

Fisheries Oceanography

January 2011, Volume 20, Issue 1, pages 1–17

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2419.2010.00546.x>

© 2010 Blackwell Publishing Ltd

The definitive version is available at <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/>

Understanding what controls the spatial distribution of fish populations using a multi-model approach

Benjamin Planqué^{1,*}, Christophe Loots², Pierre Petitgas³, Ulf Lindstrøm¹, Sandrine Vaz²

¹ Institute of Marine Research, Postboks 6404, 9294 Tromsø, Norway

² Institut Français de Recherche pour l'Exploitation de la Mer, Laboratoire Ressources Halieutiques, 150 quai Gambetta, BP 699, 62321 Boulogne-sur-Mer, France

³ Institut Français de Recherche pour l'Exploitation de la Mer, Département Ecologie et Modèles pour l'Halieutique, rue de l'île d'Yeu, B.P. 21105, 44311 Nantes Cedex 03, France

*: Corresponding author : B. Planqué, email address : benjamin.planque@imr.no

Abstract:

Understanding and predicting the distribution of organisms in heterogeneous environments lies at the heart of ecology. The spatial distribution of fish populations observed in the wild results from the complex interactions of multiple controls both external or internal to the fish populations. Whilst species distribution models (SDMs) have been mostly concerned with static description of species distribution as a function of environmental constraints, models of animal movements (MAMs) have focussed on the dynamic nature of spatial distribution of groups of individuals under a number of constraints external and internal to the population. Besides SDMs and MAMs, modelling the spatial distribution of fish populations can be achieved by models that are fundamentally static (like SDMs) but can also incorporate many hypotheses on the control of fish spatial distribution (like MAMs). The hypotheses underlying these models need to make sense at the population level - rather than at the individual or species level –we term these ‘population distribution models’ (PDMs). PDMs are statistical models that rely on several hypotheses, which include: (i) control through geographical attachment, (ii) environmental conditions, (iii) density-dependent habitat selection, (iv) spatial dependency, (v) population demographic structure, (vi) species interactions and (vii) population memory. We review the basis behind each of these conceptual models and we examine corresponding numerical applications. We argue that the conceptual models are complementary rather than competing, that existing numerical applications are still rarely compared and combined, and that PDMs can offer a statistical framework to achieve this. We recommend that the numerical models associated with different hypotheses be constructed within such a common general framework. This will permit evaluation, comparison and combination of the multiple hypotheses on fish spatial distribution. It will ultimately lead to a more comprehensive understanding of the factors controlling the spatial distribution of fish populations and to more accurate predictions in which model uncertainty is accounted for.

Keywords: demographic structure; density-dependent habitat selection; environmental control; fish spatial distribution models; multi-model inference; population memory; spatial dependency

45

Introduction

Animal and plant populations are not distributed randomly in space but exhibit spatial patterns, and fish populations are no exception. Understanding what drives these patterns of spatial distribution is both a fundamental ecological question and a requirement for sound management when fish species are of commercial or conservation interest. The various controls on fish spatial distributions can be both external and internal to the populations. External controls, such as environmental forcing, are mainly known to affect the suitability of fish habitats. On the other hand, internal controls such as population size, age structure, fish condition, diversity and behaviour, can also modulate the spatial distribution of fish population, through mechanisms such as density dependence, age- or stage-dependent habitat preference, differential migration capacities, and so on.

50

55

In recent decades, a large body of literature has focused on species distribution models (SDMs, see Rushton et al., 2004 for a review). SDMs are mostly concerned with the control of species spatial distribution by the environment. Such approach finds deep theoretical roots in the niche theory as defined by Hutchinson (1957). The theory, which is defined at the species level, is attractive as it can be easily translated into a wide range of statistical models that associate environmental conditions with species presence or abundance. Environment based models are often referred to as habitat models (Guisan and Zimmermann, 2000), species distribution models (Guisan and Thuiller, 2005) or habitat suitability models (Hirzel et al., 2006) and their aim is to relate observations of animal presence or abundance to various attributes of the environment using a statistical method (Randin et al., 2006, Austin, 2002, Rushton et al., 2004, Araújo and Guisan, 2006, Guisan et al., 2006, Austin, 2007, MacNally, 2000, Boisclair, 2001). In essence, SDMs are restricted to modelling species response to the environment but environmental forcing alone cannot be expected to fully explain the spatial distribution of fish populations, unless such forcing is so strong that it over-rides all other drivers. Other mechanisms such as site fidelity, learning behaviour, life-history changes, competition (intra- and inter specific), predator avoidance, spawning behaviour, and exploitation are expected to affect the spatial distribution of fish populations, possibly to a large extent. Ignoring these mechanisms can lead to incomplete or erroneous representations of the processes controlling fish distribution. These processes are complex, interacting, and evolving as populations constantly adapt to new ecological conditions. For this reasons SDMs are often (but not always) used to model the ‘potential’ spatial distribution of species, that is the distribution resulting from environmental constraints only, which is the geographical realisation of the fundamental niche. Because they are based on niche theory, these models are primarily applicable to species rather than populations. They constitute very useful and powerful tools to model and predict the spatial distribution of species’ potential habitats, but are not primarily designed to model and predict actual spatial distribution of animals at the population level.

60

65

70

75

80 Models of animal movements (MAMs) constitute a radically different approach to the description and prediction of animals' spatial distribution. These are primarily concerned with the movement and behaviour of individuals or groups of individuals. They are dynamic rather than static models. When used in marine systems, they are often coupled with hydrodynamic circulation models. MAMs set their foundations on assumptions or empirical knowledge of individuals: physiological tolerance, energy requirements, behaviour, known preys and predators, swimming capacities, interactions with congeners, and so on (Fisken et al., 2007, Gallego et al., 2007, Heath and Gallego, 1998, Huse et al., 85 2002, Peck and Daewel, 2007). Although MAMs are often built using individual-based models (IBMs), which explicitly represent the movements of individuals or small groups thereof, they are not restricted to IBMs. In some cases, the IBM modelling may be conveniently approximated by advection-diffusion models in which it is not individuals but the density field of the population that is modelled (Faugeras and Maury, 2007). There is a wide range of motivations for constructing models of animal movements 90 in fish, from the understanding of passive larval transport processes to the role of collective behaviour in migration. Like SDMs, MAMs have sometimes been used to represent and predict the spatial distribution of fish populations (see e.g. Lehodey et al., 1998, Lehodey et al., 2008).

95 Whilst SDMs are well suited to model and predict potential fish species, the use of statistical model for understanding and modelling the controls of fish spatial distribution at the population level has received less attention. The population level (i.e. a group of individuals from the same species which can freely interbreed) can encompass relatively large spatial scales and number of individuals, which distribution is framed by geographical, environmental and historical contingencies. Besides SDMs and MAMs, modelling the spatial distribution of fish populations can be achieved by models which are 100 fundamentally static (like SDMs) but can incorporate many hypotheses on the control of fish spatial distribution (like MAMs). The hypotheses underlying these models need to make sense at the population level - rather than at the individual or species level - and we term these 'population distribution models' (PDMs). Like SDMs, PDMs are constructed using statistical models, but in addition to SDMs, they can incorporate explicit modelling of non-environmental control processes such as site fidelity, spatial dependency, density dependence, species interactions or population memory. 105 Such models may be advantageous when the information necessary to adequately model the movement of fish is poorly known (which is often the case, e.g. vertical and horizontal swimming behaviour), but when information on current and past spatial distribution of the population of interest, spatial distribution of other species and environmental conditions are known.

110 The intention here, is to revisit the ecological rationale behind the conceptual models of spatial distribution of fish populations and to examine and discuss the corresponding numerical applications that have been developed for fish populations. Whilst a review of MAMs would merit special attention these have been deliberately excluded from this study. Instead, the present work focuses on PDMs with which the authors are more familiar. The following conceptual models for explaining fish spatial

115 distribution are explored: (i) control through geographical attachment, (ii) environmental conditions,
(iii) density-dependent habitat selection, (iv) spatial dependency, (v) population demographic structure,
(vi) species interactions (direct and indirect) and (vii) population memory. Numerical applications exist,
to variable degrees of development, for each of these hypotheses. We present some of the most
common numerical applications, with a focus on models that are amenable to statistical inference and
120 prediction. When developing such spatial distribution models, the issue of scale needs to be carefully
considered (e.g. Levin, 1992). Here, we focus on the population level and assume that the spatial scale
of investigation encompasses the extent of population distribution and that the resolution is sufficient to
discriminate between areas where important differences in mean abundance or environmental
conditions do occur. We argue that a common modelling framework, in which numerical models
125 associated with each hypothesis can be constructed, will provide the basis to evaluate, compare and
combine models in an objective manner. Under such conditions, it will be possible to test and challenge
the ecological hypotheses and to progress in the understanding of what controls the spatial distribution
of fish populations. This will also provide tools directly applicable for predicting fish population
distribution under a wide range of ecological scenarios.

130 **The multiple controls of population spatial distribution**

Factors that control the spatial distribution of fish populations can be grouped into two main categories,
external and internal. External controls, which are often referred to as environmental controls, are
independent of population state. Such controls would typically include factor such as hydrological
conditions, bottom types, turbidity or oxygen concentration. Interactions with other species (predators,
135 preys and competitors) are also often treated as external controls although they are not strictly so.
Internal control are directly linked to the status of the population under study. These typically include
density-dependent processes, the effect of demographic structure and historical contingencies (i.e. the
past states of the population). Below, we review seven hypotheses of control that are commonly
considered for explaining fish population spatial distribution and which include both internal and
140 external controls.

Absence of control

The absence of control, neither internal nor external is the simplest hypothesis concerning the spatial
distribution of fish populations. In such case, the distribution is expected to be unstructured (i.e. to
resemble 2D or 3D white noise). This situation is never observed in the real world, but we explicitly
145 state this hypothesis here because it is implicitly used in standard statistical tests. When population
distribution models are tested using conventional statistical inference, it is often this unrealistic
situation that is taken as the null hypothesis against which other hypotheses may be tested.

