. 2015. Data Portal's Location Processing (GPE3 & FastLoc-671GPS) User Guide, 25 pp.

672

673Wildlife Computers. 2016. MiniPAT User Guide, 26 pp.

674

675

Table 1: Tag deployments metadata for the 24 pop-up archival tags deployed during 2015 (n=6) and 2016 (n=18) in the Gulf of Lions. France. The * symbol indicates prematurely released tags with deployment durations of less than 15 days that transmitted DepthTS at 300 s resolution unless the originally programmed resolution was higher.

#		Fork	Fork Deployment			Release		Days at	DepthTS	epthTS TS	sot	
π	Tay ID	(cm)	Date	Longitude	Latitude	Date	Longitude	Latitude	Liberty	(sec)	(sec)	561
1	14P0818	127	2015-08-05 06:48	4,84	43,24	2015-09-09 17:40	8,61	40,89	36	600	3	recovered
2	14P0814	144	2015-08-05 14:15	4,84	43,24	2015-09-27 12:00	6,43	39,17	53	600	600	transmitted
3	14P0813	131	2015-09-10 09:24	4,87	43,25	2015-10-25 20:00	4,93	42,93	46	600	600	transmitted
4	14P0824	130	2015-09-10 09:55	4,87	43,25	2015-10-25 22:20	4,18	43,11	46	600	3	recovered
5	14P0825	140	2015-09-25 09:00	5,12	43,25	2015-11-14 20:00	4,97	43,15	51	150	150	transmitted
6	14P0821	141	2015-09-25 11:45	5,12	43,25	2015-11-08 02:37	4,76	43,03	44	150	150	transmitted
7	14P0823	120	2016-04-17 10:57	3,27	42,43	2016-09-11 12:10	13,51	34,79	147	600	600	transmitted
8	14P0819	117	2016-04-17 12:57	3,26	42,4	2016-09-15 15:45	3,13	41,65	151	600	600	transmitted
9	14P0815	129	2016-04-22 07:45	3,1	42,66	2016-05-04 11:46	3,42	38,24	12	300	5	recovered
10	14P0816	132	2016-04-22 09:51	3,08	42,69	2016-05-30 07:00	2,95	40,81	37	600	600	transmitted
11	15P0986	140	2016-08-03 08:55	5,2	43,14	2016-08-09 18:50	6,72	41,09	6	300	300	transmitted
12	15P0983	146	2016-08-03 12:00	5,2	43,14	2016-08-06 17:00	5,1	41,67	3	300	300	transmitted
13	15P0985	156	2016-08-03 12:25	5,2	43,14	2016-08-05 13:15	5,08	40,94	2	300	300	transmitted
14	15P1019	146	2016-08-07 08:00	5,2	43,13	2016-08-19 18:05	4,68	42,67	12	300	300	transmitted
15	15P1022	153	2016-08-07 14:45	5,2	43,13	2016-09-03 17:20	4,93	42,89	27	600	600	transmitted
16	11P0584	142	2016-08-25 08:30	5,18	43,14	2016-11-23 21:54	5,01	43,31	91	600	5	recovered
17	11P0587	144	2016-08-26 12:50	5,16	43,14	2016-11-24 22:10	5,05	43,16	91	600	600	transmitted
18	11P0279	147	2016-08-26 13:39	5,16	43,14	2016-09-29 12:00	4,74	43,35	34	600	600	transmitted
19	13P0243	147	2016-08-26 14:36	5,16	43,15	2016-11-16 00:30	6,75	40,94	82	600	3	recovered
20	15P1025	125	2016-08-28 08:40	4,77	43,23	2016-11-26 20:00	3,9	41,7	90	600	600	transmitted
21	15P0984	158	2016-08-28 15:00	4,23	43,23	2016-10-19 14:01	4,37	43,24	52	600	3	recovered
22	15P1023	128	2016-08-31 10:00	4,74	43,23	2016-09-19 15:00	4,79	41,44	19	600	600	transmitted
23	15P1024	135	2016-08-31 11:00	4,74	43,23	2016-10-16 01:01	4,55	43,2	46	600	3	recovered
24	15P1016	130	2016-08-31 12:30	4,74	43,23	2016-10-12 12:20	8,57	41,62	41	600	600	transmitted

Table 2: Monthly average of daytime CRT_{VSL} , CRT_{VSL}^{school} , CRT_{NSL} and CRT_{DL} recorded for the recovered tags. Values in brackets report the standard deviation.

