

Isolation of microsatellite markers from tiger grouper (*Mycteroperca tigris*) and characterization in yellowfin grouper (*Mycteroperca venenosa*), coney (*Cephalopholis fulva*), and red hind (*Epinephelus guttatus*)

Mark A. Renshaw · Richard S. Nemeth ·
John R. Gold

Received: 11 June 2012 / Accepted: 25 June 2012
© Springer Science+Business Media B.V. 2012

Abstract Thirty-six microsatellite markers were isolated from an enriched genomic library of tiger grouper (*Mycteroperca tigris*) and characterized in 20 individuals each for yellowfin grouper (*Mycteroperca venenosa*), coney (*Cephalopholis fulva*), and red hind (*Epinephelus guttatus*). The microsatellites include 23 dinucleotide repeats, twelve trinucleotide repeats, and one tetranucleotide repeat. The microsatellites characterized in this study will be useful for further evaluation of population-genetic indices in the economically important subfamily Epinephelinae.

Keywords Microsatellites · *Mycteroperca tigris* · *Mycteroperca venenosa* · *Cephalopholis fulva* · *Epinephelus guttatus*

Introduction

The tiger grouper, *Mycteroperca tigris*, a western Atlantic member of the economically important subfamily Epinephelinae (groupers), is distributed from southern Florida and Bermuda to southern Brazil (Heemstra and Randall 1993). Tiger grouper are susceptible to increased fishing pressure targeted at spawning aggregations, a shared concern among several grouper species (Sadovy et al. 1994;

Sadovy de Mitcheson et al. 2008). The population density of tiger grouper is generally sufficiently low such that they are rarely caught except when spawning in large aggregations (Robinson et al. 2011). Large bodied groupers, such as tiger groupers, recently have been proposed as potential biocontrol agents for invasive lionfish in the Caribbean Sea (Maljkovic et al. 2008; Mumby et al. 2011). Given the potential for tiger grouper (and other large bodied groupers) to mitigate the alarming spread of lionfish in Caribbean waters, the conservation of these species is of more than passing interest.

Nuclear-encoded microsatellite markers are ideal tools for assessments of population-genetic indices, including genetic variability and the identification of stock-structure (Ward 2000). These markers allow for the evaluation of indices both within and between spawning aggregations, identifying locations that are critical for conservation efforts. Microsatellites can also enable the measurement of larval dispersal (Planes et al. 2009) and estimate the optimal sizing and spacing for conservation zones such as marine protected areas (MPAs). Herein, we describe polymerase chain reaction (PCR) primers for 36 microsatellite markers isolated from an enriched tiger grouper genomic library.

Specifics pertaining to the production of the enriched microsatellite library can be found in Renshaw et al. (2011). Whole genomic DNA was extracted from a single tiger grouper (*M. tigris*) using the DNeasy® Blood and Tissue Kit (Qiagen). Independent dinucleotide and trinucleotide microsatellite enrichments were ligated into pCR® 2.1-TOPO® vectors (Invitrogen), and transformed into *Escherichia coli* (One Shot® TOP10 Chemically Competent Cells, Invitrogen). Positive (white) colonies were handpicked with sterile toothpicks, placed in 96-well tissue culture plates with 200 µl LB broth (containing 50 µg/ml

M. A. Renshaw (✉) · J. R. Gold
Center for Biosystematics and Biodiversity, Texas A and M
University, College Station, TX 77843-2258, USA
e-mail: mrenshaw@nd.edu

R. S. Nemeth
Center for Marine and Environmental Studies, University
of the Virgin Islands, 2 John Brewer's Bay, St. Thomas,
VI 00802-9990, USA

Table 1 Summary data for 36 microsatellite markers isolated from tiger grouper (*M. tigris*) and characterized in yellowfin grouper (*M. venenosus*), coney (*C. fulva*), and red hind (*E. guttatus*)