Geographical attachment

150 In the hypothesis of a geographical control of fish distribution, it is assumed that the presence or abundance of fish is solely determined by the geographical location, i.e. site attachment. There are no explicit processes hypothesized. Contrary to the absence of control, the site attachment hypothesis can often constitute a valid null hypothesis against which other hypotheses can be tested. Physical or biological process which can lead to persistence or variations in population geographical distribution are discussed in the following sections

155 Environmental conditions

The environment is usually thought as the major factor that controls the spatial distribution of fish populations. This constitutes an extension – in the geographical space - of the concept of ecological niche (Hutchinson, 1957). The fundamental niche is defined as a hypervolume of n environmental dimensions, each of them representing a environmental factor which may constrain species survival, growth and reproduction. Identification of the environmental factors that should be retained is one of the many challenges for ecologists when studying the environment influence on the spatial distribution of fish populations. These may be classified according to their nature, as resources, direct and indirect gradients and also according to their function, as proximal and distal gradients (Austin, 2002, Austin, 2007). Once the environmental factors have been identified, the form of the relationship that links the environment to the species needs to be specified. In Hutchinson's niche theory, the species response (either biological, physiological and biochemical) along the environmental gradient has a bell-shaped form. This leads to the assumption of the continuum theory from which the response shape of the species is assumed to have a unimodal and symmetric form. However, the response to environmental factors does not always match this theoretical pattern, and interactions between factors may seriously complicate investigations on their respective roles. This can lead to species response taking more complicated shape, e.g. skewed or non-unimodal form (Oksanen and Minchin, 2002). The notion of the habitat is directly derived from the ecological niche concept. In the concept of habitat, the ecological niche is represented by a map on which species-environment relationship has been applied to the environmental spatial pattern observed. Thus, the habitat can be considered as the geographical realisation of the niche.

Density-Dependent Habitat Selection

180 In their influential work, Fretwell and Lucas (1970) expressed that the suitability of a particular part of the environment will decrease with an increase in the density of individuals occurring locally. This has formed the basis for density-dependent habitat selection (DDHS) and the original development of ideal free distribution (IFD) theory. In the ideal free distribution, individuals are "ideal" i.e. they possess a complete knowledge of the suitability of the environment and they seek access to habitat with the highest suitability. They are also "free" to access every habitat without any particular cost in time,

185 energy or mortality risk. In the ideal free distribution world, individuals distribute themselves in habitats of varying quality in such way that the resulting suitability (often expressed as individual fitness) of every occupied habitat is even. One consequence of DDHS is that populations will tend to occupy wider geographical areas as their size increases while retract to refuge areas when their size decreases, leading to a population abundance-area relationship. However, observed abundance-area relationships may not always result from true DDHS and these should be analysed with caution (see Shepherd and Litvak, 2004 for a discussion on this aspect). DDHS models have found applications in fish ecology mainly through the development of the “basin model” (MacCall, 1990) and its application to the Pacific “northern anchovy” (*Engraulis mordax*).

195 The original form of the IFD has been gradually relaxed from the ideal and free assumptions by constraining patch accessibility (Ideal despotic distribution IDD, Fretwell, 1972), including predator-prey dynamics (Sutherland, 1983), allowing for differences in competitive ability between individuals (Sutherland and Parker, 1985, Parker and Sutherland, 1986), including long-term memory of habitat patches (Milinski, 1994) or accounting for energetic costs of reaching patches (Tyler and Gilliam, 1995).

200 Self-organising behaviour (area restricted search) by species can also generate large scale patterns through a phenomenon called density-dependent migratory waves. This phenomenon was suggested by Fauchald et al. (2006) as an explanation for the increased aggregation and displacement of Barents sea capelin observed during feeding, in years of high capelin abundance.

Spatial dependency

205 Fish spatial distribution in the ocean is directly affected by individual interactions (e.g. schooling or shoaling) and interspecific interactions (e.g. prey searching and predator avoidance behaviours). These interactions result in non-random spatial distributions where groups of individuals tend to aggregate in specific areas whilst being nearly absent from others. Dense fish schools, as observed for many small pelagic fish, are extreme example of aggregated spatial distribution occurring at relatively small scale (few meters to few hundred meters). Shoaling fish will often generate less dense aggregations but will still result in aggregated spatial distributions at relatively small spatial scales. The spatial dependency (i.e. existence of areas of higher and lower densities of fish) can therefore be explained, at least partially, by interactions occurring within the population or between preys and predators. However, when environmental control is spatially structured, fish distribution will also be spatially structured, even if there is no true aggregative process at play. In such situation it is difficult to assign the origin of the spatial dependency observed to endogenous processes (population biological interactions) or to exogenous processes (spatially structured environmental controls). Endogenous spatial contagion may be important to consider and it may vary greatly with time. For example in temperate fish populations

with contracted spawning season, the spatial distribution may be highly aggregative during spawning and much less during other life-stages.

Demographic structure

220 Fish populations are demographically structured, i.e. they are composed of individual of different development stages (larvae, juveniles, adults), different sexes, different ages and different sizes. Habitat occupation by individuals may vary according to these traits. The concept of size-dependent habitat selection was formalised by Werner and Gilliam (1984). This was not done in a spatial context, but rather in a theoretical context in which several habitats with distinct properties are available to a size-
225 structured population. Particular habitats correspond to optimal sizes of individuals, so it is advantageous for individual fishes to move from one habitat to another, as they grow larger. The principles of the size-dependent habitat selection model outlined by Werner and Gilliam (1984) is that fitness (which they measured as the ratio between natural mortality and growth) is size-dependent and that individuals will inhabit the most suitable habitats according to their size. Experimental work on
230 coral-dwelling goby show that size-dependent spatial organisation resulting from inter-cohort competition can be modified by removing old/large individuals (Hobbs and Munday, 2004). Similarly, habitat modification experiments coupled with variations in large fish densities have shown that juvenile flatfishes may change habitat preference and therefore spatial distribution as a result of increased large fish densities (Ryer et al., 2007). Aside from theoretical and experimental work,
235 empirical evidence for size-dependent spatial organisation is common for marine fish. Small individuals are often found close to the coast in shallow waters whilst larger individuals are found further offshore in deeper waters (see e.g. Chen et al., 1997, Gordo and Duarte, 1991). Long-range migrating populations such as the Norwegian spring spawning herring display differential distribution with larger/older individuals expanding their distribution much further offshore than do
240 smaller/younger ones (Holst et al., 2004).

There is evidence of age-specific spatial distribution in fish (see e.g. Swain, 1993), but strict age-dependent habitat selection seems rare and there is, to our knowledge, little empirical support for it. Instead, age-dependent spatial distribution mostly results from size-dependent habitat selection (above), because older fish tend to be larger than younger ones. Age may also play an important role in the
245 ability of fish individuals and fish populations to memorise and reproduce particular spatial distribution patterns. This is further discussed in the section on memory.

Sex-dependent spatial distribution may be expected when a species displays sex-specific life history tactics. There is evidence of sex-dependent spatial distribution patterns for a number of fish species. For example, in the St Lawrence Swain and Morin (1996) observed that depth distribution of American
250 Plaice (*Hippoglossoides platessoides*) tended to be more spread out for females than for males. Sex-

dependent spatial distribution may also be connected with size/age-dependency for hermaphrodite species in which individuals change sex at a given size or age in their life.

In summary, the demographic structure of a given fish population will influence its spatial distribution, primarily through size distribution. Observed differences in distribution at age are most likely to result from size effects rather than from strict age effects. Sex specific spatial distributions are observed for a number of populations, and can be expected when sex-specific life-history tactics are at play or when sex determination is environmentally influenced (Han and Tzeng, 2007).

Species interactions

The spatial extent and location of fish population is modulated by local resource availability (preys), direct competition for space or food resources (competitors) or mortality (predators, parasites, pathogens). Predators play an important role in shaping the spatial distribution of prey on local and/or regional scales either directly by inflicting mortality on prey or indirectly through risk effects (i.e. by inducing costly antipredator behaviour, Heithaus et al., 2008). Predators displaying adaptive collective self-organising behaviour such as schooling, local enhancement or area-restricted prey search, may create unstable spatial predator-prey interactions on small scales (Abrams, 2007). In some situations, schooling predators may deplete local prey aggregations (Temming et al., 2007). Indirect predatory effects may be equally important in shaping the spatial distribution of prey as direct effects (Creel and Christianson, 2008). Two recent studies have shown that the presence of predators (killer whales and dusky sharks) can change the habitat use of their preys (harbour seal and stellar sea lions) through risk effects (Frid et al., 2008, Frid et al., 2009). In a simple predator-prey context, predators are expected to distribute themselves in areas of high prey densities whereas prey would move away from areas with high predator densities, i.e. a typical 2-way spatial game (e.g., Fauchald, 2009, Sih, 2005). The sign and strength of the spatial correlation between predator and prey abundance depends on whether the predator or the prey distributions are constrained. Constraints imposed on the predator, due for example to inaccessibility to prey refugia, is expected to result in negative predator-prey relationships at specific scale (Fauchald, 2009, Rose and Leggett, 1989). Thus, not surprisingly, studies of spatial predator-prey correlations varies considerably among functional groups such as seabirds (Hunt et al., 1999), fish (e.g. Lehodey et al., 1998) and sea mammals (e.g. Skern-Mauritzen et al., 2009), partly because the predator and prey constraints are likely to vary between functional groups and prey (Sih et al., 1998). The outcome of spatial games, which can include multiple predators as is often observed in the ocean, is difficult to predict.

How interactions between competing species can shape the spatial distributions of populations has been a central issue in terrestrial ecology (see e.g. Pacala and Levin, 1997, Tilman and Kareiva, 1997), but has received far less attention from fish ecologists. In upwelling systems where the spatial distributions of small pelagic fish species can overlap, it has been hypothesised that opposite expansion/contraction

patterns of sardine and anchovy stocks are related to inter-specific competition (Ward et al., 2001). In theory, two competing species sharing the same resources can coexist if their niche overlap is low or their fitness are equal (Chesson and Kuang, 2008).

