

The following supplement accompanies the article

Morphological and molecular differentiation of wild and farmed gilthead sea bream *Sparus aurata*: implications for management

Tanja Šegvić-Bubić^{1,*}, Igor Talijančić², Leon Grubišić¹, David Izquierdo-Gomez³,
Ivan Katavić¹

¹Institute of Oceanography and Fisheries, PO Box 500, Šetalište Ivana Meštrovića 63, 21000 Split, Croatia

²University Department of Marine Studies, University of Split, Livanjska 5/III, 21000 Split, Croatia

³Department of Marine Sciences and Applied Biology, University of Alicante, PO Box 99, 03080 Alicante, Spain

Corresponding author: tanja.segvic@izor.hr

Aquaculture Environment Interactions: 6: 43–54 (2014)

Supplement. Additional data

Table S1. Overview of indicators for discriminant function significance from the truss network system for *Sparus aurata*

Function	Eigenvalue	% of variance	Cumulative %	Canonical correlation	Wilk's lambda	χ^2	df	p
1	0.938	100.0	100.0	0.696	0.516	75.09	7	0.00

Table S2. Classification function coefficients from the truss network system for *Sparus aurata* (see Table 1 in the main article for vector codes)

Morphological vector	Origin	
	Wild	Farmed
Av1	5.619	5.368
A6	0.458	0.264
B1	3.437	3.133
B3	2.094	2.273
B5	0.543	0.913
C4	2.193	1.975
E2	0.178	0.734
(Constant)	-431.662	-425.279

Table S3. Species assignment for the Mali Ston Bay subsample composed of 50 wild and 30 farmed *Sparus aurata* individuals identified with both the morphological and molecular approaches. Individuals categorized as admixture forms were excluded from the combined analysis. W: wild individual; F: farmed individual. **Bold** indicates individuals for which the species assignment was not univocal

Fish origin	Sample number	Morphological	Molecular
Wild Mali Ston Bay	WMB_01	W	W
	WMB_02	W	W
	WMB_03	W	W
	WMB_04	W	W
	WMB_05	W	F
	WMB_06	W	W
	WMB_07	W	W
	WMB_08	W	W
	WMB_09	W	W
	WMB_10	W	W
	WMB_11	F	F
	WMB_12	W	W
	WMB_13	W	W
	WMB_14	W	W
	WMB_15	W	F
	WMB_16	W	W
	WMB_17	W	W
	WMB_18	W	W
	WMB_19	W	W
	WMB_20	W	W
	WMB_21	W	W
	WMB_22	W	W
	WMB_23	F	F
	WMB_24	W	F
	WMB_25	W	W
	WMB_26	W	W
	WMB_27	W	W
	WMB_28	W	W
	WMB_29	F	F
	WMB_30	F	F
	WMB_31	W	W
	WMB_32	W	W
	WMB_33	F	F
	WMB_34	W	F
	WMB_35	W	W
	WMB_36	W	W
	WMB_37	W	W
	WMB_38	W	W
	WMB_39	W	W
	WMB_40	F	F
Farmed Mali Ston Bay	FMB_01	F	F

FMB_02	F	F
FMB_03	W	W
FMB_04	F	F
FMB_05	F	F
FMB_06	F	F
FMB_07	F	F
FMB_08	F	F
FMB_09	F	F
FMB_10	F	F
FMB_11	F	F
FMB_12	F	F
FMB_13	F	F
FMB_14	W	W
FMB_15	F	F
FMB_16	F	W
FMB_17	F	F
FMB_18	F	F
FMB_19	F	F
FMB_20	F	F
FMB_21	F	F
FMB_22	F	F
FMB_23	F	F
FMB_24	F	F
FMB_25	F	F

Table S4. Overview of comparative morphology studies of gilthead sea bream (*Sparus aurata* L. 1758) across the Mediterranean. CL/SL: head/standard length ratio

Location	Method	Head shape	Body shape	Fins	Condition index	Authors
<i>Spain</i>	Truss network system	No statistical difference in CL/SL ratio; Wild individuals had sharper snout than reared ones	Spanish wild and farmed stock had higher mean sizes for length and weight than wild and farmed individuals from Greece; Wild specimens characterized by lower body height and more spindle-shaped body		Farmed fish exhibited higher values of Fulton's condition index than wild ones	Arechavala-Lopez et al. (2012)
<i>Greece</i>	Traditional set of measurements; Truss network system	Farmed fish had a longer head in comparison with wild and hatchery-released ones	Farmed individuals had a more blocky-belly body with higher body height than wild and hatchery-released specimens, which were characterized by a more elongated body shape	Farmed fish had shorter fins in relation to wild and hatchery-released ones	Farmed fish exhibited higher values of Fulton's condition index than wild ones	Grigorakis et al. (2002), Rogdakis et al. (2011), Arechavala-Lopez et al. (2012)
<i>France</i>	Truss network system	Farmed individuals showed rounding of entire head region (profile does not resemble the typical sea bream profile)	Farmed sea bream had a more slender body and streamlined frontal region	Farmed individuals had shortened extension of anal fin base in comparison with Spanish ones		Loy et al. (1999)
<i>Croatia</i>	Traditional set of measurements; Truss network system	No statistical differences found in CL/SL ratio, though farmed individuals were characterized by a flattened head profile in comparison with wild specimens	Farmed sea bream were characterized by a stocky body while wild ones had an elongated body with smaller body depth	Wild fish had longer pectoral, anal, and caudal fins and taller dorsal fin	Farmed fish exhibited higher values of Fulton's condition index than wild ones	Present study

LITERATURE CITED

- Arechavala-Lopez P, Sanchez-Jerez P, Bayle-Sempere J, Sfakianakis D, Somarakis S (2012) Morphological differences between wild and farmed Mediterranean fish. *Hydrobiologia* 679:217–231
- Grigorakis K, Alexis MN, Taylor KDA, Hole M (2002) Comparison of wild and cultured gilthead sea bream (*Sparus aurata*); composition, appearance and seasonal variations. *Int J Food Sci Technol* 37:477–484
- Loy A, Boglione C, Cataudella S (1999) Geometric morphometrics and morpho-anatomy: a combined tool in the study of sea bream (*Sparus aurata*) shape. *J Appl Ichthyol* 15:104–110
- Rogdakis Y, Koukou K, Ramfos A, Dimitriou E, Katselis G (2011) Comparative morphology of wild, farmed and hatchery-released gilthead sea bream (*Sparus aurata*) in western Greece. *Int J Fish Aquacult* 3:1–9