

MyDas- Ref: ITT17-015  
colorlinks, urlcolor=darkblue

Supply of Research Services to establish MSY proxies for  
data-limited stocks (2017-18) to the Marine Institute, Rinville,  
Oranmore, Co. Galway. (Ref: ITT17-015)

Laurence Kell, Cóilín Minto

December 11, 2019

## SUMMARY

This report summarises the main activities and outcomes of MyDas with respect to the tasks, namely i) Stock prioritisation, ii) Data Collation, iii) Framework Development; iv) Performance Appraisal, v) Reference Point Comparison, vi) Liaison with Marine Institute, and vii) Linkage with other Projects.

The main outcomes were i) R packages with documentation, ii) vignettes with reproducible examples, iii) peer review papers, and iv) example management procedures for data poor stocks.

Initially a number of stocks were proposed as potential case studies and fisheries dependent and independent data and life history characteristics were collated. After discussion with the Marine Institute (MI) seven case study stocks, i.e. sprat, brill, turbot, pollack, ray, razor clams and lobster, were selected, based on economic and ecological importance.

Data-poor stock assessment models, based on length and catch, in use worldwide were reviewed and simulation tested. The best performing methods were identified implemented in a Management Strategy Evaluation framework. Two R packages, mydas and FLife, were developed for simulating stocks based on life history theory and testing data poor harvest control rules, and vignettes with examples were developed. The framework was tested at an MI workshop and results presented at the ICES Workshop On The Development Of Quantitative Assessment Methodologies Based On Life-History Traits, Exploitation Characteristics, And Other Relevant Parameters For Data-Limited Stocks (WKLIFE).

## Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Tasks</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1 Stock Prioritisation . . . . .	4
2.2 Data collation . . . . .	5
2.3 Assessment Methods . . . . .	5
2.4 Performance Appraisal . . . . .	5
2.5 Simulation . . . . .	6
2.6 Liason . . . . .	6
2.7 Linkage . . . . .	6
<b>3. Case Studies</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>4. Data Collation</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>5. Assessment Methods</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>6. Framework</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>7. Simulations</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>8. Liason and Linkage</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Appendix A</b>	<b>22</b>
A1 Database . . . . .	22
A2 Dataset Summary . . . . .	28
<b>Appendix B Peer Review Papers</b>	<b>46</b>
B1 Linking the performance of a data-limited empirical catch rule to life-history traits . . . . .	46
B2 Performance of length-based data-limited methods in a multi-fleet context . . . . .	86
B21 ROC . . . . .	160
B22 Pareto . . . . .	162

## 1. Introduction

The goal of MyDas was to develop and test a range of assessment methods to establish Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY) or proxy MSY reference points, across the spectrum of data-limited stocks.

Case studies were identified based on their economic and ecological importance and then appropriate datasets on life histories, commercial catches and surveys collated. Candidate data poor assessment methods were identified and their performance evaluated using simulation testing and Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE). The simulation framework was developed in R, and assessment methods were integrated with [FLR](#), a collection of tools for quantitative fisheries science, developed in the R language [?]. This required extending and updating existing FLR packages; for example [FLife](#) was extended to include methods to build simulation models based on life history theory, and new package [mydas](#) was developed to provide tools for simulation of data advice frameoworks.

As well as liason with the Marine Institute the project supported participation at the ICES Workshop On The Development Of Quantitative Assessment Methodologies Based On Life-History Traits, Exploitation Characteristics, And Other Relevant Parameters For Data-Limited Stocks ([WKLIFE](#)).

Outputs from MyDas included

- R packages with assessment models for data-limited stocks implemented in an MSE framework.
- R Vignettes describing the methods and findings.
- Publication in peer-reviewed journals on new methods/tools/evaluations.

## 2. Tasks

There were seven tasks namely: i) Stock prioritisation, ii) Data Collation, iii) Framework Development; iv) Performance Appraisal, v) Reference Point Comparison, vi) Liaison with Marine Institute, and vii) Linkage with other Projects.

### 2.1 Stock Prioritisation

- **Objective** A number of potential stocks were identified at the start of the project from which the final choice of case studies were selected based on economic value; importance of the species to the ecosystem (i.e. key-stone species); sensitivity to the impacts of fishing; and availability of data.
- **Outcome** The final case studies chosen were sprat, brill, turbot, thornback ray, pollack, lobster, and razor clams, and reflect a range of valuable stocks, ecological roles and [life histories](#).

## 2.2 Data collation

- **Objective** Data collation ran in parallel with other tasks, and relied on existing data sets which were either available from the Marine Institute, other European labs/agencies or publicly available.
  - The main datasets were fishery independent surveys, commercial catches, stock assessment inputs and outputs and life history parameters.
- **Outcome** The data were collated into a PostgreSQL [database](#) and [R code](#) was developed for processing.
  - At the end of the project the data were archived on [google drive](#).

## 2.3 Assessment Methods

- **Objective** A number of data limited methods already exist, in order to allow them to be simulation tested and their performance compared they were implemented within a common R framework.
- **Outcome** Data limited methods in use worldwide were summarised in a [google spreadsheet](#). Following a review five catch-only and three length-only assessment methods were then compared, allowing the best performing methods to be identified.
  - Two peer review papers were produced that evaluated length based methods [?] and compared length and catch based methods [?].
  - The best performing methods were Length Based Spawning Potential Ratio [LBSPR ?] and Depletion Based Stock Reduction Analysis [DBSRA ?].
  - These were then implemented as [vignettes](#) in the mydas package, see the vignettes [lbspr](#) and [bdsra](#).

## 2.4 Performance Appraisal

- **Objective** Method performance appraisal was based on the develop of a set of diagnostics that can be applied across a range of models to assess the stability of the model, sensitivity to assumptions and bias.
- **Outcome** A simulation framework based on R was developed using [FLR](#), a collection of tools for quantitative fisheries science developed in the R language, that facilitates the construction of simulation models of fisheries systems. Two R packages were developed, [FLife](#) which uses life history theory to build simulation models and [mydas](#) which provides an interface to the data poor methods, [vignettes](#) document the approach and provide worked examples.
  - Operating Models conditioned on life history theory were developed for each of the [case studies](#).
  - An [Observation Error Model](#) was developed also developed to simulate psuedo data under a range of assumptions to allow the bias and sensitivity of stock estimates and reference points to be estimated.
  - Vignettes include examples of conducting [MSE](#) and the use of [parallel computing](#), estimation of [proxy reference points](#) and calculation of [performance metrics](#), [OM conditioning](#) and simulation testing [length](#) and [catch](#) based methods.

## **2.5 Simulation**

- **Objective** Once reference points are identified, their performance was evaluated through simple Management Strategy Evaluations.
- **Outcome**
  - Simulation testing was conducted for the ICES control rule using the FLife package for data limited stocks [?].
  - A comparison of [length based indicators](#) was conducted and a peer review paper is currently in preparation.
  - An [empirical control rule](#) was simulation tested using MSE, and a peer review paper is in preparation.

## **2.6 Liason**

- **Objective** Meetings on a regular basis with the MI.
- **Outcome** Meetings at the Marine Institute ensured that the over-arching goals of the project were achieved.
  - Regular [presentations](#) were made at the MI and a Workshop was held where the methods were tested.
  - In addition to ensure good communication between the consortium and the Marine Institute and that the project keeps focus and delivers as well as the scheduled meetings code, data and results were made available on the cloud and in a github repository during the life of the project.

## **2.7 Linkage**

- **Objective** Link with other projects
- **Outcome**
  - The MyDas framework was developed though case studies in collaboration with the MI.
  - Attendance at Workshop on the Development of Quantitative Assessment Methodologies based on LIFE-history traits, exploitation characteristics, and other relevant parameters for data-limited stocks ([WKLIFE](#)) and the Working Group for the Celtic Seas Ecoregion ([WGCSE](#)), see presentations and report
    - \* [WKLIFE VIII](#)
    - \* [WKLIFE IX](#)

### 3. Case Studies

A number of example stocks were identified in the original call, i.e.

- Sprat in the Celtic Sea and West of Scotland Sprat (Sub-area VI & Divisions VIIa-c and f-k)
- Grey gurnard VI & VII (excl. VIId)
- Ling IIIa, IVa, VI, VII, VIII, IX, XII, and XIV
- Rays, primarily in areas VIIa,f,g
- John dory in ICES Sub-area VII and Divisions VIIa,b and d (Northeast Atlantic)
- In collaboration with Newport STO:
  - Saithe VII, VIII, IX, X
  - Pollock VII
- Turbot VIIe,f,j,h and sub area VIII and IXa
- Brill VII (or suitably defined)

Available data sources and relevant publications were reviewed (Table 1). Following which the final choice of case studies was then made in liaison with the Marine Institute based on economic value of the stock; importance of the species to the ecosystem (key-stone species); sensitivity to the impacts of fishing and available data.

Species	TAC	Commercial Data	Data	Comments
Sprat	No	Targeted species for small fleet	Poor; mainly landings weights	Key-stone prey fish
Gurnards	No	Nearly 100% discarded & Reasonable discard and survey data. No age data	Key-stone prey – widely distributed and abundant	
Saithe, Pollock Ling	Yes	Mixed fishery	Some port sampling, observer and survey data. Very limited age data	Key-stone predator
Rays, Skates	Yes	Targeted and mixed fishery	Some port sampling, observer and survey data. No age data	Sensitive species – slow reproduction
John Dory	No	Mixed fishery but can be targeted to an extent	Some port sampling, observer and survey data. No age data	Sensitive species – valuable non-TAC species (not protected by fisheries management)
Turbot, Brill	No	Mixed fishery but can be targeted to an extent	Some port sampling, observer and survey data. Very limited age data	Sensitive species – valuable non-TAC species (not protected by fisheries management)

Table 1: Summary of potential study stocks.

The final case studies were [sprat](#), [pollack](#), [brill](#), [turbot](#), [thornback ray](#), [lobster](#) and [razor clams](#) as these represent a range of life histories, and have a variety of roles in maintaining the structure of pelagic and demersal communities. The data on vertebrate life histories were accessed directly from [fishnets](#).




Figure 1: Life history parameters for case study vertebrate stocks.

#### 4. Data Collation

The project relied on existing datasets rather than collecting new data and collating these data ran in parallel with other tasks. As well as Marine Institute data datasets were also obtained from ICES<sup>1</sup> and the JRC<sup>2</sup>. While life history parameters were obtained from Fishbase<sup>3</sup> and fishnets<sup>4</sup>, and stock assessment inputs and outputs from stock.assessment.org<sup>5</sup>.

A database was designed to provide; see the [database summary](#) in the Appendix. The data were summarised to help identify the case studies. For example to chose different species a key dataset were the life history parameters, since many studies have shown that relationships between life history traits exists for processes such as growth, maturity and natural mortality. For data poor stocks where infomation on key processes is lacking life history theory can be used allowing simulation models to be developed. See the vignette on [conditioning Operating Models](#) on life history parameters.

<sup>1</sup><https://www.ices.dk/marine-data/dataset-collections/Pages/default.aspx>

<sup>2</sup><https://stecf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/dd/medbs/ram>

<sup>3</sup><http://www.fishbase.org/search.php>

<sup>4</sup><https://github.com/fishnets/fishnets>

<sup>5</sup><https://www.stockassessment.org>

The various analyses based are archived on [google drive](#)

## 5. Assessment Methods

A number of data-limited methods already exist, in order to compare their performance they need to be run in a common framework. Therefore methods were interfaced to R, using the Fishery Library in R (**FLR**) [?] a toolset that is composed of a variety of packages, covering the various steps in the fisheries advice and simulation workflow. Using **FLR** means that advantage can be taken of existing methods, and that dissemination and support is easier and will be maintained after the life of the project.

To identify the appropriate advice given the quality of data rules ICES classifies stock assessments into six [categories](#) on the basis of the available data, e.g. total landings, indices of abundance, length frequency and age data.

**Category 1: stocks with quantitative assessments** Full analytical assessments and forecasts as well as stocks with quantitative assessments based on production models.

**Category 2: stocks with analytical assessments that are only treated qualitatively** Quantitative assessments and forecasts which for a variety of reasons are considered indicative of trends in fishing mortality, recruitment, and biomass.

**Category 3: stocks for which survey based assessments indicate trends** Survey or other indices are available that provide reliable indications of trends in stock metrics, such as total mortality, recruitment, and biomass.

**Category 4: stocks for which only reliable catch data are available** Time series of catch can be used to approximate MSY.

**Category 5: landings only** Only landings data are available.

**Category 6: negligible landings** Landings are negligible in comparison to discards and stocks that are primarily caught as bycatch species in other targeted fisheries

For data limited stocks a number of methods already exist, for example the ICES Working Group on Category 3 and 4 stocks ([WGMSYCAT34](#)) has been working on rules for survey-based assessments which indicate trends in stock status (Category 3) or for which only catch data are available (Category 4).

Data limited methods in use worldwide were summarised in a [google spreadsheet](#). Following which five catch and three length based methods, were then selected for simulation testing, based on the availability of code, whether the method had been peer reviewed and the appropriateness of estimated quantities for use as proxy reference points. The methods were [?] with the intention of selecting the best catch and length-only methods for further evaluation.

### *Catch Only*

Catch-only assessment methods evaluated were Catch-Maximum Sustainable Yield [Catch-MSY ?], Depletion Based Stock Reduction Analysis [DBSRA ?], Simple Stock Synthesis [SSS ?], an extension of Catch-MSY (CMSY), and State Space Catch Only Method [SSCOM ?]. Length based methods evaluated were Length Based Spawning Potential Ratio [LBSPR ??], Length-Based Integrated Mixed Effects [LIME ?], and Length-Based Bayesian [LBB ?].

Catch-MSY is based on stock reduction analysis (SRA) that assume a Schaefer biomass dynamic model. Inputs are a time series of removals, priors for the population rate of increase at low population size ( $r$ ), carrying capacity ( $K$ ), and a probability distribution of stock depletion in the final year. CMSY, extends Catch-MSY by using a Monte-Carlo filter to fix systematic biases in the Catch-MSY.

DBSRA further modifies the SRA approach by using Monte Carlo draws from the parameter distributions for  $M$ ,  $F_{MSY}/M$ ,  $B_{MSY}/B_0$ , depletion, and age at maturity ( $A_{mat}$ ) to separate total biomass into immature and mature biomass using a delay-difference production model.

