

MixFishSim: highly resolved spatiotemporal simulations for exploring mixed fishery dynamics

Paul J. Dolder^{a,b,*}, C  il  n Minto^a, Jean-Marc Guarini^c, Jan Jaap Poos^d

^a*Galway-Mayo Institute of Technology (GMIT), Dublin Road, Galway, Ireland*

^b*Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (Cefas), Pakefield Road, Lowestoft, UK*

^c*Sorbonne Universit  , Faculty of Sciences ~~Universit   Pierre-et-Marie-Curie^{JM}~~, 4 Place Jussieu, 75005 Paris, France*

^d*Wageningen Marine Research, Haringkade 1 1976 CP IJmuiden, Netherlands*

Abstract

Most fisheries ~~Fishing~~^{JJ} exploits^{JJ} spatially and temporally heterogenous fish populations, using species-unselective gear that can result in unintended, unwanted catch of low quota or protected species. Reducing these unwanted catches is crucial for biological and economic sustainability of ‘mixed fisheries’ and implementation of an ecosystem approach to fishing.

To implement effective spatial measures to reduce discards a good understanding of spatiotemporal fishery dynamics is required. However, traditional scientific advice is limited by a lack of highly resolved knowledge of population distribution, movement and how fishers interact with different fish populations. This reflects that data on fish location at high temporal and spatial resolutions is expensive and difficult to collect and therefore proxies inferred from either scientific surveys or commercial catch data are often used to model distributions, often with limited spatial and temporal resolution.

To understand how resolution impacts mixed fisheries inference, we develop a highly resolved spatiotemporal simulation model incorporating: i) delay-

*Corresponding author

Email address: paul.dolder@gmit.ie (Paul J. Dolder)

difference population dynamics, ii) population movement using Gaussian Random Fields to simulate patchy, heterogenously distributed populations, and iii) fishery dynamics for multiple fleet characteristics based on targetting via correlated random walk movement and learned behaviour.

We simulate 20 years of exploitation of the fish populations and use the results from the fishing model to draw inference on the underlying population structures. We compare this inference to i) a simulated fixed-site sampling design commonly used for fisheries monitoring purposes, and ii) the true underlying population structures input to the simulation, to establish the potential and limitations of fishery-dependent data - an inherently biased sampling method due to fisher's targeting- to provide a robust picture of spatiotemporal distributions. Finally, we simulate an area closure based on areas defined from commercial the known ("real-population") distribution, commercial catch data and survey data at different temporal and spatial resolutions and assess their effectiveness on reducing catches of a fish population.

We conclude from our simulations that commercial data, while not unbiased, provides a useful tool for managing catches in mixed fisheries if applied at the correct spatiotemporal scale.

[333 words]

Keywords: Some, keywords, here. Max 6

2010 MSC: 00-01, 99-00

1. Introduction

Fishers exploit fish populations that are heterogenously distributed in space and time with varying knowledge of species distributions using species-unselective fishing gear. Fisheries that catch an assemblage of species, known as mixed fisheries may, ~~when managed by single species quotas can end up~~^{JJ} discarding^{JJ}

overquota catch when managed by single species quotas,^{JJ} leading to overex-
 ploitation of fish populations (Ulrich et al., 2011; Batsleer et al., 2015)^{JJ}. This
 discarding of fish in excess of quota hampers the ability to limit fishing mortal-
 ity to within sustainable limits (Alverson et al., 1994; Crowder and Murawski,
 1998; Rijnsdorp et al., 2007).^{JJ} Reducing discarding is crucial to ensure biological
 and economic sustainability of fisheries ~~and implementation of an ecosystem~~
~~approach to fisheries~~^{JJ} and. As such^{PD} there is increasing interest in technical
 solutions such as gear and spatial closures as ways of avoiding discarding of
 fish (Kennelly and Broadhurst, 2002; Catchpole and Revill, 2008; Bellido et al.,
 2011)s^{JJ}.

Use of spatial management as a tool has been proposed as a method to reduce
 discards (Holmes et al., 2011; Little et al., 2014; Dunn et al., 2014)^{PD}. How-
 ever, its implementation is hampered by lack of knowledge of fish and fishery
 spatiotemporal dynamics and understanding of the scale at which processes are
 important for management. Understanding the correct scale for spatial man-
 agement is crucial in order to implement measures at a resolution that ensures
 effective management (Dunn et al., 2016) while minimising economic impact.
 For example, a scale that promotes species avoidance for vulnerable or low
 quota species while allowing continuance of sustainable fisheries for available
 quota species.

Ensuring measures are implemented at an appropriate scale has been a chal-
 lenge in the past that has led to ineffectual measures with unintended conse-
 quences such as limited impact towards the management objective or increased
 benthic impact on previously unexploited areas (e.g. the cod closure in the
 North Sea (Rijnsdorp et al., 2001; Dinmore et al., 2003)). Since then more
 refined spatial information has become available through the combination of
 logbook and Vessel Monitoring System (VMS) data (Lee et al., 2010; Bastardie
 et al., 2010; Gerritsen et al., 2012; Mateo et al., 2016) and more real-time spatial
 management has been possible (e.g. Holmes et al., 2011). Such information is,

37 however, patchy and derived from an inherently biased sampling programme
38 (i.e. targeted fishing). Further, fishers generally only recorded landings (not
39 catch) on a daily basis. This leads to questions about the validity of inference
40 that can be drawn from landings data assigned to VMS activity pings.

Its not clear what the problem is: landings collected on daily basis or landings recorded rather than catch^{JJ}

41
42 In order to understand challenges that face VMS-linked landings to draw
43 inference on the underlying population structure we develop a simulation model
44 where population dynamics are highly-resolved in space and time and are known
45 rather than inferred from sampling or commercial catches. Population move-
46 ment is driven by a random (diffusive) and directed (advective) process and we
47 incorporate characterisation of a number of different fisheries exploiting four
48 fish populations with different spatial and population demographics.

This comes as a surprise: I thought this was going to be about discards^{JJ}

49
50 Using our model we simulate 20 years of exploitation of the fish populations
51 and use the results from the fishing model to draw inference on the underlying
52 population structures. We compare this inference to: i) a stratified fixed-site
53 sampling survey design commonly used for fisheries monitoring purposes, other-
54 wise know as a fisheries-independent survey, and ii) the underlying population
55 structures input to the simulation.

