

A peer-reviewed version of this preprint was published in PeerJ on 26 July 2016.

[View the peer-reviewed version](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.2268) (peerj.com/articles/2268), which is the preferred citable publication unless you specifically need to cite this preprint.

Queiroz AC, Sakai Y, Vallinoto M, Barros B. 2016. Morphometric comparisons of plant-mimetic juvenile fish associated with plant debris observed in the coastal subtropical waters around Kuchierabu-jima Island, southern Japan. PeerJ 4:e2268 <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.2268>

Morphometric comparisons of plant-mimetic juvenile fish associated with plant debris observed on Kuchierabu-jima Island, southern Japan

Alexya Cunha de Queiroz, Yoichi Sakai, Marcelo Vallinoto, Breno Barros

The general morphological shape of plant-resembling fish and plant parts were compared using a geometric morphometrics approach. *Lobotes surinamensis* (Lobotidae), *Platax orbicularis* (Ephippidae) and *Canthidermis maculata* (Balistidae), three plant-mimetic fish species, were compared during their early developmental stages with accompanying plant parts (i.e. leaves of several taxa) in the coastal subtropical waters of Kuchierabu-jima Island, closely facing the Kuroshio Current. The degree of similarity shared between the plant parts and co-occurring fish species was quantified, however fish remained morphologically distinct from their plant models. Such similarities were corroborated by a linear model, in which relative body areas of fish and plant models were strongly interdependent. Our results strengthen the paradigm that morphological clues can lead to ecological evidence to allow predictions of behavioural and habitat choice by mimetic fish, according to the degree of similarity shared with their respective models. The resemblance to plant parts detected in the three fish species may provide fitness advantages via convergent evolutionary effects.

1 Morphometric comparisons of plant-mimetic juvenile fish associated with plant debris observed
2 on Kuchierabu-jima Island, southern Japan

3

4 Alexya C. Queiroz¹, Yoichi Sakai², Marcelo Vallinoto^{1,3}, and Breno Barros^{1,2,4}

5

6 ¹ Universidade Federal do Pará - campus de Bragança, Laboratório de Evolução, Instituto de
7 Estudos Costeiros, Alameda Leandro Ribeiro, s/n, Aldeia, CEP 68600-000 Bragança, Pará.

8 Brazil

9 ² Graduate School of Biosphere Science, Hiroshima University, 1-4-4, Kagamiyama, 739-8528.

10 Higashi-Hiroshima, Japan

11 ³ CIBIO-InBIO, Centro de Investigação em Biodiversidade e Recursos Genéticos, Campus

12 Agrário de Vairão, Universidade do Porto, 4485-661. Vairão, Portugal

13 ⁴ Ichthyology Division, Coordination of Zoology. Museu Paraense Emílio Goeldi Av. Perimetral

14 s/n, Montese, CEP 66077-830. Belém, Pará, Brazil

15

16 Running title: Comparative fish and plant morphometrics

17

18 Corresponding author: breno_eduardo@terra.com.br

19 Tel: +55 91 3075 6125

20

22 Abstract

23 The general morphological shape of plant-resembling fish and plant parts were compared using a
 24 geometric morphometrics approach. *Lobotes surinamensis* (Lobotidae), *Platax orbicularis*
 25 (Ephippidae) and *Canthidermis maculata* (Balistidae), three plant-mimetic fish species, were
 26 compared during their early developmental stages with accompanying plant parts (i.e. leaves of
 27 several taxa) in the coastal subtropical waters of Kuchierabu-jima Island, closely facing the
 28 Kuroshio Current. The degree of similarity shared between the plant parts and co-occurring fish
 29 species was quantified, however fish remained morphologically distinct from their plant models.
 30 Such similarities were corroborated by a linear model, in which relative body areas of fish and
 31 plant models were strongly interdependent. Our results strengthen the paradigm that
 32 morphological clues can lead to ecological evidence to allow predictions of behavioural and
 33 habitat choice by mimetic fish, according to the degree of similarity shared with their respective
 34 models. The resemblance to plant parts detected in the three fish species may provide fitness
 35 advantages via convergent evolutionary effects.