SSS is based on Stock Synthesis [?], and fixes all parameters in a Stock Synthesis model except for initial recruitment ( $\ln R_0$ ). An artificial index of abundance that represents the relative stock biomass is used for fitting where the first value of the index is 1, and the value in the final year represents depletion (i.e. the proportion of the population left in the final year). Values of steepness ( $h$ ) and depletion are randomly drawn from a specified distribution using a Monte Carlo approach and  $\ln R_0$  is then estimated.

SSCOM is a Bayesian state-space model that integrates across three stochastic functional forms, variation in effort, population dynamics and fishing efficiency.

#### *Length Only*

LBSPR, estimates the proportion of the unfished reproductive potential per recruit (SPR) under a given level of fishing pressure. In an exploited population is calculated as a function of the ratio of fishing mortality to natural mortality ( $F/M$ ), selectivity, and the two life-history ratios  $M/k$  and  $L_m/L_\infty$ ; where  $k$  is the von Bertalanffy growth coefficient,  $L_m$  is the size of maturity and  $L_\infty$  is asymptotic size. The inputs are length at maturity specified in terms of  $L_{50}$  and  $L_{95}$  (the size at which 50% and 95% of a population matures) and length frequency data. LBSPR is an equilibrium based method and assumes asymptotic selectivity, von Bertalanffy growth, length at-age is normally distributed, rates of natural mortality are constant across adult age classes, recruitment is constant over time, and growth rates remain constant across the cohorts within a stock.

LIME like LBSPR uses biological information and the length composition of the catch to estimate F and SPR. Unlike LBSPR, however, it does not assume equilibrium conditions and uses mixed effects to estimate changes in recruitment and fishing mortality separately over time.

LBB is a simple and fast method for estimating relative stock size that uses a Bayesian Monte Carlo Markov Chain (MCMC) approach. LBB uses pre-specified priors on parameters, and thus, technically does not require any inputs other than to length frequency data. It does provides the user the option to specify priors for  $L_\infty$ , length at first capture ( $L_c$ ), and relative natural mortality ( $M/k$ ).  $F/M$  is estimated over the age range represented in the length-frequency sample.

#### *Evaluation*

The methods were simulation tested for three life history types (short, medium and long-lived), three historical exploitation scenarios, and three depleted levels [?]. The results of the simulations are shown in Figure 5.. Of the five catch based methods SSCOM performs poorly in terms of precision and bias, while SSS is the least bias DBSRA the most precise. The length based methods tend to perform less well than the catch based methods, while LIME is the least biased while LBSPR is the most precise.

Bias and precision are both important factors to consider when assessing fish stocks. Bias reflects how close an estimate is to a known value; precision reflects reproducibility of the estimate. For example, if an assessment is to be re-conducted every year to monitor the impact of a management measure, a precise but biased method would be able to detect a trend better than an unbiased but imprecise method. Like a scientific instruments, this trade-off require calibration to correct for the bias, and such calibration can be explored using closed-loop simulations (i.e. MSE), where the choice of parameters and reference points in a Management Procedure are tuned (i.e. calibrated) to meet the desired management objectives as represented by the Operating Model. Thus, a biased method (e.g., DBSRA) may be preferable to one that is less biased, but more imprecise (e.g., LIME). Alternatively, imprecision can be addressed through the choice of the percentile (e.g., median being the 50% percentile value) for the derived model output used by management (e.g., catch or SPR); assuming that the true value is contained within the

parameter distribution. For example, instead of taking the median value, one could instead use the derived model output associated with the 40th percentile to incorporate risk tolerance as reflected in the calculated imprecision. Such an approach [?] is used in fisheries management systems to directly incorporate scientific uncertainty (both bias and imprecision), and can also be explored and tuned using MSE.

The best performing catch-only methods were SSS and DBSRA, SSS was the least biased method while DBSRA was the most precise. A problem with SSS is that it is based on SS3 and so is a complicated method that requires a lot of assumptions in the form of fixed parameters. DBSRA in contrast is based on a biomass based stock production function and so requires fewer assumptions, it also allows data poor and data rich assessments to be compared, i.e. if an index of abundance could be developed then an ICES Category 3 assessment could be converted into a Category 1 assessment. This allows the value of information to be evaluated. Therefore DBSRA was selected for further evaluation.

Both LBSPR and LIME use the same inputs, the main difference is that LIME is a non-equilibrium method, takes longer to run than LBSPR and often failed to converge, so although LIME estimates are less biased than LBSPR it is likely to perform poorly in closed loop simulations. LBB performed poorly in terms of both bias and precision. Therefore LBSPR was selected for the next stage of simulation evaluation.

## 6. Framework

The majority of fish stocks worldwide lack sufficient data on which to base quantitative assessments. In some cases Management Strategy Evaluation [MSE ?] has been used to develop harvest control rules (HCRs) based on empirical indicators that follow trends in survey estimates of abundance, catch rates or size composition.

A reason for the use of MSE is because it is recognised that the robustness of advice depends on the combination of data, estimation method, choice of reference points as well as the rules used to set management action, i.e. the Management Procedure (MP). When conducting MSE an Operating Model (OM) is used to represent the dynamics of system being managed, and control actions from an MP are fed back into the OM so that its influence on the stock and hence on future fisheries data is propagated through the stock and fishery dynamics. Conducting MSE requires six steps; namely i) identification of management objectives; ii) selection of hypotheses for the OM; iii) conditioning the OM based on data and knowledge, and possible weighting and rejection of hypotheses; iv) identifying candidate management strategies; v) running the Management Procedure (MP) as a feedback control in order to simulate the long-term impact of management; and then vi) identifying the MPs that robustly meet management objectives.

The MSE framework was based on the Fishery Library in R [**FLR** ?], which comprises a variety of packages that cover the various steps in the fisheries advice and simulation workflow. Using **FLR** means that advantage can be taken of existing methods, and that dissemination and support is easier and will be maintained after the life of the project. Under MyDas development focused on two main packages **FLife** and **mydas**. **FLife** is a package for modelling life history relationships and **mydas** provides a set of tools for simulation and conducting Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) by providing wrappers for the various assessment methods, implementing Observation Error Models (OEMs) to simulate empirical indicators and other datasets, and to model harvest control rules (HCRs).

**FLife** was used to condition OM based on life history relationships and ecological theory, MP were then implemented using **mydas**. The link between the OM and the MP is the **OEM**, which generates fishery-dependent or independent resource monitoring data. The OEM models the uncertainties due to sampling and limited data and so mimics the types of data currently required for each assessment method. In addition the types of data that could be made available in the future,

Simulation tests were also performed without feedback where the OEM was used to generate datasets from the OM. This allows the performance of the candidate methods to be compared, since if there is little correlation between the estimates of reference points and status from a candidate method and the OM then there is little point in running that method in the MSE. Tests were performed for

[Biomass dynamic configured to use only catch data](#) and [Biomass dynamic LBSPR](#)

### Performance measures

Management objectives include (e.g. under the ([http://ec.europa.eu/environment/marine/good-environmental-status/descriptor-3/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/marine/good-environmental-status/descriptor-3/index_en.htm)) of the European Union) that stocks should be exploited sustainably consistent with high long-term yields, have full reproductive capacity in order to maintain stock biomass and that the proportion of older and larger individuals in the stock is high.

These general objectives can be mapped to performance measures, so that alternative management strategies can be compared. For example

**Safety** Probability of avoiding a limit such as  $B_{lim}$  where recruitment is impaired

**Status** Probability of achieving targets related to MSY, e.g.  $B_{MSY}$  and  $F_{MSY}$

**Yield** Yield:MSY

**Variability** Inter-annual variation in catches or stock status

A range of summary statistics will be required to illustrate trade-offs between multiple potentially

conflicting objectives. Although there are many potential summary statistics so that decision makers can choose between tangible options on the basis of actual projections rather than abstract concepts and performance statistics, however, should ideally be few, informative and based axes such as stock status, 'safety', 'stability' and 'yield'. It is also necessary to distinguish between technical summary statistics (i.e. those required to evaluate model fits and performance) and those required to evaluate management objectives.

## 7. Simulations

ICES is in the process of developing methods to identify MSY proxy reference points for data-limited stocks at the ICES Workshop On The Development Of Quantitative Assessment Methodologies Based On Life-History Traits, Exploitation Characteristics, And Other Relevant Parameters For Data-Limited Stocks ([WKLIFE](#)). **MyDas** contributed to this process by proposing and testing new assessment models and methods of establishing reference points and attended both WKLIFE VIII and IX. There are key differences with the ICES approach, however, since **MyDas** stocks are not currently assessed by ICES and **MyDas** focused on the available data for each stock first and then on methods, while the ICES approach focuses on the methods first and then applies a limited number of methods to a large number of stocks.

The importance of the work of **MyDas** was recognised at WKLIFEVIII where recommendations for [future directions](#) were made. Following this several examples based on the work of **MyDas** were made at WKLIFEIX. These included i) the use of life history theory to condition the OM used to evaluate the ICES advice rule proposed for [category 3 and 4 stocks](#); ii) Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curves to explore the setting of appropriate [reference levels](#) in the catch rule; and iii) the use of trends in an index [without a reference level](#). It was also recommended to use the methods of **MyDas** to evaluate the robustness of SPiCT based upon the development of Operating Models developed under [MyDas](#).

For stocks with analytical assessments (i.e. category 1 and 2 stocks), the advice rules applied by ICES are consistent with the objective of achieving MSY. For stocks in categories 3 and 4 ICES uses MSY proxy reference points as part of a Precautionary Approach to provide advice on the status of the stock and exploitation. The  $F_{MSY}$  proxy corresponds to the exploitation rate that will provide maximum long-term yield, while the  $MSY_{Btrigger}$  proxy corresponds to the stock size that triggers a cautious response; i.e. advises a reduced fishing mortality relative to  $F_{MSY}$  proxy in order to allow the stock to rebuild.

### *Advice Rule*

For stocks with  $MSY$  proxy reference points not derived from an assessment model, ICES uses a generic rule of the form

$$C_{y+1} = C_{current} r f b \quad (1)$$

where  $C_{current}$  is the catch either in the most recent year available (typically  $y - 1$ ) or the average over a number of recent years (e.g.  $y - n, \dots, y - 1$ ),  $r$  should account for the trend in stock biomass ( $r > 0$ ; with  $r = 1$  if there is no trend),  $f$  is a proxy for the ratio  $F_{MSY}/(\text{current exploitation})$  and  $b = \min(1, \text{proxy for the ratio (current stock size)}/(MSY_{Btrigger}))$ . The latter is in effect a hockey stick type HCR.

$f$  is derived from length based indicators and a number of potential length based reference point and indicators<sup>6</sup> have been identified by ICES for stocks in categories 3 and 4 (see Table 2)

The **mydas** package includes methods to simulate length frequency data and estimate indicators; Figure 3 shows an OM based on pollack that was used to simulate indicators (Figure 4).

To ensure that advice based on such indicators is precautionary, Management Strategy Evaluation was used to evaluate an empirical rule of the form  $C_{y+1} = C_{current} r f b$  that bases catch advice on recent catches, information from a biomass survey index ( $r$ ), length based indicators ( $f$ ) and proxy MSY reference point ( $b$ ) [?]. The OM was conditioned on life histories using the method developed by **MyDas**. The performance of the rule varied substantially between stocks, and the risk of breaching limit reference

<sup>6</sup> '[http://ices.dk/sites/pub/PublicationReports/GuidelinesandPolicies/16.04.03.02\\_Category\\_3-4\\_Reference\\_Points.pdf](http://ices.dk/sites/pub/PublicationReports/GuidelinesandPolicies/16.04.03.02_Category_3-4_Reference_Points.pdf)'

**Table 2** Selected indicators for LBI screening plots. Indicator ratios in bold used for stock status assessment with traffic light system.

Ind	Select table column	Calculation	Reference point	Indicator ratio	Expected value	Property
$L_{max5\%}$	Mean length of largest 5%		$L_{inf}$	$L_{max5\%} / L_{inf}$	> 0.8	Conservation (large individuals)
$L_{95\%}$				$L_{95\%} / L_{inf}$		
$P_{mega}$	Proportion of individuals above $L_{opt} + 10\%$ . ( $L_{opt}$ is estimated from $L_{inf}$ ).	0.3 – 0.4	$P_{mega}$	> 0.3		
$L_{25\%}$	25 <sup>th</sup> percentile of length distribution	$L_{mat}$	$L_{25\%} / L_{mat}$	> 1		Conservation (immature)
$L_c$	Length at 50% of modal abundance*	$L_{mat}$	$L_c / L_{mat}$	> 1		
$L_{mean}$	Mean length of individuals > $L_c$	$L_{opt} = \frac{2}{3} L_{inf}$	$L_{mean} / L_{opt}$	$\approx 1$		Optimal yield
$L_{maxy}$	Length class with maximum biomass in catch	$L_{opt} = \frac{2}{3} L_{inf}$	$L_{maxy} / L_{opt}$	$\approx 1$		
$L_{mean}$	Mean length of individuals > $L_c$	$L_{F=M} = (0.75L_c + 0.25L_{inf})$	$L_{mean} / L_{F=M}$	$\geq 1$		MSY

\*Note this definition is different from the  $L_c$  used for the Mean-length Z estimator.

Table 2: Length based indicators.

points was inversely correlated to the von Bertalanffy growth parameter  $k$ . Stocks with  $k < 0.32$  had a high probability of stock collapse. It was shown that a single generic catch rule cannot be applied across all life-histories, and management should instead be linked to life-history traits, and in particular, the nature of the time series. This supported the premise of **MyDas** that to develop robust management it is important to consider the nature of the stock dynamics, knowledge and data. Counter-intuitively the catch rule performed poorly for the more productive stocks (those with higher  $k$ ) compared to the less productive stocks (with lower  $k$ ). The performance of the catch rule, however, is an emergent property of the interaction between the operating model and the catch rule. Therefore this is an important results which would not have been apparent without the work of our manuscript.

The advised catch was mainly influenced by one component of the rule (the trend in the relative index of abundance) and biomass trends for stocks with higher are inherently more variable, which in turn leads to higher fluctuations in catch. Therefore when managed by the ICES catch rule, the stocks with higher were more likely to collapse during simulation. This behaviour can be attributed to an initial rapid recovery, which resulted in an increase in catch. Once the stocks started to decline again, however, catch was not reduced quickly enough to avoid stock collapse. This undesirable feature is caused by the design of the catch rule, which bases the newly advised catch on the previous catch and observed data with a time-lag. Since the less productive stocks (those with low  $k$ ) were also less variable, the catch rule was sufficiently reactive to avoid stock collapse.

