

Individual activity levels and presence of conspecifics affect fish passage rates over an in-flume barrier

*Original*

Individual activity levels and presence of conspecifics affect fish passage rates over an in-flume barrier / Nyqvist, D.; Tarena, F.; Candiotta, A.; Comoglio, C.. - In: ECOLOGY OF FRESHWATER FISH. - ISSN 0906-6691. - (2024). [10.1111/eff.12787]

*Availability:*

This version is available at: 11583/2990816 since: 2024-07-16T09:58:21Z

*Publisher:*

John Wiley and Sons Inc

*Published*

DOI:10.1111/eff.12787

*Terms of use:*

This article is made available under terms and conditions as specified in the corresponding bibliographic description in the repository

*Publisher copyright*

Wiley postprint/Author's Accepted Manuscript

This is the peer reviewed version of the above quoted article, which has been published in final form at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/eff.12787>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Use of Self-Archived Versions.

(Article begins on next page)

1 Individual activity levels and presence of  
2 conspecifics affect fish passage rates over  
3 an in-flume barrier

4 Daniel Nyqvist<sup>1\*</sup>, Fabio Tarena<sup>1</sup>, Alessandro Candiotta<sup>2</sup>, and Claudio Comoglio<sup>1</sup>

5

6 <sup>1</sup> Department of Environment, Land and Infrastructure Engineering, Politecnico di Torino, Italy

7 <sup>2</sup> Ittiologo libero professionista, Predosa, Italy

8 \*Corresponding author. DIATI, Corso Duca degli Abruzzi, 24, Torino, 10129, Italy. +46701756369

9

10 **Emails and ORCID:**

11 Daniel Nyqvist: [daniel.nyqvist@polito.it](mailto:daniel.nyqvist@polito.it); 0000-0002-3098-0594

12 Fabio Tarena: [fabio.tarena@polito.it](mailto:fabio.tarena@polito.it); 0009-0004-4465-3537

13 Alessandro Candiotta: [ale.candiotta@libero.it](mailto:ale.candiotta@libero.it)

14 Claudio Comoglio: [claudio.comoglio@polito.it](mailto:claudio.comoglio@polito.it); 0000-0002-7962-0653

15 **Short running title:** Activity levels and presence of conspecifics affect fish passage rates

16

17 **ABSTRACT**

18 Dams and other in-stream obstacles disrupt longitudinal connectivity and hinder fish from  
19 moving between habitats. Fishways and other fish passage solutions are used to pass fish over  
20 these artificial migration barriers. Fish passage functionality, however, varies greatly with fish  
21 passage design and environmental conditions, and depends on fish species and characteristics.  
22 In particular, swimming performance and fish behavior are considered key characteristics to  
23 predict fish passage performance. It is also well known, but not well quantified, that the  
24 presence of conspecifics affects fish passage behavior. In this study, we quantified individual  
25 passage rates of PIT-tagged gudgeons (*Gobio gobio*) over a scaled deep side notch weir in an  
26 hydraulic flume. We then quantified individual swimming capability (time to fatigue) and  
27 activity level (distance moved in an open field test) for PIT-tagged gudgeons (*Gobio gobio*) for  
28 the same individual fish and tested for potential effects on fish passage rate. To check for  
29 potential group effects, we then repeated the passage experiment for fish individually or in  
30 groups of five. More active fish displayed higher passage rates compared to less active fish, and  
31 fish passed the obstacle at higher rates in groups of five compared to alone. No effect of fish  
32 swimming capability on passage rates was detected. This result highlights the need to take both  
33 individual variation as well as the presence and behavior of conspecifics into account in fish  
34 passage studies and evaluations. Doing so has the potential to improve the understanding of  
35 fish behavior, and in the end the design of fish passage solutions. Future studies should explore  
36 these results on free ranging fish and in relation to in-situ fish passage solutions.

37 Keywords: fish swimming performance, behavioral type, personality, social facilitation, gudgeon

38

## 39 INTRODUCTION

40 Fish migrate for feeding, reproduction and refuge, and in response to environmental or  
41 developmental changes (Lucas *et al.*, 2001). Fish migrate in the marine environment, between  
42 freshwaters and the sea, or exclusively in freshwater (Morais & Daverat, 2016). Even within rivers  
43 the scale of fish migration varies from meters to thousands of kilometers (Herrera-R *et al.*, 2024;  
44 Lucas *et al.*, 2001; Schiavon *et al.*, 2024). For riverine fish, the presence of dams and other in-  
45 stream obstacles hinder fish from migrating between habitats and has caused declines and  
46 sometimes even local extinctions of migratory species (Jonsson *et al.*, 1999; Lenders *et al.*, 2016).  
47 Maintaining open migratory routes in river systems is an important aspect of safeguarding  
48 ecological connectivity and conserving migratory fish species (McIntyre *et al.*, 2015). Ideally, non-  
49 migrating fish should also be able to pass dams to maintain genetic diversity and fish dispersal in  
50 rivers (De Fries *et al.*, 2023; Jones *et al.*, 2021). In face of this, fishways and other fish passage  
51 solutions (e.g. eel ladders, fish lifts, trap-and-transport solutions, low-sloping racks) are used to  
52 pass fish over migration barriers (Katopodis & Williams, 2012; Noonan *et al.*, 2012; Silva *et al.*,  
53 2018).

54 The need for fishways and other passage solutions to facilitate two way fish passage at migration  
55 barriers has been acknowledged for hundreds of years (Calles *et al.*, 2013; Katopodis & Williams,  
56 2012), but their functionality remains variable, and is often low (e.g. passage efficiency and  
57 attraction efficiency; Bunt *et al.*, 2012; Noonan *et al.*, 2012). Passage performance of fish varies  
58 with fish passage design and environmental conditions, but also between species and related to  
59 fish characteristics (Nyqvist *et al.*, 2018; Silva *et al.*, 2018). Swimming performance is considered  
60 a key characteristic to predict fish passage performance (Katopodis & Gervais, 2012), and fish  
61 behavior in relation to local conditions is central to successful passage (Mawer *et al.*, 2023;  
62 Williams *et al.*, 2011). Importantly, swimming performance and behavior differ between, but also  
63 within species, something that contributes to the high variability in fish passage functionality  
64 (Fraser *et al.*, 2001; Katopodis & Gervais, 2012; Silva *et al.*, 2018).

65 Fish swimming performance is crucial for dispersal, migration, and predator-prey interactions  
66 (Katopodis & Gervais, 2012; Tudorache *et al.*, 2013), and fish swimming capabilities are tested  
67 explicitly to contribute to fish passage design (Castro-Santos *et al.*, 2022; Peake *et al.*, 1997;  
68 Romão *et al.*, 2012). Low swimming capabilities compared to prevailing hydrodynamic conditions  
69 are often the reason for low fish passage performance for weak swimmers and small-sized fishes  
70 (Marsden & Stuart, 2019; Volpato *et al.*, 2009). Fish swimming performance varies with species  
71 and sizes (Katopodis & Gervais, 2012), but also between individuals (Hechter & Hasler, 2019;  
72 Oufiero & Garland Jr, 2009), potentially modulating selection in fish populations having to pass  
73 velocity barriers (Haugen *et al.*, 2008; Volpato *et al.*, 2009).

74 Fish behavior in relation to its environment is crucial for the fish to approach, enter, ascend, and  
75 exit the fishway (Nyqvist *et al.*, 2016; Williams *et al.*, 2011). Fish can be guided or repelled by  
76 hydrodynamic cues such as absolute or changing water velocities (Kemp *et al.*, 2005, 2008), but

77 also react to light (Hansen *et al.*, 2019; Tétard *et al.*, 2019) and sound (Heath *et al.*, 2021), or their  
78 combinations (Miller *et al.*, 2022). In addition, consistent inter-individual differences in activity,  
79 such as exploration or boldness can influence animal movement patterns (Wu & Seebacher,  
80 2022). For example, both in killifishes (*Rivulus hartii*) and salmonids (*Salmo trutta*), activity in the  
81 laboratory correlates with dispersal in nature (Fraser *et al.*, 2001; Watz, 2019). Related to fish  
82 passage, activity levels have been observed to correlate with bypass passage in Atlantic salmon  
83 smolts (*Salmo salar*; Haraldstad *et al.*, 2021). There are also indications of fish with higher  
84 boldness score to be better upstream passers (Hirsch *et al.*, 2017; Lothian & Lucas, 2021),  
85 although not always (Landsman *et al.*, 2017). Even if not conclusive in the literature, high activity  
86 and exploratory behavior should, intuitively, be conducive to finding and navigating fishways.