36

37 Key-words: Protective camouflage, Masquerade, Coastal Environments, Morphometrics, Shape
 38 analysis, Convergent evolution

39

1. Introduction

Mimesis is defined as a phenotype evolved in response to selective pressures favouring individuals that can disguise their identity by masquerading as another organism (Wickler, 1968; Pasteur, 1982; Moland, Eagle & Jones, 2005; Skelhorn, Rowland & Ruxton, 2010a; Skelhorn *et al.*, 2010b). Therefore, many organisms have never been evaluated as mimetic examples despite their high resemblance to plant parts because of insufficient data suggesting an adaptive function. Mimesis in fish is a relatively well-studied subject (Wickler, 1968; Moland, Eagle & Jones, 2005; Robertson, 2013), particularly regarding deceptive resemblance to plant parts via protective camouflage, which is a known feature in several freshwater and marine fish species, as extreme crypsis examples of protective resemblance (Breder, 1942, 1946, 1949, 1955; Randall, 1965, 2005a; Vane-Wright, 1980; Sazima *et al.*, 2006; Barros & Higuchi, 2007). Although these reports have addressed the patterns and general similarities in morphology or colouration of model plant parts and mimetic fish, few studies have examined similarities among them based on morphological and/or ethological details (Barros *et al.* 2008, 2011, 2012).

Studies focusing on morphology and geometric morphometrics frequently used fish species as models, and several authors have suggested that morphological clues can be used as ecological predictors from basic behavioural constraints, such as swimming mode (Walker, 2004; Comabella, Hurtado & García-Galano, 2010; Xiong & Lauder, 2014), feeding behaviour (Galis, 1990; Franssen, Goodchild & Shepard, 2015) and habitat choice (Loy *et al.*, 1998; Gibran, 2010; Soares, Ruffeil & Montag, 2013), especially in juvenile fish, suggesting that such changes are important for improving fitness and increasing the chance for survival during subsequent ontogenetic stages (Barros *et al.*, 2011; Comabella *et al.*, 2013). Nevertheless, such a

tool has not been used to establish comparisons among distant taxa belonging to completely different groups (i.e. fish and plants). In the present study, previously well-known plant-mimetic juvenile fish, the tripletail, *Lobotes surinamensis* (Bloch, 1790), the orbicular batfish, *Platax orbicularis* (Forsskal, 1775) and the ocean triggerfish, *Canthidermis maculata* (Bloch, 1786) were compared with their respective plant models co-occurring in the field to objectively evaluate their resemblance in shape to their respective models.

Lobotes surinamensis is generally found in shallow brackish water habitats but may occur far offshore with drifting algae or flotsam, and juveniles may lie on their side matching the colour of the plant material with which they are drifting, from near black to yellow (Randall, 2005b). Juveniles are usually dark-coloured, presenting drifting swimming patterns among dry leaves, exhibiting similar movements to their associated plant model (Uchida, 1951; Randall, 2005b). Uchida (1951) also described that young *C. maculata* resemble pieces of pine bark and were observed drifting among pieces of bark in a horizontal swimming posture, suggesting mimetic effects. Juveniles of *P. orbicularis* look similar to yellow waterlogged jack tree leaves (genus *Rhizophora*) and greatly resemble floating dead leaves (Wiley, 1904; Breder, 1946). Randall (1960) reported that larger individuals (87 mm standard length [SL]) resemble large sea hibiscus leaves (*Hibiscus tiliaceus*) with a yellowish-brown colouration, with dorsal and anal fins appearing to lengthen with growth. Such drastic changes in morphological shape occur in juvenile *P. orbicularis* while they maintain a resemblance to drifting leaves (Barros *et al.*, 2008, 2011).

The novel comparative methods presented herein may provide useful associations between behavioural ecology and morphological studies. We tested the null hypothesis of a lack of shape similarity among the studied fish and plant parts, considering both classic and geometric

morphometrics comparative approaches. We briefly discuss the functional contributions of camouflage characteristics to fish fitness using mimetic shape attributes as a disguise based on morphological resemblance data among fish and model plants, adopting the concepts of cryptic mimesis as synonym of protective camouflage or masquerading, following the definitions as proposed by Pasteur (1982), where all fish samples are defined as "mimetic fish" and all plant part samples as "models", instead of adopting the terminology as proposed by Skelhorn, Rowland & Ruxton (2010a). This is due to the highly dynamic environments such fish usually occur, where mimetic behaviour is achieved not only by appearance, but also through actively behaving alike the drifting models (Barros *et al.*, 2008).