Therefore two papers are currently being drafted. The first used Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curves used to explore the setting of appropriate reference levels in the f component of the catch rule for the **MyDas** case studies. In particular to explore how these depend on life-history traits and the nature of the time-series. The second evaluated the use of trends in an index without a reference level for pollack. To do this, a Management Strategy Evaluation (MSE) was conducted to evaluate an empirical harvest control rule (HCR) based on a trend in an index of abundance. The Operating Model (OM) was conditioning on pollack life-history characteristics and the HCR was based on that used by the Commission for the Conservation of Southern Bluefin Tuna (CCSBT). The HCR has several parameters that require tuning [?], i.e. the parameters are found by choosing values that best meet the objectives of asset and stakeholders; i.e. optimises the outcomes modelled as a reward function.

## **8. Liason and Linkage**

*Liaison with Marine Institute](<https://github.com/laurieKell/mydas/wiki/6-Liaison-with-Marine-Institute>)*  
The service provider is expected to meet on a regular basis with MI staff involved in the project: Monthly update meetings at the Marine Institute premises in Oranmore Galway with researcher providing the research services, 6-monthly progress reports and meetings at the Marine Institute with the researcher providing the research services and contract manager.

The service provider meet on a regular basis with Marine Institute staff involved in the project. The proposal is ambitious but achievable. However there needs to be good communication between the consortium and the Marine Institute to ensure the project keeps focused and delivers. Therefore we will arrange monthly face-to-face meetings, make all code, data and results available on the cloud and in a suitable repository (e.g. github) and provide a web based interface for model results.

Wider project 6-monthly progress reports and meetings at the Marine Institute will ensure the overarching goals of the project are achieved. Attendance at [wklifeix: 4 Length-based approaches](#) and ICES WKLIFE & Working Group for the Celtic Seas Ecoregion ([WGCSE](#))

*Linkage with other projects](<https://github.com/laurieKell/mydas/wiki/7-Linkage-with-other-projects>)*  
The service provider is required to link research output to the following projects:

The MyDas framework was developed through case studies in collaboration with a range of partners, as well as the MI and ICES, these included the tuna Regional Management Fisheries Organisations (tRFMOs), the University of Washington and the JRC. These case studies resulted in a number of peer review manuscripts.

- Monkfish

This project will develop in close collaboration with the Cullen Fellowship of Mr Luke Batts, co-supervised by Dr Hans Gerritsen (MI) and Dr Cóilín Minto (GMIT). Active collaboration will occur with Tasks 3–5, as these are similarly proposed in the Cullen Fellowship where they are applied specifically to *Lophius budegassa* and *Lophius piscatorius* stocks in ICES areas VII–VIII.

- Pollock

Active collaboration exists between GMIT and the Newport Research Cluster (e.g., *Unlocking the Archive* project). Further collaboration and linkages will be built around data-poor assessment of pollock (liaising with the dedicated Scientific and Technical Officer working on pollock at the Furnace research facility). Both visits to Newport and group attendance at the monthly meetings will facilitate collaboration and crossover.

- DRuMFISH project

The project will also link with the DGMARE project: “Study on approaches to management for data-poor stocks in mixed fisheries (DRuMFISH)” to which GMIT is a partner in the consortium. Methodological development from DRuMFISH (e.g., hierarchical methods) will be directly relevant to the present proposal.

- CPV codes 71354500-9 Marine survey services 73112000-0 Marine research services 90712300-4 Marine conservation strategy planning 98360000-4 Marine services 77700000-7 Services incidental to fishing 73000000-2 Research and development services and related consultancy services 73110000-6 Research services 73200000-4 Research and development consultancy services 73210000-7 Research consultancy services.

- There are also other projects worldwide that can be linked to e.g. the global group on stock assessment methods and the tRFMO MSE WG.

- Achievements
- Promises & Differences
- What & Why

wklifeix: 4 Length-based approaches

[wklifeix: ROC]([http://ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication Reports/Expert Group Report/Fisheries Resources Steering Group/2019/WKLIFEIX/WKLIFEIX\\_2019.pdf](http://ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication Reports/Expert Group Report/Fisheries Resources Steering Group/2019/WKLIFEIX/WKLIFEIX_2019.pdf))page = 58)

[wklifeix: hake]([http://ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication Reports/Expert Group Report/Fisheries Resources Steering Group/2019/WKLIFEIX/WKLIFEIX\\_2019.pdf](http://ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication Reports/Expert Group Report/Fisheries Resources Steering Group/2019/WKLIFEIX/WKLIFEIX_2019.pdf))page = 100)

[wklifeix: hake]([http://ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication Reports/Expert Group Report/Fisheries Resources Steering Group/2019/WKLIFEIX/WKLIFEIX\\_2019.pdf](http://ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication Reports/Expert Group Report/Fisheries Resources Steering Group/2019/WKLIFEIX/WKLIFEIX_2019.pdf))page = 101)

Evaluate further improvements to the performance of the WKMSYCat34 catch rule 3.2.1. Focus on improving the catch rule for stocks with von Bertalanffy growth parameter  $k \leq 0.32$ , investigate more extensively the definition of the catch rule components and their impact on performance, and investigate the possibility of alternative catch rules. Explore the operating model set-up for data-limited simulations, including sensitivity analyses based on the Jacobian; e.g. elasticity analysis, on how the different life-history and fishery parameters affect the simulated stock behaviour under exploitation, an analysis of the nature of time-series and trends of observable stock characteristics (such as fishery-dependent and -independent metrics) and how the knowledge gained can be used to further improve the performance of catch rules

+ \*\*The International Council of the Exploration of the Sea (ICES)\*\* is in the process of developing methods to identify MSY proxy reference points for data-limited stocks ([WKLIFE]([http://ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication Reports/Expert Group Report/Fisheries Resources Steering Group/2019/WKLIFEIX/WKLIFEIX\\_2019.pdf](http://ices.dk/sites/pub/Publication Reports/Expert Group Report/Fisheries Resources Steering Group/2019/WKLIFEIX/WKLIFEIX_2019.pdf))). The service week meetings at ICES headquarters in Copenhagen. However there are key differences with the ICES approach. Since this is




Figure 2: Relative error (RE) in exploitation rate for all the catch-based and length-based models considered under the different harvest scenarios (a) and depletion scenarios for differing life histories, (b) short-lived, (c) medium-lived, and (d) long-lived.




Figure 3: Time series of simulated length based indicators, compared to  $F/F_{MSY}$




Figure 4: Time series of simulated length based indicators, compared to  $F/F_{MSY}$

## A

### A1 *Database*

## PostgreSQL database mydas\_dev

data\_faocodes (includes price – source Hans Gerritsen Marine Institute)

	Variable name	Type	Description
<b>1</b>	species_fao	Character	e.g. BLL, SPR, LIN, GUG, SKA, POK, POL,TUR, JOD.
<b>2</b>	scientific_name	Character	Latin names e.g. <i>Sprattus sprattus</i> .
<b>3</b>	english_name	Character	Sprat.
<b>4</b>	speciesgroup	Character	e.g. ANG, MON, ANF = Monkfish.
<b>5</b>	priceperkg	Double	Irish market prices 2015.

data\_icesrects (source ICES web site)

	Variable name	Type	Description
<b>1</b>	longitude	Double	Decimal degrees
<b>2</b>	latitude	Double	Decimal degrees
<b>3</b>	ices_rectangle	Character	ICES Rectangle code
<b>4</b>	area_km2	Integer	Area of ICES rectangle.
<b>5</b>	ecoregion	Character	Ecological region

data\_icesrects\_div (source ICES website)

	Variable name	Type	Description
<b>1</b>	area_27	Character	FAO area code and division notation, i.e. 10.a.1
<b>2</b>	ices_rectangle	Character	ICES Rectangle code
<b>3</b>	ices_division	Character	ICES division.

data\_lhistories (life histories of MYDAS species sourced from literature)

	Variable name	Type	Description
<b>1</b>	species	Character	Latin name.
<b>2</b>	speciesgp	Character	e.g. grouping blue ling and common ling into 1 var BLI, LIN = LIN.
<b>3</b>	sex	Character	Code for sex of individual fish i.e. M = Male, F=Female, U=Unsexed
<b>4</b>	t.0	Double	Time at which fish is at 0 length
<b>5</b>	linf	Double	Asymptotic maximum length (cm)
<b>6</b>	k	Double	Growth rate.
<b>7</b>	tm	Double	Age at maturity
<b>8</b>	lmat	Double	Length at maturity (cm)
<b>9</b>	area	Character	Area experiment was performed i.e. North Sea etc.
<b>10</b>	source	Character	Reference from literature source (table on shiny)

data\_psa\_default (life histories (above) of MYDAS species together with this table produce interactive page for shiny app for year 2015)

	Variable name	Type	Description
<b>1</b>	stock	Character	i.e. Speciesgroup BLL.7 for area 7 catching BLL.
<b>2</b>	gear	Character	Beam, Otter etc..
<b>3</b>	speciesgp	Character	e.g. grouping blue ling and common ling into 1 variable BLI, LIN = LIN.
<b>4</b>	totland	Double	Total landings in tonnes.
<b>5</b>	totfleetarea	Double	Total area gear went km <sup>2</sup>
<b>6</b>	stockarea	Double	Total area for the stock
<b>7</b>	olap_percent	Double	Totfleetarea/ stockarea x 100
<b>8</b>	price	Double	Price per kg of the species
<b>9</b>	score_olap	Integer	1 to 3 overlap score 3 is high susceptibility.
<b>10</b>	score_price	Integer	1 to 3 price score 3 is high susceptibility.
<b>11</b>	score_catch	Integer	1 to 3 catchability 3 is high susceptibility.
<b>12</b>	score_postc	Integer	1 to 3 post capture mortality 3 is high susceptibility.
<b>13</b>	tm_score	Integer	1 to 3 ages at maturity 1 is high productivity.
<b>14</b>	fec_score	Integer	1 to 3 fecundity score 1 is high productivity.
<b>15</b>	repro_score	Integer	1 to 3 reproductive score 1 is high productivity.
<b>16</b>	troph_score	Integer	1 to 3 trophic level score 1 is high productivity.
<b>17</b>	lmat_score	Integer	1 to 3 length at maturity score 1 is high productivity.
<b>18</b>	linf_score	Integer	1 to 3 asymptotic maximum length 1 is high productivity.

data\_speciescodes (look up table)

	Variable name	Type	Description
<b>1</b>	species_fao	Character	Species FAO codes for MYDAS species
<b>2</b>	scientific_name	Character	Latin names e.g. <i>Sprattus sprattus</i>
<b>3</b>	english_name	Character	Sprat.
<b>4</b>	speccode	Integer	WORMS code
<b>5</b>	speciesgp	Character	e.g. grouping blue ling and common ling into 1 var BLI, LIN = LIN.

data\_stecf\_aer\_cpuedays (summary table to calculate cpue for shiny app from STECF annual economic report)

	Variable name	Type	Description
<b>1</b>	year	Integer	Year of fishing activity
<b>2</b>	speciesgp	Character	e.g. grouping blue ling and common ling into 1 var BLI, LIN = LIN.
<b>3</b>	country_code	Character	ESP = Spain etc. See appendix
<b>4</b>	gear_type	Character	Fishing activity etc BEAM = beam trawl see appendix.
<b>5</b>	vessel_length	Character	Length of fishing boat.
<b>6</b>	totval	Double	Total value in Euros (€)
	totctch	Double	Total catch in tonnes (t)
	totdays	Double	Total days fished.

data\_stecf\_aer\_econ (summary table to calculate cpue for shiny app from STECF annual economic report)

	Variable name	Type	Description
<b>1</b>	year	Integer	Year of fishing activity
<b>2</b>	speciesgp	Character	e.g. grouping blue ling and common ling into 1 var BLI, LIN = LIN.
<b>3</b>	country_code	Character	ESP = Spain etc. See appendix
	country_name	Character	Spain
<b>4</b>	fishing_tech	Character	Fishing activity cluster constructed fleet segment. See AER report.
<b>5</b>	variable_name	Character	e.g. vessel tonnage.
<b>6</b>	variable_code	Character	Total vessel tonnage = totgt
	value	Double	Value of variable code

data\_stecflandings (just for mydas species/areas) and (data\_otherstecflandings – all species)

	Variable name	Type	Description
<b>1</b>	annex	Character	??
<b>2</b>	area	Character	ICES area see appendix below
<b>3</b>	country	Character	ESP = Spain etc. See appendix
<b>4</b>	fishery	Character	??
<b>5</b>	gear	Character	Fishing gear
<b>6</b>	landings	Double	Landings in tonnes
<b>7</b>	mesh	Character	Meshsize range e.g. 100-119
<b>8</b>	quarter	Integer	Given as 1-4
<b>9</b>	ices_rectangle	Character	ICES Rectangle code
<b>10</b>	regulated_area	Character	??
<b>11</b>	regulated_gear	Character	???
<b>12</b>	species	Character	3 letter FAO code
<b>13</b>	speccon	Character	???
<b>14</b>	length	Character	Vessel length
<b>15</b>	year	Integer	Year of fishing
<b>16</b>	division	Character	ICES division
<b>17</b>	stock	Character	Mydas stock grouping
<b>18</b>	speciesgp	Character	e.g. grouping blue ling and common ling into 1 var BLI, LIN = LIN.
<b>19</b>	longitude	Double	Midpoint of ices rectangle
<b>20</b>	latitude	Double	Midpoint of ices rectangle
<b>21</b>	area_km2	Integer	Area of ICES rectangle
<b>22</b>	ecoregion	Character	Ecological region

data\_stockprior (summary table resulting from PSA and economic weighting – see stock prioritisation code on mydas wiki)

	Variable name	Type	Description
<b>1</b>	year	Character	Year of fishing
<b>2</b>	country	Character	Country i.e ESP
<b>3</b>	gear	Integer	Fishing gear i.e BEAM.

<b>4</b>	rank	Double	Weighted ranked vulnerability
<b>5</b>	value	Double	Total value of catch in €
<b>6</b>	speciesgp	Character	e.g. grouping blue ling and common ling into 1 var BLI, LIN = LIN.

div\_area (also geometric table for shiny called ices areas shapefile)

	Variable name	Type	Description
<b>1</b>	subarea	Integer	3, 4, 5 etc..
<b>2</b>	subdiv	Character	d, e, f, g... etc.
<b>3</b>	area_full	Character	Full code for ICES area
<b>4</b>	area_27	Character	Full code for ICES area 27 (North Atlantic)
<b>5</b>	area_km2	Double	Area of sub region in km2
<b>6</b>	division	Character	ICES division.