56
57 We simulate a fishery closure to protect one species based on the fishery-
58 dependent inferred distributions at a spatial and temporal scale typical in fish-
59 eries management, and assess a theoretical "benefit" to the population, and
60 effect on the other three populations. Further, we extend our analysis to a
61 range of spatial and temporal scales to assess the impact of these processes on
62 the success of the management measure.

If the paper has two goals this should be clear from the start, but may be better over 2 MSs^{JJ}

64 2. Materials and Methods

65 ~~A We developed and implemented a simulation model with a~~^{PD} modular

event-based simulation model was developed with approach, where sub-^{PD} modules
^{are}^{PD} implemented on independent time-scales appropriate to capture the char-
acteristic of the different processes~~process modelled~~^{PD} (Figure 1). The following
sub-modules were included to capture the full system: 1) Population dynamics,
2) Recruitment dynamics, 3) Population movement, 4) fishery dynamics.^{PD}

The fishing model operated on a tow-by-tow basis, while ^{PD} P^{PD} population
dynamics (fishing and natural mortality, growth) operate on a daily time-step,
while p.^{PD} population movement occurs on a weekly time-step. R,^{PD} while
^r^{PD} recruitment takes place~~occurs~~^{PD} periodically each year for a set time duration~~period~~^{PD}
(e.g. 3 weeks)^{PD} at a specified point individual to a species.^{PD}, while the fish-
ing module operates on a tow-by-tow basis (multiple events a day)^{PD}. The
simulation framework is implemented in the statistical software package R (R
Core Team, 2017) and^{PD} available as an R package from the authors github
(www.github.com/pdolder/MixFishSim).

Here we describe each of the model components; 1) Population dynamics, 2)
Recruitment dynamics, 3) Population movement dynamics, 4) fishery dynamics.^{PD}

2.1. Population dynamics

The basic population level processes are simulated using a modified two-
stage Deriso-Schnute delay difference model (Deriso, 1980; Schnute, 1985; Dich-
mont et al., 2003) occurring at a daily time-step. A daily time-step was cho-
sen as to discretise continuous population processes on a biologically relevant
and computationally tractable timescale.^{PD} Under the population dynamics
module~~Here~~,^{PD} population biomass growth and depletion for pre-recruits and
fish^{PD} recruited fish^{PD} to the fishery^{PD} are modelled separately as a function
of previous recruited biomass, intrinsic population growth and recruitment:




Figure 1: Overview Schematic of simulation model. The blue boxes indicate fleet dynamics processes, the green boxes population dynamics processes while the white boxes are the timesteps at which processes occur; $t = \text{tow}$, t_{max} is the total number of tows, wk is a weekly timestep, day is a day timestep, $trip$ is a trip time step. **I NEED TO REDO THIS TO MAKE NOTATION MORE CONCISE AND CONSISTENT**

$$\begin{aligned}
B_{c,d+1} = & \\
& (1 + \rho)B_{c,d} \cdot e^{-Z_{c,d}} - \rho \cdot e^{-Z_{c,d}} \quad \times \\
& (B_{c,d-1} \cdot e^{-Z_{c,d-1}} + Wt_{R-1} \cdot \alpha_{d-1} \cdot R_{\tilde{y}(c,y,d-1)}) \quad + \\
& Wt_R \cdot \alpha_d \cdot R_{\tilde{y}(c,y,d)}
\end{aligned}$$

93 where ρ is Brody's coefficient, shown to be approximately equal to $\exp(-K)$,
 94 where K is the growth rate from a von bertalanffy logistic growth model (Schnute,
 95 1985). Wt_{R-1} is the weight of fish prior to recruitment, while Wt_R is the re-
 96 cruited weight. α_d represents the proportion of fish recruited during that day
 97 for the year, while $R_{c,y}$ is the annual recruits in cell c for year y .

98

99 Mortality $Z_{c,d}$ can be decomposed to natural mortality, $M_{c,d}$, and fishing
 100 mortality, $F_{c,d}$, where both $M_{c,d}$ and $F_{c,d}$ are instantaneous rates with $M_{c,d}$
 101 fixed and $F_{c,d}$ calculated by solving the Baranov catch equation (Hilborn and
 102 Walters, 1992) for $F_{c,d}$:

$$C_{c,d} = \frac{F_{c,d}}{F_{c,d} + M_{c,d}} * (1 - e^{-(F_{c,d} + M_{c,d})}) * B_{c,d}$$

103 where $C_{c,d}$ is the summed catch from the fishing model across all fleets and
 104 vessels in cell c for the population during the day d , and $B_{c,d}$ the daily biomass
 105 for the population in the cell.

106

107 2.2. Recruitment dynamics

108 Recruitment is modelled through a function relating the mature biomass to
 109 recruits at time of recruitment. In *mixfishsim*, it can be modelled either either
 110 as a stochastic Beverton-Holt stock-recruit form (Beverton and Holt, 1957):

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{R}_{c,d} &= \frac{(\alpha * B_{c,d})}{(\beta + B_{c,d})} \\
R_{c,d} &\sim \log N[(\log(\bar{R}_{c,d}), \log(\sigma^2))]
\end{aligned}$$

[link F to effort
 and catchabil-
 ity - as I think
 we have F as
 an emergent
 property of the
 fleets rather
 than something
 we solve for (I
 could be wrong
 though!) -
 catch for a ves-
 sel is a product
 of catchability
 and biomass,
 i.e. $C = qB$,
 but this catch
 is summed to
 solve for F .
 So its both
 really]CM

Where α is the maximum recruitment rate, β the spawning stock biomass (SSB) required to produce half the maximum, B current SSB and σ^2 the variability in the recruitment due to stochastic processes.

114

or a stochastic Ricker form (Ricker, 1954):

$$\bar{R}_{c,d} = B_{c,d} * e^{(\alpha - \beta * B_{c,d})}$$

$$R_{c,d} \sim \log N[(\log(\bar{R}_{c,d}), \log(\sigma^2))]$$

where α is the maximum productivity per spawner and β the density dependent reduction in productivity as the SSB increases.