2. Material and Methods

2.1. Sampling

Sampling was conducted in the port of Honmura, Kuchierabu-Jima Island (Ohsumi Group, 30° 28' N, 130° 10' E), southern Japan, during diurnal observations July 3–14, 2011 (S1 Fig.). The island closely faces the Kuroshio Current and maintains a rich subtropical fish fauna (Gushima & Murakami, 1976). Fish samples and plant debris were collected using hand nets, and the sampled fish were euthanized using 5 ml 95% eugenol in 1 L ethanol as a stock solution. All plant material were sampled along with their associated fish. Of this, 20 ml was added to each 1 L of water containing the fish to be euthanized to minimise suffering, following international ethical standards (Jenkins *et al.*, 2014). As there is no national Japanese licensing framework, samples were collected following the “Guidelines for Proper Conduct of Animal Experiments” set out by the Hiroshima University Animal Research Committee, which are based on international ethical

standards, and only after obtaining local community permission.

The fish were identified to as low a taxonomic category as possible, according to available literature (Nakabo, 2002; Nelson, 2006; Okiyama, 2014). Fifteen mimetic fish specimens of three species (Fig. 1A–C) were analysed: *Lobotes surinamensis* (Lobotidae; $n = 6$, $TL = 2.71 \pm 0.46$ cm), *Canthidermis maculata* (Balistidae; $n = 2$, $TL = 2.02 \pm 0.98$ cm) and *Platax orbicularis* (Ephippidae; $n = 7$, $TL = 1.80 \pm 0.42$ cm).

Floating plant debris (hereafter, models, $n = 52$) were collected using hand nets and sorted, then visually subdivided using two subjective criteria (round shapes, as for the Podocarpaceae *Nageia nagi* and the Sapindaceae *Acer morifolium*; or elongated shapes, as for the Laureaceae *Neolitsea sericea* and for the Fagaceae *Castanopsis sieboldii*; Fig. 1D–E), regardless of taxonomy and dried in paper envelopes until they were photographed for further analysis.

High resolution digital pictures of the left lateral view of the mimetic fish and model samples were taken over a black background using a Nikon D700 equipped with AF-S 60-mm immersive lens and a stand table with a reference scale of 1 cm for the fish and models. The left lateral view of the models was defined as the “dorsal view of leaves with the petiole oriented to the right”. Artificial light was used to avoid shading morphological structures.

126

2.2. Data Analyses

Sixteen landmarks (LM) were established for the mimetic fish and models using ImageJ v. 1.47 software for geometric morphometrics purposes (Abramoff, Magelhaes & Ram, 2004).

Homologous LM for the mimetic fish were marked obeying the morphological structures constraining or related to mimetic behaviour to cover the fish general outline profile, including peripheral structures (Fig. 1A, Table I). The data set used in the present analysis is made

available in Supplementary Information 1. We established equidistant 16 semilandmarks (SLM) for each model using the ImageJ grid tool to cover all lateral profiles of the model (Fig. 1D). Raw coordinate LM and SLM data were implemented in MorphoJ v. 1.02n software (Klingenberg, 2011), where preliminary adjustments, such as the Procrustes fit, and creation of the data matrix, were done. The morphometric comparisons among the fish and models were not intended for use to analyse homologous patterns, as we were interested in shape similarities randomly shared among the mimetic fish and their respective models distributed in the same environment, from a geometric morphometrics perspective. Therefore, the necessity of marking peripheral anatomic structures in the mimetic fish, instead of fins insertions only, in order to check for general appearance of mimetic fish with the plant models.

Data analyses were performed with Geomorph v. 2.0 software (Adams & Otárola-Castillo, 2013). A post-hoc general Procrustes analysis (GPA) and principal components analysis (PCA) were run followed by analysis of variance (ANOVA) to compare the mimetic fish and models plotted together in the analyses. Also, a linear discriminant function was run, in order to visualize how close were these group associations, using the package MASS v. 7.3-42 (Venables & Ripley, 2002).

In addition, individual TL and relative body area (BA, cm^2/SL) of the fish and models were calculated using ImageJ to establish interdependent comparisons among the fish species and plant debris via analysis of covariance (ANCOVA). BA was chosen because of its importance for discriminating teleost aggregations (Gómez-Laplaza & Gerlai, 2013). Fish were measured from the tip of the snout to the edge of the caudal fin (TL), and models were measured from edge to edge and considered TL. All statistical analyses were conducted in 'R' v. 3.1.3 (R

Development Core Team, 2015), and all relevant data for the current analysis are available within this paper (S2 dataset).

3. Results

Mimetic fish were observed mimicking plant debris near the water surface in all extensions of the port of Honmura. The mimetic assemblages resembled the models in shape, colour and drifting movements, having shared the same environment during the entire sampling period. All fish drifted among fallen plant debris near the water surface.

