

Improving Catch Estimation Methods in Sparsely Sampled Mixed-Stock Fisheries.

Nick Grunloh, E.J. Dick, Don Pearson, John Field, Marc Mangel

Introduction

- I am Nick
- describe the california spp comps. port sampling data for modeling
- describe our modeling efforts for estimating spp comps.

Request: Diagnostic

- Create fully stratified performance diagnostics based on my tabulated (tables 2 and 3) aggregate performance numbers.
- Quickly refresh on the model in question
- Tools for sorting through all of this information
- Diagnostics for evaluating performance

Beta-Binomial Model

- $y_{ijklm\eta}$: i^{th} sample of the j^{th} species' integer weight, in the k^{th} port, caught with the l^{th} gear, in the η^{th} quarter, of year m , for a particular market category.
- Stratum μ linked to θ and observed cluster size (n)
- Stratum σ^2 is largely a function of μ but with overdispersion ρ
 - $\rho \rightarrow 0$: Binomial variance
 - $\rho \rightarrow 1$: n times Binomial variance
- Modeling of θ (all predictors are categorical):
 - Intercept
 - Additive offsets for: Species, Port, Gear
 - Consider multiple time models

Diagnostic Files

- Consider a toy example to get our hands dirty with the diagnostic.
- Recall the model (M4).
- Recall we had some model selection criterion. Here I show the DIC and WAIC information criterion not as a diagnostic, but merely to guide our search through the numerous models under consideration.
- Through out this document you will see green underlined tags.
 - Depending on your pdf viewer, these lines may look slightly different and you may get slightly different behavior when clicking.
 - In any case these should be clickable links to various github pages.
 - If you are veiwing this in a browser you may prefer to [ctrl]-click to avoid redirecting away from the presentation tab.
- **click** We'll talk more about them later
 - marginal species directories (BCAC pdf and csv)

- directories of various levels of stratification (pdfs) species-gear-year
- stratification csvs gearYearSpp68.csv

MAD Diagnostic

- As we add more models there is a lot of information to sort through, consider the MAD diagnostic as a tool for sorting.
 - ℓ_i : the landings in stratum i ,
 - \mathcal{O}_{ij} : the observed predictive accuracy of species j in stratum i
 - \aleph : the nominal level of prediction for a particular model run
- Low MAD scores occur when ℓ_i is low -or- $|\mathcal{O}_{ij} - \aleph|$ is small.
- High MAD scores occur when ℓ_i is large and $|\mathcal{O}_{ij} - \aleph|$ is large.
- ??? example ???
 - High MAD v. Low MAD

Stratum Plots

- Prediction shown at three levels of stratification
 - Disaggregated
 - By species, gear group, and year aggregating across port complexes, and quarters. (“data-rich assessment”)
 - By species, and year aggregating across port complexes, gears, and quarters. (“data-moderate/poor assessment”)
 - csv versions of these files are in base run directory.
- **click each**

Diagnostic Wrap-up

- Marginal plots organized by species, each marginal stratum summed over everything else.
- Sort species by MAD, explore margins via margin plots
- Explore within margins via previously described stratum plots

Request: Sample Size

- a request for Sample sizes by mcat and time block
- through out the rest of the requests we work with the top 3 landed mcats in 1978-1982
 - 250, 253, 269
- tables show number of port sampling sightings
- other mcats and higher stratifications are provided as supplemental excel files.

MCAT 250 Sample Sizes

- observed species all time in mcat 250
 - note these are not multinomial sample sizes, but rather sighting occurrences.
 - multinomial structure fills in zeros for all unsighted species in a particular sample id.
- We'll see that model performance will get some of the common species, while the less common species are very hard to predict.
 - Common: BCAC, CLPR, CNRY, WDOW, YTRK
 - Intermediate: BANK, BLGL, CWCD *often worrisome
 - Uncommon: BRNZ, MXRF

MCAT 253 & 269 Sample Sizes

- MCAT 253:
 - Common: BCAC, CLPR, WDOW
 - Intermediate: SNOS, YTRK
 - Uncommon: BLGL, CWCD
- MCAT 269:
 - Common: WDOW
 - Intermediate: CLPR, YTRK // BCAC, CNRY
 - Uncommon: DBRK, POP

Flatfish and Elasmobranchs

- number of port sampling sightings
- Largest landed Flatfish and Elasmobranchs
 - Sampling Flatfish since 2002
 - Sampling Elasmobranchs since 2009
- See Flat/Elasmobranch Table

Request: Redo modeling w/o So-Cal

- Redo modeling in early time block MCAT 250 w/o Southern California
- Here we look at predictions from top species:
 - CLPR, CNRY, WDOW, YTRK

Redo SoCal Summary

- Out of sample predictions do not effect observed strata.
- Small difference just come from slight run-by run variation
- When Sample sizes become very sparse it can cause slight model instability.