2.3. Population movement dynamics

To simulate ~~how~~^{JJ} fish populations ~~might be~~^{JJ} distributed^{JJ} in space and time, ~~we employed~~^{JJ} a Gaussian spatial process ~~was employed~~^{JJ} to model habitat suitability for each of the populations. ~~An, with an~~^{JJ} advection-diffusion process ~~to~~^{JJ} controlled^{JJ} ~~how the~~^{JJ} populations^{JJ} movement^{JJ} over time with a moving temperature covariate to capture temporal dependencies. ~~This was intended to balance realism in population movement, capturing the main directed and random processes, and practicality of modelling the population rather than individual fish.~~^{JJ}

127

For ~~the~~^{PD} habitat we defined^{PD} a Gaussian random field process, $\{S(c) : c \in \mathbb{R}^2\}$, ~~that is a stochastic process~~^{PD} where ~~for~~^{PD} any set of cells c_1, \dots, c_n ~~where for each $c_i \in \mathbb{R}^{2PD}$, the joint distribution of $S = \{S(c_1), \dots, S(c_n)\}$ is multivariate Gaussian. The distribution is specified by its mean function, $\mu(c) = E[S(c)]$ and its covariance function, $\gamma(c, c') = Cov\{S(c), S(c')\}$ (Diggle and Ribeiro, 2007).~~^{PD}

134

The covariance structure affects the smoothness of the surfaces which the process generates; ~~and~~^{PD} we used the *Matérn family of*^{PD} covariance struc-

What have a temperature covariate? Could just use time^{JJ} Was intended as some biological meaning - species thermal tolerances load onto the temperature effect^{PD}

Not clear how habitat/GRF affect local abundances, only have $B_{y,d}$ ^{JJ} Have included cell reference, c to make spatial link explicit^{PD}

Introduce the gamma function, and why this covariance structure? Why correlate values in the random field?^{JM} to

137 tures^{PD}, ~~as one where~~^{PD} the correlation strength weakens the further the dis-
 138 tance apart ~~(i.e. the correlation between $S(x)$ and $S(x')$ decreases as the~~
 139 ~~distance $u = ||x - x'||$ increases)~~^{PD}. The Matérn covariance structure models
 140 the spatial autocorrelation observed with animal distributions (Tobler, 1970;
 141 F. Dormann et al., 2007)^{PD} and ~~The Matérn correlation~~^{PD} is a two-parameter
 142 family where:

$$143 \quad \rho(u) = \{2^{\kappa-1}\Gamma\kappa\}^{-1}(u/\phi)^{\kappa}K_{\kappa}(u/\phi)$$

144 $K_{\kappa}(\cdot)$ is a modified Bessel function of order κ , $\phi > 0$ is a scale parameter
 145 with the dimensions of distance, and $\kappa > 0$, called the order, is a shape param-
 146 eter which determines the smoothness of the underlying process.

147
 148 ~~In the simulation model,~~^{PD} the habitat for each of the populations ~~was~~^{PD}
 149 ~~generated with~~^{PD} the *RFSimulate* function of the *RandomFields* R
 150 package (Schlatter et al., 2015), implementing different parameter settings to
 151 affect the patchiness of the populations. Each population ~~was~~^{PD} initialised at
 152 a single location, and subsequently ~~move~~^{PD} according to a probabilistic dis-
 153 tribu^{PD}tion based on habitat suitability, temperature and distance from current
 154 cell.^{PD}

$$Pr(J|I) = \frac{e^{-\lambda * d_{IJ}} \cdot (Hab_{J,p}^2 \cdot Tol_{J,p,wk})}{\sum_{c=1}^C e^{-\lambda * d} \cdot (Hab_{c,p}^2 \cdot Tol_{c,p,wk})} \quad (1)$$

155 Where d_{IJ} is the euclidean distance between cell I and cell J , λ is a given
 156 rate of decay, $Hab_{J,p}^2$ is the squared index of habitat suitability for cell J and
 157 population p , with $Tol_{J,p,wk}$ the temperature tolerance for cell J by population
 158 p in week wk .

159
 160 During specified weeks of the year, the habitat quality ~~was~~^{PD} modified for
 161 ~~user-defined~~^{PD} spawning habitats^{PD}, ~~resulting in~~^{PD} each population
 162 ~~had~~^{PD} a concentrated area where spawning takes place and the population

163 moved^{PD} towards these cell^{PD} in the weeks prior to spawning.

164

165 The temperature field ^{PD} simulated to be on a gradient from a South-
166 Westerly to North-Easterly direction, with temperature in each cell changing
167 gradually on a week-by-week basis so that initially high temperature areas cy-
168 cled^{PD} to lower temperatures and low temperature areas vice versa. Each pop-
169 ulation p was^{PD} assigned a thermal tolerance with mean, μ_p^{PD} and variance,
170 σ_p^2 so that each cell and population temperature suitability is defined that:

$$Tol_{c,p,wk}^{\text{PD}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(2\pi \cdot \sigma_p^2)}} \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{(T_{c,wk}^{\text{PD}} - \mu_p^{\text{PD}})^2}{2 \cdot \sigma_p^2}\right) \quad (2)$$

171 Where $Tol_{c,p,wk}^{\text{PD}}$ is the tolerance of population p in cell c in week wk^{PD} ,
172 $T_{c,wk}^{\text{PD}}$ is the temperature in the cell given the week^{PD} and μ_p^{PD} and σ_p^2
173 the mean and standard deviation of the population temperature tolerance.

174

175 The final process resulted in independent populations structure and move-
176 ment patterns, with population movement occurring on a weekly basis. This
177 process approximated the demographic shifts in fish populations throughout a
178 year while maintaining seasonal patterns for spawning.^{PD}

179 2.4. Fleet dynamics

180 The fleet dynamics can be broadly categorised into three components; fleet
181 targeting - which determined^{PD} the fleet catch efficiency and preference towards
182 a particular species; trip-level decisions, which determined^{PD} the initial location
183 to be fished at the beginning of a trip; and within-trip decisions, determining
184 movement from one fishing spot to another within a trip.

