

Quantifying maternal reproductive output of chondrichthyan fishes

Alastair V Harry¹, Ivy E Baremore², and Andrew N Piercy³

¹Fisheries & Agriculture Resource Management, Department of Primary Industries and
Regional Development, 39 Northside Drive, Hillarys, 6025, WA, Australia *

²MarAlliance, Roatán, Islas de la Bahía, Honduras

³College of Southern Maryland, La Plata MD 20646, United States

*alastair.harry@gmail.com

7 Abstract

8 For the live-bearing and egg-laying class of chondrichthyan fishes a three parameter logistic ‘maternity’
9 function with a variable upper asymptote, P_{Max} , can be used to predict the average probability of a female
10 giving birth or laying eggs in a season. Although fundamental to calculating the reproductive capacity of a
11 population, few studies report maternity functions, with maturity functions often used as a proxy. Applying
12 logistic models to simulated and empirical data showed that it was feasible to estimate P_{Max} from maternal
13 data and that precision, bias, and confidence interval coverage often improved compared to when a fixed
14 value was used. Maturity parameters could be estimated with greater precision however substituting them
15 for maternity parameters overestimated lifetime reproductive output. Greater use of maternity functions
16 has the potential to improve calculation of reproductive output in quantitative populations models. In
17 addition to improvements in parameter estimation, this method involves fewer assumptions and enables
18 statistical inferences to be made on frequency of reproduction. This study suggests that for sample sizes >
19 100, estimation of P_{Max} is generally preferable to using a fixed value.

20 **Key words** Logistic regression; reproductive biology; maturity ogive; fisheries management

1 Introduction

Many ecological and evolutionary applications need quantitative data on the reproductive capacity of a population and in fisheries science this information forms the basis of widely-used management reference points such as spawning stock biomass (Hilborn and Walters 1992, Quinn and Deriso 1999). Calculating reproductive capacity requires data on the sexually mature proportion of the population contributing to reproduction at a given size or age. For most populations of teleost fishes a simple two-parameter logistic regression function (2PLF) is sufficient to model this process using dichotomous sexual maturity stage data (immature / mature) from a sample of individuals (Jennings et al. 2001, King 2007). While the mathematical formulae and methods of statistically estimating parameters for a 2PLF vary, the estimated values are similar and can be obtained with the built in generalised linear model (GLM) programs in most modern statistical software.

In chondrichthyan fishes (sharks, rays, and chimaeras), the process of maturation can be modelled in a similar manner to teleost fishes with a simple 2PLF; however, for the intents and purposes of calculating reproductive capacity, chondrichthyans differ in several ways to most teleosts. Firstly, in many chondrichthyans the duration of the reproductive cycle is longer than a year, meaning the proportion of females that will give birth in the population in a given season is less than one (Frisk et al. 2005, Dulvy et al. 2008, Rigby and Simpfendorfer 2015). Secondly, there may be a lag between when females reach sexual maturity and when they begin reproducing (Harry et al. 2013, Fujinami et al. 2017). This is confounded by the adopted definition of maturity, which can lead to variable estimates of size and age at maturity (Braccini et al. 2006, Walker 2007, Montealegre-Quijano et al. 2014). Finally, because female fecundity is low (usually \ll 100 embryos), total pup or egg production and recruitment are likely to be closely related to the number of reproductively active females, exhibiting little interannual variability (Taylor et al. 2013). This contrasts the often highly variable relationship between stock size and recruitment in teleost fish, and warrants a precise definition and calculation of reproductive output. For these reasons, unlike in teleosts, a maturity function may not be the most appropriate tool to quantify reproductive capacity.

46 1.1 Maternity function

47 Walker (2005) recognised the need for a maternity function, as distinct from a maturity function, to accurately
 48 quantify reproductive capacity in chondrichthyans. For this purpose he used a non-linear, three-parameter
 49 logistic function (3PLF) of the form:

$$Y_i \sim B(x_i; n_i, P_i)$$

50

$$E[Y_i] = n_i P_i = \frac{\alpha}{1 + e^{-(b_0 + b_1 x_i)}}$$

51 where the proportion of individuals in a given length or age category, x_i , that are in maternal condition, Y_i ,
 52 is a binomially distributed random variable, with an expected value equal to the probability of an individual
 53 from that category being in maternal condition, P_i , multiplied by the total number of individuals in the
 54 category, n_i . If x is a continuous rather than categorical variable (i.e. $n = 1$), Y_i reduces to a Bernoulli
 55 random variable (Zuur et al. 2007). α is the upper asymptote of the curve, controlling the maximum value
 56 of Y as x approaches infinity. The lesser-used 3PLF reduces to the ubiquitous 2PLF when $\alpha = 1$, as is
 57 appropriate for most teleost and chondrichthyan populations if modeling maturity (Quinn and Deriso 1999,
 58 Roa et al. 1999). When $\alpha = 1$, the function also belongs to the class of generalised linear models; logistic
 59 transformation of the dependent variable allows Y to be modeled as a linear function of x_i , where b_0 and b_1
 60 are the intercept and slope, respectively (Zuur et al. 2007). Alternatively, the model can be expressed in
 61 more biologically relevant terms as:

$$E[Y_i] = P_{Max} \left(1 + e^{-\ln(19) \left(\frac{x_i - x_{50}}{x_{95} - x_{50}} \right)} \right)^{-1}$$

62 where x_{50} and x_{95} are the sizes or ages at which 50% and 95% of the maximum proportion of individuals
 63 (P_{Max}) are in maternal condition. Instead of being fit to data on female maturity condition the model is fit
 64 to dichotomous data on female maternal condition (non maternal / maternal).

65 Walker (2005) defines individual females as being in maternal condition if they would have given birth or
 66 laid eggs by the end of a given year such that they contribute to annual recruitment (age 0+ cohort) at
 67 the beginning of the next year. Pregnancy is a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for maternity, and

the two conditions are not always synonymous. For example, reproduction in the Australian population of school shark, *Galeorhinus galeus*, occurs triennially, such that approximately one third of mature females give birth annually and $P_{Max} \approx 1/3$ (Walker 2005). Gestation lasts 20 months, and includes a protracted period of ovulation. Newly pregnant females are not considered to be in maternal condition until the year of pre-recruitment. Walker's (2005) definition is specific to species that reproduce during a single, well-defined period of the year, but the concept can be generalised to accommodate asynchronously reproducing species or those that reproduce more than once a year.

Numerous authors have adopted Walker's (2005) maternity function, including for species with biennial or longer reproductive cycles (Huveneers et al. 2007, Rochowski et al. 2015, Trinnie et al. 2016) as well as those with annual or shorter reproductive cycles (Trinnie et al. 2009, Mejía-Falla et al. 2012, Harry et al. 2013, Taylor et al. 2016). Techniques have been described for determining maternal output in asynchronously reproducing species (Braccini et al. 2006, Colonello et al. 2016), and maternity functions are also increasingly being used directly in shark and ray population assessments (SEDAR 2012, 2017, 2023).