For tables data\_surveybio/data\_surveystns (see DATRAS @ ICES)

#### Appendix 1 Country coding

COUNTRY	CODE
Belgium	BEL
Denmark	DEN
Estonia	EST
Finland	FIN
France	FRA
Germany	GER
Ireland	IRL
Latvia	LAT
Lithuania	LIT
Netherlands	NED
Norway	NOR
Poland	POL
Portugal	POR
Spain	SPN
Sweden	SWE
United Kingdom (Jersey)	GBJ
United Kingdom (Guernsey)	GBG
United Kingdom (Alderney/Sark/Herm)	GBC
United Kingdom (England and Wales)	ENG
United Kingdom (Isle of Man)	IOM
United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)	NIR
United Kingdom (Scotland)	SCO
Other countries	OTH

#### Appendix 2 Gear coding

TYPES OF FISHING TECHNIQUES			Gear code
Mobile gears	Beam trawl		BEAM
	Demersal trawl & demersal seine	Bottom trawl	OTTER
		Danish & Scottish seiners	DEM_SEINE
	Pelagic trawl & Seiners	Pelagic Trawl	PEL_TRAWL

	Pelagic seiner & purse seiner	PEL_SEINE
Dredges		DREDGE
Passive gears	Longlines	ONGLINE
	Drift & fixed Nets except Trammel Nets	GILL
	Trammel Nets	TRAMMEL
	Pots & traps	POTS

### Appendix 3 Mesh size coding

Gear type	Mesh size range
Mobile gears	<16
	16-31
	32-54
	55-69
	70-79
	80-89
	90-99
	100-119
	>=120
Passive gears	10-30
	50-59
	60-69
	70-79
	80-89
	90-99
	100-109
	110-119
	120-219
	>=220

## **A2** *Dataset Summary*

# Dataset for use in data poor methods

*Laurence Kell and Alex Tidd*

*25 December, 2018*

## MYDAS

Task 5 of the MYDAS project <https://github.com/laurieKell/mydas> requires a review of data available on length composition, mean size, catch and indices of abundance (commercial or survey).

Data are available from the MI or from collective sources such as DATRAS <http://www.ices.dk/marine-data/data-portals/Pages/DATRAS.aspx> for survey data and the STECF <https://steclf.jrc.ec.europa.eu/data-dissemination> for commercial data.

## Work plan

- Condition the operating model using life histories (from table above) from brill, turbot, skate and Pollack as per the Mydas project (see the quick start). Will have to use MI estimates for sprat. Use estimates of length (brill, sprat, skate). Obtain length frequencies for turbot and pollack from MI.

The life histories were reviewed by Hans, using data from the MI databases.

- With further investigation look at predicted abundance estimates for brill, sprat (although on high side) and skate (abundance was for all species of skates and rays, will have to make consistent with commercial species... maybe use thornback only). Pollack and turbot catches are greater than abundance so cannot use these.

If the absolute abundance estimates are wrong relative indices can be used, as normal practice.

- With such good time series of survey length data for brill, sprat and skate it would be good to simulate the mean size by using the mlz package <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/MLZ/vignettes/MLZ.html#introduction>. This would give an estimate of Z (assuming constant M) and thus look at changes in F.

MLZ uses mean size, it is unlikely to provide good estimates of Z for sprat due to high M and high recruitment variability, the mean size is therefore determined by recruitment not F.

- It may also be worth pursuing the LBSR for length-based composition for the above (and compare) with life-history parameters M/K ratio and Linf to estimate F/M and F/FMSY. With SPR being the biological reference point. <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/LBSPR/vignettes/LBSPR.html>

LBSPR is better at estimating F.

- For turbot and pollack it maybe beneficially to use an empirical approach (as survey info pretty poor) based on the commercial cpue (biomass index from MI lengths or estimated by weights) such as the ICES 2/3 rule (as per Simon Fischer).

The surveys could be used in the

For the observation model commercial cpues could be used.


Further: Need to discuss with MI what data we can get for Lobsters and Razors in terms of lengths. We have 1 set of priors from Iyes.

## Survey data extraction


Extract via sql the case study stocks from Mydas survey database and get numbers at length

For more in depth detail of the data see <https://data.marine.gov.scot/sites/default/files//SMFS%200816.pdf>


Calculate weighted mean length for case study species




**Figure 1** Plot of numbers at length for pollock with weighted mean length represented by dashed red line.




**Figure 2** Plot of numbers at length for turbot with weighted mean length represented by dashed red line.




**Figure 3** Plot of numbers at length for brill with weighted mean length represented by dashed red line.




**Figure 4** Plot of numbers at length for brill with weighted mean length represented by dashed red line.



**Figure 5** Plot of numbers at length for skate with weighted mean length represented by dashed red line.




**Figure 6** Plot of numbers at length for sprat with weighted mean length represented by dashed red line.



**Figure 7** Time series of weighted mean length.


Get all survey data from sql query

Estimate fish weight in kgs



**Figure 8** Catch per unit effort in kgs (CPUE) time series with red line depicting mean cpue.

Fish numbers




**Figure 9** Catch per unit effort in numbers (CPUE) time series with red line depicting mean cpue.

### Commercial data


Part of the issues with the main catch data in the stecf database is that the effort does not match up by gear and area with the effort estimations. Here the STECF Annual Economic Report database is used.

Extract the data via sql

Estimate catch in kgs per day



**Figure 10** Time series of commercial cpue.



**Figure 11** Time series of total catch in tonnes.


#### Estimate abundance from survey data

See <http://www.fao.org/docrep/w5449e/w5449e0f.htm> section 13.7

Get survey stations

Calculate total area/total number of stations the survey covered by division and merge with catch tonnes perkm<sup>2</sup>

Biomass = totalsurveyarea x 1/total number of stations within the survey area x sum of catch



#### Life history parameters from the literature

Table 1: life history paramters

id	species	speciesgrp	t.0	linf	k	lmat	tm	sex	area	source
1	Amblyraja radiata	SKA		66.00	0.2330	46.0	4.0	U	North Sea	[12]
7	Leucoraja circularis	SKA		98.80	0.1210	51.2	5.3	U	North Sea	[12]
8	Leucoraja fullonica	SKA		98.80	0.1210	51.2	5.3	U	North Sea	[12]
17	Pollachius pollachius	POL		85.60	0.1900	NA	NA	U	North Sea	[18]
18	Pollachius pollachius	POL		85.60	0.1860	44.8	3.7	U	North Sea	[12]
23	Psetta maxima	TUR	-0.05	64.80	0.2600	46.0	NA	F	North Sea	[15]
24	Psetta maxima	TUR	-0.51	49.20	0.3700	NA	NA	M	North Sea	[15]

id	species	speciesgp	t.0	linf	k	lmat	tm	sex	area	source
25	Psetta maxima	TUR		65.20	0.3240	49.0	NA	M	Bay of Biscay	[9], [7]
26	Psetta maxima	TUR		73.60	0.2770	49.0	NA	F	Bay of Biscay	[9], [7]
27	Psetta maxima	TUR	-1.79	69.60	0.2497	49.0	4.5	U	North Sea	[19], [8], [16], [17]
28	Psetta maxima	TUR		57.00	0.3200	46.0	4.5	U	North Sea	[12]
29	Psetta maxima	TUR		52.50	0.3200	NA	NA	M	North Sea	[17]
30	Psetta maxima	TUR	-1.79	70.00	0.1480	NA	NA	F	North Sea	[17]
31	Raja batis	SKA	-1.63	254.00	0.0600	130.0	11.0	U	North Sea	[11]
32	Raja batis	SKA		253.70	0.0570	155.0	15.0	U	North Sea	[12]
33	Raja brachyura	SKA		139.00	0.1200	100.0	9.3	U	North Sea	[12]
34	Raja brachyura	SKA	-0.8	118.00	0.1900	NA	NA	M	Irish Sea	[13]
35	Raja brachyura	SKA	-1.52	139.00	0.1200	NA	NA	F	Irish Sea	[13]
36	Raja clavata	SKA	-1.32	128.00	0.0900	NA	NA	F	Irish Sea	[13]
37	Raja clavata	SKA	-0.6	85.60	0.2100	NA	NA	M	Irish Sea	[13]
38	Raja clavata	SKA		105.00	0.2200	65.0	5.0	U	North Sea	[12]
39	Raja montagui	SKA	-0.37	72.80	0.1800	NA	NA	F	Irish Sea	[13]
40	Raja montagui	SKA	-0.56	68.70	0.1900	NA	NA	M	Irish Sea	[13]
41	Raja montagui	SKA		97.80	0.1480	67.0	6.0	U	North Sea	[12]
42	Raja naevus	SKA	-0.465	92.00	0.1100	59.0	9.0	U	North Sea	[11]
43	Raja naevus	SKA		91.60	0.1090	59.0	9.0	U	North Sea	[12]
44	Raja radiata	SKA		66.00	0.2300	46.0	4.0	U	North Sea	[22]
45	Raja undulata	SKA		112.00	0.1000	57.5	6.3	U	North Sea	[12]
46	Scophthalmus rhombus	BLL		74.88	0.1400	37.0	NA	M	Bay of Biscay	[9], [7]
47	Scophthalmus rhombus	BLL		85.23	0.1470	37.0	NA	F	Bay of Biscay	[9], [7]
48	Scophthalmus rhombus	BLL		50.00	0.2700	37.0	4.5	U	North Sea	[12]
49	Sprattus sprattus	SPR	*	16.00	0.6500	13.0	NA	U	North Sea	[20]

#### Conclusion from the above analysis for 5 of the 7 case studies

- Pollack and turbot have poor coverage in terms of numbers at length from the survey data and hence potentially poor abundance estimates.
- Brill, sprat and skates have long time series of numbers at length. Brill has adequate numbers from 1993 to 2016 as has skate, while sprat contains a longer time series from 1985-to 2016.
- Observations from the commercial time-series show that for all species there are 9 years of data.
- There are enough life history parameters from the literature to condition an operating model for all case-study species apart from sprat.

## Software Versions

- R version 3.5.1 (2018-07-02)
- plyr: 1.8.4
- dplyr: 0.7.8
- ggplot2: 3.1.0
- DBI: 1.0.0
- RPostgreSQL: 0.6.2
- reshape 0.8.8
- **Compiled:** Tue Dec 25 20:37:56 2018

## Author information

Alex Tidd. emperorfish@gmail.com

## Acknowledgements

This vignette and many of the methods documented in it were developed under the MyDas project funded by the Irish exchequer and EMFF 2014-2020. The overall aim of MyDas is to develop and test a range of assessment models and methods to establish Maximum Sustainable Yield (MSY) reference points (or proxy MSY reference points) across the spectrum of data-limited stocks.

## References

7. Deniel, C. (1981). Les poissons plats (TelCostCens, Pleuronectiformes) en baie de Douarnenez. Reproduction croissance et migration des Bothidae, Scophthalmidae, Pleuronectidae et Soleidae. These, Universite Bretagne Occidentale, Brest. 476 PP.
8. Deniel, C. (1990). Comparative study of growth of flatfishes on the west coast of Brittany. Journal of Fish Biology, 37: 149–166.
9. Dorel, D. (1986). Poissons de l'Atlantique Nord-Est Relations tailles-poids.
10. Greenstreet, S.P.R., Rossberg, A.G., Fox, C.J., Le Quesne, W.J.F., Blasdale, T., Boulcott, P., Mitchell, I., Millar, C., Moffat, C.F. (2012). Demersal fish biodiversity: species- level indicators and trends-based targets for the Marine Strategy Framework Directive. ICES J. Mar. Sci. 69, 1789–1801.
11. Holden, M. J. (1972). The growth rates of *R. brachyura*, *R. clavata* and *R. montagui* as determined by tagging data. Journal du Conseil International pour l'Exploration de la Mer 34:161–168.
12. Jones, A. (1974). Sexual maturity, fecundity and growth of the turbot, *Scophthalmus maximus* L. Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the UK, 54: 109–125.
13. Knijn, R.J., Boon, T.W., Heessen, H.J.L., Hislop, J.F.G. (1993). “Atlas of North Sea Fishes” (ICES Coop. Res. Rep. 194, ICES, Copenhagen, 1993).
14. Mengi, T. (1963). Ber. Deut. Wiss. Komm. 7, 119.
15. Moreau, J. (1964). Contribution à l'étude du lieu jaune (*Gadus pollachius* L.). Revues de Travaux Institut de Peches Maritimes, 28:237–255.
16. Muus, B.J., Nielson, J. G. (1999). Sea Fish (Scandinavian Fishing Year Book, Hedehusene, Denmark.
17. Pauly, D. (1978). A preliminary compilation of fish length growth parameters. Berichte des Institut für Meereskunde an der Universität Kiel, 55. 200 pp.

18. Vinther, M. (1989). Some notes on the biology of the starry ray, *Raja radiata*, in the North Sea. Working document: ICES Study Group on Elasmobranch Fisheries, 4/1989, 1–20. mimeo.

