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INTRODUCTION: The spider crab, Maja squinado, has a complex life history and population dynamics, being their main feature the planktonic larval phase, ontogenetic changes in habitat use in postlarval phases, small-scale aggregations, large-scale migrations, and a metapopulation structure comprising a chain of local coastal populations connected by larval dispersal and adult migrations (Freire et al., 2002; GonzálezGurriarán et al., 2002; Sampedro et al. 1999; unpublished data). The objective of the present study is to estimate the main parameters driving dynamics (growth-at-moult, mortality and recapture rates and local population size) in shallow-water local populations of Maja using markrecapture experiments. Connectivity among local shallow-water populations and between these and deep-water mating ground populations is also described.


Figure 1. Experimental traps used in the study.

SAMPLI NG: Monthly samplings were carried out between December 1997 and November 1999 using experimental traps (Fig. 1). The sampling area was the Ría de A Coruña (NW Spain) (Fig. 2). Three shallow water (5-15 m) sampling stations were selected was selected in deeper water (25-30 m) in the central channel of the ría, that constitutes the migration corridor for postpubertal adults. In the inner area of the ría (Bastiagueiro), where the abundance is higher, sampling was performed along a transect in the longitudinal axis of the ría where seven tows were carried out disposing the
along the ría.

Another station


Figure 2. Location and sampling areas in the Ría de A Coruña. traps parallel to the coast. Each tow was separated approx. 180 m from each other.


Figure 3. T bar anchor tags used in the experiment.

Mark-recapture experiments: Crabs were captured, marked and released in the same area. T-bar anchor tags FD 89-SL (Fig. 3), from Floy Tag® (Seattle, Washington, USA), with individual codes were used. The tag was inserted in the base line of the fifth leg, between the cephalothorax and the abdomen. Recaptures were obtained during monthly sampling. Additional recapture data coming from commercial fisheries were used only for the analysis of movements among local populations. During the sampling period a total of 12606 crabs were captured. From these, 9093 were marked and 670 recaptured, what shows a recapture rate of $7.4 \%$.

Growth at moult: 38 of the recaptured crabs had grown. Average growth at moult was $32.4 \%$ of the preecdysial size, ranging from 22.9 and $45.7 \%$ (table 1). No significative differences were found between sexes or type of moult (prepubertal vs. terminal) (ANCOVA, p>0.05 in both cases).

Table 1. Growth at moult of Maja squinado in the Ría de A Coruña.
Percentage of moult increment (PMI) by sex and type of moult.

|  |  | Prepubertal moult |  |  | Terminal moult |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Males Females Total |  |  | Males | Females | Total |  |
| PIM | Mean | 32.65 | 31.95 | 32.30 | 32.86 | 32.27 | 32.43 | 32.38 |
|  | SD | 2.66 | 5.97 | 4.43 | 6.88 | 3.94 | 4.70 | 4.54 |
|  | Min | 29.88 | 23.49 | 23.49 | 25.95 | 22.88 | 22.88 | 22.88 |
|  | Max | 37.49 | 39.42 | 39.42 | 45.71 | 38.99 | 45.71 | 45.71 |
| CL min |  | 73.1 | 76.1 |  | 93.7 | 97.2 |  |  |
| CL max |  | 112.8 | 94.3 |  | 119.5 | 130.0 |  |  |
|  | N | 6 | 6 | 12 | 6 | 17 | 23 | 35 |

Conectivity: Two local juvenile populations were found in shallow waters along the ría. The first one, with higher crab abundance, in the inner part (Bastiagueiro), and the second one in the middle part (Canide). No exchange of crabs was observed between both populations (more than 95\% were recaptured in the same area were they were marked).
Some adult crabs marked in shallow areas were recaptured in the central channel (migration corridor). Two thirds of these were coming from the inner part (Bastiagueiro).