Despite an increase in use, only a small fraction of reproductive studies in recent years have reported maternity functions. Classification of maternal condition is more data-intensive than maturity condition, ideally requiring monthly sampling over a year or longer in order to establish the timing and duration of the female ovarian and uterine cycles. Such data can be difficult and costly to collect for sharks and rays, which are often data-poor and sampled opportunistically. The teleost-oriented foundations of fisheries science have also contributed to the general lack of awareness of maternity functions; Walker (2005) is the sole description on this type of analysis for chondrichthyans and there are no primary literature sources that describe specific methods for chondrichthyan fishes.

For practitioners that are aware of maternity functions, lack of information on implementation may also have discouraged use. Walker's (2005) approach to estimating parameters in the maternity function is difficult to reproduce, apparently due to the constraints of the proprietary statistical program first used to implement the analysis. Specifically, the method as described involves adjusting the raw data prior to parameter estimation and then weighting it during analysis (Walker 2005). Additionally, the use of a fixed value for P_{Max} , as in the

original analysis, has the potential to bias parameter estimates and reduce their standard errors (Motulsky and Christopoulos 2004). Alternative approaches to estimating maternal parameters have also arisen in the literature, indicative of a lack of guidance on implementation. For example, some authors have obtained maternity parameters by fitting a 2PLF to maternity data (Baremore and Hale 2012, Baremore and Passerotti 2013).

A consequence of the low uptake in use of maternity functions is that most practitioners undertaking population assessments invariably take an *ad hoc* approach to quantifying maternal reproductive output. This typically involves approximating maternal output using a maturity function. Under such an approach all mature females are tacitly assumed to reproduce in each breeding season (Cortes 1998). Non-annual reproduction is accounted for by weighting fecundity or the maturity function by the assumed (but often unknown) duration of the reproductive cycle (Walker 2005). In some cases, calculations of reproductive output may use the age-at-first-reproduction, defined as the mean age at maturity plus the gestation period (Mollet and Cailliet 2002). This accounts for the protracted gestation period of many chondrichthyan, but still assumes that all individuals begin reproducing immediately after maturity. Measures of annual reproductive output that follow this approach are hence built upon a series of assumptions that are rarely tested in practice.

1.2 Revisiting the maternity function

Wider use of maternity functions in studies of chondrichthyan reproductive biology is needed to improve calculation of reproductive capacity in the quantitative population assessments that are increasingly being used to support fisheries management and prioritize conservation actions (Cortés et al. 2012). It may also help address the lack of empirical data on the periodicity of chondrichthyan reproductive cycles. Historically, reproductive periodicity has only been determined qualitatively, and has been assumed to be fixed (e.g. annual, biennial), despite observations of plasticity in this trait within discrete populations (Higgs et al. 2020). Information on reproductive periodicity is contained within maternal data, however the existing approach of fixing P_{Max} in maternity functions prevents statistical inference from being made on these data. Changes to the way in which maternity functions are implemented may also contribute to quantifying uncertainty in

120 reproductive frequency and help understand the temporal stability of reproductive cycles. To date only a
121 single study on spiny dogfish, *Squalus acanthias*, has statistically estimated P_{Max} from data (Colonello et al.
122 2016), and the feasibility of doing so for a wider range of species has not been investigated.

123 This study revisits the use of maternity functions with the objectives of providing guidance on implementation
124 and appropriate use. To address this objective a combination of simulated and empirical data were used to 1)
125 evaluate the performance of two alternative methods for estimating maternity parameters, subject to varying
126 reproductive frequency, sample size, and gear selectivity, 2) illustrate the effect of not using using maternity
127 functions on calculations of lifetime reproductive output, and 3) outline strategies for making inferences on
128 reproductive frequency from maternity data.

129 2 Materials and methods

130 2.1 Approach

131 To assess the feasibility of estimating maternity parameters a simulation study was carried out using the 3PLF
132 to generate data for populations with varying reproductive frequencies (Figure 1). Simulations were conducted
133 for a range of gear selectivities and sample sizes reflective of those typically available in reproductive studies
134 and fishery sampling programs. The performance of three methods in estimating ‘true’ maternity parameters
135 from simulated data was tested by examining precision, bias, and interval coverage. To illustrate the
136 effects of misspecifying maternity parameters, lifetime reproductive output was calculated for each simulated
137 population using parameters derived from each of the methods, and by substituting maturity parameters for
138 maternity parameters. Finally, empirical data from previously published studies were reanalysed to illustrate
139 possible strategies for estimating maternity parameters and making inferences on reproductive frequency. All
140 simulation modelling and data analysis was conducted using the R language [Version 4.2.0] (R Core Team
141 2022) and the Template Model Builder (TMB) R package [Version 1.9.1] (Kristensen et al. 2016).

142 2.2 Simulation

143 2.2.1 Data generation

144 Data were generated for the gummy shark, *Mustelus antarcticus*, and school shark, *Galeorhinus galeus*,
145 using parameters from studies conducted on southern Australian populations (Table 1) (Grant et al. 1979,
146 Kirkwood and Walker 1986, Moulton et al. 1992, Walker 1992, Punt and Walker 1998, Walker 2005, 2007).
147 Both species are well-studied and were chosen to be representative of fast and slow chondrichthyan life history
148 styles, respectively (Stevens 1999).

149 Catch at length data were simulated using a female-only, length- and age-based equilibrium population model
150 (Hesp 2023). The approach involved calculating expected survival and catches per recruit subject to specified
151 life history parameters, gear selectivity, and total mortality. Growth was modelled using a von Bertalanffy
152 growth function with length l , of a fish of age, a , calculated as

$$l(a) = L_{\infty}(1 - e^{-K(a-a_0)})$$

153 where L_{∞} is asymptotic length, K is the growth coefficient and a_0 is the hypothetical age at zero length.
154 Recruitment into the population was assumed to occur at age 0 with length conforming to a normal distribution.
155 The proportion of fish of length, l , at age, $a = 0$, was calculated as

$$\Theta_k = \int_{l_k^-}^{l_k^+} f_{a=0}(l) dl$$

156 where l^- and l^+ are the lower and upper limits of each 1cm length class, k . $f_{a=0}(l)$ is the value of the normal
157 probability density function at age $a = 0$ for a given length, l ,

$$f_{a=0}(l) = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp \left[-\frac{(l - \mu)^2}{2\sigma^2} \right]$$

158 where mean length, μ , was calculated from the growth curve. The standard deviation, σ was not available for
159 either species so was assumed to be directly proportional to length, with a constant of proportionality of 5%

160 i.e. $\sigma = 0.05\mu$ (Table 1).

161 Growth in subsequent age classes was modelled using a length transition matrix (Punt et al. 1997, Hall et al.
162 2000), $G = g_{j,k}$ that represents the probability that a fish in length class, j , will grow into length class, k ,
163 over a specified time interval

$$G = \begin{bmatrix} g_{1,1} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ g_{2,1} & g_{2,2} & 0 & 0 \\ \dots & \dots & \ddots & 0 \\ g_{n,1} & g_{n,2} & \dots & g_{n,n} \end{bmatrix}$$

164 where the elements of the matrix followed the general form of Punt et. al. (1997) and are given by

$$g_{k,j} = \begin{cases} \int_{\infty^-}^{l_k^+} f[\phi(l, j)] dl & \text{if } k = 1 \\ \int_{l_k^-}^{l_k^+} f[\phi(l, j)] dl & \text{if } k = 1 < k < n \\ \int_{l_k^-}^{\infty^+} f[\phi(l, j)] dl & \text{if } k = n \end{cases}$$

165 where l is mean length, f is the specified normal distribution, l_k^- and l_k^+ are the lower and upper limits of
166 length class j , and ϕ is a vector of parameters.