Year	Month	CRTvs∟			
		(min)	(min)	(h)	(h)
	August	2.1 (4.2)	5.7 (21.8)	1.6 (2.2)	0.6 (1.0)
2015	September	1.1 (1.5)	3.5 (6.0)	1.9 (2.7)	0.3 (0.4)
	October	2.2 (3.7)	4.9 (8.4)	0.5 (0.5)	0.9 (1.1)
	August	1.7 (5.9)	4.6 (16.7)	2.6 (4.0)	0.4 (0.7)
2016	September	1.8 (4.4)	4.7 (13.1)	1.1 (1.9)	0.5 (0.9)
	October	1.5 (3.1)	4.8 (9.1)	0.9 (1.7)	1.1 (1.8)



Figure 1: The Gulf of Lions, North Western Mediterranean Sea. The green and blue dots indicate the tag deployment locations for year 2015 and 2016, respectively and the yellow lines show the aerial survey transects. The dotted black rectangle denotes the study area. Maps were generated using the "plotmap"-functions of the R-package "oceanmap" (Bauer, 2019).



Figure 2: Schematic illustration of the 3 different depth layers (VSL: Visual surface layer; NSL: Near-Surface Layer; DL: Deep Layer) and related CRT examples of individual fish and tuna schools that were used to study the vertical behavior of ABFT.



Figure 3: Temporal coverage (green) of DepthTS data per deployed tag. Data gaps due to transmission loss are shown in red. Blue bars indicate the periods spent inside the study area of the Gulf of Lions. Bold serial numbers indicate tagging data used in the analyses.



Figure 4: a) 80% Surface probability maps for each tag based on the most likely of the assumed travel speeds. b) Combined kernel densities of all tags deployed during 2015 and 2016. Maps were generated using the "plotmap"-and "v"-functions of the R-package "oceanmap" (Bauer, 2019). For individual tracks see Figure S2.



Figure 5: Average monthly percentages of the time at depth and its standard deviation (error bars) obtained from the daytime DepthTS data of all tags at 600 s resolution. Histograms were generated using the "hist_tad"-function of the R-package "RchivalTag" (Bauer, 2018).



Figure 6: Average daily presence rates recorded in the 0-20m depth layer (NSL) from all tags (blue dots) and its standard deviation (error bars) as well as the thermal stratification index (orange) in 2015 (left) and 2016 (right).



Figure 7: Average daily presence rates recorded in the 0-1 m depth layer (VSL) for the recovered tags (blue dots) and its standard deviation (error bars) as well as the thermal stratification index (orange) in 2015 (left) and 2016 (right).



Figure 8: Boxplot of daytime CRT_{VSL} (top) and CRT_{VSL}^{school} (bottom) recorded between August and October for 2015 (left) and 2016 (right).



Figure 9: Cumulative curves of the depth records surrounding surface presence events (0–1 m) within a randomly allocated interval of 600 s based on the DepthTS from recovered tags.



Figure 10: Boxplot of daytime CRT_{NSL} (top; 0-20m) and CRT_{DL} (bottom; >20m) recorded between August and October for 2015 (left) and 2016 (right).



Figure 11: Relationship between the continuous residence times in the 0-20 m layer (CRT_{NSL}) during daytime of individual tunas to the number of surface events (left) and that of tuna schools (right). The red line indicates the correlation of the variables in both relationships, with the number of surface events being a function of the CRT_{NSL} durations.

Supplementary Material

Layer	Data	Resolution used
VSL	Recovered tags	15 s
NSL	Recovered tags and transmitted	600 s
DL	Recovered tags and transmitted	600 s

Table S1 Resolution and tag data used for the calculation of CRTs in each layer

Table S2 Number of deployment days and the number of completely transmitted daytime periods per miniPAT.