The visual GPA analysis indicated significant variance in the shape configurations among the different models (Fig. 2A) and mimetic fish (Fig. 2B). All-pooled data showed a relative tendency of the mimetic fish to resemble plant debris with ~50% of the variation explained in PC1 and ~40% of the variation explained in PC2 (ANOVA $F_{1,49} = 53.34$, $P < 0.001$, Fig. 2C).

Discriminant function analysis has revealed that while mimetic fish and models present morphometric similarities, they do also maintain their “morphological identity”.

While analogous LM in fish are associated with the same structures, shape differs amongst the three species of mimetic fishes and the shape of fishes overall is substantially different from the shape of plant models, where function 1 explains 94.14%, and function 2 responsible for 4.76% of the groupings, respectively (Discriminant Function Analysis, $F_{93,96} = 10.29$, $P < 0.001$; Fig. 3).

BA of the mimetic fish and models regressed against TL revealed a highly significant interdependency (ANCOVA, $F_{2,67} = 112.1$, $P < 0.001$; Fig. 4), where juvenile *L. surinamensis*

and *P. orbicularis* have shown a size gradient, sharing similar BA with round and elongated leaves of different sizes, accordingly to different growth stages of each mimetic fish species.

4. Discussion

The present results show significant shape heterogeneity among mimetic fish and the models, with a significant level of similarity shared in their general external shape profile, yet maintaining each group identity as fishes and plant structures, as observed through the grouping by linear discriminant function. Such results are highly expected, as mimetic behaviour is more likely to be driven by a combination of factors (i.e.: shape, colour and movements) than solely by morphological attributes (Wickler, 1968; Pasteur, 1982). Although the importance of floating plant debris for passive transportation, providing shelter and feeding grounds for fish in coastal environments has been evaluated (Castro, Santiago & Santana-Ortega, 2001; Vandendriessche *et al.*, 2007), the closeness of these interactions has not been investigated, particularly regarding plant resemblance by fish. According to observed shape similarities shared among the mimetic fish and models, it was clear that the present fish assemblage accompanied their respective models, being probably dependent on drifting plant material for survival, also suggested by the linear model of covariance shared amongst drifting fish and plants. While not the main goal of the present study, such association might suggest an allometric dependence for the plant mimetic species, at least until a given ontogenetic stage when such fish species suffer significant changes in both morphology and behaviour, cessing with the mimetic association with plants (Barros *et al.*, 2015).

The concepts regarding mimetic behaviour are still a matter of discussion, as it is difficult to define a case of mimetic association using only a shape resemblance to another animal/inanimate object (Skelhorn, Rowland & Ruxton, 2010a; Skelhorn *et al.*, 2010b), especially in marine systems (Roberston, 2013; 2015). The observed species herein not only presented good shape similarity with the models, but also behaved alike, via drifting movements along with their respective models, far away of being “inanimate” (BBarros, personal observation; data not shown). Close resemblance of fish to their models in shape and drifting behaviour at the water surface environment could confuse visually oriented predators through the camouflage effect. Thus, “mimetic behaviour” was a valid classification in the present case.

All species tested in the present study, such as *L. surinamensis* (Lobotidae), *C. maculata* (Balistidae) and *P. orbicularis* (Ephippidae) have been described previously as resembling dried leaves in shallow water (Uchida, 1951; Breder, 1942, 1946, 1949; Randall & Randall, 1955; Barros *et al.*, 2008, 2011, 2012). Although coastal fish resembling a plant via cryptic colouration has been an intriguing subject since the early reports, the present study is the first attempt to establish analytical comparisons between mimetic fish and models at the morphometrics level. Kelley & Merilaita (2015) suggested that successful crypsis in fish is more likely achieved through colouration, via a background matching effect. Although we did not test the predation rate of mimetic fish, our results add relevant information, in which background matching is achieved not only by cryptic colouration (Breder, 1946; Randall & Randall, 1960; Randall, 2005b), but also through shape and behavioural resemblance of mimetic fish to their respective models. The present level of protective camouflage shared by the fish assemblage analysed herein might be important against potential aerial and bottom predators, as background colour matches surrounding environments (Donnelly & Whoriskey Jr., 1991; Cortesi *et al.*, 2015; Kelley

& Merilaita, 2015). However, no predatory attempt by a bird species has been observed. Further experiments and field observations of all observed species are necessary to test this assumption.

