Supplementary Material

The distribution and abundance of electrosensory pores in two benthic sharks: a comparison of the wobbegong shark *Orectolobus maculatus* and the angel shark *Squatina australis*

Channing A. Egeberg[A], *Ryan M. Kempster*[A,C], *Susan M. Theiss*[B], *Nathan S. Hart*[A] *and Shaun P. Collin*[A]

[A]The UWA Oceans Institute and the School of Animal Biology, The University of Western Australia, 35 Stirling Highway, Crawley, WA 6009, Australia.
[B]Fisheries Queensland, Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, GPO Box 46, Brisbane, Queensland 4001, Australia.
[C]Corresponding author. Email: ryankempster@supportoursharks.com

Table S1.   Mean total abundance of electrosensory pores in *Orectolobus maculatus* and *Squatina australis*

Data are presented as the mean number of pores ± one standard deviation and the range. '*' denotes a statistically significant difference in pore abundance between species (two-sample t-test with a P-value ≤ 0.001)

Genus	Species	n	Ventral*		Dorsal*		Total*	
Squatina	*australis*	8	76.4 ± 4.9		174.9 ± 8.8		251.3 ± 9.8	
			66 - 82		164 - 192		237 - 269	
Orectolobus	*maculatus*	4	45.3 ± 2.9		526.8 ± 9.4		572.0 ± 7.7	
			41 - 47		515 - 538		561 - 579	