	Deploym	Completely	
Serial			daytime
	date	days	periods
14P0818	2015-08-05	36	17
14P0814	2015-08-05	53	28
14P0813	2015-09-10	46	26
14P0824	2015-09-10	46	14
14P0825	2015-09-25	51	1
14P0821	2015-09-25	44	6
14P0823	2016-04-17	147	76
14P0819	2016-04-17	151	106
14P0815	2016-04-22	12	11
14P0816	2016-04-22	37	37
15P0983	2016-08-03	3	0
15P0985	2016-08-03	2	1
15P0986	2016-08-03	6	5
15P1019	2016-08-07	12	11
15P1022	2016-08-07	27	25
11P0584	2016-08-25	91	48
11P0587	2016-08-26	91	54
11P0279	2016-08-26	34	20
13P0243	2016-08-26	82	60
15P1025	2016-08-28	90	65
15P0984	2016-08-28	52	10
15P1023	2016-08-31	19	18
15P1024	2016-08-31	46	37
15P1016	2016-08-31	41	41

Serial	Ptt	set	2.1 km h ⁻¹	3.1 km h ⁻¹	4.2 km h ⁻¹
14P0818	112780	transmitted	31.36	36.20	40.59
14P0818	112780	recovered	36.28	40.12	45.16
14P0814	94261	transmitted	32.22	33.92	35.08
14P0813	34205	transmitted	26.14	34.88	38.42
14P0824	148820	transmitted	61.14	62.85	63.40
14P0824	148820	recovered	72.57	74.72	75.69
14P0825	148821	transmitted	36.53	50.67	52.89
14P0821	148818	transmitted	62.50	65.34	66.39
14P0823	148819	transmitted	NA	44.75	47.26
14P0819	148817	transmitted	29.43	36.22	44.78
14P0815	104658	transmitted	NA	45.28	51.45
14P0815	104658	recovered	NA	60.19	62.61
14P0816	104683	transmitted	36.66	50.74	57.39
15P0986	98726	transmitted	54.06	58.20	59.84
15P0983	34205	transmitted	49.22	48.83	49.46
15P0985	98716	transmitted	42.81	41.10	40.44
15P1019	104659	transmitted	40.58	42.82	45.87
15P1022	112779	transmitted	32.02	37.87	47.04
11P0584	104672	transmitted	44.60	45.86	49.57
11P0584	104672	recovered	58.75	60.10	65.59
11P0587	104679	transmitted	45.03	51.75	53.67
11P0279	94251	transmitted	32.00	38.25	42.82
13P0243	98715	recovered	60.43	65.55	68.11
15P1025	148821	transmitted	48.43	50.00	52.37
15P0984	94252	transmitted	38.65	41.36	44.06
15P0984	94252	recovered	56.71	60.06	61.14
15P1023	112782	transmitted	45.82	54.45	56.50
15P1024	148818	transmitted	57.96	60.51	62.22
15P1024	148818	recovered	57.16	62.01	63.92
15P1016	104655	transmitted	53.28	54.41	56.51

Table S3 GPE3 model scores per tag and travel speed (50, 75 and 100 km/d).

Year	Month	CRT _{NSL} (h)	CRT _{DL} (h)
	August	1.0 (1.5)	0.8 (1.7)
2015	September	0.8 (1.1)	0.4 (0.4)
	October	0.3 (0.3)	1.6 (2.1)
	August	1.2 (1.8)	0.5 (0.8)
2016	September	0.8 (1.2)	0.6 (1.1)
	October	0.7 (1.4)	1.3 (2.2)

Table S4: Monthly average of daytime CRTs in the NSL (0-10m) and DL (>10m) recorded for the recovered tags. Values in brackets report the standard deviation.