The co-occurring mimetic assemblages observed herein are a typical example of convergent evolution in a coastal environment (Endler, 1981; Hamner, 1995; Johnsen, 2014). Some taxa analysed undergo numerous morphological and ethological changes. For example, *P. orbicularis* adults inhabit deeper environments, changing in both shape and behaviour within the settlement (Kuitert & Debelius, 2001; Barros *et al.*, 2011). As major morphological changes are usually expected through ontogeny of several fish groups (Galis, 1990; Loy *et al.*, 1998; Comabella, Hurtado & Garcia-Galano, 2010; Leis *et al.* 2013; Nikolioudakis, Koumoundouros & Somarakis, 2014; Barros *et al.*, 2015), resemblance to leaves by the fish species observed here may be crucial for first settlement, as it could improve survival chances (Johnsen, 2014).

Nevertheless, our results are based solely on morphometrics data, our observations support fundamental information on the distributions of these fish species during early stages, their life history and evolutionary paths if combined with mimetic fish and model ethological and ecological data that are available for some taxa (Barros *et al.*, 2008, 2011, 2012). Strictly morphological studies are ineffective for providing all of the clues necessary to interpret the natural history of most living organisms (Scholtz, 2010). Our results provide a novel approach using morphological data to interpret complex ecological interactions under a convergent evolution perspective to understand the shape similarities shared by mimetic fish and models. Although refinements to the methodologies are necessary, this new comparative approach may stimulate discussion of morphology as a predictor of ecology (Douglas & Matthews, 1992; Gibran, 2010; Oliveira *et al.*, 2010). More experimental studies are expected to understand how important plant models are for plant-mimetic fish species in coastal waters.

245

246 Acknowledgements

247 We thank all members of the Kuchierabu-jima Island community, particularly M. Yamaguchi,
248 the crew of the Laboratório Multi-Imagem and F. R. R. de Oliveira (UFPA), and A. Akama
249 (MPEG) for criticism and logistic and technical support during this study. This study was
250 financially supported by CAPES (process #6718-10-8) and FAPESPA (process # 456780/2012).
251 We dedicate this study to the memory of Dr. Kenji Gushima (Hiroshima University).

252

253 References

- 254 Abramoff, M. D., Magelhaes, P. J. & Ram S. J. (2004). Image processing with imageJ.
255 *Biophotonics International* **11**, 36-42.
- 256 Adams, D. C. & Otarola-Castillo, E. (2013). Geomorph: an R package for the collection and
257 analysis of geometric morphometric shape data. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* **4**, 393-
258 399.
- 259 Barros, B. & Higuchi, H. (2007). Notes on morphological characters in early-developed
260 *Monocirrhus polyacanthus* (Polycentridae, Perciformes). *Kempffiana* **3** (2), 18-22.
- 261 Barros, B., Sakai, Y., Hashimoto, H. & Gushima, K. (2008). Feeding behaviors of leaf-like
262 juveniles of the round batfish *Platax orbicularis* (Ehippidae) on reefs of Kuchierabu-jima
263 Island, southern Japan. *Journal of Ethology* **26**, 287–293.
- 264 Barros, B., Sakai, Y., Hashimoto, H. & Gushima, K. (2011). Effects of prey density on nocturnal
265 zooplankton predation throughout the ontogeny of juvenile *Platax orbicularis* (Teleostei:
266 Ehippidae). *Environmental Biology of Fishes* **91** (2), 177-183
- 267 Barros, B., Sakai, Y., Hashimoto, H., Gushima, K. & Vallinoto, M. (2012). "Better off alone than

- 268 in bad company": Agonistic colour display in mimetic juveniles of two ehippid species.
- 269 *Journal of Fish Biology* **81** (3), 1032-1042.
- 270 Barros, B., Sakai, Y., Hashimoto, H., Gushima, K., Oliveira, Y., Abrunhosa, F. A. & Vallinoto,
- 271 M. (2013). Are ehippid fish a "sleeping functional group"? – Herbivory habits by four
- 272 Ehippidae species based on stomach contents analysis. In *Herbivory* (Barros, B. &
- 273 Fernandes, M. E. B. eds), pp 33-46. Rijeka, Croatia, InTech press.
- 274 Barros, B.; Sakai, Y.; Pereira, P. H. C.; Gasset, E.; Buchet, V.; Maamaatuaiahutapu, M.; Ready,
- 275 J. S.; Oliveira, Y.; Giarrizzo, T. & Vallinoto, M. (2015) Comparative allometric growth of the
- 276 mimetic ehippid reef fishes *Chaetodipterus faber* and *Platax orbicularis*. *PLoS ONE* 10(12):
- 277 e0143838. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0143838
- 278 Breder, C. M. (1942). Ichthyological Notes: On the behavior of young *Oligoplites saurus* (Bloch
- 279 and Schneider). *Copeia* **4**, 267.
- 280 Breder, C. M. (1946). An analysis of the deceptive resemblances of fishes to plant parts, with
- 281 critical remarks on protective coloration, mimicry and adaptation. *Bulletin of the Bingham*
- 282 *Oceanographic Collection* **10**,1–49.
- 283 Breder, C. M. (1949). On the behaviour of young *Lobotes surinamensis*. *Copeia* **4**, 237-242.
- 284 Breder, C. M. & Rasquin, P. (1955). Further notes on the pigmentary behaviour of
- 285 *Chaetodipterus faber* in reference to background and water transparency. *Zoologica* **40**, 85-
- 286 89.
- 287 Castro, J. J., Santiago, J. A. & Santana-Ortega, A. T. (2001). A general theory on fish
- 288 aggregation to floating objects: an alternative to the meeting point hypothesis. *Reviews in Fish*
- 289 *Biology and Fisheries* **11**, 255-277.
- 290 Comabella, Y., Hurtado, A. & García-Galano, T. (2010). Ontogenetic Changes in the