185 2.4.1. Fleet targeting

186 Each fleet of n vessels was^{PD} characterised by both a general efficiency, Q ,
187 and a population specific efficiency, Q_p . Thus, the product of these parameters
188 affected^{PD} the overall catch rates for the fleet and the preferential targeting of
189 one population over another. This, in combination with the parameter choice

What does
it mean con-
cisely? Areas
are assigned?^{JM}
Yes, the ar-
eas are pre-
defined - I have
amended to re-
flect and tried
to clarify.^{PD}

for the step-function defined below^{PD} (as well as some randomness from the exploratory fishing process) determined^{PD} the preference of fishing locations for the fleet. All species prices ~~were~~^{are}^{PD} kept the same, across fleets and seasons, ~~though can be made to vary seasonally~~^{PD}.

2.4.2. Trip-level decisions

Several studies (e.g. Hutton et al., 2004; Tidd et al., 2012; Girardin et al., 2015) have confirmed past activity and past catch rates are strong predictors of fishing location choice. For this reason, the fleet dynamics sub-model included^{PD} a learning component, where a vessel's initial fishing location in a trip ~~was~~^{is}^{PD} based on selecting from previously successful fishing locations. This ~~was~~^{is}^{PD} achieved by sorting all previous fishing events in the previous trip as well as the previous time periods in past years, and choosing randomly from the top 75 % of fishing events as defined by the revenue gained~~in value~~^{PD}. Simulation testing indicated that this learning increased the mean value of catches for the vessels, over just relying on the correlated random walk function as described for the 'within trip' decisions below^{PD}.

Correlated random walk of what^{JJ}

2.4.3. Within-trip decisions

Fishing locations within a trip are determined by a modified random walk process. A random walk type was chosen as it is the simplest assumption commonly used in ecology to describe optimal^{PD} animal ~~movement which~~^{PD} search ~~strategising~~^{PD} for exploiting^{PD} homogeneously distributed prey about which there is uncertain knowledge (Viswanathan et al., 1999). In a random walk, movement is a stochastic process through a series of steps. ~~These steps have a length, and a direction~~^{JJ} that can either be equal in length or take some other functional form. The direction of the random walk can be correlated, a characteristic known as 'persistence', providing some overall ~~location of~~^{PD} directional movement (Codling et al., 2008) ~~or uncorrelated~~^{PD}.

A *Lévy flight*~~levy walk~~^{JJ} is a particular form of random walk characterised by

219 a heavy-tailed distribution of step-length . The Lévy flight^{JJ} has received a
 220 lot of attention in ecological theory in recent years as having shown to have very
 221 similar characteristics as those observed by animals in nature, and being a near
 222 optimum searching strategy for predators pursuing patchily distributed prey
 223 (Viswanathan et al., 1999; Bartumeus et al., 2005; Sims et al., 2008). Bertrand
 224 et al. (2007) showed that Peruvian anchovy fishermen have a stochastic search
 225 pattern similar to that observed with a lévy walk. However, it remains a subject
 226 of debate (e.g. see Edwards, 2011; Reynolds, 2015)^{PD}, with the contention that
 227 search patterns may be more simply characterised as random walks (Sakiyama
 228 and Gunji, 2013) with specific patterns related to the characteristics of the prey
 229 field (Sims et al., 2012).

230

We use a modified random walk where directional change is based on a correlated circular distribution where a favourable fishing ground is likely to be “fished back over” by the vessel returning in the direction it came from and step length (i.e. the distance travelled from the current to the next fishing location) is determined by relating^{JJ} recent fishing success, measured as the summed value of fish caught (revenue, *Rev*),

$$Rev = \sum_{p=1}^P \underline{LC}^{\text{PD}}_p \cdot Pr_p$$

231 where $\underline{LC}^{\text{PD}}_p$ is landingseatch^{PD} of a population p , and Pr_p price of a popula-
 232 tion, to step distance. Here, when fishing is successful vessels remain in a similar
 233 location and continue to exploit the local fishing grounds. When unsuccessful,
 234 they move some distance away from the current fishing location. The movement
 235 distance retains some degree of stochasticity, which can be controlled separately.

236 The step function takes the form:

$$StepL = e^{\log(\beta_1) + \log(\beta_2) - (\log(\frac{\beta_1}{\beta_3}))} * Rev$$

237

238 So that, a step from (x1,y1) to (x2, y2) is defined by:

So step length increases with increasingly gross revenue?^{JJ} No, the opposite^{PD}

$$\begin{aligned}
(x2, y2) &= x1 + StepL \cdot \cos\left(\frac{\pi \cdot Br}{180}\right), \\
& y1 + StepL \cdot \sin\left(\frac{\pi \cdot Br}{180}\right) \\
\text{with } Br_{t-1} &< 180, Br_t = 180 + \sim vm[(0, 360), k] \\
Br_{t-1} &> 180, Br_t = 180 - \sim vm[(0, 360), k]
\end{aligned}$$

239 with k the concentration parameter from the von Mm^{JJ} ises distribution
 240 which we correlate with the revenue so that $k = (Rev + 1/RefRev) * max_k$,
 241 where max_k is the maximum concentration value, k , and RefRev is parame-
 242 terised as for β_3 in the step length function.

243 2.4.4. Local population depletion

244 Where several fishing vessels are exploiting the same fish population compe-
 245 tition is known to play an important role in local distribution of fishing effort
 246 (Gillis and Peterman, 1998). If several vessels are fishing on the same patch of
 247 fish, local depletion and interference $competition^{JJ}$ will affect fishing location
 248 choice of the fleet as a whole (Rijnsdorp, 2000; Poos and Rijnsdorp, 2007). In
 249 order to account for this behaviour, the fishing sub-model operates spatially on
 250 a daily time-step so that for future days the biomass available to the fishery
 251 is reduced in the areas fished. The cumulative effect is to make heavily fished
 252 areas less attractive as future fishing opportunities.