Microsatellite	Primer sequence (5'-3') ^a	GenBank ^b	Repeat ^c	Clone Size ^d	Species ^e	N/N _A ^f	Size Range ^g	H _E /H _O ^h	P _{HW} ⁱ
<i>Mti4</i>	TGGGATGAAGTTGGAGAAAGG ^{NED} CCCTGAAAAATGGAGTTGTGC	JX091787	(GAT) ₆	232	<i>Mve</i> <i>Cfu</i>	20/1 20/8	252 267–294	0.000/0.000 0.837/0.800	1.000 0.512
<i>Mti7</i>	TGCTGTAAAGCCCTGTGAGG ^{FAM} CAATCACTGCTTCTGAACTGC	JX091788	(ATTG) ₁₀	333	<i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i> <i>Cfu</i>	20/4 20/5 20/1	255–273 347–371 279	0.449/0.350 0.641/0.550 0.000/0.000	0.308 0.410 1.000
<i>Mti9</i>	AGAGCTGGATACAGCGTTGG ^{FAM} ATTGGTGAATGGCACTAGCC	JX091789	(CAT) ₁₄	323	<i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i> <i>Cfu</i>	X 20/3 X	X 329–341 X	X 0.497/0.600 X	X 0.503 X
<i>Mti10</i>	TGAGTCAGTCTCTTTGGATGC ^{HEX} TCAGATAGTAATTTTGTCAATGTATTGC	JX091790	(TCA) ₁₁	165	<i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i> <i>Cfu</i>	X X X	X X X	X X X	X X X
<i>Mti11</i>	TCAGATAGTAATTTTGTCAATGTATTGC ^{FAM} GGCTGACATTGTGGTTTGG	JX091791	(GAT) ₁₆	290	<i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i> <i>Cfu</i>	20/8 18/5 X	167–188 287–317 X	0.833/0.500 0.768/0.722 X	0.002 0.763 X
<i>Mti12</i>	GCTGCAGAGGGACAGATACC ^{NED} CACAGCGTATCCCTGTTGC	JX091792	(AC) ₅₀	259	<i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i> <i>Cfu</i>	X 20/8 X	X 225–273 X	X 0.841/0.900 X	X 0.223 X
<i>Mti14</i>	CGGTGCAGTGTGTTTCAGC ^{FAM} TAGTGTCTCGCATGATGAGC	JX091793	(TGA) ₆	340	<i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i> <i>Cfu</i>	20/18 18/3 20/1	231–307 362–371 361	0.937/0.750 0.452/0.500 0.000/0.000	0.002 1.000 1.000
<i>Mti16</i>	TTTGAAAGAAATCCATGTGC ^{NED} ATCTGGCAGACGGTTAATGG	JX091794	(CAT) ₆	223	<i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i> <i>Cfu</i>	X 20/3 20/2	X 225–246 228–255	X 0.145/0.150 0.050/0.050	X 1.000 1.000
<i>Mti17</i>	TCACTGAGGGCTACTGTGATG ^{HEX} ACAGCTGGGAAACAAACCAG	JX091795	(TGA) ₈	187	<i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i> <i>Cfu</i>	20/2 20/5 20/1	227–230 190–205 141	0.262/0.300 0.451/0.500 0.000/0.000	1.000 0.253 1.000
<i>Mti18</i>	AACACGCTGAGTCTGTACGC ^{HEX} CCTGTCTTCGTCTTCACATCG	JX091796	(TGA) ₁₄	177	<i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i> <i>Cfu</i>	X 20/3 X	X 175–181 X	X 0.188/0.200 X	X 1.000 X
<i>Mti21</i>	TCCTGATCTGAGCGACTACG ^{FAM} GAAATGAGGCAGATTTCAGG	JX091797	(CAT) ₁₄	332	<i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i> <i>Cfu</i>	X 20/6 X	X 353–368 X	X 0.633/0.550 X	X 0.327 X
<i>Mti22</i>	CTTAGTGACCAAGCCACTGTCC ^{HEX} CTTAGTGACCAAGCCACTGTCC	JX091798	(TGA) ₇	182	<i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i> <i>Cfu</i>	20/7 20/2 20/6	334–352 200–203 205–220	0.769/0.750 0.328/0.300 0.712/0.750	0.117 1.000 0.937
<i>Mti23</i>	TGATGGATCTCATGGAGTCCG ^{FAM}	JX091799	(ATG) ₅	296	<i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	20/2 20/2	202–205 311–317	0.224/0.250 0.185/0.200	1.000 1.000