Environmental data analysis

Three major indicators for the thermal-structure of the water column were estimated from the tag data: daily thermocline depth, thermocline gradient as well as the thermal stratification index, following the approach used by Bauer et al. (2015) implemented in the R-package "RchivalTag" (Bauer, 2018). To do so, we first interpolated transmitted PAT-style Depth-Temperature profiles (PDT) or, when available, recovered Depth-Temperature time series data, per day and tag, using the function "interpolate_TempDepthProfiles" (Bauer, 2018). From the resulting interpolated Depth-Temperature profiles, we then estimated the three indicators, by applying the function "get thermalstrat" (Bauer, 2018). The thermocline depth was thereby estimated as the depth of the maximum temperature gradient, which served as an indicator of the thermocline gradient. By contrast, the stratification index was defined as the standard deviation of interpolated daily depthtemperature profiles up to a depth of 100 m (Valdés and Moral, 1998). This depth limit was chosen to confine temperature values to the layer of highest thermal variability, in order to increase the representativeness of the stratification index. A comparative analysis on the accuracy of the three indicators obtained from PDT and Depth-Temperature time series data from the recovered tags (see Figure S1 in the Supplementary Information) revealed that the stratification index was particularly robust for those days where the tagged individuals attained depths ≥ 88 m. We therefore estimated the stratification index from PDT profiles, or (if available) recovered Depth-Temperature time series data, that met this requirement in the subsequent analyses. Missing values in the time series of the stratification index were estimated by applying an exact cubic regression spline, using the function "spline" of the standard R-package "stats" (Forsythe et al., 1977, R Core Team, 2017).

Refrerences

Bauer, R. K., Forget, F., and Fromentin, JM. 2015c. Optimizing PAT data transmission: Assessing the accuracy of temperature summary data to estimate environmental conditions. Fisheries Oceanography, 24:533–539.

Bauer, R. 2018. RchivalTag: Analyzing Archival Tagging Data. R package version 0.0.8. https://cran.r-project.org/package=RchivalTag.

Bauer, R. 2019. oceanmap: A Plotting Toolbox for 2D Oceanographic Data. R package version 0.1.0.1. https://cran.r-project.org/package=oceanmap.

Forsythe, G. E., Malcolm, M. A., and Moler, C. B. 1977. Computer methods for mathematical computations. Prentice-Hall series in automatic computation. 259 pp. Wiley, Prentice-Hall.

Valdés, L., and Moral, M. 1998. Time-series analysis of copepod diversity and species richness in the southern Bay of Biscay off Santander, Spain, in relation to environmental conditions. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 55:783–792.



Figure S1 Correlation between PDT and depth temperature time series data derived indicators of the thermal water column structure: the daily thermocline depth (red rectangle), its gradient (green triangle) as well as a stratification index (blue circle). PDT profiles were simulated based on the daily interpolated depth temperature time series data from the recovered tags, using the depth values of transmitted and recovered ABFT PDT profiles (up to 200 m depth) as sampling points.





0+ E



14P0821 - 2015-09-25 : 2015-11-08 14P0823 - 2016-04-17 : 2016-09-11

14P0814 - 2015-08-05 : 2015-09-27

47

47

10: E

0 V

40 N

14P0818 - 2015-08-05 : 2015-09-09

14P0825 - 2015-09-25 : 2015-11-14

40° N

40: N



14P0813 - 2015-09-10 : 2015-10-25

14P0819 - 2016-04-17 : 2016-09-15

14P0824 - 2015-09-10 : 2015-10-25



Figure S3: Average daily presence rates recorded in the 0-10m depth layer (NSL) from all tags (blue dots) and its standard deviation (error bars) as well as the thermal stratification index (orange) in 2015 (left) and 2016 (right).



Figure S4: Daily CRT_VSL (top) and CRT_VSL_school (bottom) for 2015 (top) and 2016 (bottom).



Figure S5: Daily average CRT_{NSL} (top; 0-20m) and CRT_{DL} (bottom; >20m) for 2015 (left) and 2016 (right).



Figure S6: Daily average CRT_{NSL} (top; 0-10m) and CRT_{DL} (bottom; > 10m) for 2015 (left) and 2016 (right).



Figure S7: Boxplot of daytime CRT_{NSL} (top; 0-10m) and CRT_{DL} (bottom; >10m) recorded between August and October for 2015 (left) and 2016 (right).



Figure S8: Relationship between the continuous residence times in the 0-10 m layer (CRT_{NSL}) during daytime of individual tunas to the number of surface events (left) and that of tuna schools (right). The red line indicates the correlation of the variables in both relationships, with the number of surface events being a function of the CRT_{NSL} durations.