167 Selectivity in the model was assumed to follow a gamma function based on gillnet selectivity experiments
168 (Kirkwood and Walker 1986, Punt and Walker 1998), where the selectivity of an individual in length class, l
169 was given by

$$S(l) = \left[\frac{l}{\theta_1 \theta_2} \right]^{\theta_1} \exp(\theta_1 - \frac{l}{\theta_2})$$

170 where θ_1 and θ_2 are estimated parameters (Kirkwood and Walker 1986). Two selectivity scenarios were
171 simulated corresponding to low and high selectivity of the maternal component of the population. For
172 consistency between species, gillnet mesh sizes were chosen that would result in peak relative selectivity
173 occurring at the lengths equal to 25% and 75% of the population in maternal condition (Table 1).

174 Fishing mortality, F , in length class l , was calculated as

$$F(l) = S(l) \cdot F$$

175 where F was assumed to be constant and nominally set to 25% of natural mortality, M (i.e. $0.25M$). The
 176 effects of varying levels of F were not investigated further in this study. Total mortality, Z , in length class, l ,
 177 was further given by

$$Z(l) = F(l) \cdot M$$

178 The number of fish, N , per recruit in length class, l , that survived to age, a , was calculated as

$$N_{l,a} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } a = 0 \\ N_{l,a-1} \exp(-Z_l) & \text{if } a = 0 < a < A_{Max} \\ N_{l,a-1} \exp(-Z_l) / (1 - \exp(-Z_l)) & \text{if } a = A_{Max} \end{cases}$$

179 where A_{Max} is the maximum age (Table 1). The estimated numbers of fish caught in length class, l , at age,
 180 a , was calculated using the Baranov catch equation as

$$\hat{C}_l = \sum_a (F_l / Z_l) (1 - \exp(-Z_l)) N_{l,a}$$

181 To examine the effect of varying sample size, six scenarios were conducted with catch ranging from 50 to
 182 2500 individuals, reflecting a gradient from data poor to rich.

183 Next, dichotomous maturity-at-length data, $\psi(l)$, were randomly generated by simulating from a Bernoulli
 184 distribution, $\Psi(l) \sim B(P)$, where P was given by the 2PLF:

$$P = \left(1 + e^{-\ln(19) \left(\frac{l - L_{50}}{L_{95} - L_{50}} \right)} \right)^{-1}$$

185 This process was then repeated to generate maternity-at-length data, $\Psi'(l)$, using the 3PLF:

$$\Psi' \sim B(P)$$

186

$$P = P_{Max} \left(1 + e^{-\ln(19) \left(\frac{l - L'_{50}}{L'_{95} - L'_{50}} \right)} \right)^{-1}$$

187 Finally, 300 iterations were run for each of the 144 unique variables combinations.

188 2.2.2 Estimation approaches

189 Two approaches to estimating maternity parameters were compared: the 3PLF itself (3PLF-estimated) and
 190 the 3PLF function with a fixed asymptote (3PLF-fixed). Additionally, two approaches using a 2PLF were also
 191 examined, using maternity-at-length data (2PLF-maternity) and maturity-at-length data (2PLF-maturity).
 192 The 3PLF-estimated method was undertaken to validate the utility of this model, which has so far been used
 193 in only a single study (Colonello et al. 2016). The 3PLF-fixed is the method described by Walker (2005)
 194 and most commonly used in practice. The 2PLF-maternity method was used to examine what effect simply
 195 ignoring the upper asymptote had (i.e. P_{Max} fixed at 1). The 2PLF-maturity method is commonly used to
 196 approximate a maternity curve, and tacitly assumed to be similar. The resulting maturity curve can then be
 197 weighted by the proportion of gravid females to calculate annual reproductive output (although in practice
 198 annual fecundity is more often modified, for example halved for a species suspected to reproduce biennially
 199 (SEDAR 2023)).

200 Only the 3PLF-estimated method involves statistically estimating P_{Max} , which must be subjectively chosen
 201 in the case of the 3PLF-fixed and the 2PLF-maturity. P_{Max} is ideally chosen based on detailed study of the
 202 ovarian and uterine cycles (Walker 2005), or alternatively based on the proportion of mature females observed
 203 to be in maternal condition during sampling (Baremore and Hale 2012, Harry et al. 2013, Trinnie et al. 2016).
 204 For the purposes of the simulation, the timing and duration of the uterine and ovarian cycles were assumed to
 205 be unknown. The following procedure was used to ‘guess’ the fixed value of P_{Max} in each simulation. P_{Max}
 206 was chosen as the proportion of females in maternal condition above a the length at which 99% of females
 207 were mature, $L > \Psi(L_{99\%})$. In some cases this procedure failed due to there being no maternal females in

the simulated data set meeting this criteria. If this occurred, L_{95} was used, followed by L_{50} , and finally the proportion of all mature females in the sample that were in maternal condition. Statistical estimation of all non-fixed parameters in each of the methods was undertaken using maximum likelihood. Nonparametric bootstrapping was used to calculate approximate 50% confidence intervals for the best-fit parameters from 250 resampled data sets.

2.2.3 Reproductive output

For each iteration, the per-generation rate of multiplication, R_0 , or lifetime female pup production, was calculated as:

$$R_0 = \int_0^{\infty} R\beta(a)e^{\int_0^a M ds} da$$

where R and M are the embryonic sex ratio and natural mortality rate (Table 1) and $\beta(a)$ is the age-specific reproductive rate which incorporates $\Psi'(L)$ (Xiao and Walker 2000).

2.2.4 Performance

Model performance was evaluated in each iteration where 1) the fitted model successfully converged as indicated by a positive definite Hessian matrix, and 2) the estimated parameters L'_{50} and L'_{95} remained within specified bounds ($0 - 10^4$). An iteration was also not attempted if there were no maternal females in the randomly generated sample. Model performance was evaluated by quantifying precision, bias, and interval coverage for L'_{50} , P_{Max} and R_0 . Bias was quantified using the mean relative error, $MRE = \text{mean}[(x_{\text{Estimated}} - x_{\text{True}})/x_{\text{True}}]$ and precision using the mean absolute relative error, $MARE = \text{mean}[|(x_{\text{Estimated}} - x_{\text{True}})/x_{\text{True}}|]$. Interval coverage measures the ability of the model to capture uncertainty and was calculated by taking the proportion of the estimated parameters for each simulation that fell within the 50% confidence intervals (Rudd and Thorson 2018). For a well-performing model, approximately 50% of parameters would be expected to fall within the nominal 50% confidence intervals.