87 Contrary to most models on fish passage behavior, many fish in nature do not pass through  
88 fishways individually, but in groups (Mawer *et al.*, 2023). The presence and behavior of  
89 conspecifics are therefore likely to affect the passage behavior of fish. Fish in larger groups can  
90 be more exploratory and bolder than single or few fish, covering more ground exploring a greater  
91 portion of the test arena (Ward, 2012), locating food faster (Pitcher *et al.*, 1982), and feeding  
92 more efficiently and for longer periods of time (Magurran & Pitcher, 1983). Fish can also learn  
93 from observing other fish (Johnsson & Åkerman, 1998), and fish more prone to move may be  
94 followed by more shy fish, increasing overall movement rates for fish in groups compared  
95 isolated fish (Cote *et al.*, 2011; Harcourt *et al.*, 2009). Related to fish passage, experiments on  
96 barbel (*Barbus barbus*) and trout (*Salmo trutta*) show an increased motivation to pass in groups  
97 (Albayrak *et al.*, 2020) compared to alone, while salmon densities downstream of dams have  
98 been observed to correlate with rates of passage (Okasaki *et al.*, 2020). Still, although many  
99 species are known to migrate and pass fishways in groups, little is known about actual group  
100 effects on fish passage rates (De Bie *et al.*, 2020; Mawer *et al.*, 2023).

101 Gudgeon (*Gobio gobio*) is a small-sized riverine and lake-dwelling fish species native in temperate  
102 Europe. Its range extend from France in the south to Southern Finland in the north, and Eastern  
103 United Kingdom in the west, while its eastern distribution is still unclear (Freyhof & Kottelat,  
104 2007; IUCN, 2010). The species is introduced in Italy, where it is of particular interest as a direct  
105 competitor to the threatened Italian gudgeon (Bianco & Ketmaier, 2005; Schiavon *et al.*, 2024).  
106 Gudgeon is a gregarious species (Fortini, 2016; Freyhof & Kottelat, 2007), with group sizes ranging  
107 from single fish or a few individuals to more than 20 fish (personal observation) and most likely  
108 varying over time and between sites (Hoare *et al.*, 2000; Svensson *et al.*, 2000). It spawns from  
109 April-August in temperatures above 12°C and in shallow water (Freyhof & Kottelat, 2007).  
110 Although typically relatively resident, it can partake in substantial dispersal movements (Stott,  
111 1967). While little is known about its fish passage behavior, it has, at places, been frequently  
112 observed in fishways (Panagiotopoulos *et al.*, 2024).

113 Individual passage performance over a scaled deep side notch weir, corresponding to the passage  
114 environment of a pool-and-weir fishway, had previously been estimated for PIT-tagged gudgeons  
115 in groups of ten, in an hydraulic flume experiment (Tarena *et al.*, 2024). In this study, we

116 quantified individual swimming performance (time to fatigue) and activity (distance moved in an  
117 open field test) for the same PIT-tagged gudgeons, and tested for effects of individual swimming  
118 performance and activity on fish passage rates. To investigate potentially modulating effects of  
119 the presence of conspecifics, we repeated the original passage experiment but in trials involving  
120 a single fish or a group of five fish. Passage rates were then compared between gudgeons in single  
121 fish treatments and gudgeons in group treatments. We hypothesized that higher swimming  
122 performance and higher activity levels are associated with higher passage rates, and that fish  
123 pass at higher rates in groups compared to alone.

124

## 125 **MATERIAL AND METHODS**


### 126 **Fish and tagging**

127 Gudgeons were caught backpack electrofishing (direct current; ELT60IIGI, Scubla, Italy) in the  
128 Rocca Grimalda Channel (44°39'47"N, 8°49'51.5"E), a tributary to Orba River (Italy) and brought  
129 to the Alessandria Province hatchery in Predosa (Italy) on 19 September 2022. The fish were PIT-  
130 tagged (Oregon, USA; 12 mm \* 2.1 mm; 0.10 g) in two batches on 20 September (n=14) and 4  
131 November (n=46).

132 Before tagging, fish were anesthetized in clove oil (Aromlabs, USA; approximately 0.05 ml clove  
133 oil / L water). A 2-4 mm ventral incision was made anterior of the pelvic fin, slightly offset from  
134 the centre. The tag was then inserted through the incision and pushed forward in the abdominal  
135 cavity to align with the fish body (eg. Bolland *et al.*, 2009; Schiavon *et al.*, 2023). Fish were  
136 measured for fork length (mean  $\pm$  standard deviation = 10  $\pm$  0.6 cm) and weighed (11.3  $\pm$  2.2 g).  
137 Tag-to-fish weight ratios were 1% ( $\pm$  0.2%), lower than recommended in telemetry literature  
138 (Brown *et al.*, 1999; Jepsen *et al.*, 2005). PIT-tags have been seen not to affect burst swimming  
139 ability or volitional swimming performance in similar sized cypriniformes (Nyqvist *et al.*, 2024;  
140 Schiavon *et al.*, 2023), even just one day after tagging (Ficke *et al.*, 2012). Tagged fish were left to  
141 recover in an aerated water tank for at least 20 min, before being transferred to spring fed flow  
142 through tanks (59x150x20 cm) and left to recover for at least three days before starting of the  
143 experiments. All fish remained healthy looking and active after tagging. Fish were held in standing  
144 water, under a natural photoperiod and semi-natural light conditions (windows and artificial  
145 lights during daytime, darkness at night), had access to perforated brick shelters in the tanks, and  
146 were fed commercial fish pellets (Tetra, TabiMin, Germany) regularly. Water temperature was  
147 stable at 13 $\pm$ 1°C.

### 148 **Passage experiment I**

149 Passage experiments I and II were conducted in a recirculating open channel flume (30x30x140  
150 cm) made of plexiglass (Fig. 1). Temperature was kept constant (mean  $\pm$  SD = 13.15  $\pm$  0.02 °C,  
151 aligned with the temperature in the holding tanks), switching on and off a chiller to counter  
152 heating from the action of the pump when needed.



153

154 *Figure. 1 – A scaled drawing of the experimental arena: (a) top view of the experimental arena inside the flume (the large arrow*  
 155 *indicates the flow direction), (b) front view (section A-A) of the deep side notch weir. The upstream end of the flume is delimited*  
 156 *by a flow straightener, and the downstream end by a fine meshed rack (Figure adopted from Tarena et al., 2024).*

157 A deep side notch weir (Larinier, 2002), consisting of a grey-painted plexiglass panel with a gum  
 158 gasket to prevent leaks from the side of the weir, was fitted to the flume dimensions (Fig. 1). A  
 159 flow straightener delimited the experimental arena in an upstream direction while a fine meshed  
 160 rack prevented fish from going downstream. The weir divided the experimental arena in an  
 161 upstream (46 cm) and downstream part (94 cm). Experimental conditions consisted of a total  
 162 discharge of 4.44 L/s that created an upstream water depth of 20 cm, a downstream water depth  
 163 of 12 cm, and a streaming flow drop of 8 cm over the 5 cm wide weir slot. The drop and the  
 164 downstream arena dimensions correspond to recommendation for small sized fish in fish passage  
 165 guidelines (Marsden & Stuart, 2019b; Schmutz & Mielach, 2013), resulting in a maximum water  
 166 velocity of 1.25 m/s (Larinier, 2002). A solid brick in the downstream part of the experimental  
 167 arena offered fish shelter from the flow (Fig 1), while a perforated brick in the upstream area  
 168 constituted both shelter from the flow and a structural shelter to discourage downstream  
 169 movements of fish.