Table 1 continued

Microsatellite	Primer sequence (5'–3') ^a	GenBank ^b	Repeat ^c	Clone Size ^d	Species ^e	N/N _A ^f	Size Range ^g	H _E /H _O ^h	P _i ^{hW}
	CGGCAACATTGTGTAGTGC				<i>Cfu</i>	X	X	X	X
<i>Mti24</i>	ATTGAAAGCAGGAACTTGG ^{NED} CAGACGCGCACATATACATAGC	JX091800	(GT) ₂₅	205	<i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	X 20/19 20/23	X 209–281 235–295	X 0.935/0.900 0.956/0.950	X 0.214 0.398
<i>Mti25</i>	AGAGGAGTGCAGTGTGAGG ^{FAM} ATCAGCTGTGACCACTGACG	JX091801	(ATG) ₆	329	<i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	X X	X X	X X	X X
<i>Mti31</i>	CTCTCACATATTCACACAGACAGC ^{NED} ACTGCGGCATTCATTAGACC	JX091802	(AC) ₉	216	<i>Cfu</i> <i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	X 20/6 20/12	X 296–362 238–288	X 0.321/0.250 0.869/0.850	X 0.102 0.330
<i>Mti33</i>	CGGGATTTTAACTCGCTTCC ^{FAM} AGCAGCAAGAAATGTCACAGG	JX091803	(TG) ₁₄	257	<i>Cfu</i> <i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	20/2 20/22 20/7	231–233 244–306 271–285	0.050/0.050 0.953/0.850 0.786/0.700	1.000 0.052 0.838
<i>Mti34</i>	GCATTGCTGTGATCTAGTGTCC ^{FAM} GGGTCTGAGCCTCTGTAAAGC	JX091804	(CA) ₃₂	232	<i>Cfu</i> <i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	X X 20/10	X X 222–242	X X 0.847/0.800	X X 0.405
<i>Mti35</i>	GCCAGGAGTAAACCAATCAC ^{HEX} TTTTCCTGTTCCACATAAAACTGG	JX091805	(GT) ₁₁	133	<i>Cfu</i> <i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	20/8 20/20 20/4	209–223 220–298 145–153	0.744/0.750 0.962/1.000 0.191/0.200	0.554 1.000 1.000
<i>Mti37</i>	GTTTCACGCCTCCTCTATCG ^{NED} CTGCTCGAGTTTCATCATGG	JX091806	(CA) ₁₀	175	<i>Cfu</i> <i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	20/25 18/8 20/1	162–224 155–205 191	0.977/0.950 0.659/0.611 0.000/0.000	0.096 0.443 1.000
<i>Mti39</i>	AACCCCTGCTGAGTAAATGC ^{HEX} AGTGGGCGAACAACACACC	JX091807	(TG) ₃₅	144	<i>Cfu</i> <i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	20/11 X 20/20	182–222 X 132–174	0.890/0.900 X 0.962/0.900	0.813 X 0.055
<i>Mti41</i>	GGATAAACTGATAAGTTGTCTGAGG ^{HEX} AAACAGATATCTGGTTTCATTGC	JX091808	(TG) ₁₉	89	<i>Cfu</i> <i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	20/15 20/21 20/4	118–176 119–181 128–136	0.936/0.950 0.958/1.000 0.529/0.550	0.797 0.146 0.304
<i>Mti42</i>	ATTCACATCCTCCCATGACC ^{FAM} CGCAGTTTGTACATGCTAAGG	JX091809	(AC) ₂₂	257	<i>Cfu</i> <i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	20/12 X 20/12	97–141 X 252–290	0.873/0.800 X 0.844/0.850	0.660 X 0.749
<i>Mti43</i>	TTGCGGGTTAAATATCAGAGG ^{NED} AACGCCTCTACCATGACAGC	JX091810	(TG) ₁₅	157	<i>Cfu</i> <i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	19/3 20/8 20/5	247–255 168–184 161–177	0.104/0.053 0.773/0.650 0.546/0.500	0.028 0.187 0.054
<i>Mti44</i>	GCGGGTATCAACACAAATGG ^{FAM} CCTACCTCCCTGCATAATGG	JX091811	(TG) ₁₃	195	<i>Cfu</i> <i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	20/12 20/5 20/7	166–188 217–225 219–245	0.865/0.700 0.606/0.450 0.676/0.600	0.207 0.060 0.426

