Figure 1. For Bristol Bay red king crab; scatterplots of weights against carapace length

Figure 2. For male St. Matthew Island blue king crab; scatterplots

Figure 3. For male Eastern Bering Sea Tanner crab; scatterplots

Figure 4. For male Eastern Bering Sea snow crab; scatterplots

Figure 5. Percent difference in weight between shell condition-thermal effect maximum likelihood size-weight models by size for male a.) Bristol Bay red king crab, b.) St. Matthew blue king crab.

Figure 6. Percent difference in weight between shell condition-thermal effect maximum likelihood size-weight models by size for a.) immature male eastern Bering Sea (EBS) Tanner crab, b.) mature male eastern Bering Sea (EBS) Tanner crab, c.) immature male eastern Bering Sea (EBS) snow crab, and d.) mature male eastern Bering Sea (EBS) snow crab.

Figure 7. Percent difference in weight between female covariate-specific least-squares size-weight models and current standard models for female EBS Bairdi. Covariates are a.) shell condition, b.) temperature, c.) clutch size = 4 (half full), d.) clutch size = 6, e.) New shell + clutch size 4 and 6, f.) Old shell + clutch size 4 and 6.

Figure 8. Percent difference in weight between female covariate-specific least-squares size-weight models and current standard models for female EBS opilio. Covariates are a.) shell condition, b.) temperature, c.) clutch size = 4 (half full) and d.) clutch size = 6, e.) New shell + clutch size 4 and 6, and f.) Old shell + clutch size 4 and 6.

Figure 9. Percent difference in weight at size between shell condition-only maximum likelihood (ML) size-weight models and current standard model, and between the ML null (no covariate effects) models for eastern Bering Sea (EBS) and northern Bering Sea (NBS) male a.) Norton Sound red king crab, b.) northern Bering Sea blue king crab, and c.) northern Bering Sea opilio crab.

Figure 10. Percent difference in population biomass estimates