170 Two synced PIT-antennas (ORSR; Oregon, USA), attached to the external wall of the flume, were  
 171 used to track the movement of the fish in the flume (Fig. 1). Presence within detection range (a  
 172 few cm) resulted in detection. The downstream antenna detected fish when they approached  
 173 the weir, and the upstream antenna detected fish when passing. The experiments were also  
 174 video recorded (Sony 4K, FDR-AX43, 100fps) from the long side of the flume. In darkness, an IR-  
 175 camera (Survey3, Mapir, USA) was supported by an IR-lamp (DOME 5 MPX, Proxe, Italy).

176 For passage experiment I, fish were randomly divided into 6 groups of 10 fish each and left to  
 177 recuperate from handling for three days in perforated boxes (37 x 54 x 13 cm) within larger flow-  
 178 through tanks. To initiate the trial, a group of fish was netted from the holding box, placed in a  
 179 small bucket and gently released into the flume on the downstream side of the weir. Fish were  
 180 given 90 min to pass before the experiment was ended and fish captured and returned to the  
 181 flow through tanks.

182 PIT-data were then used to assign passage success (yes/no) and passage time (time since start of  
183 the trial) for each fish. Single detections were not used as proof of passage (to avoid occasional  
184 false positives) and video recordings were scrutinized to confirm each passage event. For some  
185 fish, PIT-detection data did not allow a direct assignment of passage time (for example when  
186 many fish upstream the weir caused tag collisions). In such cases video recordings were also used  
187 to extract passage time. Although some fish passed the weir several times, only the time of first  
188 passage was used in the analyses.

189 The sixty gudgeons were tested in a series of passage tests under three different light conditions  
190 (daylight, darkness at night, low light at night) in the period 9-11 November 2022. The light  
191 treatments were part of another study (see Tarena et al., 2024 for details and results of the light  
192 experiment). Here only the passage data from these trials were used while taking the effect of  
193 light into account in the statistical modelling. Only the first passage trial for each fish was included  
194 to avoid learning effects, and repeated measures on the same individual. This means that, in  
195 passage experiment I, 20 fish were tested in darkness (LI = 0 lx) at night, 20 fish in lit conditions  
196 during daytime ( $= 6 \pm 0.7$  lx), and 20 fish in lit conditions during night ( $4 \pm 0.17$  lx).

### 197 **Fish swimming performance**

198 Individual swimming trials for the 60 gudgeons were conducted on 23 November 2022 in the  
199 same open channel flume as the passage experiment I, following Schiavon *et al.*, (2023). The  
200 swimming arena was 97 cm long, delimited by the flow straightener in the upstream direction  
201 and the fine meshed rack in the downstream direction. An individual fish was netted, gently  
202 released in the swimming arena, and given 5 min to habituate to the flume at a low a flow velocity  
203 of 18-20 cm/s (Ashraf *et al.*, 2024). At the start of the swimming trial, water velocity was  
204 increased to 60 cm/s. This velocity was based on pilot trials to achieve fatigue times in the range  
205 of seconds to around a minute; relevant in a fish passage context (Katopodis *et al.*, 2019; Starrs  
206 *et al.*, 2011). Water depth during the swimming trial was 9.4 cm. When the fish rested on the  
207 downstream grid, it was gently encouraged (poked with a stick) from the downstream side of the  
208 downstream grid. The fish sensed the poke but the poke could not displace the fish. A fish was  
209 considered fatigued after resting on the grid despite poking or after resting again after the third  
210 poke, and the time from the start of the swimming trial constituted the time to fatigue (Ashraf *et al.*,  
211 2024). After the swimming trial, the fish was scanned for PIT-ID and returned to a separate  
212 holding tank.

### 213 **Open field test**

214 On 24 November, the 60 gudgeons were subject to an open field test to score their movement  
215 activity (Miklósi *et al.*, 1992; Nyqvist *et al.*, 2023; Watz, 2019). Without eliciting an escape  
216 response, an individual fish was randomly netted from the holding tank, placed in a small bucket  
217 and gently released into an arena (length\*width\*depth = 56.5\*36.5\*10.0 cm). Water in the test  
218 tanks was changed regularly to maintain a stable temperature across trials. Temperature was  
219 measured continuously in a separate tank, subject to identical conditions as the test tanks. The



220 fish was left in the arena for 10 minutes: 5 minutes to habituate to the new environment and 5  
221 minutes for the open field test (Miklósi *et al.*, 1992; Nyqvist *et al.*, 2023; Watz, 2019). Two trials  
222 were run in parallel. The arena was filmed with an overhead video camera (Sony 4K, FDR-AX43 ,  
223 50fps). After the open field test, the fish was scanned for PIT-ID and placed in an aerated tank.  
224 When all fish had been tested and recovered, they were returned to the holding tank. Using the  
225 video recordings and a custom-made MATLAB script ([https://github.com/SilverFox275/manual-](https://github.com/SilverFox275/manual-point-tracking)  
226 [point-tracking](https://github.com/SilverFox275/manual-point-tracking); R2021b The MathWorks Inc, Natick, Massachusetts, USA), fish positions (center  
227 of mass) were manually tracked at one frame per second. Distances in pixels were translated to  
228 distance in meters based on known dimensions of the arena (Nyqvist *et al.*, 2023). From the series  
229 of positions, a total distance moved was quantified for each fish (eg. Haraldstad *et al.*, 2021; Watz,  
230 2019; Nyqvist *et al.* 2023).

### 231 **Passage experiment II – groups vs individuals**

232 To test for effects of the presence of conspecifics on individual passage rates, passage trials were  
233 repeated on 14-15 December using the same experimental design of experiment I and a subset  
234 of fish (n = 40). This resulted in 20 trials with one fish, and four trials with groups of five fish. One  
235 or five fish were randomly netted from the holding tank and placed in the downstream part of  
236 the experimental arena. Fish were given 60 min to pass the weir, before the experiment was  
237 aborted and fish returned to a separate holding tank. Individual passage success and times (20  
238 per treatment) were assessed using PIT-data and videos as for the original passage experiment.  
239 The experiments were conducted under a randomized block design (1 group trial, 5 single fish  
240 trials) and in lit conditions during daytime and evenings. One fish (in a five fish treatment) had  
241 lost its tag and was therefore excluded from the analysis. After finalizing the experiments, the  
242 fish were released in an isolated pond at the hatchery premises.

### 243 **Statistical analysis**

244 Time-to-event analysis (also called survival analysis) is suitable for fish passage data, taking in to  
245 account both the proportion of fish passing and the time it takes for them to pass (Castro-Santos  
246 & Haro, 2003; Castro-Santos & Perry, 2012; Hosmer *et al.*, 2008). It is widely applied in medical  
247 research, but during the last decades also increasingly in behavioral ecology and fish passage  
248 research (Bravo-Córdoba *et al.*, 2021; Silva *et al.*, 2018). Cox-regression, a type of time-to-event  
249 analysis, was used to model effects of the categorical variable light condition (daylight, artificial  
250 light at night, darkness at night) and the continuous variables swimming capability (time to  
251 fatigue) and activity score (distance moved in the open field test) on passage rate in the first trials  
252 for each fish in experiment I. Fish were defined as available to pass from the time of release into  
253 the downstream experimental arena. Fish not passing were censored at the end of the  
254 experiment (that is after 90 min) but considered available to pass until this time (i.e. included in  
255 the analysis as fish failing to pass after 90 minutes of having be possibility to do so). All  
256 combinations of light treatment, activity score, and swimming capability were included among  
257 the candidate models. The interaction between light treatment and activity score was included  
258 among the candidate models to check for context dependent effects. For the follow up

259 experiment investigating group effects (passage experiment II), all combinations of group  
260 treatment (one or five fish), swimming capability (time to fatigue) and activity score (distance  
261 moved), as well as the interaction between activity score and group treatment, were included  
262 among the candidate models. The tested fish were relatively uniform in length and hence this  
263 variable was not included among the candidate model. To account for non-independence of  
264 observations from the same trial/group, all models were clustered on trial (Kelly, 2004; Therneau  
265 & Grambsch, 2000; Therneau & Lumley, 2017). Clustering is used to deal with correlated or  
266 grouped data, allowing the use of individual event times for subjects within groups. It has, for  
267 example, been used to handle non-independence in spatially autocorrelated field data (Binning  
268 *et al.*, 2018; Stelbrink *et al.*, 2019), among chicks from the same nest (Christensen-Dalsgaard *et al.*,  
269 2018), and between multiple animals in experimental trials (Harbicht *et al.*, 2022; Nyqvist *et al.*,  
270 2024). To select the best model among candidate models, minimization of Akaike information  
271 criterion (AIC) was used. Models with an AIC-value of 2 or lower from the null model, and within  
272 2 AIC units from the best model were considered good models (Burnham and Anderson 2003). If  
273 more than one competing model fulfilled these criteria, all were presented and used to describe  
274 the effects of covariates. For all good models, the assumption of proportionality of hazard was  
275 explicitly tested (Fox, 2002). The analysis was performed in R, and packages survival (Therneau &  
276 Lumley, 2017) and mass (Ripley *et al.*, 2013), and plotted with ggplot (Wickham, 2016) and  
277 survminer (Kassambara *et al.*, 2017).


