

Orientation of fish larvae *in situ* is consistent among locations, years and methods, but varies with time of day

Jeffrey M. Leis^{1,2,*}, Claire B. Paris³, Jean-Olivier Irisson^{3,5,6}, Michelle N. Yerman^{1,7}, Ulrike E. Siebeck⁴

¹Ichthyology, Australian Museum, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia

²Institute for Marine and Antarctic Studies, University of Tasmania, Tasmania, Australia

³Division of Applied Marine Physics, Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Sciences, University of Miami, Miami, Florida, USA

⁴School of Biomedical Sciences, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia

⁵Present address: UPMC Univ Paris 06, LOV, Observatoire Océanologique, 06234, Villefranche-sur-Mer, France

⁶Present address: CNRS, UMR 7093, LOV, Observatoire Océanologique, 06234, Villefranche-sur-Mer, France

⁷Present address: West Australian Fisheries, Perth, Western Australia, Australia

*Corresponding author: jeff.leis@austmus.gov.au

Marine Ecology Progress Series 505: 193–208 (2014)

Supplement. Comparison of Following and DISC methods

Table S1. Comparison of median within-run *r* values (precision): *p*-values from pairwise Mann-Whitney tests. See Table 1 for *r* values, and for explanation of dataset codes. Significant comparisons (*p* < 0.05) are in **bold**. Shaded cells are between- (cross-) method comparisons, unshaded are within-method comparisons

(A) *Chromis atripectoralis*. Comparison of all data sets

	CDE1	CDE2	CDE3	CDW1	CFE1	CFE2	CFE3	CFW1	CFW2	CFW3	CFW4	CFW5	CFW6
CDE2	0.172	–											
CDE3	0.019	0.001	–										
CDW1	0.674	0.175	0.031	–									
CFE1	<0.001	<0.001	0.178	<0.001	–								
CFE2	0.025	0.003	0.774	0.013	0.427	–							
CFE3	0.084	0.008	0.435	0.060	0.004	0.103	–						
CFW1	0.122	0.001	0.288	0.021	0.002	0.192	0.824	–					
CFW2	0.013	<0.001	0.906	0.002	0.080	0.647	0.216	0.196	–				
CFW3	0.133	0.008	0.476	0.121	0.032	0.403	0.659	0.845	0.458	–			
CFW4	0.001	<0.001	0.218	<0.001	0.770	0.702	0.006	0.017	0.237	0.104	–		
CFW5	0.802	0.489	0.069	0.467	0.002	0.038	0.122	0.078	0.021	0.105	0.002	–	
CFW6	0.005	0.001	0.615	0.002	0.562	0.754	0.102	0.080	0.340	0.197	0.864	0.023	–
CFW7	<0.001	<0.001	0.003	<0.001	0.013	0.016	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	0.007	<0.001	0.031

Comparison among locations and methods

	CDE	CDW	CFE
CDW	0.850	–	
CFE	<0.001	<0.001	–
CFW	<0.001	<0.001	0.730

(B) *Pomacentrus lepidogenys*. Comparison of all data sets

	PDW1	PFW1	PFW2
PFW1	0.824	–	
PFW2	0.061	0.058	–
PFW3	0.042	0.019	0.605

Table S2. Comparison of Following and DISC results for median bearings and angular dispersion. See Table 1 for median bearing values and explanation of dataset codes. Significant comparisons ($p < 0.05$) are in **bold**. Shaded values are between- (cross-) method comparisons, unshaded are within-method comparisons

(A) *Chromis atripectoralis*. Comparison of among-run median bearings among data sets: p-values from pairwise Watson U2 tests

	CDE1	CDE2	CDE3	CDW1	CFE1	CFE2	CFE3	CFW1	CFW2	CFW3	CFW4	CFW5	CFW6
CDE2	<0.05	–											
CDE3	<0.01	<0.01	–										
CDW1	>0.5	<0.005	<0.005	–									
CFE1	<0.05	>0.5	>0.05	<0.005	–								
CFE2	>0.5	>0.1	>0.05	>0.5	>0.1	–							
CFE3	>0.2	<0.05	>0.5	<0.05	>0.2	>0.5	–						
CFW1	<0.02	>0.5	<0.001	<0.001	>0.2	>0.1	<0.05	–					
CFW2	>0.1	<0.001	>0.2	>0.05	<0.01	>0.1	>0.5	<0.001	–				
CFW3	>0.5	>0.2	>0.05	>0.2	>0.5	>0.5	>0.1	>0.2	>0.05	–			
CFW4	<0.02	<0.05	>0.05	<0.001	<0.05	>0.05	>0.1	<0.02	<0.02	<0.05	–		
CFW5	<0.05	>0.2	>0.05	<0.005	>0.1	>0.05	>0.05	>0.2	<0.02	>0.1	>0.5	–	
CFW6	>0.2	>0.2	>0.1	<0.2	>0.5	>0.5	>0.5	>0.2	>0.2	>0.5	>0.05	>0.05	–
CFW7	<0.01	>0.05	>0.5	<0.002	>0.1	<0.05	>0.2	<0.02	>0.05	>0.1	>0.05	>0.1	>0.2

Comparison of angular dispersion among data sets: p-values from pairwise Walraff tests

	CDE1	CDE2	CDE3	CDW1	CFE1	CFE2	CFE3	CFW1	CFW2	CFW3	CFW4	CFW5	CFW6
CDE2	0.002	–											
CDE3	0.003	0.670	–										
CDW1	0.988	0.003	0.004	–									
CFE1	0.022	0.192	0.439	0.014	–								
CFE2	0.571	0.117	0.150	0.740	0.349	–							
CFE3	0.152	0.131	0.357	0.090	0.677	0.463	–						
CFW1	0.001	0.721	0.887	0.001	0.199	0.180	0.153	–					
CFW2	0.085	0.181	0.234	0.146	0.725	0.598	0.975	0.199	–				
CFW3	0.228	0.063	0.115	0.288	0.349	0.876	0.715	0.081	0.662	–			
CFW4	0.001	0.750	0.539	0.001	0.131	0.076	0.084	0.519	0.084	0.031	–		
CFW5	0.001	0.187	0.115	0.002	0.036	0.030	0.038	0.132	0.035	0.008	0.346	–	
CFW6	0.351	0.054	0.153	0.374	0.297	0.777	0.670	0.043	0.556	0.837	0.042	0.019	–
CFW7	0.005	0.352	0.725	0.004	0.562	0.232	0.327	0.425	0.456	0.177	0.230	0.057	0.208

(B) *Pomacentrus lepidogenys*. Comparison of among-run median bearings among data sets: p-values from pairwise Watson U2 tests

	PDW1	PFW1	PFW2
PFW1	>0.20	–	
PFW2	<0.05	>0.10	–
PFW3	>0.50	>0.20	<0.05

Comparison of angular dispersion among data sets: p-values from pairwise Walraff tests

	PDW1	PFW1	PFW2
PFW1	0.518	–	
PFW2	0.499	0.103	–
PFW3	0.705	0.667	0.280