229 2.2.5 Empirical case study

230 An empirical case study was also undertaken to show how maternity functions can be used in practice.
231 Data from two studies of the reproductive biology of the sandbar shark, *Carcharhinus plumbeus*, in the
232 Gulf of Mexico and western North Atlantic Ocean were combined and reanalysed using both 3PLF methods.
233 The sandbar shark is a relatively long-lived ($A_{Max} = 33$ years) and slow growing species ($K = 0.12 \text{ yr}^{-1}$)
234 with a protracted reproductive cycle lasting longer than a year (Springer 1960). The Gulf of Mexico and
235 western North Atlantic Ocean population has been considered overfished since the late 1970s (Sminkey and
236 Musick 1995) and during the 2000s detailed studies of sandbar shark reproductive biology and growth were
237 undertaken for stock assessment purposes (Baremore and Hale 2012, Piercy et al. 2016). In their study,
238 Baremore and Hale (2012) estimated maternity parameters using the 2PLF-maternity method, weighting
239 the final curve by 0.37 based on the proportion of pregnant females observed, most closely aligning with a
240 triennial reproductive cycle. Piercy *et al.* (2016) did not estimate maternity parameters but also suggested
241 that the average reproductive cycle was likely to be longer than two years based on examination of ovarian
242 follicles. To examine relative support for either a biennial or triennial reproductive cycle, 3PLF-fixed models
243 were fit with P_{Max} estimated and fixed at 0.5 and 0.33, respectively.

244 3 Results

245 3.1 Simulation study

246 Parameter estimation was generally straightforward; with sample sizes > 50 a success rate of $\geq 95\%$ was
247 achieved in all scenarios (Figure S1, Table S1). Overall, convergence and parameter boundary failures
248 were most common with the 2PLF-maternity method which essentially involved fitting data to an under-
249 parameterized model where P_{Max} was always fixed at 1. In addition to convergence failures, 12 simulations
250 also generated insufficient maternal data (zero or one maternal females in the simulated data), and were
251 discarded.

252 Generally when using the 3PLF methods model performance declined as the periodicity of the reproductive
253 cycle increased. The nature of this problem can be seen in the positive correlation between the \hat{L}_{50}^t and

254 \hat{P}_{Max} parameters whereby P_{Max} affects the magnitude and direction of bias in these parameters (Figure 2).
 255 With lower values of P_{Max} it was apparently more difficult for the model to separate the point of inflection
 256 in the logistic model and the upper asymptote. As true underlying P_{Max} decreased there was also a greater
 257 potential for positive bias in \hat{P}_{Max} (Figure 2).

258 For the 3PLF methods, parameter estimates tended to be biased high at lower sample sizes (Figure S2,
 259 Figure S3). In some scenarios, particularly with sample sizes ≤ 250 , fixing the asymptote was effective at
 260 reducing bias, although for larger sample sizes neither method was clearly preferable (Figure S2, Figure S3).
 261 The accuracy of parameter estimates varied considerably across different combinations of variables used in
 262 the simulation and among parameters (Figure S4, Figure S5). Again, in some scenarios with smaller sample
 263 sizes ≤ 250 , fixing the asymptote improved precision with the 3PLF methods, although at larger sample
 264 sizes better precision was achieved by estimating P_{Max} (Figure 3). Overall, P_{Max} was comparatively more
 265 challenging to estimate accurately than L'_{50} (Figure S4, Figure S5).

266 While the 3PLF-fixed method was in some cases able to reduce bias at lower sample sizes, a trade off in
 267 the use of this method was poorer interval coverage (Figure 4, Figure S6). For most simulations, interval
 268 coverage for \hat{L}'_{50} was well below the expected level of 50%, irrespective of sample size. In contrast, for the
 269 3PLF-estimated method interval coverage oscillated around 50% for both \hat{L}'_{50} and \hat{P}_{Max} .

270 Differences in life history and gear selectivity played an important role in the ability to obtain precise and
 271 unbiased maternity parameters. Certain combinations of variables in the simulated data resulted in fewer
 272 females in maternal or immature condition making parameter estimation difficult (Figure S8, Figure S9).
 273 These effects were not necessarily consistent between species and seemed to reflect differences in the underlying
 274 population length structure. For example, in low selectivity scenarios for gummy sharks ~60% of individuals
 275 were immature compared to ~50% in the corresponding scenarios for school sharks (Figure S9). As P_{Max}
 276 decreased the proportion of maternal females in the analysis also decreased.

277 Overall, the 2PLF-maternity method performed the poorest. Ignoring P_{Max} introduced a fixed bias in this
 278 parameter that increased in magnitude as reproductive periodicity increased (Figure S3). This manifested
 279 in an overestimation of L'_{50} that was exacerbated by gear selectivity effects (Figure S2). In contrast, using

280 a maturity function to approximate the maternity function (2PLF-maturity method) resulted in relatively
 281 good performance. L_{50} could usually be estimated with a higher precision than L'_{50} . For the gummy shark,
 282 where L_{50} and L'_{50} were relatively similar, using the 2PLF-maturity method led to a constant underestimate
 283 of L'_{50} of approximately 2%, exceeding the performance of the 3PLF-methods at most sample sizes.

284 The effect of the different methods in ultimately calculating R_0 varied considerably across the various scenarios.
 285 For school sharks, estimating P_{Max} , was the most effective way to minimize bias in most scenarios (Figure 5,
 286 Figure S10). Substituting maturity parameters (2PLF-maturity method) led to a median overestimation
 287 of R_0 by 3.4% across all scenarios, while the 2PLF-maternity method led to a median underestimate of
 288 11.1%. (Table S1, Figure S10). In contrast, for the gummy shark substituting maturity parameters led to a
 289 median overestimation of R_0 of just 1% across all scenarios which outperformed the 3PLF methods in several
 290 instances (Figure 5, Figure S10). Using the 2PLF method for gummy sharks led to a median overestimate of
 291 R_0 of 22% (Figure S10). For both species, better precision in calculating R_0 was achieved with the 3PLF
 292 methods, with the 3PLF-estimated method performing best in most scenarios tested (Figure 6, Figure S11).
 293 For gummy sharks the 3PLF-fixed method performed best at lower sample sizes and lower values of P_{Max} .

294 3.2 Empirical case study

295 Maternal data were re-analysed for 1087 sandbar sharks including 0 mature individuals of which $\infty\%$ were in
 296 maternal condition. Using the 3PLF-estimated method, the maximum likelihood estimate for \hat{P}_{Max} was 0.48
 297 (Table 2). Despite having a sample size of > 600 mature females, the proportion of maternal individuals at
 298 length was still uncertain and \hat{P}_{Max} was estimated to lie between 0.39 and 0.60 with 95% confidence. For
 299 3PLF-fixed models a value of $P_{Max} = 0.5$ was strongly supported ($\Delta_{AIC} = 14.15$) over the alternative fixed
 300 value of $P_{Max} = 0.33$. The model with $P_{Max} = 0.5$ also outperformed the 3PLF-estimated method ($\Delta_{AIC} =$
 301 1.86). Given the fixed model had one fewer estimated parameters, both models had essentially the same level
 302 of support given the data (Burnham and Anderson 2002).