## 278 **Ethical statement**

279 The study was performed in accordance with the Ufficio Tecnico Faunistico e Ittiofauna of the  
280 Provincia di Alessandria (n.50338 of 20 September 2022), under the provisions of art.2 of the  
281 national Decree n.26/2014 (implementation of Dir. 2010/63/EU).

282

## 283 **RESULTS**

284 In all tests, fish exhibited normal swimming behavior. Gudgeons displayed a high inter-individual  
285 variation in swimming performance and activity in the open field test, with no correlation  
286 between the two traits (Spearman rank test,  $p = 0.23$ ; Fig. 2).



287

288 *Figure 2. Time to fatigue (s) in swimming performance test at a constant velocity of 0.6 m/s on the x-axis, and total distance*  
 289 *moved (m) during 5 minutes in an open field test for the tested gudgeons (n=60). No correlation between the two traits*  
 290 *(Spearman rank test,  $p = 0.23$ ,  $\rho = 0.15$ ).*

### 291 **Passage experiment I**

292 In total, 46 out of 60 fish (77%) successfully passed the barrier. Higher activity in the open field  
 293 test (distance moved) corresponded to higher passage rates, taking effects of the light  
 294 treatment into account. No interaction between light conditions and activity score, nor fish  
 295 swimming capability, affected passage rates (Table 1a). Light treatment also affected passage  
 296 rates (see Tarena et al 2024; Table 1a).

297 *Table 1. List of good models based on the Akaike information criterion (AIC; an AIC-value of 2 or lower from the null model, and*  
 298 *within 2 AIC units from the best model). Delta AIC (null) is the difference between the AIC of the model and AIC of the null model*  
 299 *(without covariates). Delta AIC (min) is the difference between AIC of the model and AIC of the best model. A) Passage*


300 experiment I (different light conditions): darkness at night as baseline for treatment. B) Passage experiment II (single fish vs  
 301 groups of five): single fish as baseline in the group variable.

	AIC Without Covariates	AIC with Covariates	Delta AIC (null)	Delta AIC (min)	Variable	Coefficient	Robust SE	P-value
<b>A. Groups under different light conditions</b>								
Treatment + activity	326.9	316.7	-10.1	0	Treatment-Day	-1.45	0.49	<0.01
					Treatment-ALAN	-0.73	0.37	0.05
					Activity	0.03	0.01	0.04
Treatment	326.9	317.6	-9.3	0.85	Treatment-Day	-1.39	0.59	0.02
					Treatment-ALAN	-0.65	0.38	0.09
Treatment + Activity + Time to fatigue	326.9	318.5	-8.4	1.74	Treatment-Day	-1.48	0.48	<0.01
					Treatment-ALAN	-0.73	0.36	0.04
					Activity	0.03	0.01	0.03
					Time to fatigue	0.01	0.02	0.68
<b>B. Groups vs individuals</b>								
Group	200.1	196.9	-3.17	0	Group	0.81	0.27	<0.01
Group + Activity	200.1	197	-3.14	0.03	Group	0.88	0.27	<0.01
					Activity	0.03	0.02	0.12
Group + TF	200.1	197.5	-2.56	0.61	Group	0.84	0.29	<0.01
					Time to fatigue	0.02	0.02	0.27
Group + Activity + Time to fatigue	200.1	197.8	-2.32	0.84	Group	0.90	0.29	<0.01
					Activity	0.03	0.02	0.12
					Time to fatigue	0.02	0.02	0.35

302

303 **Passage experiment II - group vs individuals**

304 The proportion of successful passages was 94% (18/19) among the fish in groups and 75%  
 305 (15/20) among single fish. Fish in groups passed at a higher rate than single fish (Fig. 3; Table  
 306 1b). No effect of activity (distance moved in the open field test) or swimming capability – or  
 307 their interaction with group treatment was detected (Table 1b).



308

309 Figure 3. Kaplan-Meier curve representing the ratio of single fish (solid line) and fish in the group treatment (dashed line)  
 310 remaining downstream the barrier over time.

311 **DISCUSSION**

312 Fish passage performance, even at the same site, varies between but also within species. Using  
313 repeated tests on individually tagged fish, we explored the effect of fish swimming capability  
314 (time to fatigue at a fixed velocity), activity level (distance moved in an open field test), and the  
315 presence of conspecifics on individual fish passage rate over an in-flume weir. More active fish  
316 displayed higher passage rates compared to less active fish, and fish also passed the obstacle at  
317 higher rates in groups of five compared to alone. No effect of fish swimming capability on passage  
318 rates was detected.

319 Fish behavioral types scored in the laboratory are known to correlate with a range of natural  
320 behaviors, making up behavioral syndromes when displaying behavioral consistency within and  
321 between individuals and contexts (Sih *et al.*, 2004), and could help explain individual variability  
322 in fish passage performance. We demonstrate an effect of activity score in an open field test on  
323 fish passage rates over a model fishway weir. Similar results are reported for Atlantic salmon  
324 smolts passing downstream over a bypass (Haraldstad *et al.*, 2021), and swimming speed in open  
325 field tests predicted the likelihood of juvenile American eel (*Anguilla rostrata*) passing an eel  
326 ladder (Mensingher *et al.*, 2021). For brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) and rainbow smelts (*Osmerus*  
327 *mordax*), however, no correlation between behavioral test scores and passage success through  
328 nature-like fishways was seen (Landsman *et al.*, 2017; Lothian & Lucas, 2021). In situation where,  
329 for example, more active fish pass at higher rates than less active fish, fish passage may exert a  
330 selective pressure on activity in affected fish populations (Wolf & Weissing, 2012) similar to what  
331 has been observed for length selective fish passage solutions (Haugen *et al.*, 2008; Maynard *et*  
332 *al.*, 2017; Volpato *et al.*, 2009). Especially if the selected trait is heritable (Brown *et al.*, 2007).  
333 With activity level also correlating with, for example, dispersal (Fraser *et al.*, 2001; Watz, 2019),  
334 diurnal behavior (Závorka *et al.*, 2016), and feeding behavior (Nannini *et al.*, 2012) there is a risk  
335 of this selection affecting a wider repertoire of fish behaviors within the population, and in the  
336 end the whole ecosystem (Raffard *et al.*, 2017; Wilson & McLaughlin, 2007).

337 Fish in groups of five passed the barrier at higher rates compared to fish exposed to the weir in  
338 solitude. The presence of conspecifics can increase activity levels of individual fish, increasing  
339 both feeding efficiencies and exploration (Magnhagen & Bunnefeld, 2009; Magurran & Pitcher,  
340 1983; Ward, 2012), and, as shown in our study, also increasing passage rates. Mechanisms behind  
341 this social facilitation can be manifold, including reduced perceived predation risk (Lima & Dill,  
342 1990) and related calming effects (reduction in metabolic rates; Nadler *et al.*, 2016; Parker Jr,  
343 1973), observation of other fish passing (Ryer & Olla, 1991; Sundström & Johnsson, 2001), and  
344 individual fish more inclined to pass increasing passage and activity rates also for others (Cote *et*  
345 *al.*, 2011; Harcourt *et al.*, 2009). Although, increased passage rates under higher densities  
346 downstream fishways have been reported (Okasaki *et al.*, 2020), and it is well known that many  
347 fish species preferably pass in groups (Albayrak *et al.*, 2020; Mawer *et al.*, 2023), the topic has so  
348 far received little attention in the scientific literature. Previously, to our knowledge, not

349 quantified, our results highlight the importance for social behavior in fish passage. This, in turn,  
350 underscores the need to accommodate groups of fish in designing fish passage solutions.