253 2.5. Fisheries independent survey

254 A fisheries-independent survey is simulated where fishing on a regular grid
 255 begins each year at the same time for a given number of stations (a fixed station
 256 survey design). Catches of the populations at each station $present^{JJ}$ are recorded
 257 but not removed from the population. This provides a fishery independent
 258 snapshot of the populations at a regular spatial $intervalsdistribution^{JJ}$ each
 259 year, similar to scientific surveys undertaken by fisheries research agencies.

260 3. Calculation

261 3.1. Population parameterisation

262 We parameterised the simulation model for four populations with differing
263 habitat preference, ~~and~~ temperature tolerances (Figures S1, S3, S4, S5, S6, S7),
264 population demographic, ~~and~~ recruitment functions. In addition, each of the
265 populations has two defined spawning areas which result in the populations
266 moving towards these areas in given weeks (Figure S2) and population-specific
267 movement rates (Table 4). The realised movement of the populations for a num-
268 ber of weeks is shown in Figure S9 while the realised daily fishing mortality are
269 shown in Figure S10.

271 3.2. Fleet parameterisation

272 The fleets were parameterised to reflect five different characteristics based
273 on targeting preference and exploitation dynamics (Table 5). ~~Setting a tar-~~
274 ~~geting parameter (Q) that differed across fleets ensured different spatial dy-~~
275 ~~namics, due to preferential targeting of populations that differ in their spatial~~
276 ~~distributions. This ensures that different fleets have different spatial dynamics,~~
277 ~~preferentially targeted different fish populations^{PD}.~~ The stochasticity in the
278 random walk process ensures that different vessels within a fleet have slightly
279 different spatial distributions based on individual experience, while the step
280 function was parameterised dynamically so that vessels take smaller steps where
281 the fishing location yields in a top quartile of the value available in that year
282 (as defined per fleet in Table 5).

283
284 Each fleet was set so that, after the first year, fishing locations were chosen
285 based on experience built up in the same month from previous years and from
286 past trip fishing success. 'Success' in this context was defined as the locations
287 where the top 75 % of revenue from was found in previous trips.

288 An example of the realised fleet movements for a single vessel during a single
289 trip are given in Figure S11, while Figure S12 shows multiple trips for a single

290 vessel, [Figure^{PD} S13](#) the vessel movements for some trips overlaid on the value
 291 field, [Figure^{PD} S14](#) shows fishing locations for an entire fleet of 20 vessels for
 292 a single trip, and [Figure^{PD} S15](#) shows an example of the step function
 293 realisation and turning angles from the correlated random walk.

294 3.3. Survey settings

295 The survey simulation was set up with follow a fixed gridded station design
 296 with 100 stations fished each year, starting on day 92 and ending on day 112
 297 (5 stations per day)^{PD} with same catchability parameters for all populations
 298 ($Q_p = 1$).

299 3.4. Simulation settings

300 To illustrate the capabilities on *MixFishSim*, we investigate the influence
 301 of the temporal and spatial resolution of different data sources on the reduc-
 302 tion in catches of a population given spatial closures. To do so, we first set up
 303 with simulation to run for 10 years based on a 100 X 100 square grid, with five
 304 fleets of 20 vessels each and four fish populations. Fishing takes place four times
 305 a day per vessel and five days a week, while population movement is every week.

306
 307 We allow the simulation to run unrestricted for 5 years, and subsequently
 308 close areas for the last 5 years of the simulation based on data (either derived
 309 from the commercial catches, fisheries-independent survey or the 'real popu-
 310 lation' - the underlying populations assumed to be known perfectly) used at
 311 different spatial and temporal scales.

312
 313 The following steps are undertaken to determine closures:

- 314 1. Extract data source
- 315 2. Aggregate according to resolution
- 316 3. Interpolate across entire area at desired resolution
- 317 4. Close top 5 % of areas

Move some of the supplementary figures to the manuscript^{JJ}

move to start of methods section^{JJ} I think ecological modelling wants the 'calculations' section here..will check^{PD}

Is there equilibrium after 5 years or still some trend in B^{JJ} Not at equilibrium yet...I need to rerun until steady state, looks 20 years. Will update^{PD}

Procedure unclear. Refer to symbols in methods section or switch order starting with description of data type etc..^{JJ} Yes, will redo^{PD}

318 In total 56 closure scenarios were run which represent combinations of

- 319 • **data types:** commercial logbook data, survey data and 'real population',
- 320 • **temporal resolutions:** weekly, monthly and yearly closures,
- 321 • **spatial resolutions:** 1 x 1 grid, 5 x 5 grid, 10 x 10 grid and 20 x 20 grid.

322 Survey closures were on an annual basis only, as this was the most temporally
323 resolved survey data available.

324 4. Results

325 The species distribution themselves

326 The consequences of different spatial aggregations of the data are shown in
327 Figure 2, which represents the aggregation of catch from each of the data sources
328 over a year at different spatial resolutions.

329
330 The finer spatial grid for the the real population (top left) and commercial
331 data (top middle) show similar patterns, though there are unsampled gaps in
332 the commercial data from a lack of fishing activity (particularly in the lower left
333 part of the sampling domain). The survey data at this spatial resolution shows
334 very sparse and uninformative information about the spatial distributions of the
335 populations. The slightly aggregated data on a 5 x 5 grid shows similar patterns,
336 and while losing some of the spatial detail there remains good consistency be-
337 tween the 'real population' and the commercial data. Survey data starts to pick
338 out some of the similar patterns as the other data sources, but lacks coverage.
339 The spatial catch information on a 10 x 10 and 20 x 20 grid loses a signifi-
340 cant amount of information about the spatial resolutions for all data sources,
341 and some differences between the commercial and 'real population' data emerge.

342
343 Figure 3 shows the consequences of different temporal aggregations of the
344 data, with 156 weekly (top), 36 monthly (middle) and 3 yearly (bottom) catch

345 compositions across a 20 x 20 area.

346

347 As can be seen from the 'real population', the monthly aggregation captures
348 the major patterns seen in the weekly data, albeit missing more subtle differ-
349 ences. The yearly data results in a constant catch pattern due to the aggregation
350 process (sometimes known as an aggregation bias). The commercial data on a
351 weekly basis shows some of the same patterns as the 'real population', though
352 the first species (in red) is less well represented and some weeks are missing
353 catches from the area. The monthly data. The monthly data shows some con-
354 sistency between the 'real population' and commercial data for species 2 - 4,
355 though species 1 remains underrepresented. On an annual basis, interestingly
356 the commercial data underrepresents the first species (in red) while the survey
357 overrepresents species 1. This is likely due to the biases in commercial sampling,
358 with the fisheries not targeting the areas where species 1 are present, and the
359 biases in the survey sampling from overrepresentation of the spatial distribution.

