

Bottom-up control of common octopus *Octopus vulgaris* in the Galician upwelling system, northeast Atlantic Ocean

Jaime Otero^{1,*}, Xosé Antón Álvarez-Salgado¹, Ángel F. González¹, Ana Miranda², Steve B. Groom³, José M. Cabanas², Gerardo Casas², Ben Wheatley³, Ángel Guerra¹

¹Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Instituto de Investigaciones Marinas, Eduardo Cabello 6, 36208-Vigo, Spain

²Instituto Español de Oceanografía, Centro Oceanográfico de Vigo, Cabo Estay, 36200-Vigo, Spain

³Plymouth Marine Laboratory, Prospect Place, Plymouth PL1 3DH, UK

*Email: jotero@iim.csic.es

Marine Ecology Progress Series 362:181–192 (2008)

Appendix 1. This appendix includes a list of the ports considered in this study, showing their effort parameters in 2 different periods (Table A1), as well as graphical output of model diagnostics (Fig. A1)

Table A1. Ports considered in the study and comparison of effort in the 2 periods (1997–2000 and 2001–2005), by means of the parameter B (sensu Otero et al. 2005) and the number of registered vessels (N). The number of each port denotes its geographical position in Fig. 1 in the main text

| Port | B 97–00 | B 01–05 | N 97–00 | N 01–05 |
|----------------------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| ¹ Ribadeo | 1.77 | 1.57 | 7 | 6 |
| ² Burela | 6.58 | 6.5 | 28 | 28 |
| ³ San Cibrao | 3.25 | 3.2 | 15 | 15 |
| ⁴ Celeiro | 4.05 | 4.18 | 19 | 19 |
| ⁵ Cariño | 5.25 | 5.7 | 25 | 27 |
| ⁶ Cedeira | 6.5 | 7.93 | 31 | 37 |
| ⁷ Caión | 3.33 | 2.93 | 12 | 10 |
| ⁸ Malpica | 16.6 | 13.95 | 56 | 50 |
| ⁹ Corme | 3.12 | 3.62 | 13 | 15 |
| ¹⁰ Laxe | 10.17 | 10.6 | 40 | 41 |
| ¹¹ Camariñas | 15.35 | 13.67 | 57 | 51 |
| ¹² Muxía | 9.05 | 7.8 | 23 | 21 |
| ¹³ Fisterra | 12.55 | 15.25 | 51 | 61 |
| ¹⁴ Lira-Carnota | 7.28 | 7.33 | 29 | 29 |
| ¹⁵ Porto do Son | 6.53 | 4.75 | 27 | 21 |
| ¹⁶ Riveira | 27.77 | 27.63 | 118 | 117 |
| ¹⁷ Rianxo | 0.58 | 0.78 | 2 | 3 |
| ¹⁸ Vilaxoán | 0.7 | 0.7 | 2 | 2 |
| ¹⁹ Cambados | 8.13 | 8.72 | 31 | 33 |
| ²⁰ O Grove | 11.2 | 11.02 | 43 | 43 |
| ²¹ Portonovo | 5.18 | 5.33 | 24 | 25 |
| ²² Bueu | 19.58 | 20.72 | 84 | 90 |
| ²³ Cangas | 20.2 | 20.68 | 76 | 80 |
| ²⁴ Moaña (Naseiros) | 5.58 | 5.42 | 22 | 21 |
| ²⁵ Vigo (Canido) ^a | nd | nd | nd | nd |
| ²⁶ Baiona | 16.35 | 18.07 | 59 | 67 |
| ²⁷ A Guarda | 10.45 | 10.8 | 40 | 42 |
| ^a No data available for this port | | | | |




Fig. A1. Graphical output of the GAM model investigated in this study. (a) Residuals versus fitted values, (b) normal QQ-plot of residuals, (c) Cook's distances (D_i values larger than 1 [dotted line] could be influential, Zuur et al. 2007), and (d) plots of the residuals versus each explanatory variable. In addition, there is not any remaining structure in the residuals plotted against year (explanatory variable not retained in the final model)

LITERATURE CITED

Otero J, Rocha F, González AF, Gracia J, Guerra A (2005) Modelling artisanal coastal fisheries of Galicia (NW Spain)

based on data obtained from fishers: the case of *Octopus vulgaris*. *Sci Mar* 69:577–585
 Zuur AF, Ieno EN, Smith GM (2007) Analysing ecological data. Springer, New York