291 Morphology and Morphometry of Cuban Gar (*Atractosteus tristoechus*). *Zoological Science*
292 **27**, 931-938.

293 Comabella, Y., Azanza, J., Hurtado, A., Canabal, J. & García-Galano, T. (2013). Allometric
294 growth in cuban gar (*Atractosteus tristoechus*) larvae. *Universidad y Ciencia* **29** (3), 301-315.

295 Cortesi, F., Feeney, W. E., Ferrari, M. C. O., Waldie, P. A., Phillips, G. A. C., McClure, E. C.,
296 Sköld, H. N., Salzburger, W., Marshall, N. J., Cheney, K. L. (2015). Phenotypic plasticity
297 confers multiple fitness benefits to a mimic. *Current Biology* **25**, 949-954.

298 R Development Core Team (2015). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
299 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <http://www.R-project.org/>.

300 Donnelly, W. A. & Whoriskey Jr., F. G. (1991). Background color acclimation of Brook Trout
301 for crypsis reduces risk of predation by Hooded Mergansers *Lophodytes cucullatus*. *North*
302 *American Journal of Fisheries Management* **11**, 206-211.

303 Douglas, M. E. & Matthews, W. J. (1992). Does morphology predict ecology? Hypothesis
304 testing within a freshwater fish assemblage. *Oikos* **65**, 213-224.

305 Endler, J. A. (1981). An overview of the relationships between mimicry and crypsis. *Biological*
306 *Journal of the Limnean Society* **16**, 25-31.

307 Franssen, N. R., Goodchild, C. G. & Shepard, D. B. (2015). Morphology predicting ecology:
308 incorporating new methodological and analytical approaches. *Environmental Biology of*
309 *Fishes* **98** (2), 713-724.

310 Galis, F. (1990). Ecological and morphological aspects of change in food uptake through the
311 ontogeny of *Haplochromis piceatus*. In: *Behavioural mechanisms of food selection*.
312 *Proceedings of the NATO advanced research workshop on behavioural mechanisms of food*
313 *selection* (Hughes, R. N. ed). pp 281–302, Berlin, Springer.

- 314 Gibran, F. Z. (2010). Habitat partitioning, habits and convergence among coastal nektonic fish
315 species from the São Sebastião Channel, southeastern Brazil. *Neotropical Ichthyology* **8**, 299-
316 310.
- 317 Gómez-Laplaza L. M. & Gerlai, R. (2013). The Role of Body Surface Area in Quantity
318 Discrimination in Angelfish (*Pterophyllum scalare*). *PLoS ONE* **8** (12): e83880.
319 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0083880
- 320 Gushima, K. & Murakami, Y. (1976). The reef fish fauna of Kuchierabu, offshore island of
321 southern Japan. *Journal of the Faculty of Fisheries and Animal Husbandry* **15**, 47-56.
- 322 Hamner, W. M. (1995). Predation, cover, and convergent evolution in epipelagic oceans. *Marine*
323 *and Freshwater Behaviour and Physiology* **26**, 71-89.
- 324 Jenkins, J. A., Bart Jr, H. L., Bowker, J. D., Bowser, P. R., MacMillan, J. R., *et al.* (2014). *Use of*
325 *Fishes in Research Committee (joint committee of the American Fisheries Society, the*
326 *American Institute of Fishery Research Biologists, and the American Society of Ichthyologists*
327 *and Herpetologists). Guidelines for the Use of Fishes in Research.* Bethesda, Maryland, USA:
328 American Fisheries Society.
- 329 Johnsen, S. (2014). Hide and seek in the open sea: Pelagic camouflage and visual
330 countermeasures. *Annual Review of Marine Science* **6**, 369-392.
- 331 Kelley, J. L. & Merilaita, S. (2015). Testing the role of background matching and self-shadow
332 concealment in explaining countershading coloration in wild-caught rainbowfish. *Biological*
333 *Journal of the Linnaean Society* DOI: 10.1111/bij.12451
- 334 Klingenberg, C. P. (2011). MorphoJ: an integrated software package for geometric
335 morphometrics. *Molecular Ecology Resources* **11**, 353-357.
- 336 Kuitert, R. H. & Debelius, H. (2001). *Surgeonfishes, Rabbitfishes, and their Relatives: A*