303 4 Discussion

304 Relatively few reproductive biology studies have used maternity functions to model maternal reproductive
305 output in chondrichthyan fishes. Where they have been employed the approach has typically been to use
306 a three parameter logistic function with a fixed, user-defined value for the upper asymptote, P_{Max} . Here
307 we show that it is feasible to estimate P_{Max} from maternal data, in turn enabling statistical inferences on
308 reproductive periodicity. Applying 3PLF models with estimated and fixed values of P_{Max} to simulated data
309 showed that precision, bias, and confidence interval coverage often improved when P_{Max} was estimated. Using
310 a fixed value for P_{Max} in some cases resulted in lower bias at low sample sizes. This study also demonstrated
311 that recruitment can be overestimated when maturity data were used to approximate maternal data and
312 inaccurate if P_{Max} was ignored when estimating maternity parameters. Based on these findings we outline
313 considerations for practitioners using these methods and illustrate how they can provide novel insights into
314 reproductive biology. We conclude by discussing the advantages of adopting this approach to quantifying
315 maternal reproductive output and future directions.

316 4.1 Implementing maternity functions

317 Using simulated data to compare the relative performance of the 3PLF-estimated and 3PLF-fixed methods
318 subject to a range of variables showed that it was feasible to estimate P_{Max} from data, but also identified
319 situations where it may be preferable to fix P_{Max} . In most scenarios sample sizes of at least 100 were needed
320 for the 3PLF-estimated method to approach or exceed the performance of the 3PLF-fixed method. At sample
321 sizes below this it is therefore advisable to fix P_{Max} . Larger sample sizes are desirable before attempting to
322 estimate P_{Max} in species with a triennial or longer reproductive cycle, due to the decline in the performance
323 of the 3PLF-estimated method as P_{Max} decreases.

324 While the estimation of maternity parameters in most simulations was possible, it was difficult to do so
325 accurately. Outcomes of the simulation study suggested that samples sizes of ≥ 500 would be needed to
326 estimate P_{Max} with $<10\%$ MARE for a triennially reproducing species. This is a much larger error than
327 is achievable from conventional logistic maturity analysis (Roa et al. 1999). In the case of the gummy
328 shark this imprecision led to the 2PLF-maturity method performing comparably or better than the 3PLF

329 methods in ultimately quantifying R_0 . Relatively wide confidence intervals were also obtained for P_{Max} in
330 the empirical analysis for sandbar sharks, even with a sample size of > 1000 . A similar sample size was used
331 by Colonello *et al.* (2016) to successfully estimate P_{Max} and maternity parameters for south Atlantic spiny
332 dogfish. These results suggest that data requirements of the 3PLF analyses may be prohibitively large for
333 many chondrichthyans and therefore best suited to use on commercially captured species where large sample
334 sizes can be obtained (Oddone *et al.* 2010, Tribuzio and Kruse 2012).

335 In light of the data requirements suggested by this study, the current practice of using maturity parameters as
336 a proxy for maternity parameters will likely still be the only option for numerous data-poor chondrichthyans.
337 From this perspective, the outperformance of the 3PLF-methods by the 2PLF-methods for the gummy shark
338 in several simulations is encouraging. However, the extent to which maturity parameters can provide a good
339 approximation of maternity parameters may be species-specific, depending on how close L_{50} is to L'_{50} . While
340 several studies have shown these parameters to be similar (Walker 2007, Soto-López *et al.* 2018), L'_{50} is more
341 frequently shifted to the right of L_{50} (Braccini *et al.* 2006, Montealegre-Quijano *et al.* 2014, Colonello *et*
342 *al.* 2016, Palacios-Hernández *et al.* 2020), and this length difference can equate to one or more years. For
343 example, Harry *et al.* (2013) found both spot-tail shark, *C. sorrah*, and Australian blacktip shark, *C. tilstoni*,
344 began reproducing the year after reaching sexual maturity. Similarly, Fujiyama found A'_{50} to be 1.4 years
345 older than A_{50} in blue sharks.

346 More research is needed to understand the relationship between size at maturity and maternity and variability
347 within and among taxa. In general, this study confirms Walker's (2005) assertion that the common practice
348 of weighting the maturity curve by the frequency of parturition overestimates recruitment. This study also
349 confirms that fitting a 2PLF to maternal data when $P_{Max} < 1$ (effectively ignoring P_{Max}) is likely to result
350 in biased parameters and can also overestimate recruitment. While not widely used, this approach has been
351 undertaken in several studies (Baremore and Hale 2012, Mejía-Falla *et al.* 2012, Baremore and Passerotti
352 2013, Rambahiniarison *et al.* 2018).

353 The success of any analysis using the 3PLF-fixed or 2PLF-maturity methods, as implemented here, ultimately
354 depends on the analyst choosing a suitable value for P_{Max} . In this study, the value for P_{Max} used in the

fixed analyses was chosen based on the proportion of maternal females observed in the simulated data. The potential to introduce a greater level of bias in the analysis through the incorrect selection of P_{Max} should also be considered if using this approach.

4.2 Empirical study

The empirical analysis carried out using data for the sandbar shark illustrates how novel insights can be gained from maternal data by estimating P_{Max} . Detailed reproductive studies of the western North Atlantic population by Baremore and Hale (2012) and Piercy *et al.* (2016) were ambiguous about the frequency of reproduction. In both studies, the low proportion of pregnant females and bimodality in ovarian follicle size led the authors to conclude that the reproductive cycle was most commonly triennial or possibly longer at the population level. Reanalysis of these combined data sets using the 3PLF-estimated method, however, resulted in a maximum likelihood estimate of $\hat{P}_{Max} = 0.48$, considerably larger than 0.37 - the proportion of pregnant mature females observed by Baremore and Hale (2012). Similarly, based on AIC values, a fixed value of $P_{Max} = 0.5$ had a much higher relative plausibility than a value of 0.33 (Table 2).

This unexpected result may be related to the gradual attainment of asymptotic maternal status. Maturity in sandbar sharks appears to occur over an extended size range. L_5 and L_{95} are 146cm and 176cm – a length interval that corresponds to around seven years given the sandbar shark’s slow growth rate (Hale and Baremore 2013). With females maturing over a broad range of sizes and ages, it is possible that smaller females reproduce less frequently. The outcomes of this study suggest that larger sharks may ultimately be capable of reproducing biennially, although few females appear to attain this size (Hale and Baremore 2013). Further work would be required to confirm this hypothesis, however, such an outcome would have important implications for management; not only are larger females more fecund (Baremore and Hale 2012), they also reproduce more frequently. This implies that size selective fishing or the removal of larger and older female sharks could have a disproportionately greater impact on population productivity.

378 4.3 Advantages and future directions

379 Despite the simplicity of the 3PLF-estimated method, it nonetheless represents a conceptual shift for
380 chondrichthyan reproductive and population biology. Until now reproductive periodicity has largely been
381 determined qualitatively from observations of female reproductive biology or inferred based on circumstantial
382 evidence. Using the 3PLF-estimated method to estimate P_{Max} within a maternity function transforms it
383 from a nuisance parameter to one of direct inferential interest that can be seen as a valuable output of the
384 modelling process itself. In addition to the potential benefits of using this method to improve estimation of
385 maternal parameters, there are also a range of other advantages that arise from estimating P_{Max} .