## Session Info

```
R version 3.5.1 (2018-07-02)
Platform: x86_64-pc-linux-gnu (64-bit)
Running under: Ubuntu 16.04.2 LTS

Matrix products: default
BLAS: /usr/lib/libblas/libblas.so.3.6.0
LAPACK: /usr/lib/lapack/liblapack.so.3.6.0

locale:
[1] LC_CTYPE=en_US.UTF-8      LC_NUMERIC=C
[3] LC_TIME=en_GB.UTF-8      LC_COLLATE=en_US.UTF-8
[5] LC_MONETARY=en_GB.UTF-8   LC_MESSAGES=en_US.UTF-8
[7] LC_PAPER=en_GB.UTF-8     LC_NAME=C
[9] LC_ADDRESS=C              LC_TELEPHONE=C
[11] LC_MEASUREMENT=en_GB.UTF-8 LC_IDENTIFICATION=C

attached base packages:
[1] splines    stats      graphics  grDevices utils     datasets  methods
[8] base

other attached packages:
[1] gam_1.16      foreach_1.4.4    bindrcpp_0.2.2
[4] reshape_0.8.8 RPostgreSQL_0.6-2 DBI_1.0.0
[7] ggplot2_3.1.0 dplyr_0.7.8     plyr_1.8.4
[10] knitr_1.20

loaded via a namespace (and not attached):
[1] Rcpp_1.0.0      highr_0.7       pillar_1.3.1    compiler_3.5.1
[5] bindr_0.1.1     iterators_1.0.10 tools_3.5.1    digest_0.6.18
[9] evaluate_0.12   tibble_1.4.2     gttable_0.2.0   pkgconfig_2.0.2
[13] rlang_0.3.0.1   rstudioapi_0.8  yaml_2.2.0     withr_2.1.2
[17] stringr_1.3.1   rprojroot_1.3-2 grid_3.5.1     tidyselect_0.2.5
[21] glue_1.3.0      R6_2.3.0       rmarkdown_1.10  reshape2_1.4.3
[25] purrr_0.2.5     magrittr_1.5    backports_1.1.2 scales_1.0.0
[29] codetools_0.2-15 htmltools_0.3.6 assertthat_0.2.0 colorspace_1.3-2
[33] labeling_0.3     stringi_1.2.4   lazyeval_0.2.1  munsell_0.5.0
[37] crayon_1.3.4
```

## B Peer Review Papers

*B1 Linking the performance of a data-limited empirical catch rule to life-history traits*





**Performance of length-based data-limited methods in a multi-fleet context: application to small tunas, mackerels and bonitos in the Atlantic Ocean**










Journal:	<i>ICES Journal of Marine Science</i>
Manuscript ID:	ICESJMS-2018-485.R1
Manuscript Types:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Dec-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Pons, Maite; University of Washington, School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences Kell, Laurence; Imperial College London, Centre for Environmental Policy Rudd, Merrill; University of Washington, School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences; National Marine Fisheries Service, Northwest Fisheries Science Center Cope, Jason; Northwest Fisheries Science Center, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries Lucena Frédou , Flávia; Universidade Federal Rural de Pernambuco, Departamento de Pesca e Aquicultura
Keyword:	length based assessments, spawning potential ratio, Scombrids, management


SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41











1  
 2  
 3     **Supplementary information: ICES Journal of Marine Science, 76**  
 4  
 5  
 6

7     **Performance of length-based data-limited methods in a multi-fleet**  
 8     **context: application to small tunas, mackerels, and bonitos in the**  
 9     **Atlantic Ocean**


10  
 11     Maite Pons, Laurence Kell, Merrill B. Rudd, Jason M. Cope, and Flávia Lucena  
 12     Frédou  
 13  
 14  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18




19  
 20     **Figure S1.** Catch of North Atlantic albacore by fleet from 1930 to 2011. Fleets 1–12 were  
 21     defined in the 2013 stock assessment performed by ICCAT (see the ICCAT, 2014 report for  
 22     more details).




**Figure S2.** Selectivity curves. (a) The 12 selectivity curves used in the 2013 North Atlantic albacore assessment (fleets 10 and 11, 8 and 9, and 4 and 12 have the same selectivity pattern). (b) Combined selectivity curves to test under the different scenarios for the fleets that operated in the last 15 years (fleets A–C). Label the two curves as (a) and (b), not A and B.



**Figure S3.** ICCAT geographical definitions (Version: 2016.02) for small scombrids. Taken from: [http://iccat.es/Data/ICCAT\\_maps.pdf](http://iccat.es/Data/ICCAT_maps.pdf).




**Figure S4.** Number of fish measured by stock, year, and gear during 2010–2016. The size of the bubbles is proportional to the logarithm of the number of fish measured, and the number is inside the bubble. Bubbles where the number of fish measured is less than 100 are in red. Gears: gillnet (GN); handline (HL); longline (LL); purse-seine (PS); trap (TP); trolling (TR); sport (SP); baitboat (BB); rod and reel (RR); haulseine (HS); trammelnet (TN); unclassified (UN).




**Figure S5.** Length composition data for the main stocks of small scrombrids by gear in the Atlantic Ocean available in Task2sz database of ICCAT. LTA, little tunny; WAH, wahoo; BON, bonito; FRI, frigate tuna. BB, bait boat; GN, gillnet; HL, handline; HS, haulseine; LL, longline; PS, purse-seine; RR, rod and reel; SP, sport; TN, trammelnet; TP, trap; TR, trolling; TW, trawl; UN, unknown. NE, Northeast; SE, Southeast; NW, Northwest, and Med, Mediterranean Sea.


1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




**Figure S6.** Time-series of the true SPR for the two OM (with and without recruitment deviations). Grey lines are the SPR time-series for each of the 100 runs with random recruitment deviations.




**Figure S7.** Bonito (BON) estimates of fishing mortality and SPR in the Northeast (NE) Atlantic and in the Mediterranean Sea (Med). Estimates from LIME are in green, and estimates from LBSPR are in purple. Bars represent standard deviation of the estimates.



**Figure S8.** Little tunny (LTA) estimates of fishing mortality and SPR in the Southeast (SE), Northwest (NW), and Northeast (NE) Atlantic Ocean and in the Mediterranean Sea (Med). Estimates from LIME are in green, and estimates from LBSPR are in purple. Bars represent standard deviation of the estimates.



**Figure S9.** Wahoo (WAH) estimates of fishing mortality and SPR in the Northwest (NW) and Northeast (NE) Atlantic Ocean and in the Mediterranean Sea (Med). Estimates from LIME are in green, and estimates from LBSPR are in purple. Bars represent standard deviation of the estimates.



**Figure S10.** Frigate tuna (FRI) estimates of fishing mortality and SPR in the Southeast (SE) and Northeast (NE) Atlantic Ocean. Estimates from LIME are in green, and estimates from LBSPR are in purple. Bars represent standard deviation of the estimates.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5

**Table S1.** North Atlantic albacore age-length conversion matrix extracted from SS. Columns are the ages and rows are length bins.

6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Length/Age	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15			
150	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	6.05E-14	4.10E-09	8.20E-09	2.40E-09	3.20E-09	1.09E-09	2.32E-09	7.47E-09	1.27E-09	2.16E-09	3.07E-09	5.26E-09			
148	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	2.79E-13	1.14E-09	1.59E-09	3.56E-09	2.75E-05	1.11E-04	2.97E-04	6.02E-04	1.01E-03	1.50E-03	2.01E-03	3.19E-03			
146	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.47E-12	4.07E-09	4.42E-09	8.32E-09	5.70E-05	2.11E-04	5.28E-04	1.02E-03	1.65E-03	2.37E-03	3.11E-03	4.75E-03			
144	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	7.33E-12	1.39E-08	1.17E-08	1.87E-09	1.14E-05	3.87E-04	9.08E-04	1.67E-03	2.61E-03	3.63E-03	4.67E-03	6.89E-03			
142	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.11E-11	3.46E-11	4.50E-08	3.00E-06	4.05E-05	2.20E-04	6.87E-04	1.51E-03	2.66E-03	4.00E-03	5.42E-03	6.81E-03	9.70E-03		
140	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	4.44E-16	1.55E-10	1.40E-07	7.34E-06	8.45E-05	4.10E-04	1.18E-03	2.45E-03	4.10E-03	5.95E-03	7.85E-03	9.65E-03	1.33E-02		
138	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	4.00E-15	6.59E-10	4.13E-07	1.72E-05	1.70E-04	7.37E-04	1.96E-03	3.83E-03	6.13E-03	8.61E-02	1.10E-02	1.33E-02	1.77E-02		
136	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.97E-13	1.81E-08	3.10E-06	8.03E-05	6.12E-05	2.15E-03	4.88E-03	8.51E-03	1.25E-02	1.64E-02	2.00E-02	2.32E-02	2.88E-02		
134	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.24E-12	1.24E-08	3.65E-06	8.44E-05	5.70E-05	1.79E-03	4.01E-03	7.78E-03	1.22E-02	1.90E-02	2.40E-02	2.92E-02	3.40E-02		
132	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.24E-12	1.24E-08	3.65E-06	8.44E-05	5.70E-05	1.79E-03	4.01E-03	7.78E-03	1.22E-02	1.90E-02	2.40E-02	2.92E-02	3.40E-02		
130	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	7.49E-12	1.25E-07	2.01E-05	3.48E-04	1.90E-03	5.43E-03	1.07E-02	1.67E-02	2.36E-02	2.78E-02	3.21E-02	3.59E-02	4.20E-02		
128	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	4.18E-11	4.06E-07	4.72E-05	6.67E-04	3.16E-03	8.20E-03	1.50E-02	2.22E-02	2.89E-02	3.46E-02	3.92E-02	4.29E-02	4.87E-02		
126	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	2.19E-10	1.25E-06	1.06E-04	1.22E-03	5.07E-03	1.19E-02	2.04E-02	2.87E-02	3.60E-02	4.18E-02	4.63E-02	4.97E-02	5.48E-02		
124	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.07E-09	3.64E-06	2.27E-04	2.16E-03	7.82E-03	1.68E-02	2.68E-02	3.60E-02	4.34E-02	4.90E-02	5.31E-02	5.60E-02	6.00E-02		
122	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	3.33E-16	4.90E-09	1.01E-05	4.65E-04	3.65E-03	1.16E-02	2.28E-02	3.41E-02	4.36E-02	5.07E-02	5.57E-02	5.90E-02	6.13E-02	6.39E-02	
120	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	2.78E-15	2.10E-08	2.64E-05	9.10E-04	5.92E-03	1.66E-02	2.99E-02	4.20E-02	5.12E-02	5.75E-02	6.14E-02	6.38E-02	6.51E-02	6.62E-02	
118	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	2.76E-14	8.45E-08	6.55E-04	1.70E-03	3.20E-02	3.79E-02	5.00E-02	5.38E-02	6.32E-02	6.58E-02	6.70E-02	6.73E-02	6.66E-02		
116	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	2.52E-13	3.18E-07	1.54E-04	3.07E-03	1.38E-02	3.05E-02	4.63E-02	5.76E-02	6.42E-02	6.74E-02	6.84E-02	6.83E-02	6.76E-02	6.52E-02	
114	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	2.18E-12	1.84E-07	5.31E-04	3.44E-03	1.21E-02	3.00E-02	4.57E-02	5.21E-02	5.83E-02	6.30E-02	6.71E-02	6.95E-02	6.32E-02	6.73E-02	
112	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.82E-11	3.68E-06	7.26E-04	8.39E-03	5.43E-03	1.08E-02	2.71E-02	4.05E-02	5.09E-02	6.08E-02	6.74E-02	7.24E-02	7.75E-02	8.25E-02	
110	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.13E-10	1.14E-05	1.45E-03	1.30E-02	3.60E-02	5.70E-02	6.86E-02	7.21E-02	7.10E-02	6.78E-02	6.42E-02	6.06E-02	5.75E-02	5.18E-02	
108	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	7.30E-10	3.30E-05	2.76E-03	1.93E-02	4.05E-02	5.07E-02	6.15E-02	7.28E-02	7.27E-02	6.89E-02	6.39E-02	5.50E-02	5.14E-02	4.54E-02	
106	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	4.30E-09	8.93E-05	4.96E-03	2.73E-02	5.56E-02	7.16E-02	7.47E-02	7.09E-02	6.47E-02	5.84E-02	5.29E-02	4.84E-02	4.47E-02	3.86E-02	
104	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	2.32E-08	2.26E-04	8.46E-03	7.50E-02	6.49E-02	7.40E-02	6.69E-02	7.58E-02	7.40E-02	6.58E-02	5.89E-02	4.60E-02	4.14E-02	3.78E-02	3.20E-02
102	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.15E-07	5.37E-07	1.37E-02	4.77E-02	7.27E-02	7.74E-02	7.07E-02	6.10E-02	5.19E-02	4.45E-02	3.87E-02	3.43E-02	3.10E-02	2.58E-02	
100	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	5.11E-16	5.21E-07	1.19E-03	2.09E-02	5.08E-02	7.82E-02	7.61E-02	6.53E-02	5.38E-02	4.43E-02	3.71E-02	3.17E-02	2.47E-02	2.02E-02	
98	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	9.99E-16	2.16E-06	2.48E-03	3.04E-02	6.93E-02	8.08E-02	7.20E-02	5.82E-02	4.60E-02	3.67E-02	3.00E-02	2.52E-02	2.17E-02	1.91E-02	
96	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.92E-14	8.27E-06	4.84E-03	4.18E-02	7.79E-02	8.00E-02	6.56E-02	5.00E-02	3.80E-02	2.35E-02	1.94E-02	1.65E-02	1.44E-02	1.14E-02	
94	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	2.95E-13	2.88E-05	8.82E-03	8.45E-02	8.80E-02	7.96E-02	7.56E-02	6.16E-02	3.03E-02	1.78E-02	1.45E-02	1.22E-02	1.04E-02	8.30E-03	
92	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.94E-12	9.19E-05	3.57E-03	6.95E-02	4.91E-02	7.25E-02	7.10E-02	6.72E-02	4.27E-02	2.11E-02	1.35E-02	1.03E-02	8.77E-03	6.94E-03	
90	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	4.73E-11	2.69E-04	2.41E-02	7.98E-02	3.09E-02	6.08E-02	1.96E-02	5.56E-02	1.57E-02	1.25E-02	9.39E-02	7.40E-02	6.00E-03	5.30E-03	
88	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	4.91E-10	7.23E-04	3.61E-02	8.74E-02	5.11E-02	3.11E-02	1.93E-02	1.27E-02	8.82E-02	6.51E-03	5.06E-03	4.11E-03	3.47E-03	2.59E-03	
86	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	4.46E-09	1.78E-03	5.05E-02	9.20E-02	7.00E-02	4.12E-02	2.35E-02	1.42E-02	8.86E-03	6.02E-03	4.37E-03	3.26E-03	2.26E-03	1.66E-03	
84	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	3.55E-08	4.01E-03	6.63E-02	9.17E-02	5.96E-02	3.19E-02	1.71E-02	9.71E-03	5.98E-03	3.99E-03	2.85E-03	2.16E-03	1.72E-03	1.43E-03	
82	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	2.47E-07	8.28E-03	8.15E-02	8.66E-02	4.85E-02	2.37E-02	1.19E-02	6.53E-03	3.92E-03	2.56E-03	1.80E-03	1.35E-03	1.07E-03	8.31E-04	
80	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.51E-06	1.57E-07	9.38E-02	7.75E-02	3.77E-02	1.69E-02	8.06E-03	4.24E-03	2.77E-03	1.52E-03	9.55E-04	6.55E-04	4.81E-04	3.75E-04	
78	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	8.08E-06	2.72E-02	1.01E-01	6.58E-02	2.72E-02	1.16E-02	5.23E-03	2.66E-03	1.52E-03	9.55E-04	6.55E-04	4.81E-04	3.75E-04	3.06E-04	
76	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	3.79E-05	4.31E-02	1.02E-01	5.29E-02	1.98E-02	7.60E-03	3.27E-03	1.61E-03	8.98E-04	5.57E-04	3.77E-04	2.75E-04	2.13E-04	1.71E-04	
74	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.55E-04	6.22E-05	4.03E-02	1.34E-02	4.79E-03	1.97E-03	9.43E-04	5.14E-04	3.14E-04	2.11E-04	1.52E-04	1.17E-04	9.47E-05	6.60E-05	
72	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.86E-03	8.18E-05	2.97E-02	1.20E-02	6.05E-03	2.12E-03	1.25E-03	7.25E-04	4.74E-04	3.11E-04	2.11E-04	1.53E-04	1.18E-04	8.30E-05	
70	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.76E-03	1.02E-01	7.04E-03	1.99E-03	5.35E-03	1.60E-03	5.06E-04	1.55E-05	5.99E-05	4.27E-05	2.36E-05	2.51E-05	1.80E-05	1.35E-05	
68	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	4.85E-03	1.15E-01	5.46E-02	1.29E-02	3.15E-03	9.37E-04	3.44E-04	1.53E-04	7.92E-05	4.67E-05	3.05E-05	2.17E-05	1.64E-05	1.21E-05	9.01E-06
66	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	0.00E+00	1.17E-02	1.88E-01	3.96E-02	7.94E-02	5.01E-02	1.77E-03	7.84E-03	7.75E-05	3.97E-05	2.32E-05</td					

**Table S2.** Life history information and references available for small scombrids in the Atlantic Ocean (ICCAT, 2018).

**Table S3.** We run the OMs under perfect equilibrium conditions and three different scenarios using one fleet: (i) fish selected before maturing; (ii) fish selected at the length at maturity; and (iii) fish selected after maturing. A large sample size of 12 000 individuals was used. It seems that a persistent bias exists for both assessment methods compared with the OM, particularly for LIME in all cases and LBSPR except when fish are selected before maturing. LIME underestimates SPR for this species (albacore tuna), particularly when individuals are selected by the fishery before maturing. LIME also overestimates selectivity. LBSPR, however, is unbiased when fish are selected by the fishing gear before maturing and positively biased when fish are caught after maturing. For LBSPR, selectivity values are very close to the real values. These results under perfect equilibrium conditions help to understand biases in performance by both methods when different OMs are used.