Table 2. Mark-recapture models for adults in Bastiagueiro

## Population dynamics:

To obtain population dynamics data, the MARK program (White \& Burnham, 1999) with the Cormack-J olly-Seber model (recaptures only), was used. From the recapture history, monthly survival (f) and recapture (p) probabilities were estimated. Sexes were

| Model | AICc | ? AICC | AICc Weights | Model Likelihood | Num. Par. | Deviance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \{Phi(t) p(.) \} | 576.24 | 0.00 | 0.685 | 1.00 | 24 | 62.03 |
|  | 577.83 | 1.59 | 0.309 | 0.45 | 2 | 96.43 |
| $\underset{\text { - }}{4}$ \{Phi(t) $\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{t})\}$ | 586.03 | 9.79 | 0.005 | 0.01 | 46 | 48.51 |
| $\sum\{$ Phi( $\left.) \mathrm{p}(\mathrm{t})\right\}$ | 588.88 | 12.64 | 0.001 | 0.00 | 24 | 62.03 |
| Model | AICc | ? AICC | AICc Weights | Model Likelihood | Num. Par. | Deviance |
| ¢ ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ (Phi(t) p(.) $\}$ | 576.24 | 0.00 | 0.999 | 1.00 | 24 | 62.03 |
| Seasonal model | 590.95 | 14.71 | 0.001 | 0.00 | 31 | 49.13 |


| Model | AICC | ? AICc | Alcc Weights | Model Likelihood | Num. Par. | Deviance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underset{\sim}{0}$ \{Phi(t) $p(t)\}$ | 330.11 | 0.00 | 0.998 | 1.00 | 46 | 18.76 |
| $\underset{\sim}{2}$ \{Phi(t) $\mathrm{p}()$. | 342.73 | 12.62 | 0.002 | 0.00 | 24 | 43.77 |
| $\sum_{i=1}$ Phi(.) $\left.\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{t})\right\}$ | 357.59 | 27.48 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 24 | 44.16 |
| W $\{$ Phi(.) p(.) $\}$ | 366.14 | 36.03 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 2 | 85.46 |
| Model | AICC | ? AICc | AlCc Weights | Model Likelihood | Num. Par. | Devia |
| < $\{$ Phi $(t) p(t)\}$ | 330.11 | 0.00 | 1.000 | 1.00 | 46 | 18.76 |
| Seasonal model | 366.20 | 36.10 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 18 | 52.77 |

analyzed separately in adults due to differences
in growth and terminal Table 3. Mark-recapture models for juveniles in Bastiagueiro and Canide. moult and migration timing. Different models were run (Table 2) and classified under the "Akaike Information Criterion" AIC. In Bastiagueiro, in the case of adults, the best fit was obtained for the model including a variable $f$ and a constant $p$ for males, and variable $f$ and $p$ for females. Both sexes were analyzed together for the juveniles, being the best fit for the model with $f$ and $p$ variable in time, with independence of sex (Table 3).

For the middle-part population (Canide), just juveniles were analyzed due to very low adult captures. In this case, the best