Memory

290 The spatial distribution of fish populations tends to have a degree of persistence over years and recurrent spawning, nursery or feeding grounds are common for many fish stocks. Memory at the population level memory can result from imprinting of individual in early life stages, which leads to natal homing, a process by which adult fish will tend to migrate back to their place and/or environment of 'birth'. The maintenance of spatial population patterns across years and across generations can also
295 be achieved by the combination of individual memory and social interactions between individuals of the same population or contingent. Individual fish are able to memorise and learn from other fish individuals (Helfman and Schultz, 1984, Brown and Laland, 2003). These two fundamental properties allow newcomers to be entrained into traditional migrations and habitats by older fish (McQuinn, 1997, Corten, 2002). This lead Petitgas et al. (2006) to develop the entrainment hypothesis, a mechanism by
300 which fish population can maintain persistent migratory and spatial distribution patterns over generations while allowing for innovation in particular circumstances. The screening of 11 fish populations (including herring, sardine, whiting, anchovy, bluefin tuna, white perch and striped bass), undertaken during the ICES¹ workshop WKTEST² (ICES, 2007) revealed that in all cases there was some support for the entrainment hypothesis. Entrainment was demonstrated for Canadian herring
305 (McQuinn, 1997) by showing crossover of individuals between spring- and autumn-spawning contingents. Conditions for entrainment to happen are met when generations overlap in space, length and condition. Because entrainment results in conservatism in habitat use, the occupancy of particular habitats may continue over the life time of several fish generations, even though the suitability of these habitats has become sub-optimal (e.g. variation in feeding grounds of North Sea herring: Corten, 2002).
310 Numerical dominance of naïve fish relative to experienced fish may lead to the colonisation of novel habitats (e.g., variation in wintering habitats of Norwegian spring spawning herring as a result of incoming strong year classes Dragesund et al., 1997, Huse et al., 2002). In contrast, stock collapse is often associated with spatial memory collapse and contingent diversity collapse (e.g. McQuinn, 1997, Corten, 2002, ICES, 2007).

315 The above studies suggest that spatial distributions of fish populations in the past may partially control their spatial distributions in the future, as long as the conditions that allow for population memory to exist are met (individual memory and trans-generational information sharing).

¹ ICES: International Council for the Exploration of the Sea

² WKTEST: Workshop on testing the entrainment hypothesis

Multiple controls

320 We have presented seven hypotheses which are usual candidates for explaining the observed patterns of
fish population spatial distribution (Fig. 1). As much as possible we have tried to isolate each individual
hypothesis from the others, for the sake of clarity, and mainly because it is only when the hypotheses
are clearly and strictly defined that they can be discussed and challenged in an objective manner. Fish
spatial distribution in the wild is complex and the hypotheses presented above are not exclusive of each
325 other. On the contrary, it is expected that fish distribution patterns observed in the wild result from the
interplay between several of the hypothesised processes: geographical attachment, environmental
conditions, density-dependent habitat selection, spatial dependency, demographic structure, species
interactions or memory. As an example, experimental studies on juvenile flatfish have shown that
habitat selection can depend upon the combined effects of ontogeny (development), temperature,
sediment type and the density of individuals (Laurel et al., 2007), thereby combining three hypotheses
330 (demographic structure, environment and density dependence). Strict abiotic environmental control of
species distribution is likely to depend upon the species abundance (at high abundance competition is
more likely to have an effect, while at low abundance abiotic factors may dominate). Thus, abiotic
control may be more applicable under some conditions (low abundance) than others (Mitchell, 2005).

335 In this context of multiple controls, testing individual hypotheses and developing single-hypothesis
models to represent or predict fish spatial distribution will likely yield poor understanding of the
processes at play, even when model predictions apparently fit well with observations. As an example, it
is easy to foresee that pure environmental models may fail when a population size dramatically
increases or decreases. Similarly, models that ignore species interactions will perform poorly if the
abundance of a key predator or prey fluctuates greatly. The question is not to determine whether
340 individual hypotheses are valid but rather to evaluate the relative contribution of the various processes
and evaluate the reliability and usefulness of the hypotheses when predicting populations' spatial
distribution under observed or projected states of the environment and populations. One way to do so is
to translate the hypotheses into numerical models which can be calibrated or fitted to field observations
and which can also be evaluated against independent observations. Below, we describe some of the
345 numerical applications currently used for modelling fish population distributions. We then discuss how
these models can be evaluated, compared and combined to improve our understanding and predicting
capabilities.

Population distribution models

350 Many statistical models can ultimately be used to predict fish population spatial distribution, under
observed, forecasted or hypothesized conditions. We have chosen to group model types according to
the underlying control hypotheses listed above. This is helpful in understanding how each hypothesis is
being addressed through numerical models and to highlight the respective strength and weaknesses in

model developments. We have primarily focussed on PDMs that can be used to predict population distribution (in the sense of statistical predictions), rather than models restricted to strict inference, (i.e. models designed to investigate the relevance of the different hypotheses but that can not be used for statistical predictions, e.g. Mantel test, Dale and Fortin, 2002).

Geographical models

Geographical models can be constructed from past empirical evidence. For example, regular stock assessment surveys carried out over a number of years can be used to construct empirical average spatial distributions for particular species. This is commonly done for constructing traditional atlases (e.g. online maps of fish species spatial distribution in the North Sea provided by the ICES-Fishmap project, <http://www.ices.dk/marineworld/fishmap/ices/>). Geographical models are not totally hypothesis-free because they require that the spatial and temporal scales at which the data aggregation is made be defined and that a particular statistical distribution be selected (e.g. Normal, Poisson, etc.). However, because the geographical hypothesis is not process-related, geographical models remain fairly simple to construct and in many cases can serve as the benchmark against which more complex models can be evaluated. Geographical models can be formulated by continuous functions in which presence or abundance is a direct function of continuous geographical coordinates (longitude and latitude). This can be achieved using a suite of possible techniques, including ordinary least square (OLS) regression, generalised additive models (GAMs), regression trees or other. Alternatively, the geographical space may be divided into discrete spatial elements, either regular or not. Regular grids are commonly found in fisheries statistics (e.g. ICES statistical rectangles are 0.5° latitude and 1.0° longitude). Regions of variable sizes can also be defined, on the basis of known environmental characteristics. As a result of these constructions, either the rectangle or region identity may be used as predictors of abundance in a given location.

Environment-based models

Environment-based models aim to relate observations of animal presence or abundance to various attributes of the environment using a statistical method. These are, in essence, SDMs. Many statistical methods can be applied to relate animal presence or abundance to environmental factors. Choice among these methods depends on the nature of biological observations (or biological response). The biological response that is modelled can be presence-only data, presence/absence, count data or continuous data such as density or biomass. For presence only data, methods pertaining to the family of climatic envelopes are generally used (Pearson and Dawson, 2003, Hirzel et al., 2002, Elith et al., 2006, Pearce and Boyce, 2006, Hirzel et al., 2006). Pearce and Boyce (2006) and Elith et al. (2006) provide a synthesis and critique of the methods currently available. For binary, counts and continuous data, classifications and regressions methods have been widely used and most methods are now easily available, either as individual software or often as a library developed in R (Crooks and Soulé, 1999, R

390 Development Core Team, 2004, <http://www.r-project.org/>). Ordinary Least Square regression (OLS),
Generalised Linear Models (GLM, McCullagh and Nelder, 1989) and Generalised Additive Models
(GAMs, Hastie and Tibshirani, 1990, Guisan et al., 2002, Wood, 2006) have been used to construct
environmental models with various statistical distributions and degree of complexity in the response
shape. Several methods based on GAMs have been implemented to allow for the automatic selection of
environmental predictors (e.g. the R packages or functions *mgcv*, *GRASP* and *BRUTO*) and the
automatic inclusion of interactions between predictors (the *Hyperniche* software, McCune, 2006).
395 Alternative approaches include Multivariate Adaptive Regression Splines (MARS, Friedman, 1991),
Artificial Neural Networks (ANN, Maravelias et al., 2003, Joy and Death, 2004, Wieland and Jarre-
Teichmann, 1997), regression trees (De'ath and Fabricius, 2000, De'ath, 2002, Sutton et al., 2005,
Stratoudakis et al., 1998, Usio, 2007) and their boosted form (Friedman et al., 2000, Friedman and
Meulma, 2003, Leathwick et al., 2006, Friedman, 2001).

400 Whilst all the methods described above are designed to model the average biological response to the
environment, alternative techniques have been developed to model specific parts (or quantiles) of the
response distribution (Mosteller and Tuckey, 1977). Quantile regressions (Koenker and Basset Jr.,
1978, Koenker, 2005) are particularly well suited for modelling environment-population relationships
in the case of limiting environmental conditions (in the sense of the law of limiting factors, van der
405 Ploeg et al., 1999). Quantile regressions have been applied for various ecological problems (Cade et al.,
1999, Cade and Noon, 2003, Planque and Buffaz, 2008, Hiddink, 2005). When applied to the upper
distribution quantiles, the method is well suited to model potential habitat in which environment
variables can be used to predict potentially suitable areas but are not used to predict the average
population response (Vaz et al., 2008, Eastwood et al., 2001, Eastwood et al., 2003). Geographical
410 Weighted Regressions (GWR, Fotheringham et al., 2002) address the problem of space-dependent
relationships. They are based on the idea that the link between the species and the environment can vary
locally, reflected by the parameters that can vary among the space using a kernel smoothing function.

A very rich and recent literature, which reviews, critically assesses and compares all these techniques is
available (Maggini et al., 2006, Moisen and Frescino, 2002, Thuiller, 2003, Segurado and Araújo, 2004,
415 Moisen et al., 2006, Elith and Graham, 2009, Dormann, 2007b, Heikkinen et al., 2006, Vaughan and
Ormerod, 2005).

Density-dependent habitat selection and Ideal Free Distribution models

Numerical models related to density-dependent habitat selection (DDHS) were primarily developed by
Fretwell and Lucas (1970) and Fretwell (1972) and are based on the concept of Ideal Free Distribution
420 (IFD). The IFD model is expressed by a suitability index, which depends on the basic local suitability
of the habitat and a function of the local population density. At equilibrium, the population is
distributed in such a way that the suitability is equal in all occupied habitats (and equal or lower in

unoccupied ones). Basic suitability is often not directly accessible but it can be derived from empirical relationships such as those obtained in environment-based models. In the specific situation of animal spatial distribution being controlled by the availability of preys and density-dependence, the equation can be written as in Sutherland (1983), where local density depends on the proportion of individuals in a given habitat and the proportion of available resource in this habitat. The equation can be applied for any type of resource (Tyler and Hargrove, 1997). DDHS models that are developed to predict habitat suitability can be written to predict species presence or abundance at given spatial locations. Particular adaptations of the original IFD model have been developed to account for predator-preys dynamics, long-term memory, individual difference in competitive ability, energetic cost of travelling between habitats or anti-predator tactics. Accounts of these developments can be found in Tregenza (1995) and Schilling (2005).

