

# Best practices for modeling time-varying selectivity

Steven Martell and Ian Stewart  
International Pacific Halibut Commission  
2320 W Commodore Way, Suite 300,  
Seattle WA, 98199-1287

2013-01-10

## Abstract

Changes in the observed size- or age-composition of commercial catch can occur for a variety of reasons including: market demand, availability, temporal changes in growth, time-area closures, regulations, or change in fishing practice, to name but a few. Two common approaches for dealing with time-varying selectivity in assessment models are the use of discrete time-blocks associated with an epoch in the history of the fishery, or the use of penalized random walk models for parametric or non-parametric selectivity curves. Time block periods, or penalty weights associated with time-varying selectivity parameters, are subjective and often developed on an ad hoc basis. A factorial simulation-estimation experiment, with discrete or continuous changes in selectivity, is conducted to determine the best practices for modeling time-varying selectivity in fisheries stock assessments. Both the statistical properties of the assessment model and the policy implications of choosing the wrong model are taken into consideration.

## Introduction

There are many reasons for selectivity to vary over time and the impact of ignoring changes in selectivity in age- or size-structured stock assessment models leads to biased estimates of abundance and mortality rates. Moreover, not accounting for changes in selectivity can lead to extremely optimistic projections in stock abundance (e.g., 2J3KL cod stocks).

Currently there are two general approaches for incorporating time-varying selectivity in stock assessment models; 1) the use of discrete time-blocks, and 2) continuous penalized random walk approach. The use of discrete time-blocks should be done *a priori*, where the specified time blocks represent periods consistent fishing practice, and a new block is specified when significant changes in fishing practice occur that may result in changes in selectivity. In practice, however, the time-blocks are also implemented *post hoc* to justify residual patterns in age- or size-composition data. To some, this practice seems rather subjective, and it is.

Table 1: caption here

<u>Assumed</u>	<u>True selectivity states</u>		
	<b>Fixed (a)</b>	<b>Discrete (b)</b>	<b>Continuous (c)</b>
<b>Fixed (1)</b>	1a	1b	1c
<b>Discrete (2)</b>	2a	2b	2c
<b>Continuous (3)</b>	3a	3b	3c

The alternative approach is to allow for continuous changes in selectivity and model estimated selectivity parameters as a penalized random walk. In this case, specification of the variance parameter in how quickly selectivity is allowed to change is also somewhat subjective. It should also be noted that the choice of a time-invariant selectivity is also a subjective structural assumption of the assessment model, and this choice can also greatly influence model results, estimates of reference points, and result in bias forecasts.

In this paper, we conduct a series of simulation experiments using a factorial design and compare this statistical fit and estimated policy parameters using simulated data with fixed selectivity, discrete changes in selectivity, and continuous changes in selectivity. Simulations are based on population parameters and growth information from the Pacific hake assessment conducted in 2010. Model details, and data can be obtained from Martell et al. (2008).

## Methods

The simulation model is conditioned on the Pacific hake fishery from 1977 to 2010, using the historical catch time series from US and Canada combined and the empirical weight-at-age data from this fishery.

### Simulation model

### Reference points

### Scenarios

Three alternative scenarios for time-varying selectivity are considered: 1) fixed size-based selectivity where changes in size-at-age leads to changes in age-based selectivity, 2) discrete time blocks corresponding to significant changes in fishing practices, and 3) continuous changes in selectivity associated with targeting strong cohorts to maximize landed value. These three scenarios result in nine model permutations summarized in Table

## References

Martell, S. J. D., Pine, W. E., and Walters, C. J. (2008). Parameterizing age-structured models from a fisheries management perspective. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.*, 65:1586–1600.