- 337 *comprehensive guide to Acanthuroidei*. TMC Publishing: Chorleywood, UK.
- 338 Leis, J. M., Hay, A. C., Sasal, P., Hicks, A.S. & Galzin, R. (2013). Pelagic to demersal transition
- 339 in a coral-reef fish, the orbicular batfish *Platax orbicularis*. *Journal of Fish Biology* **83** (3),
- 340 466-479.
- 341 Loy, A., Mariani, L., Bertelletti, M. & Tunesi, L. (1998). Visualizing allometry: Geometric
- 342 morphometrics in the study of shape changes in the early stages of the two-banded sea bream,
- 343 *Diplodus vulgaris* (Perciformes, Sparidae). *Journal of Morphology* **237** (2), 137-146.
- 344 Moland E., Eagle, J. V. & Jones G. P. (2005). Ecology and evolution of mimicry in coral reef
- 345 fishes. *Oceanography and Marine Biology - An Annual Review* **43**, 455-482.
- 346 Nakabo, T. (ed) (2002). *Fishes of Japan with pictorial keys to the species, English edition*. Tokai
- 347 University Press, Tokyo.
- 348 Nelson, J. S. (2006). *Fishes of the world*. 4th edn. Wiley, NJ.
- 349 Nikolioudakis, N., Koumoundouros, G. & Somarakis, S. (2014). Synchronization in allometric
- 350 and morphological changes during metamorphosis: Comparisons among four sparid species.
- 351 *Aquatic Biology* **21**, 155-165.
- 352 Okiyama, M. (ed) (2014). *An Atlas of Early Stage Fishes in Japan, 2nd edition*. Tokai University
- 353 Press, Tokyo.
- 354 Oliveira, E. F., Goulart, E., Breda, L., Minte-Vera, C.V., Paiva, L.R.S. & Vismara, M.R. (2010).
- 355 Ecomorphological patterns of the fish assemblage in a tropical floodplain: effects of trophic,
- 356 spatial and phylogenetic structures. *Neotropical Ichthyology* **8**, 659-586.
- 357 Pasteur, G. (1982). A Classification Review of Mimicry Systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and*
- 358 *Systematics* **13**, 169-199.
- 359 Randall, J. E. (2005a). A review of mimicry in marine fishes. *Zoological Studies* **44** (3), 299-328.

- 360 Randall, J. E. (2005b). *Reef and shore fishes of the South Pacific: New Caledonia to Tahiti and*
361 *the Pitcairn Island*. University of Hawai'i Press, Honolulu
- 362 Randall, J. E. & Randall, H. A. (1960). Examples of mimicry and protective resemblance in
363 tropical marine fishes. *Bulletin of Marine Science* **10**, 444-480.
- 364 Robertson, D. R. (2013). Who resembles whom? Mimetic and coincidental look-alikes among
365 tropical reef fishes. *PLoS ONE* **8** (1): e54939
- 366 Robertson, D. R. (2015) Coincidental resemblances among coral reef fishes from different
367 oceans. *Coral reefs* **34**: 977 DOI 10.1007/s00338-015-1309-8
- 368 Sazima, I., Carvalho, L. N., Mendonça, F. P. & Zuanon, J. (2006). Fallen leaves on the water-
369 bed: diurnal camouflage of three night active fish species in an Amazonian streamlet.
370 *Neotropical Ichthyology* **4** (1), 119-122.
- 371 Scholtz, G. (2010). Deconstructing morphology. *Acta Zoologica* **91**, 44-63.
- 372 Skelhorn, J., Rowland, H. M. & Ruxton, G. D. (2010a). The evolution and ecology of
373 masquerade. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **99**, 1-8.
- 374 Skelhorn, J., Rowland, H. M., Speed, M. P. & Ruxton, G. D. (2010b). Masquerade: Camouflage
375 without crypsis. *Science* **327**, 51.
- 376 Soares, B. E., Ruffeil, T. O. B. & Montag, L. F. A. (2013). Ecomorphological patterns of the
377 fishes inhabiting the tide pools of the Amazonian Coastal Zone, Brazil. *Neotropical*
378 *Ichthyology* **11**, 845-858.
- 379 Uchida, K. (1951). Notes on a few cases of mimicry in fishes. *Science Bulletin of the Faculty of*
380 *Agriculture of Kyushu University* **13**, 294-296.
- 381 Vandendriessche, S., Messiaen, M., O'Flynn, S., Vincx, M. & Degraer, S. (2007). Hiding and
382 feeding in floating seaweed: Floating seaweed clumps as possible refuges or feeding grounds