| Model | AICC | ? AICc | AlCc Weights | Model Likelihood | Num. Par. | Deviance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \{Phi(t) $\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{t})$ \} | 3023.00 | 0 | 0.99402 | 1 | 46 | 239.04 |
| $\bigcirc^{\text {\{Phi(.) } p(t)\}}$ | 3034.75 | 11.75 | 0.00279 | 0.0028 | 24 | 293.26 |
| - ${ }^{\text {( }}$ Phi(t) $\left.\mathrm{p}\left(\mathrm{g}^{*} \mathrm{t}\right)\right\}$ | 3035.40 | 12.391 | 0.00203 | 0.002 | 68 | 204.59 |
| ${ }^{\text {a }}$ \{Phi(g) $\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{t})$ \} | 3036.60 | 13.6 | 0.00111 | 0.0011 | 25 | 293.10 |
| . $\left\{\right.$ Phi $\left.\left(g^{*} t\right) p(t)\right\}$ | 3043.81 | 20.808 | 0.00003 | 0 | 69 | 213.01 |
|  | 3044.68 | 21.678 | 0.00002 | 0 | 48 | 254.63 |
| $\underline{@}\left\{\right.$ Phi(.) $\mathrm{p}\left(\mathrm{g}^{*} \mathrm{t}\right) \mathrm{\}}$ | 3046.74 | 23.739 | 0.00001 | 0 | 47 | 258.72 |
| $\underset{\sim}{\text { ¢ }}$ (Phi $\left.\left(\mathrm{g}^{*} \mathrm{t}\right) \mathrm{p}\left(\mathrm{g}^{\star} \mathrm{t}\right)\right\}$ | 3055.17 | 32.166 | 0 | 0 | 92 | 183.35 |
|  | 3081.05 | 58.047 | 0 | 0 | 24 | 339.56 |
| ${ }_{\sim}\{\mathrm{Phi}(\mathrm{t}) \mathrm{p}(\mathrm{g})\}$ | 3082.34 | 59.34 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 338.84 |
|  | 3098.13 | 75.128 | 0 | 0 | 48 | 308.08 |
| $\underset{\underline{\underline{2}}}{\underline{2}}\left\{\right.$ Phi $\left.\left(\mathrm{g}^{*} \mathrm{t}\right) \mathrm{p}().\right\}$ | 3100.91 | 77.903 | 0 | 0 | 47 | 312.88 |
| $\omega_{\text {¢ }}\{$ Phi $(\mathrm{g}) \mathrm{p}(\mathrm{g})\}$ | 3245.32 | 222.32 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 544.01 |
| ${ }^{\text {W }}$ \{Phi(.) $\left.\mathrm{p}().\right\}$ | 3246.99 | 223.99 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 549.69 |
| $\left.\sum_{\text {dPhi(.) }} \mathbf{p}(\mathrm{g})\right\}$ | 3247.65 | 224.65 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 548.35 |
| $\geq$ PPhi(g) p(.) \} | 3248.88 | 225.88 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 549.58 |
| Model | AICC | ? AICc | AICc Weights | Model Likelihood | Num. Par. | Deviance |
| \{Phi(t) $\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{t})$ \} | 3023.00 | 0.00 | 1.000 | 1.000 | 46 | 139.25 |
| Seasonal model | 3111.72 | 88.72 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 16 | 286.55 |


| Model | AICC | ? AICc | AlCc Weights | Model Likelihood | Num. Par | Deviance |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{\text {Prhi(t) } \mathrm{p}(.)\}}$ | 418.94 | 0.00 | 0.224 | 1.00 | 24 | 47.54 |
| - ${ }^{\text {d }}$ \{Phi(.) p(.) $\}$ | 419.54 | 0.61 | 0.165 | 0.74 | 2 | 84.65 |
|  | 419.79 | 0.85 | 0.146 | 0.65 | 25 | 46.34 |
| $\mathcal{O}^{(1)}$ Phi(g) p(.) $\}$ | 419.90 | 0.96 | 0.138 | 0.62 | 3 | 83.00 |
| $\underset{\sim}{\mathbb{W}}\left\{\mathrm{Phi}^{(t)} \mathrm{p}(\mathrm{t})\right\}$ | 419.92 | 0.98 | 0.137 | 0.61 | 46 | 36.17 |
| $\underset{\sim}{\text { ¢ }}$ ¢ $\{$ Phi(.) $\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{g})$ \} | 420.05 | 1.11 | 0.128 | 0.57 | 3 | 83.16 |
| ${ }_{\sim}^{\text {¢ }}$ Phi(g) $\left.\mathrm{p}(\mathrm{g})\right\}$ | 421.85 | 2.91 | 0.052 | 0.23 | 4 | 82.95 |
| ${ }^{\text {a }}$ \{ $\mathrm{Phi}(\mathrm{t}) \mathrm{p}\left(\mathrm{g}^{*} \mathrm{t}\right)$ \} | 427.20 | 8.26 | 0.004 | 0.02 | 69 | 22.66 |
|  | 427.64 | 8.70 | 0.003 | 0.01 | 24 | 48.02 |
| $\sum_{i n}\{$ Phi $(\mathrm{g}) \mathrm{p}(\mathrm{t}) \mathrm{\}}$ | 428.49 | 9.56 | 0.002 | 0.01 | 25 | 46.81 |
|  | 430.05 | 11.11 | 0.001 | 0.00 | 69 | 17.12 |
| $\underset{\text { E }}{ }\left\{\operatorname{Phi}\left(\mathrm{g}^{\star} \mathrm{t}\right) \mathrm{p}().\right\}$ | 433.27 | 14.33 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 47 | 28.73 |
| $\underset{\sim}{\sim}\left\{\operatorname{Phi}\left(\mathrm{g}^{*} \mathrm{t}\right) \mathrm{p}(\mathrm{g})\right\}$ | 434.84 | 15.90 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 48 | 28.21 |
| $\bigcirc\left\{\operatorname{Phi}\left(\mathrm{g}^{*} \mathrm{t}\right) \mathrm{p}\left(\mathrm{g}^{*} \mathrm{t}\right)\right\}$ | 441.79 | 22.85 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 92 | 16.19 |
| \{Phi(.) p(g*t) | 461.40 | 42.46 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 47 | 33.69 |
| $\left\{\right.$ Phi(g) $\left.\mathrm{p}\left(\mathrm{g}^{\star} \mathrm{t}\right)\right\}$ | 463.52 | 44.58 | 0.000 | 0.00 | 48 | 33.69 | fitting model was a f variable and constant $p$ one, with independence of sex.

