

Avoiding tradeoffs between global seafood production and seafloor impacts through fisheries innovation

T. Scott Smeltz, Christopher M. Free, Bradley P. Harris, Olaf P. Jensen, Jonathan H. Grabowski, Suresh A. Sethi

Supplemental Methods

Standardizing recovery rates

Recovery of seafloor habitats was parameterized as the time to recover from 5% to 95% (τ^*) following an asymptotic recovery trajectory. Three benthic recovery meta-analyses^{1–3} were used parameterize τ^* for soft, hard, and rocky reef seafloor habitat types. However, each of these analyses employed different recovery trajectories in their estimation of recovery. Grabowski et al.² reported the mean time to recovery ($\bar{\tau}$); Hiddink et al.¹ estimated an intrinsic growth rate, r , of a logistic recovery curve; and Graham et al.³ reported the yearly proportional recovery, C_{rp} , along a linear recovery path, equivalent to the slope of the recovery line. In order to standardize recovery rates across these analyses, we calculated τ^* from each of the respective recovery functions. In the following equations we set $H_0 = 0.05$ and $H_1 = 0.95$, representing recovery from 5% to 95%.

The Hiddink et al. r parameter was converted as:

$$\tau^* = -\frac{1}{r} \log \left(\frac{\frac{1}{H_1} - 1}{\frac{1}{H_0} - 1} \right) \quad (\text{S.1})$$

The Graham et al. t parameter was converted as:

$$\tau^* = \frac{H_1 - H_0}{C_{rp}} \quad (\text{S.2})$$

The Grabowski et al. $\bar{\tau}$ parameter was converted to recovery parameter $\bar{\tau}$ then calculated from τ^* as follows:

$$\tau^* = \tau [\log(1 - H_0) - \log(1 - H_1)] \quad (\text{S.3})$$

| Habitat type | Source | Reported value | Description of value | τ^* equivalent (years to recover from 5% to 95%) |
|----------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------|
| Soft substrate | Hiddink et al. | $r = 0.82$ | Recovery to pre-trawl biomass | 7.2 |
| | | $r = 1.05$ | Recovery to pre-trawl abundance from otter trawls | 5.6 |
| | | $r = 4.49$ | Recovery to pre-trawl abundance from beam trawls | 1.3 |
| | Grabowski et al. | $\bar{\tau} = 3.25$ | High energy mud habitats | 9.6 |
| | | $\bar{\tau} = 3.13$ | High energy sand habitats | 9.2 |
| | | $\bar{\tau} = 3.00$ | High energy granule/pebble habitats | 8.8 |
| | | $\bar{\tau} = 3.29$ | Low energy mud habitats | 9.7 |
| | | $\bar{\tau} = 3.17$ | Low energy sand habitats | 9.3 |
| | | $\bar{\tau} = 3.14$ | Low energy granule/pebble habitats | 9.3 |
| Hard substrate | Grabowski et al. | $\bar{\tau} = 2.95$ | High energy cobble habitats | 8.69 |
| | | $\bar{\tau} = 2.91$ | High energy boulder habitats | 8.57 |
| | | $\bar{\tau} = 3.10$ | Low energy cobble habitats | 9.13 |
| | | $\bar{\tau} = 3.06$ | Low energy boulder habitats | 9.01 |
| Rocky reef | Graham et al. | $C_{rp} = 0.0356$ | | 25.28 |

Table S1. Reported recovery times from meta-analyses