Scenario	Year	SPR_OM	SPR_LBSPR	SPR_LIME	S <sub>50</sub> _OM	S <sub>95</sub> _OM	S <sub>50</sub> _LBSPR	S <sub>95</sub> _LBSPR	S <sub>50</sub> _LIME	S <sub>95</sub> _LIME
i	Last year	0.42	0.41	0.09	78	86	77	91	81	89
ii	Last year	0.42	0.56	0.16	90	96	89	103	95	99
iii	Last year	0.42	0.68	0.21	101	108	96	112	113	125

1  
2  
3

## References

- Baibat, S., Malouli, I., Abid, N., and Benazzouz, B. 2016. Study of the reproduction of Atlantic bonito (*Sarda sarda*) in South Atlantic Ocean of Morocco. *Aquaculture, Aquarium, Conservation & Legislation - International Journal of the Bioflux Society*, 9: 954–964.
- Cabrera, M. A., Defeo, O., Aguilar, F., and Martínez, J. D. D. 2005. La pesquería de bonito (*Euthynnus alletteratus*) del noreste del banco de Campeche, México. *Proceedings of the Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute*, 46: 744–758.
- Cayré, P., Amon Kothias, J. B., Diouf, T., and Stretta, J. M. 1993. Biology of tuna. In *Resources, Fishing and Biology of the Tropical Tunas of the Eastern Central Atlantic*. Ed. by A. Fonteneau, and J. Marcille. FAO Fisheries Technical Paper No. 292. FAO, Rome, Italy. 354 pp.
- Cayré, P., and Diouf, T. 1980. Croissance de la thonine (*Euthynnus alletteratus*) (Rafinesque, 1810) établie à partir de coupes transversales du premier rayon de la nageoire dorsale. *Collected Volume of Scientific Papers of ICCAT*, 15: 337–345.
- Claro, R. 1994. Características generales de la ictiofauna, (Ecología de los peces marinos de Cuba). Instituto de Oceanología Academia de Ciencias de Cuba and Centro de Investigaciones de Quintana Roo, Quintana Roo, México.
- Collette, B. B., and Nauen, C. E. 1983. FAO Species Catalogue, Vol. 2 Scombrids of the World. An annotated and illustrated catalogue of tunas, mackerels, bonitos and related species known to date. FAO Fisheries Synopsis, 125(2). 137 pp.
- Diouf, T. 1980. Peche et biologie de trois Scombridae exploités au Sénégal: *Euthynnus alletteratus*, *Sarda sarda* et *Scomberomorus tritor*. Thèse de doctorat 3ème cycle, Université de Bretagne Occidentale, France. 159 pp.
- Frota, L. O., Costa, P. A. S., and Braga, A. C. 2004. Length-weight relationships of marine fishes from the central Brazilian coast. *Naga, WorldFish Center Quarterly*, 27: 20–26.
- Grudtsev, M. E., and Korolevich, L. I. 1986. Studies of frigate tuna *Auxis thazard* (Lacepede) age and growth in the eastern part of the Equatorial Atlantic. *Collective Volume of Scientific Papers of ICCAT*, 25: 269–274.
- Hajjej, G., Hattour, A., Hajjej, A., Cherif, M., Allaya, H., Jarboui, O., and Bouain, A. 2012. Age and growth of little tunny, *Euthynnus alletteratus* (Rafinesque, 1810), from the Tunisian Mediterranean coasts. *Cahiers de Biologie Marine*, 53: 113–122.
- Hansen, J. E. 1987. Aspectos biológicos y pesqueros del bonito del Mar Argentino (Pisces, Scombridae, *Sarda sarda*). *Collective Volume of Scientific Papers of ICCAT*, 26: 441–442.
- Hattour, A. 2000. Contribution à l'étude des poissons pelagiques des eaux Tunisiennes. Thèse de Doctorat, Faculté des Sciences de Tunis, Université d'El Manar II. 327 pp.
- Hattour, A. 2009. Les thons mineurs tunisiens: étude biologiques et pêche. *Collective Volume of Scientific Papers of ICCAT*, 64: 2230–2271.
- Hogarth, W.T. 1976. Life history aspects of the wahoo *Acanthocybium solandri* (Cuvier and Valenciennes) from the coast of North Carolina. Ph.D. Dissertation. North Carolina State University, Raleigh, NC, USA. 119 pp.
- ICCAT. 2014. Report of the 2013 ICCAT North and South Atlantic Albacore stock assessment meeting. *Collective Volume of Scientific Papers of ICCAT*, 70: 830–995.
- IGFA. 2011. World Record Game Fishes. International Game Fish Association, Dania Beach, Florida, USA.
- Jenkins, K. L. M., and McBride, R. S. 2009. Reproductive biology of wahoo, *Acanthocybium solandri*, from the Atlantic coast of Florida and the Bahamas. *Marine and Freshwater Research*, 60: 893–897.
- Kahraman, A. E., Göktürk, D., Yıldız, T., and Uzer, U. 2014. Age, growth, and reproductive

- 1  
2  
3 biology of Atlantic bonito (*Sarda sarda* Bloch, 1793) from the Turkish coasts of the  
4 Black Sea and the Sea of Marmara. *Turkish Journal of Zoology*, 38: 614–621.  
5 McBride, R. S., Richardson, A. K., and Maki, K. L. 2008. Age, growth, and mortality of  
6 wahoo, *Acanthocybium solandri*, from the Atlantic coast of Florida and the Bahamas.  
7 *Marine and Freshwater Research*, 59: 799–807.  
8 Ramírez-Arredondo, I. 1993. Aspectos reproductivos de la carachana pintada, *Euthynnus*  
9 *alletteratus* (Pisces:Scombridae) de los alrededores de la Isla de Picua, Estado Sucre,  
10 Venezuela. *Boletín del Instituto Oceanográfico de Venezuela*, 32: 69–78.  
11 Ramírez-Arredondo, I., Silva, J., and Marchán, F. 1996. Relación longitud peso y factor de  
12 condición en *Euthynnus alletteratus* (Rafinesque 1810), (Pisces: Scombridae) de los  
13 alrededores de las Islas los Testigos, Venezuela. *Boletín del Instituto Oceanográfico de*  
14 *Venezuela*, 35: 63–68.  
15 Saber, S., Ortiz de Urbina, J., Lino, P. G., Gómez-Vives, M. J., Coelho, R., Lechuga, R., and  
16 Macias, D. 2017. Biological samples collection for growth and maturity studies EU  
17 Portugal and Spain: Northeastern Atlantic and Western Mediterranean. ICCAT,  
18 Madrid. 41 pp.  
19 Santana, J. C., Delgado de Molina, A., and Ariz, J. 1993. Estimación de una ecuación talla-  
20 peso para *Acanthocybium solandri* (Cuvier, 1832), capturado en la Isla de el Hierro  
21 (Islas Canarias). *Collective Volume of Scientific Papers of ICCAT*, 40: 401–405.  
22 Sinović, G., Franičević, M., Zorica, B., and Cikes-Keč, V. 2004. Length-weight and length-  
23 length relationships for 10 pelagic fish species from the Adriatic Sea (Croatia). *Journal*  
24 *of Applied Ichthyology*, 20: 156–158.  
25 Viana, D., Branco, I., Fernandes, C., Fischer, A., Carvalho, F., Travassos, P., and Hazin, F.  
26 2013. Reproductive biology of the wahoo, *Acanthocybium solandri* (Teleostei:  
27 Scombridae) in the Saint Peter and Saint Paul Archipelago, Brazil. *International Journal*  
28 *of Plant and Animal Sciences*, 2: 49–57.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**ICESJMS-2018-485 (EA)****Performance of length-based data-limited methods in a multi-fleet context: application to small tunas, mackerels, and bonitos in the Atlantic Ocean**

Maite Pons<sup>1\*</sup>, Laurence Kell<sup>2</sup>, Merrill B. Rudd<sup>1,3</sup>, Jason M. Cope<sup>1,3</sup>, and Flávia Lucena Frédu<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences, University of Washington, Box 355020, Seattle, Washington 98195-5020, USA

<sup>2</sup> Centre for Environmental Policy, Imperial College London, London SW7 1NE, UK

<sup>3</sup> National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service, Northwest Fisheries Science Center, Fishery Resource Analysis and Monitoring Division, 2725 Montlake Boulevard East, Seattle, Washington 98112-2097, USA

<sup>4</sup> Departamento de Pesca e Aquicultura, Universidade Federal Rural de Pernambuco, Av. Dom Manoel s/n, Recife, Pernambuco, Brazil, 52171-900

\*Corresponding author: tel: +1 xxx xxx xxxx; e-mail: [mpons@uw.edu](mailto:mpons@uw.edu)

Please provide telephone number and fax number (if available)

Large scombrids, commercial tuna species, are regularly assessed and managed. However, most of the small scombrids, many mackerels and bonitos, lack accurate catch data to implement traditional stock assessments despite their economic importance in many small-scale fisheries. In this study, we analyzed different approaches using length composition data from multiple fleets with different gear selectivity to assess small scombrids in the Atlantic Ocean. Using simulated populations, we compared two length-based methods [length-based spawning potential ratio (LBSPR) and length-based integrated mixed effects (LIME)], under different length data grouping scenarios. We found that using length data from the fleet targeting the broadest range of sizes resulted in the lowest bias in spawning potential ratio of all options tested. Based on these results, we used biological and length data to estimate a quantitative proxy of current stock status for ten small scombrid stocks in the Atlantic Ocean. We found that some small scombrid stocks are likely to be overfished, such as little tunny (*Euthynnus alletteratus*) in the Southeast Atlantic and wahoo (*Acanthocybium solandri*) in the Northwest Atlantic. This is a starting point in the estimation of stock status for these species, but should not be thought of as a replacement for other more data-intensive assessment techniques. Instead, the framework developed should be used to help identify the data and knowledge needed to improve the sustainable utilization of these species.

## Introduction

For the “principal market tunas”, like Southern (*Thunnus maccoyii*), Pacific (*T. orientalis*), and Atlantic bluefin (*T. thynnus*), bigeye (*T. obesus*), yellowfin (*T. albacares*), albacore (*T. alalunga*), and skipjack (*Katsuwonus pelamis*), stock assessments are performed regularly, and a variety of management procedures are in place to protect these stocks from overfishing (Pons *et al.*, 2017). However, there are also other scombrid species, commonly referred to as “small

tunas, mackerels, Spanish mackerels and bonitos" (from now on "small scombrids"), that account for a notable proportion of the total tuna and tuna-like species catch and that are mostly unassessed and unmanaged (Juan-Jordá *et al.*, 2015; Pons *et al.*, 2018). Small scombrids are generally coastal and associated with continental shelves and islands (Collette and Nauen, 1983). Although their economic value is lower than that of the principal market tunas (Collette *et al.*, 2011), they sustain important regional commercial fisheries in many coastal communities throughout their distributions (Majkowski, 2007). Juan-Jordá *et al.* (2011) showed that within the Scombridae family, the fastest declines in biomass are exhibited not only for the largest, longest-lived, most valuable tunas, but also for a few smaller, short-lived mackerels. Also, some small Scombridae stocks in the Atlantic Ocean were assigned as "moderate to high risk" of being overfished or subject to overfishing in a recent qualitative risk assessment, even if they have not been formally assessed in recent years (Lucena-Frédu<sup>o</sup> *et al.*, 2017a).

Total catch is one of the main data sources required for most classical stock assessment methods, particularly when estimating absolute estimates of spawning or total biomass. Stock assessment methods used for principal market tunas use catch data, but obtaining accurate landings and discards for small scombrids is generally challenging (Pitcher *et al.*, 2002). Small scombrids are targeted by multiple fleets, particularly medium- and small-scale fisheries, and caught as bycatch in many industrial fisheries targeting commercial tuna species. Available catch data usually consist of incomplete catch time-series from tuna regional fisheries management organizations (tRFMO) statistics and from catch time-series that might be highly aggregated by species from the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) database (FAO, 2016). While quantifying total catch is difficult, there is a wide-ranging toolbox of qualitative and quantitative assessment approaches for data-limited fisheries to infer the exploitation status of the stocks (Chrysafi and Kuparinen, 2016; Dowling *et al.*, 2016). In 2017, Lucena-Frédu<sup>o</sup> *et al.* (2017b) performed a qualitative risk assessment for small scombrids in the Atlantic Ocean. They identified five of 13 species as priority for evaluation and implementation of future management actions: the low productivity and susceptible *Euthynnus alletteratus* (little tunny), *Acanthocybium solandri* (wahoo), and *Scomberomorus cavalla* (king mackerel), and the highly targeted *Sarda sarda* (bonito) and *Auxis thazard* (frigate tuna). This study served to identify priority species, but does not estimate population processes, productivity, or stock status that would be required for more specific management advice. In addition, qualitative risk assessment methods have been questioned recently since their performance is poor under a wide range of conditions (Hordyk and Carruthers, 2018).