Table 1 continued

Microsatellite	Primer sequence (5'-3') ^a	GenBank ^b	Repeat ^c	Clone Size ^d	Species ^e	N/N _A ^f	Size Range ^g	H _E /H _O ^h	P _{HW} ⁱ
<i>Mti45</i>	CTCTCTGGTTTCCCATTCG ^{HEX} AGAGGGACATCCTGTGTCATGG	JX091812	(TG) ₃₂	194	<i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	20/13 20/3	232–276 168–172	0.912/0.900 0.188/0.200	0.859 1.000
<i>Mti49</i>	CACACAGGAAAGTGAGAAATTC ^{NED} TCTAACACAGAAAAACAAACATCTGG	JX091813	(AC) ₂₄	186	<i>Cfu</i> <i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	18/3 20/5 20/8	176–180 175–187 178–214	0.110/0.111 0.677/0.600 0.773/0.750	1.000 0.243 0.269
<i>Mti50</i>	CAGCGATTACATGCCTTACG ^{HEX} GGGTCACTTGTCATTGTGC	JX091814	(TG) ₁₅	103	<i>Cfu</i> <i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	X 20/14 20/8	X 185–215 117–145	X 0.888/0.900 0.762/0.800	X 0.142 0.681
<i>Mti51</i>	CCAGCATATGGAAAAACAATAATC ^{FAM} CCAAGTTAGTGCCAAACTGC	JX091815	(TG) ₁₆	193	<i>Cfu</i> <i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	X 20/4 20/17	X 118–124 202–270	X 0.545/0.650 0.941/1.000	X 0.722 1.000
<i>Mti52</i>	GCTGTCTGTTCTCTTCTCTCC ^{HEX} GCTTTGAAGCAGAACCATGC	JX091816	(GT) ₃₅	192	<i>Cfu</i> <i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	X 20/1 20/4	X 243 166–176	X 0.000/0.000 0.556/0.500	X 1.000 0.716
<i>Mti53</i>	TGGACTTCCAAAGACAGTGAGC ^{HEX} ACGATACCTCTGGGTCAAGC	JX091817	(TG) ₂₈	173	<i>Cfu</i> <i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	X 20/15 20/10	X 183–223 170–194	X 0.917/0.950 0.854/0.900	X 0.980 0.293
<i>Mti55</i>	TGAACATCAGGAAAAACACAAAAC ^{FAM} TGGAACTCTCGTCTGTCTCATC	JX091818	(GT) ₃₂	200	<i>Cfu</i> <i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	X X 20/8	X X 185–199	X X 0.805/0.850	X X 0.948
<i>Mti56</i>	TTCTTAGTTTTTCATCCGACAGC ^{NED} TGACCTCACAGATTGCATCC	JX091819	(CA) ₁₁	199	<i>Cfu</i> <i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	X X 20/1	X X 215	X X 0.000/0.000	X X 1.000
<i>Mti59</i>	AACATAATGTGACGGTGTGATG ^{HEX} CGGGTGTGATCTCTACATTTTC	JX091820	(TG) ₁₆	94	<i>Cfu</i> <i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	17/10 20/5 20/4	239–247 254–280 97–111	0.099/0.100 0.840/0.706 0.478/0.450	1.000 0.298 0.773
<i>Mti60</i>	CCAGTTTCCAAAGCCACAAC ^{NED} CCTGTTGGAGATAAACACACAC	JX091821	(TG) ₂₄	184	<i>Cfu</i> <i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	20/17 19/10 20/4	94–100 103–139 190–228	0.691/0.600 0.950/0.900 0.744/0.632	0.023 0.276 0.197
<i>Mti61</i>	CGTGAGAAACATCTCGTCTCC ^{FAM} TGCTGTAAACACCAGAAATGAAC	JX091822	(TG) ₁₁	199	<i>Cfu</i> <i>Egu</i> <i>Mve</i>	16/18 20/2 20/18	171–227 205–207 201–253	0.946/1.000 0.050/0.050 0.914/0.900	0.418 1.000 0.470
					<i>Egu</i>	20/7	229–249	0.488/0.450	0.630

^a Primer sequences are forward (top) and reverse (bottom); ^b GenBank Accession number; ^c Repeat motif; ^d Size (in base pairs) of the allele in the sequenced clone; ^e Species characterized; yellowfin grouper (*Mve*), coney (*Cfu*), and red hind (*Egu*); ^f N is number of individuals assayed; ^g Size range for alleles identified; ^h H_E is probability of deviation from Hardy–Weinberg expectations—significant deviations are noted in bold. The fluorescent 5'-tail-sequence label attached to the forward (top) primer is noted as 6-FAM^{FAM}, NED^{NED}, or HEX^{HEX}. Species in which a given marker failed to amplify are indicated by X

of ampicillin and 8 % glycerol), and incubated at 37 °C overnight to increase culture density. For each microsatellite enrichment (dinucleotide and trinucleotide), a single tissue culture plate was then sent to the Interdisciplinary Center for Biotechnology Research at the University of Florida (<http://www.biotech.ufl.edu/>) for sequencing with the M13 forward primer. Resulting sequences were edited and vector trimmed with SEQUENCHER 4.1 (Gene Codes); clones containing viable microsatellite motifs were identified with Simple Sequence Repeat Identification Tool (SSRIT, <http://www.graene.org/db/markers/ssrtool>); primer pairs were developed using PRIMER3 (<http://frodo.wi.mit.edu/>).