Spatial dependency in models

Spatial dependency in fish distribution occurs when locations close to each other exhibit more similar values than those further apart. This results in spatial autocorrelation, a statistical issue that has long been recognized (Student, 1914) but which has been integrated in ecological studies only more recently (Legendre, 1993). There has been an extensive development of the tools available to measure, test and account for autocorrelation in species distribution models during the recent decade. It is not the intention here to review the list of possible models available to deal with autocorrelation in habitat models. Such review can be found in Keitt et al. (2002), Segurado et al. (2006), Wintle and Bardos (2006) and Dormann et al. (2007). The following section is restricted to the presentation of models that appear to be particularly suited to deal with the modelling of fish population spatial distribution.

Habitat models that include spatial autocorrelation are usually extensions of models from two opposite origins. They can originate from geostatistical models to which an environmental component is added or from environment-based models to which a spatial component is added (Nishida and Chen, 2004). The result is a combination of environmental control and spatial dependence, which can be estimated sequentially or simultaneously. Geostatistical models are specifically developed to model spatially autocorrelated processes and have been applied to the study and modelling of fish spatial distribution (Petitgas, 2001). In geostatistical models, the spatial prediction is analogous to spatial interpolation and is referred to as “kriging”. In co-kriging spatial dependence on variables and co-variables are considered simultaneously when modelling spatial distribution. Regression Kriging (RK) is an example of sequential method that combines predictions from a regression model with kriging of the model residuals. RK methods allow for flexible regression models to be used (e.g., GAMs, GLMs), and a wide variety of predictor variables to be included (Miller et al., 2007). Other methods may partially account for spatio-temporal autocorrelation within regression models. These may include modified wild bootstrap to take into account heteroskedastic errors and build confidence interval of model predictions

(Llope et al., 2009, Stige et al., 2006). Permutation techniques may also be used to test non parametrically for the significance of the investigated effects to enhance robustness in presence of autocorrelation (Stige et al., 2006).

460

Autologistic regression (Augustin et al., 1996), allows to model simultaneously environmental effects and spatial dependency with multi-regression implemented with GLM or GAM, and is suited to fit normal (auto-gaussian) and Poisson (auto-Poisson) data. However, autologistic regression have a poor capacity for parameter estimation and limited predictive power in comparison with other methods (Dormann, 2007a, Carl and Kühn, 2007).

465

Autoregressive models (AR) allow for the inclusion of a term accounting for spatial autocorrelation in addition to environmental factors. Conditional autoregressive models (CAR) and simultaneous autoregressive models (SAR) have been derived from conventional AR models to better estimate the regression and autoregression parameters. In these models, endogenous and exogenous autocorrelation can be included using a term accounting for each of them (Kissling and Carl, 2008). However, as they are based on OLS, only Gaussian distribution can be modelled. For binomial and other distributions, Generalised Estimating Equation (GEE) seems to be a promising method (Carl and Kühn, 2007).

470

Models that include population structure

To our knowledge, there is little or no application of statistical fish distribution models that include population demographic structure. Bartolino et al. (2008) proposed a way to test for changes of distribution along a depth gradient in relation to the size of fish and similar approaches may be used to investigate such changes along latitudinal or longitudinal gradients. When demographic structure is believed to influence the geographical distribution of a fish population, a valid strategy is to separate the population in entities that are then modelled separately (e.g. different age/size or sex groups). Spatial distribution models can be constructed, for each sub-group of the population, using the modelling approaches outlined in this review. The spatial distribution of the whole fish population can then be reconstructed by assembling distributions of individual sub-group afterwards (Loots et al., in press, Loots et al., submitted)..

475

480

The same would obviously apply when modelling specific life stages or ecophases (i.e. mating, feeding, overwintering, etc.) that are controlled by distinct processes. In such instances, the developed PDMs would not encompass the population as a whole, but only a specific part of the population or of its life-cycle. The PDMs developed for plaice (Loots et al., in press) and whiting (Loots et al., submitted) in the North Sea provide an example of such application restricted to the actively spawning fraction of the population.

485

490 **Species interactions**

During the last decades, there have been several developments of spatially explicit multispecies models of fish populations, e.g. Ecospace (Walters et al., 1999), Gadget (Begley and Howell, 2004) or Atlantis (Smith et al., 2007) amongst others. These models have been developed to mimic marine ecosystem dynamics and species interaction in time and space. They are generally far more complex than the
495 simpler statistical models considered here (because they simulate the population dynamics by modelling biological processes) and space has often been reduced to a small number of areas or boxes. Species interactions have also been explicitly represented in individual-based models (1995). Statistical models designed to incorporate the effects of species interaction on spatial distribution have been developed (see e.g. Pacala and Levin, 1997, Sutherland and Parker, 1985, Parker and Sutherland, 1986,
500 Sutherland, 1983), but there are only few examples in which such models have been used to predict fish spatial distribution with explicit account for the distribution of other species. The effect of fish preys has been included, often as an additional or transformed environmental variable (as in Lehodey et al., 1998). Spatially explicit statistical models, which incorporate inter- and intra specific interactions in the sea, still remain to be done for most marine populations and systems.

505 **Memory**

Memory can be modelled as a factor controlling the spatial distribution of fish populations in a variety of ways. We shall here consider only how it can be implemented in regression models. In a regression modelling approach in which the occurrence of fish is fitted as a response to explicative covariates, the concept of memory can be directly translated into covariates. A variable accounting for population
510 memory can be used as a covariate. Such variable can be similar to that constructed and used in the Eulerian displacement modelling approach. Also, the conditions for entrainment to happen (sensu Petitgas et al., 2006) can be formulated as covariates. For instance the occurrence of older fish in previous years can be used as covariates to predict the spatial distribution of recruits in the current year (Rindorf and Lewy, 2006). The effects of past spatial distributions of the population can be included
515 one or several time steps back in time, in a manner similar to what is commonly done for temporal autoregressive models.

Evaluation and selection of fish spatial distribution models

Evaluating single models

The conventional approach for testing the statistical significance of a model is to compare a selected
520 metrics (for example, the parameters of a regression between a given environmental variable and local fish abundance) associated to the model with that same metrics under a null hypothesis (e.g. no relationship between the selected environmental variable and abundance). While this approach is valid if model uncertainty is small (i.e. there is only one or few models to choose from) and the null

525 hypothesis is clearly defined and makes biological sense, it may not be appropriate if one or both of
these assumptions are violated (Johnson and Omland, 2004). This is unfortunately a common situation
when modelling spatial distribution of fish populations. The null hypotheses are rarely explicitly stated
in the literature and they often implicitly refer to the total absence of spatial structure and control of fish
presence or abundance (the above-mentioned hypothesis of ‘absence of control’). Models performing
530 better than the “no control” hypothesis are often taken as being ecologically meaningful because they
appear to be statistically significant. However, since most models, even when wrong, can do better than
the “no control” one, most studies which only test a single hypothesis will turn out to find their model
statistically significant. This is true even when the model displays very poor fitting or predictive
performances.

535 An additional difficulty when testing for individual models is related to spatial and temporal
autocorrelation in the data. Fish data is very often autocorrelated in space, time or both, resulting in
non-independence between observations. In most statistical tests, individual observations are assumed
to be independent from one another, and failure to meet this assumption results in biased statistical tests
(Legendre, 1993, Dale and Fortin, 2002). This effect is particularly worrying because it often remains
unrecognised and lead to high rejection rates of the null hypothesis, a situation which encourages
540 publication of biased results and use of wrongly specified numerical models.

The relevant performance of spatial distribution models relates to their prediction capabilities. Whilst
model-fitting performance can be constantly improved by adding complexity to the model formulation,
model-predicting performance will decline after a certain degree of complexity has been reached
because added complexity is modelling noise (or error terms) rather than signal in the observation data.
545 This is commonly known as the bias/variance trade-off (Hastie et al., 2001). Model evaluation should
therefore be performed on a testing data set independent from the training data set. Truly independent
data sets may yet be difficult to obtain because of autocorrelation in the data collected. This point is
discussed further in the following section.

Selecting among single-hypothesis based models

550 Even when a single ecological hypothesis can be selected as the principal object of investigation, this
ecological hypothesis may possibly be expressed in many different numerical formulations. In such
case null hypothesis statistical testing (NHST) becomes ill-adapted because the question is no longer to
test a unique numerical model against a null model (for the null hypothesis), but rather to compare
different models of the same family. As an example, models developed along the lines of
555 environmental control of population spatial distribution may be formulated in very different manners
(e.g. GLMs, GAMs, regression trees and so on) and may include different environmental variables or
combination thereof. NHST done on each individual model can result in several competing models
being significantly better than the null hypothesis. However, comparison of the models cannot be

560 achieved through NHST and requires instead multimodel inference. This can be accomplished by an information-theoretic approach as prescribed by Burnham and Anderson (2002), Johnson and Omland (2004), Stephens et al. (2007) and Diniz-Filho et al. (2008).

565 In multimodel inference, several models are compared on the basis of a distance metrics between the model predictions and the observations. One commonly used metric is the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC, Akaike, 1974), a measure of the likelihood between the fitted values of the model and the observed values, penalised by the number of parameters in the model. Model selection based on AIC is done as a compromise between model complexity and model ability to reproduce the observations. It is possible to compared models by calculating their difference of AIC (Δ_i) with the best model and the probability (w_i) of each model to be the best model (details on calculation of Δ_i and w_i are given in Burnham and Anderson, 2002). The selection procedure can result in several models being reasonably
570 good candidates for ‘best model’, so the outcome of multimodel inference may not always be the identification of a unique solution but rather an ensemble of likely solutions. In multimodel selection, the null hypothesis is no longer needed and mis-specification of H_0 is therefore no longer an issue.