360

361 We implemented a spatial closure using the different data sources and spatial
362 and temporal aggregations as outlined in the protocol in Section 3.4. We used
363 this to assess the efficacy of a closure in reducing fishing mortality on species 1,
364 given availability of data and its use at different resolutions in order to evaluate
365 the trade-offs in data sources. Figure 4 shows the trend in fishing mortality
366 for each species simulated (columns) given the data sources (rows), temporal
367 aggregations (colour lines) and spatial aggregations (linestyles), while Figure 5
368 shows the change in fishing mortality from before the closure (average F years
369 2 - 4) to after the closure (average F years 8 - 10).

370

371 For the closures based on 'real population' (bottom row), the most disag-
372 gregated data (a weekly timescale and 1 x 1 resolution) was most effective,
373 reducing fishing mortality on species 1 (left) by ~ 60 %. Next was the monthly
374 closures ($< \sim 30$ %). The least effective were the yearly closures (blue lines)
375 at all spatial resolutions, which resulted in increased fishing mortalities (> 30

376 % - N.B. Note though, this is consistent with the increasing trends in F, which
377 is probably more related to the fact that Fs hadn't stabilised in the simulation
378 from the fishing vessels "learning" the best locations - I will rerun the sims for
379 a longer time (20 - 30 years).

380

381 For the survey data, which can only be implemented on a yearly timescale,
382 the closures had no effect at any data resolution. The results are identical for
383 the different data resolutions except 20 x 20, which is why you can't see more
384 than 2 points. This is because of the sparsity of the sampling locations.

385

386 For the commercial data, the most effective closure scenario was based on 1
387 x 1 data at a monthly temporal resolution. This results in ~ 10 % reduction
388 in F for species 1. This was the only closure scenario to have positive effect
389 according to Figure 5, though looking at the trend in Figure 4 this looks more
390 related to the continued increased in F trend, as other scenarios had an initial
391 effect. Interestingly the monthly data scenario was more effective than weekly
392 data, which I'd posit is due to the increase amount of data available from the
393 commercial sampling across a month compared to a week. Commercial data
394 used at an annual timestep was ineffective in bringing fishing mortality down
395 for species 1.

396

397 Given the scenarios above, it seems clear that spatial disaggregation is more
398 important than the temporal disaggregation of the commercial data, except
399 when its used at an annual timeframe, which is the scenario that gave the worst
400 results.

401 For the other species in the simulation (population 2 - 4) there was little
402 difference in fishing mortalities across scenarios.

403 Note: The monthly commercial data scenario is the most effective of the
404 realistic scenarios, as the 'real population' can only be seen as a baseline com-
405 parison.

406 **5. Discussion**

407 **6. Conclusions**

408 **Appendices**

409 **Abbreviations**

410 Detail any unusual ones used.

411 **Acknowledgements**

412 those providing help during the research..

413 **Funding**

414 This work was supported by the MARES doctoral training program; and the
415 Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science seedcorn program.

Table 1: Description of variables for population dynamics sub-module

Variable	Meaning	Units
Population dynamics		
<i>Delay-difference model</i>		
$B_{c,d}$	Biomass in cell c and day d	kg
$Z_{c,d}$	Total mortality in cell c for day d	-
$R_{c,\bar{y}}$	Annually recruited fish in cell	yr ⁻¹
ρ	Brody's growth coefficient	yr ⁻¹
Wt_R	Weight of a fully recruited fish	kg
Wt_{R-1}	Weight of a pre-recruit fish	kg
α_d	Proportion of annually recruited fish recruited during day d	-
<i>Baranov catch equation</i>		
$C_{c,d}$	Catch from cell c for day d	kg
$F_{c,d}$	Instantaneous rate of fishing mortality in cell c on day d	-
$M_{c,d}$	Instantaneous rate of natural mortality in cell c on day d	-
$B_{c,d}$	Biomass in cell c on day d	kg
Recruitment dynamics		
$\tilde{R}_{c,d}$	is the recruitment in cell c for day d	d^{-1}
$B_{c,d}$	is the Biomass in cell c for day d	d^{-1}
α	the maximum recruitment rate	kg
β	the biomass required to produce half the maximum rate of recruitment	kg

Table 2: Description of variables for population movement sub-module

Variable	Meaning	Units
Population movement dynamics		
<i>Habitat model</i>		
a	b	c
<i>Thermal tolerance</i>		
$T_{c,wk}$	Temperature for cell in week	°C
μ_p	Mean of the thermal tolerance for population	°C
σ_p^2	Standard deviation of thermal tolerance for the population	°C
<i>Population movement model</i>		
λ	decay rate for population movement	-
$Hab_{c,p}^2$	Square of habitat suitability for cell c and population p	-
$Tol_{c,p,wk}$	Thermal tolerance for population p in cell c at week wk	-
d_{IJ}	euclidean distance between cell I and cell J	-

Table 3: Description of variables for fleet dynamics sub-module

Variable	Meaning	Units
Short-term fleet dynamics		
Rev	Revenue from fishing tow	€
L_p	Landings of population p	kg
Pr_p	Average price of population p	€ kg ⁻¹
StepL	Step length for vessel	euclidean distance
Br	Bearing	degrees
k	Concentration parameter for Von mises distribution	-
β_1	shape parameter for step function	-
β_2	shape parameter for step function	-
β_3	shape parameter for step function	-