386 One benefit of this approach is that it that it reduces the need for subjective modelling assumptions relating to
387 P_{Max} . Such assumptions can have important implications for population modelling. For example, to account
388 for uncertainty in temporal and spatial frequency of reproduction in sparsely-spotted stingarees, *Urolophus*
389 *paucimaculatus*, Trinnie *et al.* (Trinnie et al. 2014) estimated maternity parameters for ten plausible scenarios.
390 In stock assessment of western North Atlantic sandbar sharks a breeding frequency of 2.5 years was assumed
391 to account for uncertainty in the duration of the reproductive cycle (SEDAR 2017).

392 More commonly, practitioners have chosen fixed values of the form $P_{Max} = 1/n$, where n is the apparent
393 duration of the reproductive cycle in years. This process also has the potential to introduce bias if a small
394 proportion of females reproduce more or less frequently than the larger population. Long-term study of
395 offspring from genetically profiled lemon sharks, *Negaprion brevirostris*, confirmed that most individuals
396 reproduced biennially, but also revealed some cases of triennial reproduction (Feldheim et al. 2014). Statistical
397 estimation of P_{Max} from data avoids these decisions and enables uncertainty in this parameter to be included
398 in subsequent population models.

399 Estimation of P_{Max} using the 3PLF-estimated method may also be a means to resolving the longstanding
400 question of reproductive frequency in some rare and threatened chondrichthyans. White sharks, *Carcharodon*
401 *carcharias*, and whale shark, *Rhynchodon typus*, are two examples of intensively studied species where only
402 fragmentary observations of female reproductive biology exist (Joung et al. 1996, Sato et al. 2016). In
403 both species lack of data on reproductive frequency is a major impediment to population modelling and

the development of management strategies (Huveneers et al. 2018, Bowlby and Gibson 2020). With many of these populations the focus of ongoing monitoring, non-lethal methods for assessing maternal state may eventually provide a way of collecting sufficient data for estimation of P_{Max} (Sulikowski et al. 2016). A logical progression from estimating P_{Max} is the consideration of alternative functional forms for this parameter such as time- or space-varying P_{Max} or more complex length- or age-dependent forms (Winton et al. 2014). Despite the diverse range of reproductive modes found in chondrichthyan fishes, the current, limited knowledge of maternal investment has typically investigated variables such as litter size and pup condition (Hussey et al. 2010). Little is known about how reproductive frequency varies as a function of size or age, in response to environmental effects, or at changing population densities. Better understanding of these factors has the potential to improve understanding reproductive strategies and is, in many cases, of direct relevance to management.

5 Acknowledgements

We thank John Carlson and all NMFS staff who were involved in collecting the sandbar shark reproductive data used in this study. We also thank Alex Hesp for valuable comments on an early draft of this paper and generosity in sharing R code.

6 Competing interests

The authors declare there are no competing interests.

7 Data availability

Data generated or analyzed during this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

References

10

- Baremore, I.E., and Hale, L.F. 2012. Reproduction of the Sandbar Shark in the Western North Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico. *Marine and Coastal Fisheries* **4**(1): 560–572. doi: 10.1080/19425120.2012.700904.
- Baremore, I.E., and Passerotti, M.S. 2013. Reproduction of the Blacktip Shark in the Gulf of Mexico. *Marine and Coastal Fisheries* **5**(1): 127–138. doi: 10.1080/19425120.2012.758204.
- Bowlby, H.D., and Gibson, A.J.F. 2020. Implications of life history uncertainty when evaluating status in the Northwest Atlantic population of white shark (*Carcharodon carcharias*). *Ecology and Evolution* **10**(11): 4990–5000. doi: 10.1002/ece3.6252.
- Braccini, J.M., Gillanders, B.M., and Walker, T.I. 2006. Determining reproductive parameters for population assessments of chondrichthyan species with asynchronous ovulation and parturition: Piked spurdog (*Squalus megalops*) as a case study. *Mar. Freshwater Res.* **57**: 105–119. doi: 10.1071/Mf05076.
- Burnham, K.P., and Anderson, D.R. 2002. Model selection and multimodel inference: A practical information-theoretic approach. 2nd edn. Springer, New York, NY.
- Colonello, J.H., Cortés, F., Belleggia, M., and Massa, A.M. 2016. Reproductive and population parameters of spiny dogfish *Squalus acanthias* in the south-western Atlantic Ocean. *J. Fish Biol.* **88**(5): 1758–1775. doi: 10.1111/jfb.12940.
- Cortes, E. 1998. Demographic analysis as an aid in shark stock assessment and management. *Fish. Res.* **39**: 199–208. doi: 10.1016/S0165-7836(98)00183-0.
- Cortés, E., Brooks, E.N., and Gedamke, T. 2012. Population dynamics, demography, and stock assessment. *In* *Biology of Sharks and Their Relatives, Second Edition. Edited by J.C. Carrier, J.A. Musick, and M.R. Heithaus.* CRC Press, New York. pp. 453–86.
- Dulvy, N.K., Baum, J.K., Clarke, S., Compagno, L.J.V., Cortes, E., Domingo, A., Fordham, S., Fowler, S., Francis, M.P., Gibson, C., Martínez, J., Musick, J.A., Soldo, A., Stevens, J.D., and Valenti, S. 2008. You can swim but you can't hide: The global status and conservation of oceanic pelagic sharks and rays. *Aquatic*

449 Conservation: Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems.

450 Feldheim, K.A., Gruber, S.H., DiBattista, J.D., Babcock, E.A., Kessel, S.T., Hendry, A.P., Pikitch, E.K., Ash-
 451 ley, M.V., and Chapman, D.D. 2014. Two decades of genetic profiling yields first evidence of natal philopatry
 452 and long-term fidelity to parturition sites in sharks. *Mol. Ecol.* **23**(1): 110–117. doi: 10.1111/mec.12583.

453 Frisk, M.G., Miller, T.J., and Dulvy, N.K. 2005. Life histories and vulnerability to exploitation of elasmobranchs:
 454 Inferences from elasticity, perturbation and phylogenetic analyses. *Journal of Northwest Atlantic
 455 Fishery Science* **35**: 27–45. doi: 10.2960/J.v35.m514.

456 Fujinami, Y., Semba, Y., Okamoto, H., Ohshimo, S., and Tanaka, S. 2017. Reproductive biology of the
 457 blue shark (*Prionace glauca*) in the western North Pacific Ocean. *Mar. Freshwater Res.* **68**(11): 2018–2027.
 458 Available from <https://doi.org/10.1071/MF16101>.

459 Grant, C., Sandland, R., and Olsen, A. 1979. Estimation of growth, mortality and yield per recruit of the
 460 Australian school shark, *Galeorhinus australis* (Macleay), from tag recoveries. *Mar. Freshwater Res.* **30**(5):
 461 625–637. doi: 10.1071/MF9790625.

462 Hale, L.F., and Baremore, I.E. 2013. Age and Growth of the Sandbar Shark (*Carcharhinus plumbeus*) from
 463 the Northern Gulf of Mexico and the Western North Atlantic Ocean. *Gulf of Mexico Science* **1**(2): 28–39.

464 Hall, N., Cao, L., Chubb, C., Caputi, N., Cheng, H., Melville-Smith, R., and Shanks, S. 2000. Modelling
 465 to explore management strategies to optimise the value of the Rock Lobster Fishery of Western Australia.
 466 Fisheries Research Development Corporation Final Report Project (97/104).

