## Publisher: CSIRO; Journal: MF:Marine and Freshwater Research Article Type: research-article; Volume: ; Issue: ; Article ID: MF12176 DOI: 10.1071/MF12176; TOC Head:

1	10.1071/MF12176_AC						
2	©CSIRO 2012						
3	Supplementary Material: Marine and Freshwater Research, 2012, 63(12), 1231-1243						
4							
5	SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL						
6							
7	Figure S1. (a) Thin transverse section of a sagittal otolith from a 49-mm (SL) Chrysophrys auratus,						
8	showing the position of the sagitta-subcupular meshwork fibre (SMF) zone along which daily increments are						
9	counted. (b) High-magnification image of the otolith core, showing the larval rings and the settlement mark.						



## Publisher: CSIRO; Journal: MF:Marine and Freshwater Research Article Type: research-article; Volume: ; Issue: ; Article ID: MF12176 DOI: 10.1071/MF12176; TOC Head:

- 17 Figure S2. Successful spawning period of Chrysophrys auratus in the Kaipara, Huruhi, Manukau and
- 18 Mahurangi Harbour sites, back-calculated from the daily otolith increments of 0+-year-old fish sampled
- 19 during 2009/2010 and 2010/2011. Each bar represents a week. Sea-surface temperatures (SST) at each site
- 20 are given on the right axis.



23

## Publisher: CSIRO; Journal: MF:Marine and Freshwater Research Article Type: research-article; Volume: ; Issue: ; Article ID: MF12176 DOI: 10.1071/MF12176; TOC Head:

- 24 **Figure S3.** The relationship between the average sea-surface temperature (SST) during the (*a*) larval and
- 25 (b) juvenile duration of Chrysophrys auratus captured from the Kaipara, Huruhi, Manukau and Mahurangi
- 26 Harbour sites in 2009/2010, and their average daily growth rate. Daily growth was back-calculated from
- 27 daily otolith increments.



28



30 **Table S1.** Results of the log-likelihood tests for difference model variance structures tested (equal

31 variances (EV), separate intercept variances per site (SI), separate slope variances per site (SS) and s	eparate
---	---------

intercept and slope variances per site (SIS)). *P* values in bold indicate a significantly better model fit at P < 0.05.

33 34

Data set		Model comparison	$\chi^2$	df	Р
2009/2010	larvae	EV vs SI	0	3	1.00
among sites		EV vs SS	4.7	3	0.20
	juveniles	EV vs SI	9.1	3	0.03
		EV vs SS	7.3	3	0.06
		SI vs SIS	7.5	3	0.06
2010/2011	larvae	EV vs SI	0	1	1.00
among sites		EV vs SS	0.1	1	0.75
	juveniles	EV vs SI	0.2	1	0.65
		EV vs SS	10.9	1	0.0009
		SS vs SIS	0.6	1	0.44
Kaipara	larvae	EV vs SI	0	1	1.00
between years		EV vs SS	0.7	1	0.4
	juveniles	EV vs SI	7.6	1	0.005
		EV vs SS	20.2	1	<0.0001
		SS vs SIS	8.6	1	0.003
Huruhi	larvae	EV vs SI	0	1	1.0
between years		EV vs SS	0.9	1	0.34
	juveniles	EV vs SI	19.6	1	<0.0001
		EV vs SS	0.1	1	0.75