Request: Time Model & Prior Sensitivity

- Top landings MCATS in early time period: 250, 253, 269
 - M models
 - Prior models

Time Models

- Bayesian Modeling
 - Heirarchical v. Random Effect Disclaimer
- (M1) Fixed main effect time model
 - No pooling
- (M2) Random main effect time model
 - years/quarter pool separately
- (M3) Random main effects + random interaction
- (M4) Random interactions jointly pooled
- (M5) Random interactions quarterly variances pooling across years
- (M6) Random interactions yearly variances pooling across quarters
- All with default IG prior

TIME MODEL: 250

- M2, M3, M4
- Least MAD worrisome: WDOW, BCAC, CLPR, CNRY
 - BCAC:
 - * Most of landings in TWL, in later years, in all qtrs,
 - * largest landings in BRG
 - * generally good performance
 - WDOW:
 - * Most landings in ERK, TWL, 1980, all qtrs
 - * very good performance
- Most MAD worrisome: BRNZ, MXRF, BLGL, CWCD, BANK * consistent
 - CWCD:
 - * MRO, HKL (some TWL), all years, spring
 - * Over fitting: mostly 0s and interval contains 0
 - MXRF:
 - * BRG, TWL, 1980, Winter/Spring
 - * Very small sample sizes
 - wouldn't be surprised if some of difference are due to model instability
 - large variance: even a little instability could cause some what larger predictive differences.
 - flat likelihood in MXRK axis => small Δ likelihood across wide area.

TIME MODEL: 253

- M4, M5, M6
- Least MAD worrisome: WDOW, BCAC, CLPR, CNRY, BANK * consistent
 - BCAC:
 - * TWL
 - * predictions are relatively good
 - * not a huge difference between models
 - WDOW:
 - * TWL
 - * slight overfitting, not bad fit
- Most MAD worrisome: DBRK, CWCD, YTRK, BLGL, SNOS * consistent
 - CWCD:
 - * OSF/MRO, TWL, 1978/1981, winter/summer
 - * Overfitting: Simpler models do better
 - Mostly zeros
 - DBRK:
 - * OSF/MNT, TWL, 1980, summer
 - * Underfitting: More complex model works better

TIME MODEL: 269

- M4, M5, M6
- Few species, some spp show on best and worst
- Least MAD worrisome: YTRK, BCAC, CLPR, CNRY
 - CNRY:
 - * CRS, TWL, 1982, Q3
 - * Overfitting: simpler model
 - YTRK:
 - * CRS/MRO, TWL, 1982, spring
 - * almost no model sensativity
- Most MAD worrisome: WDOW, DBRK, POP
 - BCAC:
 - * ERK/MNT, TWL, 1982, Fall/Summer
 - * Overfitting
 - * almost no model sensativity
 - WDOW:
 - * BDG, TWL, 1982, spring
 - * underfitting:??

Request: Landings

- Aggregate across MCATs 250, 253, 269 by year and year:gear for each spp.
 - new model runs against calcom in black
- Only show select species relevant for management
- **WDOW**
 - little sensitivity to M model
 - low estimates in TWL, 1979, 1980, 1981
- **BCAC**
 - little sensitivity
 - driven by TWL
 - reasonably small differences
- **CLPR**
 - little sensitivity
 - driven by TWL (very similar)
 - other gears off a bit (S:G)
- **DBRK & CWCD**
 - little sensitivity
 - lots of variance but basically similar
 - we can estimate variance! wouldn't be able to say that from calcom
- **MXRK**
 - suuuper skewed distributions
 - * 9000 samples at 0 and some up to 1
 - * high variance
 - Bayesian inference estimating higher moments
 - * complex posterior as a result of extreme lack of information
 - * statistics are breaking down, yet mean not far from calcom.
 - * all of the instability is masked in calcom but the model can see it.
 - we should want to see those failures in the data; the model does.