In every case, except for Canide, monthly models were compared with seasonal ones, but the last show worse fit in every case. Juvenile survival rates in Bastiaguiero are the highest, confirming this area as an adult production ("source") area, while in Canide, with a high mortality rate, adult production is almost zero ("sink population") (Fig.4)

Population size: A first approximation to population size was performed using the Petersen method modified by Seber (1982) to reduce bias in small samples: $N=[(M+1)(C+1) /(R+1)]-1$, where $M$ is the number of crabs marked in month $1, C$ the total number of captured crabs in month 2, and R number of marked crabs captured in month 2. N estimates population size at the beggining of the experience. This is a valid method for closed populations, so just consecutive months with no migration, no recruitment and no terminal moult were used to estimate population size.

Table 4. Estimated population size ( N ) and $95 \%$ Poisson confidence interval of juveniles (left) and adults (right) of Maja squinado in the Ría de A Coruña. M, number of individuals marked in the first sample; C, total number of individuals captured in the second sample; $R$, number of marked individuals in the second sample.

|  | Inner area (Bastiagueiro) |  |  | Middle area (Canide) |  |  | Adults | Males |  | Females |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Juveniles | Oct 98 | Nov 98 | Oct 99 | Nov 98 | Dec 99 | Oct 99 |  | Jul 98 | Jul 99 | Aug 98 | Aug 99 |
| M | 195 | 407 | 359 | 185 | 168 | 174 | M | 137 | 91 | 155 | 54 |
| C | 498 | 354 | 595 | 180 | 127 | 200 | C | 213 | 155 | 258 | 383 |
| R | 7 | 5 | 10 | 5 | 3 | 3 | R | 13 | 9 | 6 | 7 |
| N | 12,225 | 24,139 | 19,504 | 5,610 | 5,407 | 8,793 | N | 2,108 | 1,434 | 5,771 | 2,639 |
| IC $95 \%$ - | 6,623 | 48,767 | 33,932 | 11,334 | 11,898 | 19,347 | IC 95\% - | 1,320 | 807 | 2,924 | 1,429 |
| IC 95\% + | 22,824 | 11,894 | 11,514 | 2,764 | 2,376 | 3,864 | IC 95\% + | 3,841 | 2,628 | 11,182 | 4,928 |

Adult males and females were separately analyzed. As seen in table 4, juvenile population size is remarkably larger than adult, and also the inner part larger than the middle one (Canide) that correlates with the higher mortality rates occurring in Canide.


Figure 4. Parameter estimates of survival rate ( $f$ ) and probability of recapture ( $p$ ) for the best fitted models of Maja squinado in the Ría de A Coruña.
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