The International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) suggested that length composition of the catch available in the ICCAT database should be used to quantitatively assess the status of these species and inform management advice (ICCAT, 2017). In fisheries without total catch data or information on relative or absolute abundance, stock assessments typically use the spawning potential ratio (SPR) as an alternative reference point to the biomass at maximum sustainable yield ( $B_{MSY}$ ). SPR can be expressed in terms of spawning stock biomass per recruit (SSBR), which is often defined as the expected lifetime reproductive potential of an average recruit. SPR then is the ratio of the fished SSBR to the unfished SSBR under equilibrium conditions (Goodyear, 1993). SPR has been recommended for data-limited assessment because it can be estimated using only biological information and length data (Brooks *et al.*, 2010).

There are several methods that use life history information and length composition from the catch to estimate fishing intensity and derive values of SPR that can be used as a proxy for

1  
2  
3 stock status. One of them is length-based spawning potential ratio (LBSPR, Hordyk *et al.*, 2015).  
4 This method uses the Beverton–Holt life history ratios in an equilibrium-based population model  
5 applying the shape of the length composition data compared with the expected unfished length  
6 structure to estimate the ratio of fishing mortality and natural mortality ( $F/M$ ) and derive SPR.  
7 Another new method is the length-based integrated mixed effects model (LIME, Rudd and  
8 Thorson, 2018), that also requires biological information and length composition data to derive  
9 SPR, but relaxes the equilibrium conditions by treating recruitment as a random effect over time  
10 and estimating annual  $F$  as fixed effects (Rudd and Thorson, 2018). Both methods can be  
11 implemented in *R* (Hordyk, 2017; R Core Team, 2017; Rudd, 2018).

12 Data-limited, length-based stock assessment methods typically assume selectivity is  
13 asymptotic by default (Hordyk *et al.*, 2015; Rudd and Thorson, 2018). If large fish are absent  
14 from the catch, logistic selectivity models assume that they do not exist in the population (as  
15 opposed to being present in the population, but evading the fishing gear). The logistic selectivity  
16 assumption is usually violated in highly size-selective fisheries (i.e. gillnets), and it could be  
17 problematic in multifleet fisheries where stocks are caught in different proportions by multiple  
18 gears with different selectivity patterns. As an example, the majority of the catch of the North  
19 Atlantic albacore stock comes from pole and line fisheries which have dome-shaped selectivity,  
20 catching mainly juvenile albacores. In addition, a smaller proportion of the catch comes from  
21 longline fisheries targeting larger individuals, but with different selectivity patterns depending on  
22 the fishery (ICCAT, 2014). These different selectivity patterns, catches, and indices of  
23 abundance are included in complex assessment models that allow for multiple fleet interactions  
24 in the formal assessment performed regularly by ICCAT. When fitting only to the length  
25 composition of a proportion of the catch, assumptions regarding fishery dynamics, particularly  
26 the shape of the selectivity curve, need to be carefully analyzed.

27 The main objective of this study is to determine the current stock status of small  
28 scombrids in the Atlantic Ocean. However, the only data available to evaluate these populations  
29 are limited biological information and length composition of the catch coming from different  
30 fleets with different selectivity patterns. Therefore, before applying any length-based assessment,  
31 we need to determine how to combine these length data to obtain an unbiased estimate of fishing  
32 intensity. Developing best practices for combining length data across multiple fleets for length-  
33 based assessments of small scombrids in the Atlantic Ocean thus becomes a critical challenge to  
34 face in order to estimate stock status. To address this challenge and meet the main objective, we  
35 used simulation testing to evaluate the performance of LBSPR and LIME by combining length  
36 composition data of the catch from multiple fleets with different selectivity patterns. Using  
37 conclusions from the simulation, we applied both length-based approaches to estimate a proxy of  
38 stock status for the priority small scombrid species determined by ICCAT (ICCAT, 2018).

## 45 Methods

46 First, we compared the performance of two length-based methods using a simulation study based  
47 on North Atlantic albacore. Then, based on the insight about the robustness of the methods, we  
48 estimated stock status for the small tuna stocks.

### 51 Simulation study

52 We chose the North Atlantic albacore stock on which to develop an operating model (OM) to  
53 simulate resource dynamics in order to evaluate the performance of the different assessment  
54 methods. ICCAT, in the 2017 report of the small tunas species group intersessional meeting

(ICCAT, 2017), suggested the North Atlantic albacore stock as a good example of a multifleet fishery to use for simulation purposes, where the selectivity patterns are considered well estimated for 12 different fleets (ICCAT, 2014). This stock is targeted by pole and line, troll, longline, and other surface gears in the Atlantic Ocean.

In the next sections, we describe the data and specifications used in the OM, the estimation models (EM), namely LBSPR and LIME, and how we measured their performance under different scenarios.

## Operating models

### *Input data*

We extracted the catch time-series (Figure S1 in the Supplementary material), selectivity patterns from 12 different fleets (Figure S2 in the Supplementary material), and the biological parameters (Table 1) from the formal assessment performed by ICCAT in 2013 for North Atlantic albacore (ICCAT, 2014) to use for the OM. For simplicity and based on similarity of selectivity patterns (Figure S2 in the Supplementary material), we combined some fleets using an average age-specific selectivity: (A) fleets 1 and 2 (bait boat and troll fisheries) which target small individuals and have a dome-shaped selectivity curve; (B) fleets 4 and 12 which are other surface gears targeting a broader range of sizes; and (C) fleets 10 and 11 which are longline fisheries targeting mainly adults with an asymptotic selectivity curve (Figure S2 in the Supplementary material). During the last 15 years only, the three fleet combinations mentioned earlier were still operating plus fleet 7, which is a longline fleet that captures less than 1% of the total catch. Eighty-seven percent of the total catch corresponds to the fleets' bait boat and troll fisheries (A), 6% longline (C) and 7% other surface gears with same selectivity (B) (Figure 1).

### *Model specifications*

We simulated an age-structured population using stock synthesis (SS) Version 3.30.10 (Methot and Wetzel, 2013; Methot *et al.*, 2018). We specified a final depletion fitting to an artificial abundance survey index equal to 1 at the beginning of the time-series (1930) and  $0.4 B_0$  in the last year (2011). The depletion value was arbitrarily selected to mimic the current depletion of the North Atlantic albacore population. All parameters were fixed, except the average recruitment in the unfished state ( $R_0$ ). We assumed a Beverton–Holt spawner-recruit function (Beverton and Holt, 1957; Methot and Wetzel, 2013). We simulated two populations, one with and one without recruitment deviations in order to verify if the outputs were different between the estimations models since LIME specifically estimates recruitment.

Fishing intensity in SS was estimated to match the observed North Atlantic albacore catch. SS assumes that the absolute level of catch is known, using the catch time-series to calculate the level of fishing intensity needed to obtain that level of catch, conditioned on the model's current estimate of age-specific population abundance and age-specific selectivity (Methot and Wetzel, 2013). Single estimates of fishing mortality rates ( $F$ ) were calculated for all gears combined in stock synthesis. LBSPR and LIME (see the estimation models section) assume a single gear, so the  $F$  estimates represent the  $F$  as covered by the stock sampled. SS calculates the SPR as the equilibrium level of spawning biomass per recruit that would occur with the current year's level of fishing intensity relative to the unfished level of spawning biomass per recruit (Goodyear, 1993).

After running SS to generate the OM, we extracted the expected catch at age by year and fleet from the SS report. We converted this catch at age in biomass into catch at age in numbers

1  
2  
3 using the mean weight at age. We used the age-length transition matrix output from SS to assign  
4 a distribution of length at each age (Table S1 in the Supplementary material). Summing across  
5 each length bin by gear gave us the length distribution of the catch. We used a 2-cm length bin,  
6 which corresponds to the bin structure applied in the formal ICCAT assessment (ICCAT, 2014).  
7 In order to analyze different length sampling scenarios, we sampled 100 individuals from the  
8 catch by year and fleet with a multinomial distribution using the probability of being harvested at  
9 each length bin for each year. We repeated this process of simulating a population and generating  
10 data for 100 replicates for each scenario. We chose to sample only 100 individuals because no  
11 big differences in the results were found when using a larger sample size (i.e. 1000 and 10 000  
12 individuals), just a small reduction in variance (see Pons, 2018).  
13  
14

#### 15 Scenarios

16 A common question that arises with length data from multifleet fisheries with different  
17 selectivity patterns is which fleets to use and how to combine data when applying length-based,  
18 data-limited methods that only estimate selectivity and fishing mortality for one fishing gear. We  
19 explored the performance of each estimation method under different approaches combining  
20 length data into one common “fleet”. The single fleet could actually be one selected fleet or  
21 multiple fleets combined in some way. In all scenarios, the selectivity for this one fleet was  
22 estimated and starting values were the same for each model run. We explored five possible  
23 scenarios:  
24

- 25 • Scenario 1: Length composition sampled proportional to the catch of each fleet (Figure  
26 1). This means that fish measured from the fleet with the highest catch would be more  
27 represented in the length composition data than other fleets.
- 28 • Scenario 2: Length composition sampled with equal weight from each fleet. This means  
29 that the same number of individuals were measured from each fleet and combined in one  
30 length-sample. All fleets are equally represented in the length composition data.
- 31 • Scenario 3: Only use length data from the fleet that targets small individuals (fleet A).  
32 Fleet A has a dome-shaped selectivity (Figure 1a) where the true  $S_{50}$  is 57 cm (~ age 1.5)  
33 and  $S_{95}$  is 61 cm (~ age 2). It was modeled in SS with a double normal distribution with 6  
34 parameters. This fishery catches mainly juveniles and it is the main fishery for North  
35 Atlantic albacore in terms of catch (Figure 1b).
- 36 • Scenario 4: Only use length data from the fleet that targets a broad range of lengths (fleet  
37 B). Fleet B has an asymptotic selectivity harvesting both juveniles and adults, with a true  
38  $S_{50}$  of 78 cm (~ age 3.5) and  $S_{95}$  of 90 cm (~ age 5, Figure 1a). In terms of catch, this fleet  
39 resents a small proportion of the total (Figure 1b).
- 40 • Scenario 5: Only use length data from the fleets that target adults (fleet C). Fleet C also  
41 catches a small fraction of the total catch (Figure 1b), but is a longline fishery that targets  
42 mainly adults with a true  $S_{50}$  of 100 cm (~ age 7) and a  $S_{95}$  of 108 cm (~ age 9) (Figure  
43 1a).

#### 44 Estimation models

45 In LBSPR, SPR in an exploited population is a function of the ratio of fishing mortality to  
46 natural mortality ( $F/M$ ), selectivity and the two life history ratios  $M/k$  and  $L_m/L_\infty$ ;  $k$  is the von  
47 Bertalanffy growth coefficient,  $L_m$  is the size of maturity, and  $L_\infty$  is asymptotic size (Hordyk *et*  
48 *al.*, 2015). The inputs to the LBSPR are:  $M/k$ ,  $L_\infty$ , the variability of length-at-age ( $CVL_\infty$ ), which  
49 was set as 10% in the OMs; and size of maturity specified in terms of  $L_{50}$  and  $L_{95}$ , the size at  
50

which 50 and 95% of a population matures (Table 1). Given the assumed values for the  $M/k$  and  $L_\infty$  parameters and length composition data from an exploited stock, the LBSPR model uses maximum likelihood methods to estimate the selectivity ogive, which is assumed to be a logistic curve defined by the selectivity-at-length parameters  $S_{50}$  and  $S_{95}$  and the relative fishing mortality ( $F/M$ ), which are then used to calculate the SPR (Hordyk *et al.*, 2015). LBSPR estimates a selectivity curve for each length sample. Estimates of SPR are primarily determined by the length of the fish in a sample, relative to the maturity and  $L_\infty$ . For example, if a reasonable proportion of fish in a sample attain lengths approaching  $L_\infty$ , estimates of  $F/M$  will be relatively low leading to a high estimate of SPR. However, the proportion of length samples near  $L_\infty$  will vary with the life history parameters such as fecundity-at-age/length and selectivity. LBSPR is an equilibrium-based method with some underlying assumptions including: (i) asymptotic selectivity, (ii) growth adequately described by the von Bertalanffy equation, (iii) a single growth curve can be used to describe both sexes which have equal catchability, (iv) length-at-age is normally distributed, (v) rates of natural mortality are constant across adult age classes, (vi) growth rates remain constant across the cohorts within a stock, and (vii) constant recruitment (Hordyk *et al.*, 2015). In this study, we used LBSPR package version 0.1.2 in R (Hordyk, 2017). The LBSPR package uses the Rauch–Tung–Striebel smoother function to smooth out the multiyear estimates of SPR (Hordyk, 2017), and these smoothed values were used for comparisons with the OM.

LIME is an integrated, age-structured model which requires, as input, biological information such as growth, natural mortality, and maturity, and, at minimum, one year of length composition data. LIME estimates, as fixed effects, annual fishing mortality rates  $F$ ,  $S_{50}$ , and  $S_{95}$ , the recruitment standard deviation, and a Dirichlet-multinomial parameter governing the relationship between the nominal and effective sample size of length measurements. LIME has most of the same assumptions as LBSPR, but LIME does not assume equilibrium conditions when recruitments can be estimated (i.e. more than one year of length data). LIME extends length-based methods by deriving time-varying recruitment deviations (Rudd and Thorson, 2018) using automatic differentiation and Laplace approximations (TMB) (Kristensen *et al.*, 2015) to calculate the marginal likelihood for the random effect on recruitment. Using the assumed biological information, recruitment deviates, estimated  $F$ , and estimated selectivity, LIME calculates the predicted abundance-at-age over time. To predict length composition of the catch, LIME calculates the predicted probability of being captured at age over time, the probability of being in a length bin given age, and then the probability of being captured in each length bin. LIME fits the predicted length composition to the observed length composition using the Dirichlet-multinomial likelihood function. In addition to the length composition marginal likelihood, the joint negative log likelihood also includes a penalty on the fishing mortality rate to avoid varying unrealistically between years and the likelihood of the random effect of annual recruitment deviations. LIME can also accommodate catch and/or abundance data if available (Rudd and Thorson, 2018), although this feature was not used in this study. We used the LIME package version 1.0.5 (Rudd, 2018).