575 However, model selection relies on several important assumptions that need to be carefully checked. The first assumption is that the set of available observations has to reflect the underlying ‘truth’ (e.g. the true spatial distribution of animals). In the case of fish populations, this is not always simple because of limitations in the observational methods. The second assumption is that the true best model needs to be present in the set of candidate models. This implies that the set of candidate models has been accurately defined and that all the reasonable hypotheses are reflected in one or several numerical models. These two assumptions can be considered rather rhetorical, as they can never be totally
580 fulfilled (Link and Barker, 2006). Third, individual observations should be independent. Non-independence due to autocorrelation in the data will tend to generate longer (with more explanatory variables) models, so that the problem is analogous to the inflated Type I errors in the NHST approach, which tend to give more statistical importance to some explanatory variables than they really have (Diniz-Filho et al., 2008). Quality of observation data, construction of the set of candidate models and
585 data autocorrelation should be carefully checked before model inference is performed.

Following Hastie et al. (2001) we have argued that model evaluation should be performed on data sets independent from those that have been used for model calibration (i.e. parameter estimation). By doing so, model prediction error rather than model fitting error is used as a measure of model performance. This should allow for a better evaluation of model performance when used in a predictive mode. Cross-validation methods are doing this by splitting the observation data set into a “training” and a “test” data
590 set and evaluating model performance on the latter. The operation is usually repeated several times, so that each observation is used alternatively for training and testing. A fundamental assumption of cross-validation is that the training and testing data sets are independent. This is often violated because field

595 surveys observations are spatially and temporally autocorrelated. This results in apparent predictive
performance being closely related to model fitting performances, and will usually lead to selection of
complex models with low bias and high variance, i.e. with low predictive power (Loots et al., in press,
Telford and Birks, 2005). Unless the absence of autocorrelation has been demonstrated, models should
be evaluated on independent datasets rather than using standard cross-validation methods. One way to
partially overcome this difficulty may be to exclude one or several years of observation from the
600 training dataset and use them only for testing (as in Loots et al., in press). This testing dataset may be
considered as an independent realisation of the underlying processes. The operation may be repeated as
many times as there are years in the dataset. Such approach is valid when temporal autocorrelation is
expected to be negligible so that datasets from different years can be considered independent. It may be
problematic if mechanisms generating year-to-year memory - of the population spatial distribution - are
605 at play.

In this section, we have concentrated on multi-model inference based on AIC criteria, as advocated in
Burnham and Anderson (2002) but alternative promising approaches such as Bayesian based methods
and hierarchical modelling are available (Soetaert and Herman, 2009, Cressie et al., 2009, Thuiller et
al., 2008) albeit only seldom used in marine ecology yet.

610 **Towards a modelling framework for combining multiple hypotheses**

The causes behind the true spatial distribution of fish populations are numerous and our perception of
such distribution is only accessible through limited observations. The processes controlling fish spatial
distribution at the population level are many, complex and are likely to vary with specific populations
and geographical regions. What really controls fish population spatial distribution is most likely a
615 combination of all the processes identified in the sections above. Any attempt to describe and model
fish spatial distribution with only one of these hypotheses is likely to generate poor results or even fail.
More promising strategies include the construction of models that include several hypotheses. This can
be achieved by combining the individual models presented above into more complex models that can
be tested through multimodel evaluation and selection procedures. We recommend that models of
620 different levels of complexity be build from the existing knowledge and hypotheses that are specific to
the population studied. Constructing such candidate models is not simple, but following
recommendations that apply for model selection is useful. These include 1) the selection of meaningful
variables (which can be associated with causal factors), 2) the (theoretical) justification of functions
that defines the relationships between controls and responses, and 3) the error structure of the model.
625 Ultimately, the number of candidate models should be small enough to avoid generating so many
models that spurious findings become likely (Johnson and Omland, 2004). A strategy consisting in the
construction of all possible combination of models is proscribed by Burnham and Anderson (2002), a
view supported by recent studies (Dormann et al., 2008, Murtaugh, 2009) showing that stepwise

630 selection or best-subset approaches can perform as well as exhaustive subset selection, but contrasting
with Whittingham et al. (2006) who recommend considering all possible model combinations. The
principles of model selection and the associated theoretical approach are now well developed and
technically available to the community of marine and fish ecology researchers (see e.g. Hilborn and
Mangel, 1997, Burnham and Anderson, 2002) So, if models can be constructed to match working
635 hypotheses, these will be amenable to model selection and the hypotheses - of combination thereof -
may be compared and selected. What remains largely unexplored today is the combination of
hypotheses through integrated spatial distribution models. Evidence exists that multiple controls of
spatial distribution or habitat selection is at play (see e.g. Laurel et al., 2007) but population distribution
models which integrate several controlling hypotheses are still the exception. This may result from
640 differences in the mathematical formulation of the various types of models, which makes them difficult
to assemble. For example, whilst all models can be applied to predict abundance (or presence) at a
given geographical location (i.e. they have the same output variable), they may request input
information of different type: geographical models rely on geographical coordinates only,
environmental models necessitate additional observed or modelled environmental conditions, DDHS
and spatial dependency models require local or neighbouring densities to be known (a difficult situation
645 since this is what the model is trying to predict), and memory models require knowledge about past
population states. How these models can be assembled remains a challenge to marine and fisheries
ecologists. Selection of models from different ‘families’ or hybrid models is also challenging, mostly
because the amount of independent information used in these models is often poorly estimated as a
result of strong spatial and temporal autocorrelation in the data. When this is the case, model selection
650 techniques will tend to favour complex models that have lower bias but also less predictive power.
Finally, if and when appropriate models can be developed to predict fish spatial distribution, model
selection procedure may lead to the selection of more than one ‘best’ model. This happens when the
data available is not sufficient to resolve model uncertainty. Researchers are then left with a subset of
possible models, structurally different from one another but with similar performances. In such
655 situation, multiple models can be used within an appropriate ensemble-forecasting framework. The
technique, if used appropriately, can lead to robust predictions without the need to identify a unique
best model (Araújo and New, 2007). Some examples of methods used for combining multiple model
predictions can be found in Link and Barker (2006), Thomson et al. (2007), Dormann et al. (2008) or
Butler et al. (2009).

660 Whatever the final set of models may be retained in a particular case study, non-stationarity or abrupt
environmental shifts are likely to reduce the predictive ability of population distribution models. This is
a common problem with most, if not all, statistical predictive models (see e.g. Zurell et al., 2009 on
SDMs). The identification of the various sources of uncertainties in ensemble modelling remains a
major issue for any attempt to forecast species distribution under anticipated future conditions, and is a

665 currently a very active field of research (Diniz-Filho et al., 2009). In many instances, PDMs may prove
more useful to explore possible outcomes of climate and/or management scenarios rather than to
provide accurate predictions of future distributions.

Conclusions

670 Observed patterns of fish population spatial distributions result from multiple controls that are not
exclusive of one another. For each hypothesis of control, population distribution models can and have
been developed and these models can be evaluated, combined and compared. Whilst SDMs have been
used to investigate and model the distribution of fish species under environmental controls only, PDMs
can be used to investigate a wider range of control mechanisms, including environmental, biological
675 (intrinsic and extrinsic) and temporal hypotheses. When the models are constructed to predict fish
spatial distribution under known or hypothesised conditions, we recommend that they should be
evaluated on their predictive rather than data fitting performance. Predicting the distribution of marine
fish populations is becoming a pressing issue and global scale predictions are currently being developed
(Cheung et al., 2008). These require models and numerical tools that are appropriate to unravel the
underlying mechanisms and accurately predict spatial patterns under plausible future scenarios, and the
680 general approach outlined here should prove useful in achieving this goal. Comparing and combining
population distribution models that are structurally different remains a major challenge for marine and
fisheries ecologists. Multi-model inference may provide an adequate framework to conduct such studies
as seen from recent modelling on fish spawning habitat (Loots et al., in press, Loots et al., submitted).
Because of the complex and adaptive nature of marine populations and ecosystems, a certain degree of
685 indetermination with regards to the ‘best’ models will always remain. Such model uncertainty should
be accounted for when predicting spatial distributions, possibly through ensemble forecasting.

Acknowledgments

The authors are grateful to EUR-OCEANS (<http://www.eur-oceans.org>), a European Network of
Excellence co-funded by the European Commission (FP 6, contract n8511106), which supported a
690 summer school during which many of the ideas presented in this paper were discussed (<http://www.eur-oceans.eu/eamr/school/habitat/>). This work was part-funded by the EU as part of the RECLAIM project
(STREP-FP6). C. Loots acknowledges financial support by the Conseil Régional de Nord Pas-de-
Calais. S. Vaz received additional financial support by the Franco-British INTERREG IIIA initiative of
the European Regional Development Fund (Priority 3, Measure 9), as part of the Channel Habitat Atlas
695 for Marine Resource Management (CHARM) Phase II Project.