Table 4: Population dynamics and movement parameter setting

Parameter	Pop 1	Pop 2	Pop 3	Pop 4
Habitat quality				
Matérn ν	1/0.15	1/0.05	1/0.55	1/0.05
Matérn κ	1	2	1	1
Anisotropy	1.5,3,-3,4	1,2,-1,2	2.5,1,-1,2	0.1,2,-1,0.2
Spawning areas (bound box)	40,50,40,50; 80,90,60,70	50,60,30,40; 80,90,90,90	30,34,10,20; 60,70,20,30	50,55,80,85; 30,40,30,40
Spawning multiplier	10	10	10	10
Movement λ	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
Population dynamics				
Starting Biomass	1e5	2e5	1e5	1e4
Beverton-Holt Recruit 'a'	60	100	80	2
Beverton-Holt Recruit 'b'	250	250	200	50
Beverton-Holt Recruit σ^2	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.3
Recruit week	13-16	12-16	14-16	16-20
Spawn week	16-18	16-19	16-18	18-20
K	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3
wt	1	1	1	1
wt_{d-1}	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
M (annual)	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1

Table 5: Fleet dynamics parameter setting

Parameter	Fleet 1	Fleet 2	Fleet 3	Fleet 4	Fleet 5
Targeting preferences					
Price Pop1	100	100	100	100	100
Price Pop2	200	200	200	200	200
Price Pop3	600	600	600	600	600
Price Pop4	1600	1600	1600	1600	1600
Q Pop1	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01
Q Pop2	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.03
Q Pop3	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02
Q Pop4	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.01
Exploitation dynamics					
step function β_1	1	2	1	2	3
step function β_2	10	10	8	12	7
step function β_3	Q90	Q90	Q85	Q90	Q80
step function $rate$	10	20	15	25	10
Past Knowledge	T	T	T	T	T
Past Year & Month	T	T	T	T	T
Past Trip	T	T	T	T	T
Threshold	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75




Figure 2: Data aggregation at different spatial resolutions




Figure 3: Data aggregation at different temporal resolutions




Figure 4: Comparison of closure scenarios - F trends




Figure 5: Comparison of closure scenarios

416 **References**

- 417 Alverson, D.L., Freeberg, M.H., Murawski, S.A., Pope, J., 1994. A global as-
418 sessment of fisheries bycatch and discards.
- 419 Bartumeus, F., Da Luz, M.G.E., Viswanatham, G.M., Catalan, J., 2005. Animal
420 Search Strategies: A Quantitative Random Walk Analysis. *Ecological Society*
421 *of America* 86, 3078–3087.
- 422 Bastardie, F., Nielsen, J.R., Ulrich, C., Egekvist, J., Degel, H., 2010. De-
423 tailed mapping of fishing effort and landings by coupling fishing logbooks
424 with satellite-recorded vessel geo-location. *Fisheries Research* 106, 41–53.
- 425 Batsleer, J., Hamon, K.G., Overzee, H.M.J., Rijnsdorp, A.D., Poos, J.J., 2015.
426 High-grading and over-quota discarding in mixed fisheries. *Reviews in Fish*
427 *Biology and Fisheries* 25, 715–736.
- 428 Bellido, J.M., Santos, M.B., Pennino, M.G., Valeiras, X., Pierce, G.J., 2011.
429 Fishery discards and bycatch: Solutions for an ecosystem approach to fisheries
430 management?
- 431 Bertrand, S., Bertrand, A., Guevara-Carrasco, R., Gerlotto, F., 2007. Scale-
432 invariant movements of fishermen: The same foraging strategy as natural
433 predators. *Ecological Applications* 17, 331–337.
- 434 Beverton, R.J., Holt, S.J., 1957. *On the Dynamics of Exploited Fish Populations*
435 , 533.
- 436 Catchpole, T.L., Revill, A.S., 2008. Gear technology in Nephrops trawl fisheries.
437 *Reviews in Fish Biology and Fisheries* 18, 17–31.
- 438 Codling, E.A., Plank, M.J., Benhamou, S., Interface, J.R.S., 2008. Random
439 walk models in biology. *Journal of the Royal Society, Interface / the Royal*
440 *Society* 5, 813–34.
- 441 Crowder, L.B., Murawski, S.A., 1998. Fisheries Bycatch: Implications for Man-
442 agement. *Fisheries* 23, 8–17.

443 Deriso, R.B., 1980. Harvesting Strategies and Parameter Estimation for an Age-
444 Structured Model. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 37,
445 268–282. [arXiv:1410.7455v3](#).

446 Dichmont, C.M., Punt, A.E., Deng, A., Dell, Q., Venables, W., 2003. Applica-
447 tion of a weekly delay-difference model to commercial catch and effort data
448 for tiger prawns in Australia ’ s Northern Prawn Fishery. *Fisheries Research*
449 65, 335–350.

450 Diggle, P.J., Ribeiro, P.J., 2007. *Model-based Geostatistics* (Springer Series in
451 Statistics). volume 1.

452 Dinmore, T.A., Duplisea, D.E., Rackham, B.D., Maxwell, D.L., Jennings, S.,
453 2003. Impact of a large-scale area closure on patterns of fishing disturbance
454 and the consequences for benthic communities. *ICES Journal of Marine Sci-*
455 *ence* 60, 371–380.

456 Dunn, D.C., Boustany, A.M., Roberts, J.J., Brazer, E., Sanderson, M., Gardner,
457 B., Halpin, P.N., 2014. Empirical move-on rules to inform fishing strategies:
458 A New England case study. *Fish and Fisheries* 15, 359–375.

459 Dunn, D.C., Maxwell, S.M., Boustany, A.M., Halpin, P.N., 2016. Dynamic
460 ocean management increases the efficiency and efficacy of fisheries manage-
461 ment. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* , 201513626.

462 Edwards, A.M., 2011. Overturning conclusions of Lévy flight movement patterns
463 by fishing boats and foraging animals. *Ecology* 92, 1247–1257.

464 F. Dormann, C., M. McPherson, J., B. Araújo, M., Bivand, R., Bolliger, J.,
465 Carl, G., G. Davies, R., Hirzel, A., Jetz, W., Daniel Kissling, W., Kühn, I.,
466 Ohlemüller, R., R. Peres-Neto, P., Reineking, B., Schröder, B., M. Schurr,
467 F., Wilson, R., 2007. Methods to account for spatial autocorrelation in the
468 analysis of species distributional data: A review. *Ecography* 30, 609–628.

