**Methods**

‘Interviews, observation, documentary work, [and] historical record” formed the set of methods in this ‘marketography’, which aimed to trace the market-making efforts of market actors across space and time (Roscoe and Loza, 2019, p. 221).

Interviews and observation

For the interviews, initial participant recruitment followed the identification of main players in the market through publicly available data, and starting contact via online channels. From this, a process of snowballing (Easterby-Smith et al., 2008) allowed for further potential participants to be selected. Sampling through snowballing poses the risk of distorting bias (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2019) (e.g., only meeting partners or X’s mind-like participants), however, the multi-sided nature of our approach to recruitment ensured accounting for a plethora of perspectives.

“Cold calling” contact was made via email to industry association, corporate emails on respective websites, and LinkedIn, while direct emails were provided by the first participants’ referral in the snowballing process. Contact with activists and aquaculture researchers and experts followed a criterion of identifiable involvement with salmon farming (e.g., campaigning for or against or published research on salmon aquaculture). One of the authors also attended one of the largest industry events in Scotland in 2023 to network and identify potential participants, which resulted in one of the expert interviews.

Interviews followed a semi-structured guide which allowed adaptation and exploration during conversations. Thus, the authors made decisions about “which line of questioning […] to explore further” (Easterby-Smith et al., 2008, p. 143) depending on which points were raised by the interviewees.

Interviews were conducted either in person in Scotland during in one week, or via Microsoft Teams or Skype, which helped researchers in accessing geographically dispersed participants. Both authors were present at each interview, except for two of them because of schedule constrains. In this case, the non-present co-author subsequently listened to the recording of the interview.

The time *in situ* involved a guided visit to one of the participant’s hatchery plants. We also independently visited (no participant involvement) a collection of salmon farming pens in a Scottish bay. These observations (cf. Gold, 1958) allowed the researchers to gather further insights into the everyday operation and intricacies of salmon farming that were not detailed in interviews. All interviews, in person and online, were recorded and transcribed *ipsis literis* by a hired transcriber and subsequently cross-checked by the authors. This formed the dataset of the thematic analysis to identify key themes raised by the participants. Analysis was performed through open, axial and selective coding in which every “pass-through” the data involved identifying and refining themes and (Neuman, 2012, p. 354). Both authors conducted an independent analysis of the texts, identifying themes. This was followed by a contrasting, discussion and agreement between the two analysis that resulted in the ‘grand themes’ making up the discussion section.
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