References

- Abrams, P. (2007) Habitat choice in predator-prey systems: spatial instability due to interacting adaptive movements. *Am. Nat.*, **169**, 581-594.
- 700 Akaike, H. (1974) A new look at the statistical model identification. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, **19**, 716-723.
- Araújo, M.B. and Guisan, A. (2006) Five (or so) challenges for species distribution modelling. *J. Biogeogr.*, **33**, 1677-1688.
- Araújo, M.B. and New, M. (2007) Ensemble forecasting of species distributions. *TREE*, **22**, 42-47.
- 705 Augustin, N.H., Muggleston, M.A. and Buckland, S.T. (1996) An autologistic model for the spatial distribution of wildlife. *J. Appl. Ecol.*, **33**, 339-347.
- Austin, M. (2002) Spatial prediction of species distribution: an interface between ecological theory and statistical modelling. *Ecol. Model.*, **157**, 101-118.
- Austin, M. (2007) Species distribution models and ecological theory: a critical assessment and some possible new approaches. *Ecol. Model.*, **200**, 1-19.
- 710 Bartolino, V., Ottavi, A., Colloca, F., Ardizzone, G.D. and Stefansson, G. (2008) Bathymetric preferences of juvenile European hake (*Merluccius merluccius*). *ICES J. Mar. Sci.*, **65**, 963-969.
- Begley, J. and Howell, D. (2004) An Overview of Gadget, the Globally applicable Area- 13 Disaggregated General Ecosystem Toolbox. *ICES CM*, **2004/FF:13**.
- 715 Boisclair, D. (2001) Fish habitat modeling: from conceptual framework to functional tools. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.*, **58**, 1-9.
- Brown, C. and Laland, K.N. (2003) Social learning in fishes: a review. *Fish Fish.*, **4**, 280-288.
- Burnham, K.P. and Anderson, D.R. (2002) *Model selection and multimodel inference: a practical information-theoretic approach*. New York: Springer, xxvi, 488 s.pp.
- 720 Butler, A., Doherty, R.M. and Marion, G. (2009) Model averaging to combine simulations of future global vegetation carbon stocks. *Environmetrics*, **20**, 791-811.
- Cade, B.S. and Noon, B.R. (2003) A gentle introduction to quantile regression for ecologists. *Front. Ecol. Environ.*, **1**, 412-420.
- 725 Cade, B.S., Terrell, J.W. and Schroeder, R.L. (1999) Estimating effects of limiting factors with regression quantiles. *Ecology*, **80**, 311-323.
- Carl, G. and Kühn, I. (2007) Analyzing spatial autocorrelation in species distributions using Gaussian and logit models. *Ecol. Model.*, **207**, 159-170.
- Chen, Y., Liggins, G.W., Graham, K.J. and Kennelly, S.J. (1997) Modelling the length-dependent offshore distribution of redfish, *Centroberyx affinis*. *Fish. Res.*, **29**, 39-54.
- 730 Chesson, P. and Kuang, J.J. (2008) The interaction between predation and competition. *Nature*, **13**, 235-238.
- Cheung, W.W.L., Lam, V.W.Y. and Pauly, D. (2008) Modelling present and climate-shifted distribution of marine fishes and invertebrates. The Fisheries Center, University of British Columbia, 16(3). 72pp.
- 735 Corten, A. (2002) The role of "conservatism" in herring migrations. *Rev. Fish Biol. Fish.*, **11**, 339-361.
- Creel, S. and Christianson, D. (2008) Relationships between direct predation and risk effects. *TREE*, **23**, 194-201.

- 740 Cressie, N., Calder, C.A., Clark, J.S., Ver Hoef, J.M. and Wikle, C.K. (2009) Accounting for uncertainty in ecological analysis: the strength and limitations of hierarchical statistical modeling. *Ecol. Appl.*, **19**, 553-570.
- Crooks, K. and Soulé, M.E. (1999) Mesopredator release and avifaunal extinctions in a fragmented system. *Nature*, **400**, 563-566.
- Dale, M.R.T. and Fortin, M.-J. (2002) Spatial autocorrelation and statistical tests in ecology. *Ecoscience*, **9**, 162-167.
- 745 De'ath, G. (2002) Multivariate regression trees: a new technique for modeling species-environment relationships. *Ecology*, **83**, 1105-1117.
- De'ath, G. and Fabricius, K.E. (2000) Classification and regression trees: a powerful yet simple technique for ecological data analysis. *Ecology*, **81**, 3178-3192.
- 750 Diniz-Filho, J.A.F., Bini, L.M., Rangel, T.F., Loyola, R.D., Hof, C., NoguÈs-Bravo, D. and Ara'jo, M.B. (2009) Partitioning and mapping uncertainties in ensembles of forecasts of species turnover under climate change. *Ecography*, **32**, 897-906.
- Diniz-Filho, J.A.F., Rangel, T.F.L.V.B. and Bini, L.M. (2008) Model selection and information theory in geographical ecology. *Global Ecol. Biogeogr.*, **17**, 479-488.
- Dormann, C.F. (2007a) Assessing the validity of autologistic regression. *Ecol. Model.*, **207**, 234-242.
- 755 Dormann, C.F. (2007b) Promising the future? Global change projections of species distributions. *Basic Appl. Ecol.*, **8**, 387-397.
- Dormann, C.F., McPherson, J.M., Araujo, M.B., Bivand, R., Bolliger, J., Carl, G., Davies, R.G., Hirzel, A., Jetz, W., Kissling, W.D., Kühn, I., Ohlemüller, R., Peres-Neto, P.R., Reineking, B., Schröder, B., Schurr, F.M. and Wilson, R. (2007) Methods to account for spatial autocorrelation in the analysis of species distributional data: a review. *Ecography*, **30**, 609-628.
- 760 Dormann, C.F., Schweiger, O., Arens, P., Augenstein, I., Aviron, S., Bailey, D., Baudry, J., Billeter, R., Bugter, R., Bukacek, R., Burel, F., Cerny, M., De Cock, R., De Blust, G., DeFilippi, R., Diekötter, T., Dirksen, J., Durka, W., Edwards, P.J., Frenzel, M., Hamersky, R., Hendrickx, F., Herzog, F., Klotz, S., Koolstra, B., Lausch, A., Le Coeur, D., Liira, J., Maelfait, J.P., Opdam, P., Roubalova, M., Schermann-Legionnet, A., Schermann, N., Schmidt, T., Smulders, M.J.M., Speelmans, M., Simova, P., Verboom, J., van Wingerden, W. and Zobel, M. (2008) Prediction uncertainty of environmental change effects on temperate European biodiversity. *Ecol. Lett.*, **11**, 235-244.
- 770 Dragesund, O., Johannessen, A. and Ulltang, Ø. (1997) Variations in migration and abundance of the Norwegian spring spawning herring (*Clupea harengus*). *Sarsia*, **82**, 97-105.
- Eastwood, P.D., Meaden, G.J., Carpentier, A. and Rogers, S.I. (2003) Estimating limits to the spatial extent and suitability of sole (*Solea solea*) nursery grounds in the Dover Strait. *J. Sea Res.*, **50**, 151-165.
- 775 Eastwood, P.D., Meaden, G.J. and Grioche, A. (2001) Modelling spatial variations in spawning habitat suitability for the sole *Solea solea* using regression quantiles and GIS procedures. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, **224**, 251-266.
- Elith, J. and Graham, C.H. (2009) Do they? How do they? WHY do they differ? On finding reasons for differing performances of species distribution models. *Ecography*, **32**, 66-77.
- 780 Elith, J., H. Graham, C., P. Anderson, R., Dudik, M., Ferrier, S., Guisan, A., J. Hijmans, R., Huettmann, F., R. Leathwick, J., Lehmann, A., Li, J., G. Lohmann, L., A. Loiselle, B., Manion, G., Moritz, C., Nakamura, M., Nakazawa, Y., McC. M. Overton, J., Townsend Peterson, A., J. Phillips, S., Richardson, K., Scachetti-Pereira, R., E. Schapire, R., Soberon, J., Williams, S., S. Wisz, M. and E. Zimmermann, N. (2006) Novel methods improve prediction of species' distributions from occurrence data. *Ecography*, **29**, 129-151.

- 785 Fauchald, P. (2009) Spatial interaction between seabirds and prey: review and synthesis. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, **391**, 139-151.
- Fauchald, P., Mauritzen, M. and Gjøsaeter, H. (2006) Density-dependent migratory waves in the marine pelagic ecosystem. *Ecology*, **81**, 773-783.
- 790 Faugeras, B. and Maury, O. (2007) Modeling fish population movements: From an individual-based representation to an advection-diffusion equation. *J. theor. Biol.*, **247**, 837-848.
- Fiksen, Ø., Giske, J. and Slagstad, D. (1995) A spatially explicit fitness-based model of capelin migrations the Barents Sea. *Fish. Oceanogr.*, **4**, 193-208.
- Fisken, Ø., Jørgensen, C., Kristiansen, R., Vikebø, F. and Huse, G. (2007) Linking behavioural ecology and oceanography: larval behaviour determined growth, mortality and dispersal. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, **347**, 195-205.
- 795 Fotheringham, A.S., Brunsdon, C. and Charlton, M. (2002) *Geographically Weighted Regression: The analysis of spatially varying relationships*. Chichester.: Wiley & Sons.
- Fretwell, S. (1972) *Populations in a seasonal environment*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 217pp.
- 800 Fretwell, S. and Lucas, H.L. (1970) On territorial behaviour and other factors influencing habitat distribution in birds. *Acta Biotheor.*, **19**, 16-36.
- Frid, A., Baker, G.G. and Dill, L.M. (2008) Do shark declines create fear-released systems. *Oikos*, **117**, 191-201.
- Frid, A., Burns, J., Baker, G.G. and Thorne, R.E. (2009) Predicting synergistic effects of resources and predators on foraging decisions by juvenile sea lions. *Oecologia*, **158**, 775-786.
- 805 Friedman, J.H. (1991) Multivariate adaptive regression splines. *Ann. Stat.*, **19**, 1-67.
- Friedman, J.H. (2001) Greedy function approximation: the gradient boosting machine. *Ann. Stat.*, **29**, 1189-1232.
- Friedman, J.H., Hastie, T.J. and Tibshirani, R.J. (2000) Additive logistic regression: a statistical view of boosting. *Ann. Stat.*, **28**, 337-407.
- 810 Friedman, J.H. and Meulma, J.J. (2003) Multiple additive regression trees with application in epidemiology. *Statistics in Medicine*, **22**, 1365-1381.
- Gallego, A., North, E.W., Petitgas, P. and Browman, H.I. (2007) Advances in modelling physical-biological interactions in fish early life history. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, **347**, 121-306.
- 815 Gordoa, A. and Duarte, C.M. (1991) Size-dependent spatial distribution of hake (*Merluccius capensis* and *Merluccius paradoxus*) in Namibian waters. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.*, **48**, 2095-2099.
- Guisan, A., Edwards, T.C. and Hastie, T.J. (2002) Generalized linear and generalized additive models in studies of species distributions: setting the scene. *Ecol. Model.*, **157**, 89-100.
- 820 Guisan, A., Lehmann, A., Ferrier, S., Austin, M., Overton, J.M.C., Aspinall, R. and Hastie, T.J. (2006) Making better biogeographical predictions of species' distributions. *J. Appl. Ecol.*, **43**, 386-392.
- Guisan, A. and Thuiller, W. (2005) Predicting species distribution: offering more than simple habitat models. *Ecol. Lett.*, **8**, 993-1009.
- Guisan, A. and Zimmermann, N.E. (2000) Predictive habitat distribution models in ecology. *Ecol. Model.*, **135**, 147-186.
- 825 Han, Y.S. and Tzeng, W.N. (2007) Sex-dependent habitat use by the Japanese eel *Anguilla japonica* in Taiwan. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, **338**, 193-198.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R.J. and Friedman, J.H. (2001) *The elements of statistical learning*. Springer-Verlag.