351 Fish swimming capability is often deemed instrumental in the design of fishways (Castro-Santos  
352 *et al.*, 2022; Katopodis & Gervais, 2012) but did not affect passage rates in our experiment. This  
353 is likely because the passage was relatively undemanding and within the performance range of  
354 the whole group of fish. Our barrier was modelled after a deep side notch weir fishway with drop  
355 and water velocity values in line with recommendations for small sized fish in fish passage  
356 literature (Marsden & Stuart, 2019a; Schmutz & Mielach, 2013), and hence expected to allow  
357 passage at high rates. In provoked swimming trials, however, maximum swimming speed for  
358 gudgeon has been estimated to 9.8 - 13.3 BL/s (average; Nyqvist *et al.*, 2024a; Tudorache *et al.*,  
359 2008), which for our gudgeons would predict a sufficient swimming capability to pass for only a  
360 portion of the fish (0-80% above 1.25 m/s). Interestingly, the very high passage performance  
361 observed could be due to our volitionally passing fish outperforming the fish in the provoked  
362 swimming trials cited (Castro-Santos *et al.*, 2013). Regardless, under more demanding passage  
363 conditions, as in the passage at real fishways with a long series of (not seldom higher) drops, it  
364 must be deemed likely that fish swimming capability affects individual variability in passage  
365 success.

366 The behavior of fish of different behavioral types have previously been found to be modulated  
367 by light conditions (Závorka *et al.*, 2016), and the presence of conspecifics (Harcourt *et al.*, 2009;  
368 Magnhagen & Bunnefeld, 2009; Webster *et al.*, 2007). For example, high and low activity scored  
369 brown trout display different diel activity patterns in streams (Závorka *et al.*, 2016), and it is  
370 known that the presence conspecifics may shape the behavior of individual fish (Harcourt *et al.*,  
371 2009; Magnhagen, 2012). In our study, we did not find any effect of the interaction between  
372 activity level and light treatment or group size on passage rates. It is, however, important to keep  
373 in mind that our sample sizes were relatively low, potentially hindering us to detect weaker  
374 effects on fish passage rates. Future, dedicated experiments need to further explore these  
375 potential interactions in more depth.

376 In real fish passage situation, fish need to approach, enter, transition several compartments, exit  
377 and continue their upstream movement, with potential effects of activity type and presence of  
378 conspecifics on the whole series of events (Castro-Santos *et al.*, 2009; Nyqvist *et al.*, 2016). This  
379 study was performed in a relatively small flume where small sized gregarious fish was exposed to  
380 a deep side notch weir, modelled after a technical fishway. Future studies need to further explore  
381 these dynamics in relation to real fishways and free ranging fish, studying also other species. In  
382 particular, video data, telemetry and machine learning technologies could be useful tools for  
383 these purposes (Couzin & Heins, 2023). In transparent waters, video data could be used to  
384 understand the behavior of individuals and groups downstream, in, and upstream fishways  
385 (Zhang *et al.*, 2022). Data from fish counters (Pereira *et al.*, 2021), although currently  
386 underutilized, could provide important data on the passage of groups of fish (and group sizes) in  
387 relation to fishway type for a range of species. Telemetry techniques can be used to study the

388 movement of tagged individuals in relation to the movement of other tagged conspecifics (Monk  
389 *et al.*, 2023), but also the behavior of the fish after or before passage s(Burnett *et al.*, 2017;  
390 Hagelin *et al.*, 2016). The latter can be used to test for correlations between passage behavior or  
391 success and other behaviors. This, like in our experiment, through standardized arena trials  
392 (Haraldstad *et al.*, 2021; Lothian & Lucas, 2021), or also based on behavior (e.g. movement rates,  
393 habitat choice, spawning behavior) in nature (Sih *et al.*, 2004).

394 To conclude, using an in-flume barrier corresponding to a deep side notch weir fishway, we  
395 demonstrate effects of individual differences in activity level on fish passage rate and that fish in  
396 groups passed at higher rates than isolated individuals. These result highlights the need to take  
397 into account both individual variation as well as the presence and behavior of conspecifics in fish  
398 passage studies and evaluation, and can help explain variation in fish passage behavior (Bunt *et*  
399 *al.*, 2012; Noonan *et al.*, 2012). Designing fishways that allows fish to pass in groups, may increase  
400 fishway functionality. Fishways as a potential selection mechanism on fish behavioral types,  
401 highlights a potential hidden ecological cost of impounded rivers (Mensingher *et al.*, 2021). Future  
402 studies should explore these dynamics on free ranging fish and in relation to real fish passage  
403 solutions.

#### 404 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

405 We wish to thank Andrea Cagninei, Usama Ashraf, Luciano Candiotta, Christos Katopodis,  
406 Costantino Manes, and Alfredo Schiavon for assistance in the setup and running of the  
407 experiment.

#### 408 **AUTHORCONTRIBUTIONS**

409 Fabio Tarena, Claudio Comoglio and Daniel Nyqvist conceived of the presented idea. Fabio  
410 Tarena, Daniel Nyqvist and Alessandro Candiotta ran the experiments. Daniel Nyqvist wrote the  
411 manuscript with final edits from Claudio Comoglio and Fabio Tarena. All authors discussed the  
412 results and contributed to the final manuscript.

#### 413 **DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT**

414 Data will be made available upon a reasonable request.

#### 415 **REFERENCES**

- 416 Albayrak, I., Boes, R. M., Kriewitz-Byun, C. R., Peter, A., & Tullis, B. P. (2020). Fish guidance structures:  
417 Hydraulic performance and fish guidance efficiencies. *Journal of Ecohydraulics*, 113–131.
- 418 Ashraf, M. U., Nyqvist, D., Comoglio, C., & Manes, C. (2024). The effect of in-flume habituation time and  
419 fish behaviour on estimated swimming performance. *Journal of Ecohydraulics*, 0, 1–9.
- 420 Bianco, P. G., & Ketmaier, V. (2005). Will the Italian endemic gudgeon, *Gobio benacensis*, survive the  
421 interaction with the invasive introduced *Gobio gobio*. *Folia Zool*, 54, 42–49.

422 Binning, S. A., Roche, D. G., Grutter, A. S., Colosio, S., Sun, D., Miest, J., & Bshary, R. (2018). Cleaner  
423 wrasse indirectly affect the cognitive performance of a damselfish through ectoparasite removal.  
424 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 285, 20172447.

425 Bolland, J. D., Cowx, I. G., & Lucas, M. C. (2009). Evaluation of VIE and PIT tagging methods for juvenile  
426 cyprinid fishes. *Journal of Applied Ichthyology*, 25, 381–386.

427 Bravo-Córdoba, F. J., Valbuena-Castro, J., García-Vega, A., Fuentes-Pérez, J. F., Ruiz-Legazpi, J., & Sanz-  
428 Ronda, F. J. (2021). Fish passage assessment in stepped fishways: Passage success and transit time as  
429 standardized metrics. *Ecological Engineering*, 162, 106172.

430 Brown, C., Burgess, F., & Braithwaite, V. A. (2007). Heritable and experiential effects on boldness in a  
431 tropical poeciliid. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 62, 237–243.

432 Brown, R. S., Cooke, S. J., Anderson, W. G., & McKinley, R. S. (1999). Evidence to challenge the “2% rule”  
433 for biotelemetry. *North American Journal of Fisheries Management*, 19, 867–871.

434 Bunt, C., Castro-Santos, T., & Haro, A. (2012). Performance of fish passage structures at upstream  
435 barriers to migration. *River Research and Applications*, 28, 457–478.