A total of 61 unlabeled primer pairs (34 from the dinucleotide enrichment plate and 27 from the trinucleotide enrichment plate) were purchased from Integrated DNA Technologies (IDT); the forward primer included a 21-bp 'tail' sequence (5'-GCCTCGTTTATCAGATGTGGA-3'), allowing for the simultaneous amplification and fluorescent labeling of targeted microsatellite fragments (Karlsson et al. 2008). The 5'-tail-sequence oligonucleotide was labeled with one of three fluorescent dyes: 6-FAM, HEX, or NED (Set D, Applied Biosystems). The original intent of the project was to characterize the markers for the species of origin, *M. tigris*. General difficulties in obtaining tiger groupers and layoffs at Caribbean resource management agencies normally responsible for monitoring tiger grouper spawning aggregations precluded procuring a sufficient number of samples. The markers were instead characterized in the congeneric species, *Mycteroperca venenosa* (yellowfin grouper) and two related epinepheline species, *Cephalopholis fulva* (coney) and *Epinephelus guttatus* (red hind). Each primer pair was evaluated initially with a subset of twelve individuals, four from each of the three species. Successful amplifications were evaluated further with an additional sixteen individuals from each species (60 individuals total), all sampled from waters off the coast of St. Thomas (U.S. Virgin Islands). All DNA samples were extracted from fin clips, using a modified Chelex protocol (Estoup et al. 1996). PCR products were run on an ABI 377 DNA Sequencer; alleles were sized using the GENESCAN® 400HD [ROX] Size Standard (Applied Biosystems); allele sizing and calling were performed with GENESCAN® 3.1.2 and GENOTYPER® version 2.5 software. Genetic variability of the microsatellite markers was measured by the number of alleles, gene diversity (expected heterozygosity), and observed heterozygosity. Fisher's exact tests, as implemented in GDA (Lewis and Zaykin 2001), were used to test significance of departure from Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium (genotype) expectations at individual microsatellites and of departure from genotypic equilibrium at pairs of microsatellites. Evidence for occurrences of null alleles was explored using MICROCHECKER (van Oosterhout et al. 2004).

Of the initial 61 putative microsatellites identified, 31 primer pairs produced easily scored polymorphic PCR amplifications in *M. venenosa* (Table 1). The number of alleles detected ranged from two (*Mti22*, *Mti23*, *Mti61*) to 20 (*Mti39*); expected heterozygosity ranged from 0.050 (*Mti61*) to 0.962 (*Mti39*), while observed heterozygosity ranged from 0.050 (*Mti61*) to 1.000 (*Mti51*). All individual microsatellites and microsatellite pairs conformed to Hardy–Weinberg expectations and genotypic equilibrium, respectively, following Bonferroni correction for multiple tests (Rice 1989). Analysis with MICROCHECKER indicated no evidence for null alleles at any of the 31 microsatellites.

A total of 17 primer pairs produced easily scored polymorphic PCR amplifications in *C. fulva* (Table 1). The number of alleles ranged from 2 (*Mti16*, *Mti31*) to 25 (*Mti35*); expected heterozygosity ranged from 0.050 (*Mti16*, *Mti31*) to 0.977 (*Mti35*), while observed heterozygosity ranged from 0.050 (*Mti16*, *Mti31*) to 0.950 (*Mti24*, *Mti35*, *Mti39*). Genotypes at one microsatellite (*Mti60*) deviated significantly from Hardy–Weinberg expectations following Bonferroni correction for multiple tests, and two pairs of microsatellites (*Mti60/Mti16* and *Mti60/Mti43*) deviated significantly from genotypic equilibrium following Bonferroni correction. Analysis with MICROCHECKER indicated evidence for null alleles at *Mti60*, along with possible scoring errors due to stuttering.