Priors

- Diffuse priors
- Main effects diffuse Normals
- ρ transformed to be a real number
 - $\text{logit}(\rho) \rightarrow (-3.91, 3.91)$
 - $\rho \rightarrow (0.02, 0.98)$
- Any heirarchical variances:
 - Default: IG prior
 - Informative: $\sqrt{v} \sim \text{Half-Cauchy}(10^1)$
 - Diffuse: $\sqrt{v} \sim \text{Half-Cauchy}(10^3)$
 - Flat: $\sqrt{v} \sim \text{Unif}(0, 10^4)$

PRIOR MODEL: 250

- M4HC1, M4HC3, M4U4
- Least MAD worrisome: WDOW, BCAC, CLPR, DBRK
 - BCAC:
 - * Most of landings in TWL, in later years, in all qtrs; largest landings in BRG; generally good performance
 - * almost no sensitivity to prior
 - WDOW:
 - * Most landings in ERK, TWL, 1980, all qtrs; very good performance
 - * again almost no sensitivity to prior
- Most MAD worrisome: CWCD, MXRK, BRNZ, BANK, BLGL * consistent
 - CWCD:
 - * MRO, HKL (some TWL), all years, spring; Overfitting: mostly 0s and interval contains 0
 - * zero prior effect
 - MXRF:
 - * BRG, TWL, 1980, Winter/Spring
 - * Very small sample sizes (could some model instability)
 - prior could be making an influence here
 - U4 prior seems best

PRIOR MODEL: 253

- M4HC1, M4HC3, M4U4 (truly no difference, M4IG)
- Least MAD worrisome: WDOW, BCAC, CLPR, CNRY, BANK * consistent (same)
 - BCAC:
 - * TWL; predictions are relatively good
 - * A bit of difference between models (more than M choice)
 - CLPR:
 - * TWL
 - * good performance, not a ton of influence from priors
- Most MAD worrisome: DBRK, CWCD, YTRK, BLGL, SNOS * consistent
 - CWCD:
 - * OSF/MRO, TWL, 1978/1981, winter/summer; mostly zeros
 - * again Overfitting: Simpler models do better
 - M4HC1 promotes most pooling => simplest models
 - M4U4 promotes least pooling => complex models => tends to overfit
 - DBRK:
 - * OSF/MNT, TWL, 1980, summer
 - * Underfitting: More complex model works better
 - M4U4 promotes most complex model

PRIOR MODEL: 269

- M4IG, M4HC3, M4U4 (M4HC1 tooo much pooling)
- Few species, some spp show on best and worst
- Least MAD worrisome: again YTRK, BCAC, CLPR, CNRY
 - CLPR:
 - * MRO/MNT, TWL, 1982, spring/summer
 - * Overfitting: although prior doesn't do a lot
 - * MRO lot of landings, but almost no samples
 - one sample and we missed it
 - YTRK:
 - * CRS/MRO, TWL, 1982, spring
 - * prior simplifies model and all coverages get smaller
- Most MAD worrisome: WDOW, DBRK, POP
 - BCAC:
 - * ERK/MNT, TWL, 1982, Fall/Summer
 - * Overfitting
 - * again almost no model sensativity
 - WDOW:
 - * BDG, TWL, 1982, spring
 - * still underfitting
 - * slight preference for HC3 prior
 - * I think it wants a more complex model but M4 is not enough to get us there

Landings

- again Aggregate across MCATs 250, 253, 269 by year and year:gear for each spp.
 - new model runs against calcom in black
- Only show select species relevant for management
- **WDOW**
 - again little sensitivity to Prior model
 - still low estimates in TWL, 1979, 1980, 1981 compared to calcom
- **BCAC**
 - a little sensitivity from prior as seen in MCAT 253
 - still driven by TWL
 - still reasonably small differences
- **CLPR**
 - almost no sensitivity
 - still driven by TWL (very similar)
 - still other gears off a bit (S:G)
- **DBRK & CWCD**
 - little sensitivity
 - still lots of variance estimated but basically similar
 - CWCD a bit more sensitive to prior, with only real changes occurring in 253
- **MXRK**
 - still suuuper skewed distributions
 - * 9000 samples at 0 and some up to 1
 - * high variance
 - HC1 giving most shrinkage, you can see it picking up on something in 1981.

Request: Interaction Modeles

- Model M4
- IG prior
- early time block
- MCATs 250, 253 and 269
- w/o Southern California
- try adding Spp:Gear and Spp:Port interactions

INTERACTION MODEL: 250

- M4, M4SG, M4SP

INTERACTION MODEL: 253

- M4, M4SG, M4SP

INTERACTION MODEL: 269

- M4, M4SG, M4SP