436 Burnett, N. J., Hinch, S. G., Bett, N. N., Braun, D. C., Casselman, M. T., Cooke, S. J., ... White, C. F. H.  
437 (2017). Reducing Carryover Effects on the Migration and Spawning Success of Sockeye Salmon through a  
438 Management Experiment of Dam Flows. *River Research and Applications*, 33, 3–15.

439 Calles, O., Rivinoja, P., & Greenberg, L. (2013). A Historical Perspective on Downstream Passage at  
440 Hydroelectric Plants in Swedish Rivers. *Ecohydraulics* (pp. 309–322). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

441 Castro-Santos, T., & Haro, A. (2003). Quantifying migratory delay: a new application of survival analysis  
442 methods. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 60, 986–996.

443 Castro-Santos, T., Goerig, E., He, P., & Lauder, G. V. (2022). Applied aspects of locomotion and  
444 biomechanics. *Fish Physiol. A*, 39, 91–140.

445 Castro-Santos, T., & Perry, R. (2012). Time-to-event analysis as a framework for quantifying fish passage  
446 performance. *Telemetry techniques: a user guide for fisheries research*. American Fisheries Society,  
447 Bethesda, Maryland, 427–452.

448 Castro-Santos, T., Sanz-Ronda, F. J., & Ruiz-Legazpi, J. (2013). Breaking the speed limit—comparative  
449 sprinting performance of brook trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*) and brown trout (*Salmo trutta*). *Canadian*  
450 *Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 70, 280–293.

451 Castro-Santos, T., Cotel, A., & Webb, P. (2009). Fishway evaluations for better bioengineering: an  
452 integrative approach. (pp. 557–575). Bethesda, MD, USA.

453 Christensen-Dalsgaard, S., May, R. F., Barrett, R. T., Langset, M., Sandercock, B. K., & Lorentsen, S.-H.  
454 (2018). Prevailing weather conditions and diet composition affect chick growth and survival in the black-  
455 legged kittiwake. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*, 604, 237–249.

456 Cote, J., Fogarty, S., Brodin, T., Weinersmith, K., & Sih, A. (2011). Personality-dependent dispersal in the  
457 invasive mosquitofish: group composition matters. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*  
458 *Sciences*, 278, 1670–1678.



459 Couzin, I. D., & Heins, C. (2023). Emerging technologies for behavioral research in changing  
460 environments. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *38*, 346–354.

461 De Bie, J., Manes, C., & Kemp, P. S. (2020). Collective behaviour of fish in the presence and absence of  
462 flow. *Animal Behaviour*, *167*, 151–159.

463 De Fries, L., Camana, M., Guimarães, M., & Becker, F. G. (2023). Road crossings hinder the movement of  
464 a small non-migratory stream fish. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, *106*, 1295–1311.

465 Ficke, A. D., Myrick, C. A., & Kondratieff, M. C. (2012). The effects of PIT tagging on the swimming  
466 performance and survival of three nonsalmonid freshwater fishes. *Ecological Engineering*, *48*, 86–91.

467 Fortini, N. (2016). Nuovo atlante dei pesci delle acque interne italiane: guida completa ai pesci,  
468 ciclostomi e crostacei decapodi di acque dolci e salmastre. Aracne.

469 Fox, J. (2002). Cox proportional-hazards regression for survival data. *An R and S-PLUS companion to*  
470 *applied regression*, 1–18.

471 Fraser, D. F., Gilliam, J. F., Daley, M. J., Le, A. N., & Skalski, G. T. (2001). Explaining leptokurtic movement  
472 distributions: intrapopulation variation in boldness and exploration. *The American Naturalist*, *158*, 124–  
473 135.

474 Freyhof, J., & Kottelat, M. (2007). Handbook of European freshwater fishes.

475 Hagelin, A., Calles, O., Greenberg, L., Nyqvist, D., & Bergman, E. (2016). The Migratory Behaviour and  
476 Fallback Rate of Landlocked Atlantic Salmon (*Salmo salar*) in a Regulated River: does Timing Matter?  
477 *River Research and Applications*, *32*, 1402–1409.

478 Hansen, M. J., Steel, A. E., Cocherell, D. E., Patrick, P. H., Sills, M., Cooke, S. J., ... Fangue, N. A. (2019).  
479 Experimental evaluation of the effect of a light-emitting diode device on Chinook salmon smolt  
480 entrainment in a simulated river. *Hydrobiologia*, *841*, 191–203.

481 Haraldstad, T., Haugen, T. O., Olsen, E. M., Forseth, T., & Höglund, E. (2021). Hydropower-induced  
482 selection of behavioural traits in Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*). *Scientific Reports*, *11*, 16444.

483 Harbicht, A. B., Watz, J., Nyqvist, D., Virmajä, T., Carlsson, N., Aldvén, D., ... Calles, O. (2022). Guiding  
484 migrating salmonid smolts: Experimentally assessing the performance of angled and inclined screens  
485 with varying gap widths. *Ecological Engineering*, *174*, 106438.

486 Harcourt, J. L., Ang, T. Z., Sweetman, G., Johnstone, R. A., & Manica, A. (2009). Social feedback and the  
487 emergence of leaders and followers. *Current Biology*, *19*, 248–252.

488 Haugen, T. O., Aass, P., Stenseth, N. C., & Vøllestad, L. A. (2008). Changes in selection and evolutionary  
489 responses in migratory brown trout following the construction of a fish ladder. *Evolutionary*  
490 *Applications*, *1*, 319–335.

491 Heath, V. L. S., Miehl, S., Johnson, N., & Higgs, D. M. (2021). Behavioural response of sea lamprey (  
492 *Petromyzon marinus*) to acoustic stimuli in a small stream. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic*  
493 *Sciences*, *78*, 341–348.

494 Hechter, D. T., & Hasler, C. T. (2019). Repeatability of burst swimming performance in medaka (*Oryzias*  
495 *latipes*). *Fish physiology and biochemistry*, *45*, 1299–1307.

496 Herrera-R, G. A., Heilpern, S. A., Couto, T. B. A., Victoria-Lacy, L., Duponchelle, F., Correa, S. B., ...  
497 Anderson, E. P. (2024). A synthesis of the diversity of freshwater fish migrations in the Amazon basin.  
498 *Fish and Fisheries*, *25*, 114–133.

499 Hirsch, P. E., Thorlacius, M., Brodin, T., & Burkhardt-Holm, P. (2017). An approach to incorporate  
500 individual personality in modeling fish dispersal across in-stream barriers. *Ecology and Evolution*, *7*, 720–  
501 732.

502 Hoare, D. J., Ruxton, G. D., Godin, J.-G. J., & Krause, J. (2000). The social organization of free-ranging fish  
503 shoals. *Oikos*, *89*, 546–554.

504 Hosmer, D. W., Lemeshow, S., & May, S. (2008). *Applied Survival Analysis: Regression Modeling of Time-*  
505 *to-Event Data, Second Edition*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, New Jersey, USA.

506 IUCN. (2010). *Gobio gobio*: Freyhof, J.: The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species 2013:  
507 e.T184448A8277959, 2010.

508 Jepsen, N., Schreck, C., Clements, S., & Thorstad, E. B. (2005). A brief discussion on the 2% tag/bodymass  
509 rule of thumb. *Aquatic telemetry: advances and applications*, 255–259.

510 Johnsson, J. I., & Åkerman, A. (1998). Watch and learn: preview of the fighting ability of opponents alters  
511 contest behaviour in rainbow trout. *Animal Behaviour*, *56*, 771–776.

512 Jones, P. E., Champneys, T., Vevers, J., Börger, L., Svendsen, J. C., Consuegra, S., ... Garcia de Leaniz, C.  
513 (2021). Selective effects of small barriers on river-resident fish. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, *58*, 1487–  
514 1498.

515 Jonsson, B., Waples, R., & Friedland, K. (1999). Extinction considerations for diadromous fishes. *ICES*  
516 *Journal of Marine Science: Journal du Conseil*, *56*, 405–409.

517 Kassambara, A., Kosinski, M., Biecek, P., & Fabian, S. (2017). Package ‘survminer’. *Drawing Survival*  
518 *Curves using ‘ggplot2’(R package version 03 1)*.