467 Harry, A.V., Tobin, A.J., and Simpfendorfer, C.A. 2013. Age, growth and reproductive biology of the
 468 spot-tail shark, *Carcharhinus sorrah*, and the Australian blacktip shark, *Carcharhinus tilstoni*, from the
 469 Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area, north-eastern Australia. *Mar. Freshwater Res.* **64**: 277–293. doi:
 470 10.1071/MF12142.

471 Hesp, A. 2023. L3Assess: Catch curve and per recruit analyses. R package version 0.1.0.

472 Higgs, J.M., Hoffmayer, E.R., Sulikowski, J.A., Driggers, W.B., Stiller, D.A., and Hendon, J.M. 2020.
 473 Reproductive biology of the finetooth shark (*Carcharhinus isodon*) in the northern Gulf of Mexico, with

evidence of both annual and biennial reproduction. Mar. Freshwater Res. Available from <https://doi.org/10.1071/MF20120>.

Hilborn, R., and Walters, C.J. 1992. Quantitative fisheries stock assessment. Choice, dynamics and uncertainty. Springer, New York, NY.

Hussey, N.E., Wintner, S.P., Dudley, S.F.J., Cliff, G., Cocks, D.T., and MacNeil, M.A. 2010. Maternal investment and size-specific reproductive output in carcharhinid sharks. J. Anim. Ecol. **79**: 184–193. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2009.01623.x.

Huveneers, C., Apps, K., Becerril-García, E.E., Bruce, B., Butcher, P.A., Carlisle, A.B., Chapple, T.K., Christiansen, H.M., Cliff, G., Curtis, T.H., Daly-Engel, T.S., Dewar, H., Dicken, M.L., Domeier, M.L., Duffy, C.A.J., Ford, R., Francis, M.P., French, G.C.A., Galván-Magaña, F., García-Rodríguez, E., Gennari, E., Graham, B., Hayden, B., Hoyos-Padilla, E.M., Hussey, N.E., Jewell, O.J.D., Jorgensen, S.J., Kock, A.A., Lowe, C.G., Lyons, K., Meyer, L., Oelofse, G., Oñate-González, E.C., Oosthuizen, H., O’Sullivan, J.B., Ramm, K., Skomal, G., Sloan, S., Smale, M.J., Sosa-Nishizaki, O., Sperone, E., Tamburin, E., Towner, A.V., Weisel, M.A., Weng, K.C., and Werry, J.M. 2018. Future research directions on the “Elusive” white shark. Frontiers in Marine Science **5**: 455. doi: 10.3389/fmars.2018.00455.

Huveneers, C., Walker, T.I., Otway, N.M., and Harcourt, R.G. 2007. Reproductive synchrony of three sympatric species of wobbegong shark (genus *orectolobus*) in New South Wales, Australia: Reproductive parameter estimates necessary for population modelling. Mar. Freshwater Res. **58**: 765–777. doi: 10.1071/MF06187.

Jennings, S., Kaiser, M., and Reynolds, J.D. 2001. Marine fisheries ecology. John Wiley & Sons, Oxford.

Joung, S.-J., Chen, C.-T., Clark, E., Uchida, S., and Huang, W.Y.P. 1996. The whale shark, *Rhincodon typus*, is a livebearer: 300 embryos found in one “megamamma” supreme. Environ. Biol. Fish. **46**(3): 219–223. doi: 10.1007/BF00004997.

King, M. 2007. Fisheries biology, assessment and management. Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.

Kirkwood, G.P., and Walker, T.I. 1986. Gill net mesh selectivities for gummy shark, *Mustelus antarcticus* Gunther, taken in southeastern Australian waters. Aust. J. Mar. Fresh. Res. **37**: 689–697.

499 Kristensen, K., Nielsen, A., Berg, C.W., Skaug, H., and Bell, B.M. 2016. TMB: Automatic Differentiation
 500 and Laplace Approximation. J. Stat. Softw. **70**(5): 1–21. doi: 10.18637/jss.v070.i05.

501 Mejía-Falla, P.A., Navia, A.F., and Cortés, E. 2012. Reproductive variables of *Urotrygon rogersi* (Batoidea:
 502 Urotrygonidae): A species with a triannual reproductive cycle in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. J. Fish
 503 Biol. **80**(5): 1246–1266. doi: 10.1111/j.1095-8649.2012.03237.x.

504 Mollet, H.F., and Cailliet, G.M. 2002. Comparative population demography of elasmobranchs using life
 505 history tables, Leslie matrices and stage-based matrix models. Mar. Freshwater Res. **53**: 503–516.

506 Montealegre-Quijano, S., Cardoso, A.T.C., Silva, R.Z., Kinas, P.G., and Vooren, C.M. 2014. Sexual
 507 development, size at maturity, size at maternity and fecundity of the blue shark *Prionace glauca* (Linnaeus,
 508 1758) in the Southwest Atlantic. Fish. Res. **160**: 18–32. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2014.03.003>.

509 Motulsky, H., and Christopoulos, A. 2004. Fitting models to biological data using linear and nonlinear
 510 regression: A practical guide to curve fitting. Oxford University Press, San Diego.

511 Moulton, P.L., Walker, T.I., and Saddler, S.R. 1992. Age and growth-studies of gummy shark, *Mustelus*
 512 *antarcticus* Gunther, and school shark, *Galeorhinus galeus* (Linnaeus), from Southern Australian waters. Aust.
 513 J. Mar. Fresh. Res. **43**: 1241–1267. doi: 10.1071/MF9921241.

514 Oddone, M.C., Paesch, L., and Norbis, W. 2010. Size structure, abundance and preliminary information on
 515 the reproductive parameters of the shortspine spurdog (*Squalus mitsukurii*) in the argentinean-uruguayan
 516 common fishing zone from the mid-1990s. J. Northw. Atl. Fish. Sci. **43**: 13–26. doi: 10.2960/j.v.43.m662.

517 Palacios-Hernández, D., Castillo-Géniz, J.L., Méndez-Loeza, I., and Pérez-Jiménez, J.C. 2020. Temporal and
 518 latitudinal comparisons of reproductive parameters in a heavily exploited shark, the bonnethead, *Sphyrna*
 519 *tiburo* (L. 1758), in the southern Gulf of Mexico. J. Fish Biol. **97**(1): 100–112. doi: 10.1111/jfb.14330.

520 Piercy, A.N., Murie, D.J., and Gelsleichter, J.J. 2016. Histological and morphological aspects of reproduction
 521 in the sandbar shark *Carcharhinus plumbeus* in the U.S. South-eastern Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico. J.
 522 Fish Biol. **88**(5): 1708–1730. doi: 10.1111/jfb.12945.

523 Punt, A.E., Kennedy, R.B., and Frusher, S.D. 1997. Estimating the size-transition matrix for Tasmanian

524 rock lobster, *Jasus edwardsii*. Mar. Freshwater Res. **48**(8): 981–992. Available from [https://doi.org/10.1071/](https://doi.org/10.1071/MF97017)
525 MF97017.

526 Punt, A.E., and Walker, T.I. 1998. Stock assessment and risk analysis for the school shark (*Galeorhinus*
527 *galeus*) off southern Australia. Mar. Freshwater Res. **49**: 719–731. doi: 10.1071/MF96101.