469 Gerritsen, H.D., Lordan, C., Minto, C., Kraak, S.B.M., 2012. Spatial patterns
470 in the retained catch composition of Irish demersal otter trawlers: High-

471 resolution fisheries data as a management tool. *Fisheries Research* 129-130,
472 127–136.

473 Gillis, D.M., Peterman, R.M., 1998. Implications of interference among fishing
474 vessels and the ideal free distribution to the interpretation of CPUE. *Canadian*
475 *Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences* 55, 37–46.

476 Girardin, R., Vermard, Y., Thébaud, O., Tidd, A., Marchal, P., 2015. Predicting
477 fisher response to competition for space and resources in a mixed demersal
478 fishery. *Ocean & Coastal Management* 106, 124–135.

479 Hilborn, R., Walters, C., 1992. Quantitative fisheries stock assessment: Choice,
480 dynamics and uncertainty. volume 2. [arXiv:1011.1669v3](#).

481 Holmes, S.J., Bailey, N., Campbell, N., Catarino, R., Barratt, K., Gibb, A., Fer-
482 nandes, P.G., 2011. Using fishery-dependent data to inform the development
483 and operation of a co-management initiative to reduce cod mortality and cut
484 discards. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 68, 1679–1688.

485 Hutton, T., Mardle, S., Pascoe, S., Clark, R.a., 2004. Modelling fishing location
486 choice within mixed fisheries: English North Sea beam trawlers in 2000 and
487 2001. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 61, 1443–1452.

488 Kennelly, S.J., Broadhurst, M.K., 2002. By-catch begone: Changes in the phi-
489 losophy of fishing technology. *Fish and Fisheries* 3, 340–355.

490 Lee, J., South, A.B., Jennings, S., 2010. Developing reliable, repeatable, and
491 accessible methods to provide high-resolution estimates of fishing-effort distri-
492 butions from vessel monitoring system (VMS) data. *ICES Journal of Marine*
493 *Science* 67, 1260–1271.

494 Little, A.S., Needle, C.L., Hilborn, R., Holland, D.S., Marshall, C.T., 2014.
495 Real-time spatial management approaches to reduce bycatch and discards:
496 experiences from Europe and the United States. *Fish and Fisheries* , n/a–
497 n/a.

498 Mateo, M., Pawlowski, L., Robert, M., 2016. Highly mixed fisheries: fine-scale
 499 spatial patterns in retained catches of French fisheries in the Celtic Sea. ICES
 500 Journal of Marine Science: Journal du Conseil , fsw129.

501 Poos, J.J., Rijnsdorp, A.D., 2007. An "experiment" on effort allocation of fishing
 502 vessels: the role of interference competition and area specialization. Canadian
 503 Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 64, 304–313.

504 R Core Team, 2017. R Core Team (2017). R: A language and environment for
 505 statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Aus-
 506 tria. URL <http://www.R-project.org/> , R Foundation for Statistical Com-
 507 puting.

508 Reynolds, A., 2015. Liberating Lévy walk research from the shackles of optimal
 509 foraging.

510 Ricker, W.E., 1954. Stock and recruitment. Journal of the Fisheries Research
 511 Board of Canada 11, 559 – 623.

512 Rijnsdorp, A., 2000. Competitive interactions among beam trawlers exploiting
 513 local patches of flatfish in the North Sea. ICES Journal of Marine Science 57,
 514 894–902.

515 Rijnsdorp, a.D., Daan, N., Dekker, W., Poos, J.J., Van Densen, W.L.T., 2007.
 516 Sustainable use of flatfish resources: Addressing the credibility crisis in mixed
 517 fisheries management. Journal of Sea Research 57, 114–125.

518 Rijnsdorp, A.D., Piet, G.J., Poos, J.J., 2001. Effort allocation of the Dutch
 519 beam trawl fleet in response to a temporarily closed area in the North Sea.
 520 Ices Cm 2001/N: 01 , 1–17.

521 Sakiyama, T., Gunji, Y.P., 2013. Emergence of an optimal search strategy from
 522 a simple random walk. Journal of the Royal Society, Interface 10, 20130486.

523 Schlater, M., Malinowski, A., Menck, P.J., 2015. Analysis, Simulation and Pre-
 524 diction of Multivariate Random Fields with Package RandomFields. Journal
 525 of Statistical Software 63, 1–25. [arXiv:1501.0228](https://arxiv.org/abs/1501.0228).

526 Schnute, J., 1985. A general theory for analysis of catch and effort data. Canadian
527 Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 42, 414–429.

528 Sims, D.W., Humphries, N.E., Bradford, R.W., Bruce, B.D., 2012. Lévy flight
529 and Brownian search patterns of a free-ranging predator reflect different prey
530 field characteristics. Journal of Animal Ecology 81, 432–442.

531 Sims, D.W., Southall, E.J., Humphries, N.E., Hays, G.C., Bradshaw, C.J.A.,
532 Pitchford, J.W., James, A., Ahmed, M.Z., Brierley, A.S., Hindell, M.A., Mor-
533 ritt, D., Musyl, M.K., Righton, D., Shepard, E.L.C., Wearmouth, V.J., Wil-
534 son, R.P., Witt, M.J., Metcalfe, J.D., 2008. Scaling laws of marine predator
535 search behaviour. Nature 451, 1098–U5.

536 Tidd, A.N., Hutton, T., Kell, L.T., Blanchard, J.L., 2012. Dynamic prediction
537 of effort reallocation in mixed fisheries. Fisheries Research 125–126, 243–253.

538 Tobler, W.R., 1970. A Computer Movie Simulating Urban Growth in the Detroit
539 Region. Economic Geography 46, 234. [arXiv:1011.1669v3](#).

540 Ulrich, C., Reeves, S.a., Vermard, Y., Holmes, S.J., Vanhee, W., 2011. Re-
541 conciling single-species TACs in the North Sea demersal fisheries using the
542 Fcube mixed-fisheries advice framework. ICES Journal of Marine Science 68,
543 1535–1547.

544 Viswanathan, G.M., Buldyrev, S.V., Havlin, S., Da Luz, M.G.E., Raposo, E.P.,
545 Stanley, H.E., 1999. Optimizing the success of random searches. Nature 401,
546 911–914.