519 Katopodis, C., & Gervais, R. (2012). ECOHYDRAULIC ANALYSIS OF FISH FATIGUE DATA: ECOHYDRAULIC  
520 ANALYSIS OF FISH FATIGUE DATA. *River Research and Applications*, *28*, 444–456.

521 Katopodis, C., Cai, L., & Johnson, D. (2019). Sturgeon survival: The role of swimming performance and  
522 fish passage research. *Fisheries Research*, *212*, 162–171.

523 Katopodis, C., & Williams, J. G. (2012). The development of fish passage research in a historical context.  
524 *Ecological Engineering*, *48*, 8–18.

525 Kelly, P. J. (2004). A Review of Software Packages for Analyzing Correlated Survival Data. *The American*  
526 *Statistician*, *58*, 337–342.

527 Kemp, P. S., Gessel, M. H., & Williams, J. G. (2005). Fine-scale behavioral responses of Pacific salmonid  
528 smolts as they encounter divergence and acceleration of flow. *Transactions of the American Fisheries*  
529 *Society*, *134*, 390–398.

530 Kemp, P. S., Gessel, M. H., & Williams, J. G. (2008). Response of downstream migrant juvenile Pacific  
531 salmonids to accelerating flow and overhead cover. *Hydrobiologia*, *609*, 205–217.

532 Landsman, S. J., Wilson, A. D. M., Cooke, S. J., & van den Heuvel, M. R. (2017). Fishway passage success  
533 for migratory rainbow smelt *Osmerus mordax* is not dictated by behavioural type. *River Research and*  
534 *Applications*, *33*, 1257–1267.

535 Larinier, M. (2002). POOL FISHWAYS, PRE-BARRAGES AND NATURAL BYPASS CHANNELS. *Bulletin*  
536 *Français de la Pêche et de la Pisciculture*, 54–82.

537 Lenders, H., Chamuleau, T., Hendriks, A., Lauwerier, R., Leuven, R., & Verberk, W. (2016). Historical rise  
538 of waterpower initiated the collapse of salmon stocks. *Scientific Reports*, *6*.

539 Lima, S. L., & Dill, L. M. (1990). Behavioral decisions made under the risk of predation: a review and  
540 prospectus. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, *68*, 619–640.

541 Lothian, A. J., & Lucas, M. C. (2021). The role of individual behavioral traits on fishway passage attempt  
542 behavior. *Ecology and Evolution*, *11*, 11974–11990.

543 Lucas, M. C., Baras, E., Thom, T. J., Duncan, A., & Slavík, O. (2001). *Migration of freshwater fishes*. Wiley  
544 Online Library. Vol. 47.

545 Magnhagen, C. (2012). Personalities in a crowd: What shapes the behaviour of Eurasian perch and other  
546 shoaling fishes? *Current Zoology*, *58*, 35–44.

547 Magnhagen, C., & Bunnefeld, N. (2009). Express your personality or go along with the group: what  
548 determines the behaviour of shoaling perch? *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*,  
549 *276*, 3369–3375.

550 Magurran, A. E., & Pitcher, T. J. (1983). Foraging, timidity and shoal size in minnows and goldfish.  
551 *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, *12*, 147–152.

552 Marsden, T., & Stuart, I. (2019a). Fish passage developments for small-bodied tropical fish: field case-  
553 studies lead to technology improvements. *Journal of Ecohydraulics*, *4*, 14–26.

554 Marsden, T., & Stuart, I. (2019b). Fish passage developments for small-bodied tropical fish: field case-  
555 studies lead to technology improvements. *Journal of Ecohydraulics*, *4*, 1–13.

556 Mawer, R., Pauwels, I. S., Bruneel, S. P., Goethals, P. L. M., Kopecki, I., Elings, J., ... Schneider, M. (2023).  
557 Individual based models for the simulation of fish movement near barriers: Current work and future  
558 directions. *Journal of Environmental Management*, *335*, 117538.

559 Maynard, G. A., Kinnison, M. T., & Zydlewski, J. D. (2017). Size selection from fishways and potential  
560 evolutionary responses in a threatened Atlantic salmon population. *River Research and Applications*, *33*,  
561 1004–1015.

562 McIntyre, P. B., LIERMANN, C. R., CHILDRESS, E., HAMANN, E. J., HOGAN, J. D., JANUCHOWSKI-HARTLEY,  
563 S. R., ... PRACHEIL, B. M. (2015). Conservation of migratory fishes in freshwater ecosystems.  
564 *Conservation of Freshwater Fishes*. Cambridge University Press Cambridge, UK.

565 Mensinger, M. A., Brehm, A. M., Mortelliti, A., Blomberg, E. J., & Zydlewski, J. D. (2021). American eel  
566 personality and body length influence passage success in an experimental fishway. *Journal of Applied*  
567 *Ecology*, *58*, 2760–2769.

568 Miklósi, A., Topal, J., & Csányi, V. (1992). Development of open-field and social behavior of the paradise  
569 fish (*Macropodus opercularis* L.). *Developmental Psychobiology: The Journal of the International Society*  
570 *for Developmental Psychobiology*, *25*, 335–344.

571 Miller, M., Sharkh, S. M., & Kemp, P. S. (2022). Response of upstream migrating juvenile European eel  
572 (*Anguilla anguilla*) to electric fields: Application of the marginal gains concept to fish screening. *PLOS*  
573 *ONE*, *17*, e0270573.

574 Monk, C. T., Aslak, U., Brockmann, D., & Arlinghaus, R. (2023). Rhythm of relationships in a social fish  
575 over the course of a full year in the wild. *Movement Ecology*, *11*, 56.

576 Morais, P., & Daverat, F. (2016). *An Introduction to Fish Migration*. London, UK: CRC Press.

577 Nadler, L. E., Killen, S. S., McClure, E. C., Munday, P. L., & McCormick, M. I. (2016). Shoaling reduces  
578 metabolic rate in a gregarious coral reef fish species. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, *219*, 2802–2805.

579 Nannini, M. A., Parkos III, J., & Wahl, D. H. (2012). Do behavioral syndromes affect foraging strategy and  
580 risk-taking in a juvenile fish predator? *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*, *141*, 26–33.

581 Noonan, M. J., Grant, J. W., & Jackson, C. D. (2012). A quantitative assessment of fish passage efficiency.  
582 *Fish and Fisheries*, *13*, 450–464.

583 Nyqvist, D., Elghagen, J., Heiss, M., & Calles, O. (2018). An angled rack with a bypass and a nature-like  
584 fishway pass Atlantic salmon smolts downstream at a hydropower dam. *Marine and Freshwater*  
585 *Research*, *69*, 1894–1904.

586 Nyqvist, D., Greenberg, L. A., Goerig, E., Calles, O., Bergman, E., Ardren, W. R., & Castro-Santos, T.  
587 (2016). Migratory delay leads to reduced passage success of Atlantic salmon smolts at a hydroelectric  
588 dam. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish*, *26*, 707–718.

589 Nyqvist, D., Schiavon, A., Candiotto, A., Mozzi, G., Eggers, F., & Comoglio, C. (2023). PIT-tagging Italian  
590 spined loach (*Cobitis bilineata*): Methodology, survival and behavioural effects. *Journal of Fish Biology*,  
591 *102*, 575–580.

592 Nyqvist, D., Schiavon, A., Candiotto, A., Tarena, F., & Comoglio, C. (2024). Survival and swimming  
593 performance in small-sized South European Cypriniformes tagged with passive integrated transponders.  
594 *Journal of Ecohydraulics*.

595 Okasaki, C., Keefer, M. L., Westley, P. A., & Berdahl, A. M. (2020). Collective navigation can facilitate  
596 passage through human-made barriers by homeward migrating Pacific salmon. *Proceedings of the Royal*  
597 *Society B*, *287*, 20202137.

598 Oufiero, C. E., & Garland Jr, T. (2009). Repeatability and correlation of swimming performances and size  
599 over varying time-scales in the guppy (*Poecilia reticulata*). *Functional Ecology*, *23*, 969–978.