- Hastie, T.J. and Tibshirani, R.J. (1990) *Generalized additive models.*: Chapman and Hall, 335pp.
- 830 Heath, M.R. and Gallego, A. (1998) Bio-physical modelling of the early life stages of haddock, *Melanogrammus aeglefinus*, in the North Sea. *Fish. Oceanogr.*, **7**, 110-125.
- Heikkinen, R.K., Luoto, M., Araujo, M.B., Virkkala, R., Thuiller, W. and Sykes, M.T. (2006) Methods and uncertainties in bioclimatic envelope modelling under climate change. *Prog. Phys. Geogr.*, **30**, 751-777.
- 835 Heithaus, M.R., Frid, A., Wirsing, A.J. and Worm, B. (2008) Predicting ecological consequences of marine top predator declines. *TREE*, **23**, 202-210.
- Helfman, G. and Schultz, E. (1984) Social transmission of behavioural traditions in a coral reef fish. *Anim. Behav.*, **32**, 379-384.
- 840 Hiddink, J.G. (2005) Implications of Liebig's law of the minimum for the use of ecological indicators based on abundance. *Ecography*, **28**, 264-271.
- Hilborn, R. and Mangel, M. (1997) *The ecological detective*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 315pp.
- Hirzel, A.H., Hausser, J., Chessel, D. and Perrin, N. (2002) Ecological-niche factor analysis: how to compute habitat-suitability maps without absence data? *Ecology*, **83**, 2027-2036.
- 845 Hirzel, A.H., Le Lay, G., Helfer, V., Randin, C. and Guisan, A. (2006) Evaluating the ability of habitat suitability models to predict species presences. *Ecol. Model.*, **199**, 142-152.
- Hobbs, J.P.A. and Munday, P.L. (2004) Intraspecific competition controls spatial distribution and social organisation of the coral-dwelling goby *Gobiodon histrio*. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, **278**, 253-259.
- 850 Holst, J.C., Røttingen, I. and Melle, W. (2004) The herring. In: *The Norwegian Sea ecosystem*. H.R. Skjoldal, R. Sætre, A. Færnø, O.A. Misund and I. Røttingen (eds) Trondheim, Norway: Tapir Academic Press. pp. 203-226.
- Hunt, G.L., Mehlum, F., Russel, R.W., Irons, D., Decker, M.B. and Becker, P.H. (1999) Physical processes, prey abundance, and the foraging ecology of sea birds. In: *Proc 22nd Int. Ornithol. Congr. Birdlife South Africa*. N.J. Adams and R.H. Slotow (eds) Durban. pp. 2040-2046.
- 855 Huse, G., Railsback, S. and Fernö, A. (2002) Modelling changes in migration pattern of herring: collective behaviour and numerical domination. *J. Fish Biol.*, **60**, 571-582.
- Hutchinson, G.E. (1957) Concluding remarks- Cold Spring Harbor Symposia on Quantitative Biology. 22:415-427. Reprinted in 1991: Classics in Theoretical Biology. *Bull. Math. Biol.*, **53**, 193-213.
- 860 ICES (2007) Report of the workshop on testing the entrainment hypothesis (WKTEST). *ICES CM*, **2007 / LRC:10**, 124pp.
- Johnson, J.B. and Omland, K.S. (2004) Model selection in ecology and evolution. *TREE*, **19**, 101-108.
- Joy, M.K. and Death, R.G. (2004) Predictive modelling and spatial mapping of freshwater fish and decapod assemblages using GIS and neural networks. *Freshwater Biol.*, **49**, 1036-1052.
- 865 Keitt, T.H., Bjørnstad, O.N., Dixon, P.M. and Citron-Pousty, S. (2002) Accounting for spatial pattern when modeling organism-environment interactions. *Ecography*, **25**, 616-625.
- Kissling, W.D. and Carl, G. (2008) Spatial autocorrelation and the selection of simultaneous autoregressive models. *Global Ecol. Biogeogr.*, **17**, 59-71.
- Koenker, R. (2005) *Quantile regression*. New York, U.S.A.: Cambridge University Press, 349pp.
- Koenker, R. and Basset Jr., G. (1978) Regression quantiles. *Econometrica*, **46**, 33-50.
- 870 Laurel, B.J., Sroner, A.W. and Hurst, T.P. (2007) Density-dependent habitat selection in marine flatfish: the dynamic role of ontogeny and temperature. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, **338**, 183-192.

- Leathwick, J.R., Elith, J. and Hastie, T. (2006) Comparative performance of generalized additive models and multivariate adaptive regression splines for statistical modelling of species distributions. *Ecol. Model.*, **199**, 188-196.
- 875 Legendre, P. (1993) Spatial autocorrelation: trouble or new paradigm? *Ecology*, **74**, 1659-1673.
- Lehodey, P., Andre, J.-M., Bertignac, M., Hampton, J., Stoens, A., Menkes, C., Memery, L. and Grima, N. (1998) Predicting skipjack tuna forage distributions in the equatorial Pacific using a coupled dynamical bio-geochemical model. *Fish. Oceanogr.*, **7**, 317-325.
- 880 Lehodey, P., Senina, I. and Murtugudde, R. (2008) A spatial ecosystem and populations dynamics model (SEAPODYM) - Modeling of tuna and tuna-like populations. *Prog. Oceanogr.*, **78**, 304-318.
- Levin, S.A. (1992) The problem of pattern and scale in ecology. *Ecology*, **73**, 1943-1967.
- Link, W.A. and Barker, R.J. (2006) Model weights and the foundations of multimodel inference. *Ecology*, **87**, 2626-2635.
- 885 Llope, M., Chan, K.S., Ciannelli, L., Reid, P.C., Stige, L.C. and Stenseth, N.C. (2009) Effects of environmental conditions on the seasonal distribution of phytoplankton biomass in the North Sea. *Limol. Oceanogr.*, **54**, 512-524.
- Loots, C., Vaz, S., Planque, B. and Koubbi, P. (in press) What controls the spatial distribution of North Sea plaice spawning population? Confronting ecological hypotheses through a model selection framework. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.*
- 890 Loots, C., Vaz, S., Planque, B. and Koubbi, P. (submitted) Identifying processes that control the spawning distribution of North Sea whiting using multi model inference.
- MacCall, A.D. (1990) *Dynamic geography of marine fish populations*. Washington: University of Washington Press, 153pp.
- 895 MacNally, R. (2000) Regression and model-building in conservation biology, biogeography and ecology: The distinction between - and reconciliation of - 'predictive' and 'explanatory' models. *Biodivers. Conserv.*, **9**, 655-671.
- Maggini, R., Lehmann, A., Zimmermann, N.E. and Guisan, A. (2006) Improving generalized regression analysis for the spatial prediction of forest communities. *J. Biogeogr.*, **33**, 1729-1749.
- 900 Maravelias, C., D., Haralabous, J. and Papaconstantinou, C. (2003) Predicting demersal fish species distributions in the Mediterranean Sea using artificial neural networks. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, **255**, 249-258.
- 905 McCullagh, P. and Nelder, J.A. (1989) *Generalized linear models, Monographs on statistics and applied probability 37, 2nd ed.*
- McCune, B. (2006) Non-parametric habitat models with automatic interactions. *J. Veg. Sci.*, **17**, 819-830.
- McQuinn, I.H. (1997) Metapopulations and the Atlantic herring. *Rev. Fish Biol. Fish.*, **7**, 297-329.
- 910 Milinski, M. (1994) Long-term memory for food patches and implications for ideal free distribution in sticklebacks. *Ecology*, **75**, 1150-1156.
- Miller, J., Franklin, J. and Aspinall, R. (2007) Incorporating spatial dependence in predictive vegetation models. *Ecol. Model.*, **202**, 225-242.
- Mitchell, S.C. (2005) How useful is the concept of habitat? - a critique. *Oikos*, **110**, 634-638.
- 915 Moisen, G.G., Edwards, J.T.C. and Osborne, P.E. (2006) Further advances in predicting species distributions. *Ecol. Model.*, **199**, 129-131.

- Moisen, G.G. and Frescino, T.S. (2002) Comparing five modelling techniques for predicting forest characteristics. *Ecol. Model.*, **157**, 209-225.
- Mosteller, F. and Tuckey, J.W. (1977) *Data analysis and regression*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- 920 Murtaugh, P.A. (2009) Performance of several variable-selection methods applied to real ecological data. *Ecol. Lett.*, **12**, 1061-1068.
- Nishida, T. and Chen, D.G. (2004) Incorporating spatial autocorrelation into the general linear model with an application to the yellowfin tuna (*Thunnus albacares*) longline CPUE data. *Fish. Res.*, **70**, 265-274.
- 925 Oksanen, J. and Minchin, P.R. (2002) Continuum theory revisited: what shape are species responses along ecological gradients? *Ecol. Model.*, **157**, 119-129.
- Pacala, S.W. and Levin, S.A. (1997) Biologically generated spatial pattern and the coexistence of competing species. In: *Spatial Ecology : the role of space in population dynamics and interspecific interactions*. D. Tilman and P. Kareiva (eds) Columbia and Princeton: University Presses of California. pp. 204-232.
- 930 Parker, G.A. and Sutherland, W.J. (1986) Ideal free distribution when individuals differ in competitive ability: phenotype-limited ideal free models. *Anim. Behav.*, **34**, 1222-1242.
- Pearce, J.L. and Boyce, M. (2006) Modelling distribution and abundance with presence-only data. *J. Appl. Ecol.*, **43**, 405-412.
- 935 Pearson, R.G. and Dawson, T.P. (2003) Predicting the impacts of climate change on the distribution of species: are bioclimate envelope models useful? *Global Ecol. Biogeogr.*, **12**, 361-372.
- Peck, M. and Daewel, U. (2007) Physiological based limits to food consumption, and individual-based modeling of foraging and growth of larval fish. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, **347**, 171-183.
- Petitgas, P. (2001) Geostatistics in fisheries survey design and stock assessment: models, variances and applications. *Fish Fish.*, **2**, 231-249.
- 940 Petitgas, P., Reid, D., Planque, B., Nogueira, E., O'Hea, B. and Cotano, U. (2006) The entrainment hypothesis: an explanation for the persistence and innovation in spawning migration and life cycle patterns. *ICES CM*, **B:07**, 9pp.
- Planque, B. and Buffaz, L. (2008) Quantile regression models for fish recruitment-environment relationships - four case studies. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, **357**, 213-223.
- 945 R Development Core Team (2004) *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria.: ISBN 3-900051-00-3, URL <http://www.R-project.org>.
- Randin, C.F., Dirnbock, T., Dullinger, S., Zimmermann, N.E., Zappa, M. and Guisan, A. (2006) Are niche-based species distribution models transferable in space? *J. Biogeogr.*, **33**, 1689-1703.
- 950 Rindorf, A. and Lewy, P. (2006) Warm windy winters drive cod north and homing keeps them there. *J. Appl. Ecol.*, **43**, 445-453.
- Rose, G.A. and Leggett, W.C. (1989) Interactive effects of geophysically-forced sea temperatures and prey abundance on mesoscale coastal distributions of a marine predator, Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*). *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.*, **46**, 1904-1913.
- 955 Rushton, S.P., Ormerod, S.J. and Kerby, G. (2004) New paradigms for modelling species distributions? *J. Appl. Ecol.*, **41**, 193-200.
- Ryer, C.H., Stoner, A.W., Spencer, M.L. and Abookire, A.A. (2007) Presence of larger flatfish modifies habitat preference by Age-0 northern rock sole *Lepidopsetta polyxystra*. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, **342**, 227-238.
- 960 Schilling, N.S. (2005) Survival of the fittest: fish in patchy environments show ideal free distribution (IFD). *Eukaryon*, **1**, 11-16.