528 Quinn, I.I., and Deriso, R.B. 1999. Quantitative fish dynamics. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

529 R Core Team. 2022. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Vienna, Austria. Available
530 from <https://www.R-project.org/>.

531 Rambahiniarison, J.M., Lamoste, M.J., Rohner, C.A., Murray, R., Snow, S., Labaja, J., Araujo, G., and
532 Ponzo, A. 2018. Life history, growth, and reproductive biology of four mobulid species in the Bohol Sea,
533 Philippines. Frontiers in Marine Science **5**: 269. doi: 10.3389/fmars.2018.00269.

534 Rigby, C., and Simpfendorfer, C.A. 2015. Patterns in life history traits of deep-water chondrichthyans. Deep
535 Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography **115**: 30–40. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2013.](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsr2.2013.09.004)
536 09.004.

537 Roa, R., Ernst, B., and Tapia, F. 1999. Estimation of size at sexual maturity: An evaluation of analytical
538 and resampling procedures. Fish. B-noaa. **97**: 570–580.

539 Rochowski, B.E.A., Graham, K.J., Day, R.W., and Walker, T.I. 2015. Reproductive biology of the greeneye
540 spurdog *Squalus chloroculus* (Squaliformes, Squalidae). J. Fish Biol. **86**(2): 734–754. doi: 10.1111/jfb.12593.

541 Rudd, M.B., and Thorson, J.T. 2018. Accounting for variable recruitment and fishing mortality in length-based
542 stock assessments for data-limited fisheries. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. **75**(7): 1019–1035.

543 Sato, K., Nakamura, M., Tomita, T., Toda, M., Miyamoto, K., and Nozu, R. 2016. How great white sharks
544 nourish their embryos to a large size: Evidence of lipid histotrophy in lamnoid shark reproduction. Biology
545 Open **5**(9): 1211–1215. doi: 10.1242/bio.017939.

546 SEDAR. 2012. SEDAR 29 stock assessment report: HMS Gulf of Mexico blacktip shark. North Charleston,
547 SC.

548 SEDAR. 2017. SEDAR 54 stock assessment report: HMS sandbar shark. North Charleston, SC.

549 SEDAR. 2023. HMS Hammerhead Sharks: Scalloped Hammerhead Shark. Section III: Assessment Report.
 550 North Charleston, SC.

551 Sminkey, T.R., and Musick, J.A. 1995. Age and growth of the sandbar shark, *Carcharhinus plumbeus*, before
 552 and after population depletion. *Copeia*: 871–883.

553 Soto-López, K., Ochoa-Báez, R.I., Tovar-Ávila, J., and Galván-Magaña, F. 2018. Reproductive biology of the
 554 brown smooth-hound shark, *Mustelus henlei* (Chondrichthyes: Triakidae), off northwestern Mexico based on
 555 macroscopic and histological analyses. *Cienc. Mar.* **44**(2): 125–139.

556 Springer, S. 1960. Natural history of the sandbar shark, *Eulamia milberti*. US Fish Wildl. Serv. Fish. Bull.
 557 **61**: 1–38.

558 Stevens, J.D. 1999. Variable resilience to fishing pressure in two sharks: The significance of different ecological
 559 and life history parameters. *Am. Fish. S. S.* **23**: 11–15.

560 Sulikowski, J.A., Wheeler, C.R., Gallagher, A.J., Prohaska, B.K., Langan, J.A., and Hammerschlag, N. 2016.
 561 Seasonal and life-stage variation in the reproductive ecology of a marine apex predator, the tiger shark
 562 *Galeocerdo cuvier*, at a protected female-dominated site. *Aquat. Biol.* **24**(3): 175–184.

563 Taylor, I.G., Gertseva, V., Methot, R.D., and Maunder, M.N. 2013. A stock–recruitment relationship based
 564 on pre-recruit survival, illustrated with application to spiny dogfish shark. *Fish. Res.* **142**: 15–21. doi:
 565 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2012.04.018>.

566 Taylor, S.M., Harry, A.V., and Bennett, M.B. 2016. Living on the edge: Latitudinal variations in the
 567 reproductive biology of two coastal species of sharks. *J. Fish Biol.* **89**(5): 2399–2418. doi: 10.1111/jfb.13126.

568 Tribuzio, C.A., and Kruse, G.H. 2012. Life history characteristics of a lightly exploited stock of *Squalus*
 569 *suckleyi*. *J. Fish Biol.* **80**(5): 1159–1180. doi: 10.1111/j.1095-8649.2012.03241.x.

570 Trinnie, F.I., Walker, T.I., Jones, P.L., and Laurenson, L.J. 2009. Reproductive biology of the eastern
 571 shovelnose stingaree *Trygonoptera imitata* from south-eastern Australia. *Mar. Freshwater Res.* **60**: 845–860.

572 Trinnie, F.I., Walker, T.I., Jones, P.L., and Laurenson, L.J. 2014. Regional differences in the reproductive
 573 parameters of the sparsely-spotted stingaree, *Urolophus paucimaculatus*, from south-eastern Australia. Mar.
 574 Freshwater Res. **65**(11): 943. doi: 10.1071/mf13275.

575 Trinnie, F.I., Walker, T.I., Jones, P.L., and Laurenson, L.J. 2016. Reproductive cycle of *Urolophus cruciatus*
 576 in south-eastern Australia: Does the species exhibit obligate or facultative diapause? Mar. Biol. **163**(11):
 577 226. doi: 10.1007/s00227-016-2976-x.

578 Walker, T. 1992. Fishery simulation model for sharks applied to the Gummy Shark, *Mustelus antarcticus*
 579 Gunther, from Southern Australian waters. Mar. Freshwater Res. **43**(1): 195–212. Available from
 580 <https://doi.org/10.1071/MF9920195>.

581 Walker, T.I. 2005. Reproduction in fisheries science. In Reproductive biology and phylogeny of Chon-
 582 drichthyans: Sharks, batoids, and chimaeras. Edited by W.C. Hamlett. Science Publishers Inc., Enfield. pp.
 583 81–127.

584 Walker, T.I. 2007. Spatial and temporal variation in the reproductive biology of gummy shark *Mustelus*
 585 *antarcticus* (Chondrichthyes : Triakidae) harvested off southern Australia. Mar. Freshwater Res. **58**: 67–97.
 586 doi: 10.1071/MF06074.

587 Winton, M.V., Wuenschel, M.J., and McBride, R.S. 2014. Investigating spatial variation and temperature
 588 effects on maturity of female winter flounder (*Pseudopleuronectes americanus*) using generalized additive
 589 models. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. **71**(9): 1279–1290. doi: 10.1139/cjfas-2013-0617.

590 Xiao, Y.S., and Walker, T.I. 2000. Demographic analysis of gummy shark (*Mustelus antarcticus*) and school
 591 shark (*Galeorhinus galeus*) off southern Australia by applying a generalized Lotka equation and its dual
 592 equation. Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. **57**: 214–222. doi: 10.1139/f99-224.

593 Zuur, A., Ieno, E.N., and Smith, G.M. 2007. Analyzing ecological data. New York, NY.