600 Panagiotopoulos, P., Buijse, A. D., Winter, H. V., & Nagelkerke, L. A. J. (2024). A large-scale passage  
601 evaluation for multiple fish species: Lessons from 82 fishways in lowland rivers and brooks. *Ecological*  
602 *Engineering*, *199*, 107158.

603 Parker Jr, F. R. (1973). Reduced metabolic rates in fishes as a result of induced schooling. *Transactions of*  
604 *the American Fisheries Society*, *102*, 125–131.

605 Peake, S., McKinley, R., & Scruton, D. (1997). Swimming performance of various freshwater  
606 Newfoundland salmonids relative to habitat selection and fishway design. *Journal of Fish Biology*, *51*,  
607 710–723.

608 Pereira, E., Quintella, B. R., Lança, M. J., Alexandre, C. M., Mateus, C. S., Pedro, S., ... Telhado, A. (2021).  
609 Temporal patterns of the catadromous thinlip grey mullet migration in freshwater. *Ecohydrology*, e2345.

610 Pitcher, T. J., Magurran, A. E., & Winfield, I. J. (1982). Fish in larger shoals find food faster. *Behavioral*  
611 *Ecology and Sociobiology*, *10*, 149–151.

612 Raffard, A., Lecerf, A., Cote, J., Buoro, M., Lassus, R., & Cucherousset, J. (2017). The functional syndrome:  
613 linking individual trait variability to ecosystem functioning. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*  
614 *Sciences*, *284*, 20171893.

615 Ripley, B., Venables, B., Bates, D. M., Hornik, K., Gebhardt, A., Firth, D., & Ripley, M. B. (2013). Package  
616 'mass'. *Cran r*, *538*, 113–120.

617 Romão, F., Quintella, B., Pereira, T., & Almeida, P. (2012). Swimming performance of two Iberian  
618 cyprinids: the Tagus nase *Pseudochondrostoma polylepis* (Steindachner, 1864) and the bordallo *Squalius*  
619 *carolitertii* (Doadrio, 1988). *Journal of Applied Ichthyology*, *28*, 26–30.

620 Ryer, C. H., & Olla, B. L. (1991). Information transfer and the facilitation and inhibition of feeding in a  
621 schooling fish. *Environmental Biology of Fishes*, *30*, 317–323.

622 Schiavon, A., Comoglio, C., Candiotta, A., Hölker, F., Ashraf, M. U., & Nyqvist, D. (2023). Survival and  
623 swimming performance of a small-sized Cypriniformes (*Telestes muticellus*) tagged with passive  
624 integrated transponders. *Journal of Limnology*, *82*.

625 Schiavon, A., Comoglio, C., Candiotta, A., Spairani, M., Hölker, F., Tarena, F., ... Nyqvist, D. (2024).  
626 Navigating the drought: upstream migration of a small-sized Cypriniformes (*Telestes muticellus*) in  
627 response to drying in a partially intermittent mountain stream. *Knowledge & Management of Aquatic*  
628 *Ecosystems*, <https://doi.org/10.1051/kmae/2024003>.

629 Schmutz, S., & Mielach, C. (2013). Measures for ensuring fish migration at transversal structures. *ICPDR*  
630 *– International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River*. 2013.

631 Sih, A., Bell, A., & Johnson, J. C. (2004). Behavioral syndromes: an ecological and evolutionary overview.  
632 *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *19*, 372–378.

633 Silva, A. T., Lucas, M. C., Castro-Santos, T., Katopodis, C., Baumgartner, L. J., Thiem, J. D., ... Braun, D. C.  
634 (2018). The future of fish passage science, engineering, and practice. *Fish and Fisheries*, *19*, 340–362.

635 Starrs, D., Ebner, B. C., Lintermans, M., & Fulton, C. J. (2011). Using sprint swimming performance to  
636 predict upstream passage of the endangered Macquarie perch in a highly regulated river. *Fisheries*  
637 *Management and Ecology*, 18, 360–374.

638 Stelbrink, P., Grendelmeier, A., Schabo, D., Arlettaz, R., Hillig, F., & Pasinelli, G. (2019). Does acoustically  
639 simulated predation risk affect settlement and reproduction of a migratory passerine? *Ethology*, 125,  
640 535–547.

641 Stott, B. (1967). The Movements and Population Densities of Roach (*Rutilus rutilus* (L.)) and Gudgeon  
642 (*Gobio gobio* (L.)) in the River Mole. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 36, 407–423.

643 Sundström, L. F., & Johnsson, J. I. (2001). Experience and social environment influence the ability of  
644 young brown trout to forage on live novel prey. *Animal behaviour*, 61, 249–255.

645 Svensson, P. A., Barber, I., & Forsgren, E. (2000). Shoaling behaviour of the two-spotted goby. *Journal of*  
646 *Fish Biology*, 56, 1477–1487.

647 Tarena, F., Comoglio, C., Candiotta, A., & Nyqvist, D. (2024). Artificial light at night affects fish passage  
648 rates in two small-sized Cypriniformes fish. *Ecology of Freshwater Fish*, n/a, e12766.

649 Tétard, S., Maire, A., Lemaire, M., De Oliveira, E., Martin, P., & Courret, D. (2019). Behaviour of Atlantic  
650 salmon smolts approaching a bypass under light and dark conditions: Importance of fish development.  
651 *Ecological Engineering*, 131, 39–52.

652 Therneau, T. M., & Grambsch, P. M. (2000). *Modeling Survival Data: Extending the Cox Model*. Statistics  
653 for Biology and Health. New York, NY: Springer.

654 Therneau, T. M., & Lumley, T. (2017). Package ‘survival’.

655 Tudorache, C., Viaene, P., Blust, R., Vereecken, H., & De Boeck, G. (2008). A comparison of swimming  
656 capacity and energy use in seven European freshwater fish species. *Ecology of freshwater fish*, 17, 284–  
657 291.

658 Volpato, G. L., Barreto, R. E., Marcondes, A. L., Andrade Moreira, P. S., & de Barros Ferreira, M. F. (2009).  
659 Fish ladders select fish traits on migration—still a growing problem for natural fish populations. *Marine*  
660 *and Freshwater Behaviour and Physiology*, 42, 307–313.

661 Ward, A. J. W. (2012). Social facilitation of exploration in mosquitofish (*Gambusia holbrooki*). *Behavioral*  
662 *Ecology and Sociobiology*, 66, 223–230.

663 Watz, J. (2019). Structural complexity in the hatchery rearing environment affects activity, resting  
664 metabolic rate and post-release behaviour in brown trout *Salmo trutta*. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 95, 638–  
665 641.

666 Webster, M. M., Ward, A. J. W., & Hart, P. J. B. (2007). Boldness is influenced by social context in  
667 threespine sticklebacks (*Gasterosteus aculeatus*). *Behaviour*, 144, 351.

668 Wickham, H. (2016). *ggplot2: elegant graphics for data analysis*. Springer.

- 669 Williams, J., Armstrong, G., Katopodis, C., Larinier, M., & Travade, F. (2011). Thinking like a fish: a key  
670 ingredient for development of effective fish passage facilities at river obstructions. *River Research and*  
671 *Applications*, 28, 407–417.
- 672 Wilson, A. D., & McLaughlin, R. L. (2007). Behavioural syndromes in brook charr, *Salvelinus fontinalis*:  
673 prey-search in the field corresponds with space use in novel laboratory situations. *Animal Behaviour*, 74,  
674 689–698.
- 675 Wolf, M., & Weissing, F. J. (2012). Animal personalities: consequences for ecology and evolution. *Trends*  
676 *in ecology & evolution*, 27, 452–461.
- 677 Závorka, L., Aldvén, D., Näslund, J., Höjesjö, J., & Johnsson, J. I. (2016). Inactive trout come out at night:  
678 behavioral variation, circadian activity, and fitness in the wild. *Ecology*, 97, 2223–2231.
- 679 Zhang, C., Xu, M., Lei, F., Zhang, J., Kattel, G. R., & Duan, Y. (2022). Spatio-temporal distribution of  
680 *Gymnocypris przewalskii* during migration with UAV-based photogrammetry and deep neural network.  
681 *Journal of Ecohydraulics*, 7, 42–57.

682