- Segurado, P. and Araújo, M.B. (2004) An evaluation of methods for modelling species distributions. *J. Biogeogr.*, **31**, 1555-1568.
- 965 Segurado, P., Araújo, M.B. and Kunin, W.E. (2006) Consequences of spatial autocorrelation for niche-based models. *J. Appl. Ecol.*, **43**, 433-444.
- Shepherd, T.D. and Litvak, M.K. (2004) Density-dependent habitat selection and the ideal free distribution in marine fish spatial dynamics: considerations and cautions. *Fish Fish.*, **5**, 141-152.
- 970 Sih, A. (2005) Predator-prey space use as an emergent outcome of a behavioral response race. In: *Ecology of predator-prey interactions*. P. Barbosa and I. Castellanos (eds) New York: Oxford University Press. pp. 240-255.
- Sih, A., Englund, G. and Wooster, D. (1998) Emergent impacts of multiple predators on prey. *TREE*, **13**, 350-355.
- 975 Skern-Mauritzen, M., Skaug, H.J. and Øien, N. (2009) Line transects, environmental data and GIS: cetacean habitat and prey selection along the Barents Sea shelf edge. In: *North Atlantic Sighting Surveys, counting whales in the North Atlantic, 1987-2001*. N. Øien and D. Pike (eds) Tromsø: North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission Scientific Publications. pp. 179-200.
- Smith, A.D.M., Fulton, E.J., Hobday, A.J., Smith, D.C. and Shoulder, P. (2007) Scientific tools to support the practical implementation of ecosystem-based fisheries management. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.*, **64**, 633-639.
- 980 Soetaert, K. and Herman, P.M.J. (2009) *A Practical Guide to Ecological Modelling. Using R as a Simulation Platform*. Springer.
- Stephens, P.A., Buskirk, S.W. and del Rio, C.M. (2007) Inference in ecology and evolution. *TREE*, **22**, 192-197.
- 985 Stige, L.C., Ottersen, G., Brander, K., Chan, K.S. and Stenseth, N.C. (2006) Cod and climate: effect of the North Atlantic Oscillation on recruitment in the North Atlantic. *Mar. Ecol.-Prog. Ser.*, **325**, 227-241.
- Stratoudakis, Y., Gallego, A. and Morrison, J.A. (1998) Spatial distribution of developmental egg ages within a herring *Clupea harengus* spawning ground. *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, **174**, 27-32.
- 990 Student (1914) The elimination of spurious correlation due to position in time or space. *Biometrika*, **10**, 179-181.
- Sutherland, W.J. (1983) Aggregation and the 'ideal free' distribution. *J. Anim. Ecol.*, **52**, 821-828.
- 995 Sutherland, W.J. and Parker, G.A. (1985) Distribution of unequal competitors. In: *Behavioural Ecology. 25th Symposium of the British Ecological Society*. R.M. Sibly and R.H. Smith (eds): Blackwell Scientific. pp. 255-275.
- Sutton, C.D., Rao, C.R., Wegman, E.J. and Solka, J.L. (2005) Classification and regression trees, bagging, and boosting. In: *Handbook of Statistics*: Elsevier. pp. 303-329.
- Swain, D.P. (1993) Age- and density-dependent bathymetric pattern of Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) in the southern Gulf of St. Lawrence. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.*, **50**, 1255-1264.
- 1000 Swain, D.P. and Morin, R. (1996) Relationships between geographic distribution and abundance of American plaice (*Hippoglossoides platessoides*) in the southern Gulf of St Lawrence. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.*, **53**, 106-119.
- Telford, R.J. and Birks, H.J.B. (2005) The secret assumption of transfer functions: problems with spatial autocorrelation in evaluating model performance. *Quat. Sci. Rev.*, **24**, 2173-2179.
- 1005 Temming, A., Floeter, J. and Ehrich, S. (2007) Predation hot spots: large-scale impact of local aggregations. *Ecosystems*, **10**, 865-876.

- Thomson, J.R., Mac Nally, R., Fleishman, E. and Horrocks, G. (2007) Predicting bird species distributions in reconstructed landscapes. *Conserv. Biol.*, **21**, 752-766.
- 1010 Thuiller, W. (2003) BIOMOD - optimizing predictions of species distributions and projecting potential future shifts under global change. *Glob. Change Biol.*, **9**, 1353-1362.
- Thuiller, W., Albert, C., Araujo, M.B., Berry, P.M., Cabeza, M., Guisan, A., Hickler, T., Midgley, G.F., Paterson, J., Schurr, F.M., Sykes, M.T. and Zimmermann, N.E. (2008) Predicting global change impacts on plant species' distributions: Future challenges. *Perspectives in Plant Ecology, Evolution and Systematics*, **9**, 137-152.
- 1015 Tilman, D. and Kareiva, P. (1997) *Spatial Ecology : the role of space in population dynamics and interspecific interactions*. Columbia and Princeton: University Presses of California, 416pp.
- Tregenza, T. (1995) Building on the ideal free distribution. *Adv. Ecol. Res.*, **26**, 253-307.
- Tyler, J.A. and Gilliam, J.F. (1995) Ideal free distributions of stream fish: a model and test with minnows, *Rhinichthys atratulus*. *Ecology*, **76**, 580-592.
- 1020 Tyler, J.A. and Hargrove, W.W. (1997) Predicting spatial distribution of foragers over large resource landscapes: a modeling analysis of the ideal free distribution. *Oikos*, **79**, 376-386.
- Usio, N. (2007) Endangered crayfish in northern Japan: Distribution, abundance and microhabitat specificity in relation to stream and riparian environment. *Biol. Conserv.*, **134**, 517-526.
- 1025 van der Ploeg, R.R., Bohm, W. and Kirkham, M.B. (1999) On the origin of the theory of mineral nutrition of plants and the law of the minimum. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, **63**, 1055-1062.
- Vaughan, I.P. and Ormerod, S.J. (2005) The continuing challenges of testing species distribution models. *J. Appl. Ecol.*, **42**, 720-730.
- Vaz, S., Martin, C.S., Eastwood, P.D., Ernande, B., Carpentier, A., Meaden, G.J. and Coppin, F. (2008) Modelling species distributions using regression quantiles. *J. Appl. Ecol.*, **45**, 204-217.
- 1030 Walters, C.J., Pauly, D. and Christensen, V. (1999) Ecospace: prediction of mesoscale spatial patterns in trophic relationships of exploited ecosystems, with emphasis on the impacts of marine protected areas. *Ecosystems*, **2**, 539-554.
- Ward, T.M., Hoedt, F., McLeay, L., Dimmlich, W.F., Jackson, G., Rogers, P.J. and Jones, K. (2001) Have recent mass mortalities of the sardine *Sardinops sagax* facilitated an expansion in the distribution and abundance of the anchovy *Engraulis australis* in South Australia? *Mar. Ecol. Prog. Ser.*, **220**, 241-251.
- 1035 Werner, E.E. and Gilliam, J.F. (1984) The ontogenetic niche and species interactions in size-structured populations. *Ann. Rev. Ecol. Syst.*, **15**, 393-425.
- Whittingham, M.J., Stephens, P.A., Bradbury, R.B. and Freckleton, R.P. (2006) Why do we still use stepwise modelling in ecology and behaviour? *J. Anim. Ecol.*, **75**, 1182-1189.
- 1040 Wieland, K. and Jarre-Teichmann, A. (1997) Prediction of vertical distribution and ambient development temperature of Baltic cod, *Gadus morhua* L., eggs. *Fish. Oceanogr.*, **6**, 172-187.
- Wintle, B.A. and Bardos, D.C. (2006) Modeling species-habitat relationships with spatially autocorrelated observation data. *Ecol. Appl.*, **16**, 1945-1958.
- 1045 Wood, S.N. (2006) *Generalized additive models: an introduction with R*. Boca Raton, Florida: Chapman and Hall, CRC Press, 392pp.
- Zurell, D., Jeltsch, F., Dormann, C.F. and Schröder, B. (2009) Static species distribution models in dynamically changing systems: how good can predictions really be? *Ecography*, **32**, 733-744.

Figure legend

Figure 1. The main categories of controls of fish spatial distribution: geographical attachment, environmental conditions, density dependent habitat selection, spatial dependency, demographic structure, species interactions, and memory. Blue controls are not dependent on the state of the population whilst red controls are. Green control (memory) is dependent on the current and past state of the population.