A total of 23 primer pairs produced easily scored polymorphic PCR amplifications in *E. guttatus* (Table 1). The number of alleles ranged from 2 (*Mti16*, *Mti22*) to 22 (*Mti31*); expected heterozygosity ranged from 0.104 (*Mti42*) to 0.962 (*Mti34*), while observed heterozygosity ranged from 0.053 (*Mti42*) to 1.000 (*Mti34*, *Mti39*, *Mti60*). Genotypes at two microsatellites (*Mti10*, *Mti12*) deviated significantly from Hardy–Weinberg expectations following Bonferroni correction for multiple tests, and five pairs of microsatellites (*Mti10/Mti12*, *Mti10/Mti43*, *Mti10/Mti53*, *Mti12/Mti25*, and *Mti12/Mti43*) deviated significantly from genotypic equilibrium following Bonferroni correction. Analysis with MICROCHECKER indicated evidence for null alleles at both *Mti10* and *Mti12*.

The microsatellite markers identified were isolated from genomic DNA of tiger grouper, *M. tigris*, and were used to cross-amplify in one congener and two species in the same subfamily. A total of 36 microsatellites appear to be useful for future research with members of the subfamily Epinephelinae.

Acknowledgments We thank E. Kadison and D. Olsen for assistance with sampling. Work was supported by the Cooperative Research Program (CRP) of the National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Department of Commerce (Grant NA08NMF4540400), and by Texas AgriLife Research (Project H-6703). This paper is number 87 in the series 'Genetic Studies in Marine Fishes,' Contribution No. 213 of the Center for Biosystematics and Biodiversity at Texas A & M

University, and Contribution number 86 of the Center for Marine and Environmental Studies at University of the Virgin Islands.

References

- Estoup A, Larigiader CR, Perrot E, Chourrout D (1996) Rapid one tube DNA extraction for reliable PCR detection of fish polymorphic markers and transgenes. *Mol Mar Biol Biotech* 5:295–298
- Heemstra PC, Randall JE (1993) FAO species catalogue. groupers of the world (family serranidae, subfamily epinephelinae). An annotated and illustrated catalogue of the grouper, Rockcod, Hind, coral grouper and *Lyretail* species to date. FAO Fish Circ 16:276–278
- Karlsson S, Renshaw MA, Rexroad CE, Gold JR (2008) PCR primers for 100 microsatellites in red drum (*Sciaenops ocellatus*). *Mol Ecol Resour* 8:393–398
- Lewis PO, Zaykin D (2001) Genetic data analysis: computer program for the analysis of allelic data. Version 1.0 (d16c). Free program distributed by the authors via the internet from <http://hydrodictyon.eeb.uconn.edu/people/plewis/software.php>
- Maljkovic A, Van Leeuwen TE, Cove SN (2008) Predation on the invasive red lionfish, *Pterois volitans* (pisces: scorpaenidae), by native groupers in the Bahamas. *Coral Reefs* 27:501
- Mumby PJ, Harborne AR, Brumbaugh DR (2011) Grouper as a natural biocontrol of invasive lionfish. *PLoS One* 6:e21510
- Planes S, Jones GP, Thorrold SR (2009) Larval dispersal connects fish populations in a network of marine protected areas. *PNAS* 106:5693–5697
- Renshaw MA, Nemeth RS, Gold JR (2011) Isolation and characterization of microsatellite markers from yellowfin grouper, *Mycteroperca venenosa*. *Conserv Genet Resour* 3:341–344
- Rice WR (1989) Analyzing tables of statistical tests. *Evolution* 43: 223–225
- Robinson J, Samoilys MA, Grandcourt E, Julie D, Cedras M, Gerry C (2011) The importance of targeted spawning aggregation fishing to the management of Seychelles' trap fishery. *Fish Res* 112: 96–103
- Sadovy de Mitcheson Y, Cornish A, Domeier M, Colin PL, Russell M, Lindeman KC (2008) A global baseline for spawning aggregations of reef fishes. *Conserv Biol* 22:1233–1244
- Sadovy Y, Colin PL, Domeier ML (1994) Aggregation and spawning in the tiger grouper, *Mycteroperca tigris*. *Copeia* 2:511–516
- Van Oosterhout C, Hutchinson WF, Shipley P (2004) MICRO-CHECKER: software for identifying and correcting genotyping errors in microsatellite data. *Mol Ecol Notes* 4:535–538
- Ward RD (2000) Genetics in fisheries management. *Hydrobiologia* 420:191–201