- 383 for fishes. *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science* **71**, 691-703.
- 384 Vane-Wright, R. I. (1980). On the definition of mimicry. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean*
- 385 *Society* **13**, 1-6.
- 386 Venables, W. N. & Ripley, B. D. (2002). *Modern Applied Statistics with S. 4th edition*. Springer.
- 387 Walker, J.A. (2004). Kinematics and performance of maneuvering control surfaces in teleost
- 388 fishes. *IEEE Journal of Oceanic Engineering* **3**, 572-584.
- 389 Willey, A. (1904). Leaf-mimicry. *Spolia Zeylan* **2**, 51-55.
- 390 Wickler, W. (1968). *Mimicry in plants and animals*. McGraw Hill, New York.
- 391 Xiong, G. & Lauder, G. V. (2014). Center of mass motion in swimming fish: effects of speed
- 392 and locomotor mode during undulatory propulsion. *Zoology* **117**, 269-281.

393

394 **Table legends**

395 Table I – List of homologous landmarks and criteria adopted for selecting each landmark used

396 for the mimetic fish.

397

398 **Supporting Information**

399 S1 - Dataset used for geometric morphometric analysis

400

Table 1 (on next page)

Table 1

List of homologous landmarks and criteria adopted for selecting each landmark used for the mimetic fish


Landmark	Landmark description
1	Tip of the snout
2	Nasal cavity
3	Posterior limit of supra-occipital
4	Anterior insertion of dorsal fin
5	Edge of last hard spine
6	Insertion of soft rays
7	Maximum height of dorsal fin
8	Posterior insertion of dorsal fin
9	Upper limit of caudal fin
10	Hypural joint
11	Lower limit of caudal fin
12	Posterior insertion of anal fin
13	Maximum height of anal fin
14	Anterior insertion of anal fin
15	Insertion of pelvic fin
16	Lower occipital edge

1

Figure 1

Examples of mimetic fish and their models (i.e. floating plant debris) occurring in the shallow water at Honmura Port, Kuchierabu-jima Island, southern Japan. a) *Lobotes surinamensis*, b) *Canthidermis maculata* and c) *Platax orbicularis* are the mimetic fish shown. The models were subdivided using three criteria of: d) round leaves, and e) elongated leaves. The established landmarks and semilandmarks are denoted in (a) for the mimics and in (f) for the models, respectively. White bars indicate 1 cm.


**Note: Auto Gamma Correction was used for the image. This only affects the reviewing manuscript. See original source image if needed for review.*



2

Figure 2


Diversity of shapes observed for the models (i.e. floating plant debris) (a) and fish mimics (b), via a general Procrustes analysis (GPA); and principal components analysis (PCA; c), of all-pooled data indicating a high tendency for shape similarities shared by the fish mimics (lower right) and models (i.e. floating plant debris) (upper left), where green plots represent leaf models (dark green representing rounded leaf models and lighter green representing elongated leaf models). Mimetic fish are represented by *Lobotes surinamensis* (yellow), *Canthidermis maculata* (white) and *Platax orbicularis* (red).



3

Figure 3

Distinct groups of fish species and plant models were also observed through a discriminant function analysis, according to the geometric morphometric data of each group, where mimetic fish are represented by *Lobotes surinamensis* (yellow), *Canthidermis maculata* (white) and *Platax orbicularis* (red), and plant models are represented by green plots (dark green representing rounded leaf models and lighter green representing elongated leaf models).



4

Figure 4

Similar relative body area values were observed among the models (i.e. floating plant debris) and mimetic fish, where mimetic fish are represented by *Lobotes surinamensis* (yellow), *Canthidermis maculata* (white) and *Platax orbicularis* (red), and plant models are represented by green plots (dark green representing rounded leaf models and lighter green representing elongated leaf models).