## Performance measures

The performance of the EMs under different scenarios was compared with the simulated “truth” from the OM using relative error (RE) calculated as  $(\text{estimated}-\text{true})/\text{true}$ , where *estimated* comes from the EM and *true* from the OM. This is a measure of uncertainty, in both bias and precision, of the EM under each scenario, and it is commonly used as a standardized metric of

1  
2  
3 model performance. We used SPR as the performance measure for all scenarios estimated by  
4 both LIME and LBSPR. We presented the relative error of the last year of the time-series of SPR  
5 in all cases for the 100 simulation replicates for each scenario.  
6

7 **Assessment of small scombrids in the Atlantic Ocean**

8 Little tunny, bonito, wahoo, king mackerel, and frigate tuna have been identified as priority to be  
9 evaluated by ICCAT in 2017 (ICCAT, 2017). In the present study, the only species that we did  
10 not evaluate was king mackerel. In the Southwest Atlantic, there is no good information on  
11 length data to evaluate this stock; in the Northwest Atlantic, it is regularly assessed by the US as  
12 two independent stocks: one in the Gulf of Mexico and the other off the southeast coast of the  
13 US (SEDAR, 2014a, 2014b). According to these reports, neither stock of king mackerel in the  
14 Northwest Atlantic is currently overfished nor undergoing overfishing.  
15

16 None of the other four species of small scombrids have studies defining stocks  
17 boundaries in the Atlantic Ocean. So, for management purposes, ICCAT uses five sampling or  
18 statistical areas for small scombrids: Northwest Atlantic, Southwest Atlantic, Northeast Atlantic,  
19 Southeast Atlantic, and Mediterranean Sea (Figure S3 in the Supplementary material). Hence, we  
20 decided to use these areas as proxies for stock boundaries to assess these putative “stocks”.  
21

22 The ICCAT database (<http://iccat.es/en/accesingdb.htm>) has length data from 1975 to  
23 2016 for the four priority species assessed in this study. The length composition data available  
24 for each stock come from different regions and different gear types. To estimate current stock  
25 status, we used only data from 2010 to the present where there is a better representation of the  
26 length composition of the catch by year and gear (Figure S4 in the Supplementary material). We  
27 used the length data reported in 1- and 2-cm bins and pooled them into 2-cm length bins for the  
28 analysis. The number of fish measured by year for the priority species varies between 17 429  
29 individuals measured in 2016 to 98 173 in 2014, all species combined (Figure S4 in the  
30 Supplementary material). We presented the stock status for the year 2014 where there are more  
31 length data and are consistent among species and representative of different gears.  
32

33 For some stocks, the length data available were limited, so we removed samples  
34 numbering fewer than 100 fish per year and gear combination (Figure S4 in the Supplementary  
35 material). Some stocks, such as wahoo in the Southwest Atlantic, were excluded from the  
36 analysis because they are targeted by multiple fleets, but length data are available only for one  
37 gear (gillnets) and would bias the results. This filtering process reduced the number of stocks  
38 with enough information to run the length-based models. We did not run these models for bonito  
39 in the Southeast, Northwest, and Southwest, little tunny in the Southwest, wahoo in the  
40 Mediterranean, Southeast, and Southwest (stock not present in the Mediterranean), and frigate  
41 tuna in the Mediterranean, Southwest, and Southeast, resulting in 10 stocks with representative  
42 information of length composition data of catch by gear (Figure S5 in the Supplementary  
43 material, Table 2).  
44

45 Both LBSPR and LIME require life history information on growth, maturity, and length-  
46 weight relationships as input parameters. These methods are very sensitive to these parameters  
47 (Hordyk *et al.*, 2015; Rudd and Thorson, 2018). In 2018, the ICCAT small tunas working group  
48 met, and a set of life history parameters were agreed among scientists from each region in the  
49 Atlantic Ocean for each stock to run data-limited methods (ICCAT, 2018, Table S2 in the  
50 Supplementary material). There are many gaps in the life history information available for these  
51 species. In cases where there was missing information, we borrowed information from the  
52

nearest stock of that species (i.e. when missing information existed for the Southeast Atlantic, we borrowed the information from the Northeast Atlantic) to run the length-based models.

Table 2 shows the final parameters used for each stock to run LBSPR and LIME. Natural mortality ( $M$ ) was calculated using a suite of empirical life history-based methods (Cope, 2017, see [http://barefootecologist.com.au/shiny\\_m](http://barefootecologist.com.au/shiny_m)). We used nine empirical methods that used growth parameters ( $L_\infty$ ,  $k$ ,  $t_0$ , and maximum age). Four of these methods are described in Then *et al.* (2015), two in Jensen (1996), and the other three in Alverson and Carney (1975), Chen and Watanabe (1989), and Jensen (1997), respectively. Table 2 shows the median and first and third quantile of the distribution of  $M$  estimated for each stock. LBSPR and LIME were run with these three  $M$  values to test their sensitivity to these parameter estimations.

### Reference points for small scombrids

We used SPR as a biological reference point. In general, it is used as a proxy for  $B_{MSY}$  when information on the scale population size is not available. A harvest strategy that targets a fishing mortality rate that is expected to result in 40% of the unfished spawning output ( $SPR_{40\%}$ ) is considered a reasonable proxy even for stocks with very low resiliency (Clark, 2002). Moreover, 30% SPR is sometimes considered a threshold beyond which overfishing would be occurring (Clark, 2002; Nadon *et al.*, 2015; Rudd and Thorson, 2018). In addition, we presented the estimated ratio  $F/M$  for each stock.

## Results

### Simulation testing: length data in multifleet fisheries

Based on the observed catch data for North Atlantic albacore used in the OM, the true SPR value in the terminal year was 0.55 for the OM without recruitment deviations; for the OM that includes random recruitment deviations, the median was 0.66, with a range 0.50–0.74 (Figure S6 in the Supplementary material). LBSPR was least biased when using length data from the fleet with asymptotic selectivity catching a broad range of lengths from juveniles to adults (Scenario 4; Figure 2). LIME was least biased with length data from the fleet that targets only adults when considering recruitment variability (Scenario 5; Figure 2). In the Supplementary information, we presented potential biases in the estimation models compared with our OMs under perfect equilibrium conditions. It seems that a persistent bias exists for both assessment methods compared with the OM, except for LBSPR when fish are selected before reaching the length at maturity. In general, LIME underestimates SPR for this species (North Atlantic albacore), particularly when individuals are selected by the fishery before maturing. LIME also overestimates selectivity most of the time, but is less biased when adults are present in the samples. LBSPR is slightly positively biased only when the sampled individuals are above the size at maturity (Table S3 in the Supplementary material).

In Scenario 1, length composition data was weighted by the fleet's proportional catch, meaning that more weight was given to the fleet with dome-shaped selectivity. In this scenario, both LBSPR and LIME underestimated SPR on average in both recruitment scenarios (Figure 2). Under an asymptotic selectivity assumption, if large individuals are absent from the catch, both assessment methods estimate  $F$  to be higher than the truth and SPR lower than the truth. LIME estimated SPR to be almost zero. Results from Scenario 3 were similar to Scenario 1 since both scenarios put higher weight on length compositions consisting of mainly juveniles or smaller individuals than the full span of vulnerable fish.

Under Scenario 2, sampling the same number of individuals by gear type, LBSPR and LIME estimated SPR higher than the truth, particularly when the OM did not consider recruitment variability. When considering recruitment variability, LBSPR was positively biased, although LIME was less biased, but less precise. Under these scenarios, the proportion of large individuals in the catch was overrepresented, leading to the EMs estimating higher SPR values than expected. The same overestimation of SPR occurred in Scenario 5 using the fleet that targets adults when no recruitment variability was included in the OM due to the proportions of large individuals in the catch. However, as was shown under perfect equilibrium conditions (Table S3 in the Supplementary material), LIME tends to be less biased when large individuals are in the samples.

LBSPR was less biased in Scenario 4 when considering only the fleet with an asymptotic selectivity that captures a broad range of sizes (from juveniles to adults), while LIME was less biased under the scenarios with recruitment variability when considering the fleets with gears that selected mainly adults in Scenario 5 (Figure 2). We observed that, in many cases, even under equilibrium conditions (Table S3 in the Supplementary material), LIME estimated higher selectivity parameter values,  $S_{50}$  and  $S_{95}$ , and lower SPR values than LBSPR. This is probably the reason why LIME performs better when using fleets that target large fish and why LIME SPR estimates are lower than LBSPR SPR estimates when using the same data.

#### Assessments of small scombrids in the Atlantic Ocean

Based on simulation testing, none of the scenarios produced the best performance for both estimation models (LIME and LBSPR) simultaneously. LBSPR performed best in Scenario 4, which used the length data coming from the fleet with an asymptotic selectivity targeting a broad range of lengths. LIME, however, performed better in Scenarios 5, where mainly adults were represented in the catch. So, based on these results, we decided to apply both LIME and LBSPR using the length composition data from small scombrids from the fleet that has a broader range of sizes including adults, but not restricted to the adult portion of the catch. The gears used then varied among small tuna stocks (Figure 3).

The length composition data for each stock by gear, filtered by year–gear combinations with at least 100 length measurements, varies among areas. These differences likely stem from variable fleets operations in each region. Length composition data for little tunny are available for two gears in the Northwest Atlantic, but rod and reel has more representative sampling by year and length range compared with traps (Figure S5 in the Supplementary material). In this case, we used length data only from rod and reel to assess this stock (Figure 3). For little tunny in the Northeast Atlantic, we selected the length data coming from traps since they cover a broader range of ages including adults, despite the fact that there are no data in 2011. For little tunny in the Mediterranean, we used length data from longlines; for the Southeast Atlantic, we used data from gillnets (Figure S5 in the Supplementary material, Figure 3). For wahoo in the Northeast, we used the length composition from handlines since it was the only information available; we used rod and reel data for the Northwest. For bonito in the Mediterranean, we used length data coming from longlines, such as for little tunny in the same area. Finally, for frigate tuna in the Northeast and Southeast, we selected the length data coming from purse-seine fisheries (Figure S5 in the Supplementary material, Figure 3).

For some small scombrid stocks, the SPR estimates were below the target of 40%, but the results varied between assumptions about  $M$  and the estimation method considered (Figure 4). LBSPR and LIME predicted different values of SPR; the estimated values were sometimes far

1  
2  
3 apart, such as for bonito in the Mediterranean and in the Northeast (e.g. 0.2 with LIME and 0.6  
4 with LBSPR). LIME estimated a higher  $F$  and lower SPR than LBSPR (Figure S7 in the  
5 Supplementary material). In contrast, for bonito in the Northeast, LIME estimated a higher  
6 selectivity ogive, lower  $F$ , and higher SPR than LBSPR. For 2014, LIME estimated high  
7 recruitment; the small individuals in the catch were attributed to the recruitment spike, as  
8 opposed to LBSPR, which interpreted the small individuals as a high  $F$  (Figure S7 in the  
9 Supplementary material). As expected, when  $M$  was assumed to be lower than in the base case  
10 scenario (median  $M$ ), the SPR estimations were lower (Figure 4).

11 SPR for little tunny in the Southeast was below 0.40 in all cases, except when LIME  
12 assumed a high  $M$ , which resulted in a SPR estimate of 0.70 (Figure 4). Assuming the median  
13 value of  $M$ , LBSPR predicted a very high  $F$  and SPR values below 0.20 for the entire time-series.  
14 LIME also predicted low SPR values, around 0.30, and a much lower  $S_{50}$  than LBSPR (Figure S8  
15 in the Supplementary material). The results of LBSPR and LIME were more similar for little  
16 tunny in the Northwest, Mediterranean, and Northeast Atlantic (Figure S8 in the Supplementary  
17 material). SPR for these stocks were above the 40% target reference point. For little tunny in the  
18 Mediterranean, the ratio between  $F/M$  is high (above 2), even though SPR is above 40%.

19 SPR estimates for both LBSPR and LIME for wahoo in the Northwest were below 40%  
20 (except in the high  $M$  scenario with LIME). LIME predicted very high  $F/M$  and SPR below 40%,  
21 except when assuming a higher  $M$  for wahoo in the Northeast. In both the Northwest and  
22 Northeast, LIME predicted a higher  $S_{50}$  and a lower SPR than LBSPR (Figure S9 in the  
23 Supplementary material). None of the frigate tuna stock assessments estimated SPR below 40%,  
24 except with LIME in the low  $M$  scenario where SPR was estimated at ca. 20% for the Northeast  
25 and Southeast stocks (Figure 4, Figure S10 in the Supplementary material). Table 3 summarizes  
26 the status of the ten small Scombrids stocks assessed under the base-case scenario, considering  
27 the median of the  $M$  distribution.

## 33 Discussion

### 34 Length data in multifleet fisheries

35 We showed how stock assessment results could be highly biased when using only one gear that  
36 is not representative of the length of the exploited population, particularly when the assumptions  
37 of asymptotic selectivity are violated (e.g. albacore length data coming from bait boat and troll  
38 fisheries targeting juveniles with dome-shaped selectivity). In this case, high catches of smaller  
39 individuals resulted in an underrepresentation of the proportion of adults in the population,  
40 estimating a lower SPR value than the actual value. Even if the asymptotic selectivity  
41 assumption is met (i.e. albacore length data coming from longline fleets targeting adults), SPR  
42 was overestimated. Hordyk *et al.* (2015) suggested that when there are multiple fleets targeting  
43 the same stock, the LBSPR model should be applied to the data from the fleet that targets the  
44 adult portion of the stock. However, we found that SPR estimates were positively biased when  
45 fish are caught after reaching the size at maturity  $L_{50}$  (Table S3 in the Supplementary material).  
46 In all the scenarios analyzed by Hordyk *et al.* (2015), the  $S_{50}$  was lower than the  $L_{50}$ , but in our  
47 scenarios 5 and 6, the  $S_{50}$  was higher than  $L_{50}$ , explaining why they did not find this bias in their  
48 results. SPR estimates are primarily determined by the size of the fish in a sample relative to both  
49 size at maturity  $L_{50}$  and  $L_{\infty}$ . In our Scenario 4, where the  $S_{50}$  was lower than the  $L_{50}$ , LBSPR was  
50 less biased, as we also showed assuming perfect equilibrium conditions (Table S3 in the  
51 Supplementary material).

Rudd and Thorson (2018) tested the performance of LIME under LBSPR's own OM (Hordyk *et al.*, 2015), with relative ages based on the  $M/k$  ratio. They found that LBSPR performs well across all life history types, but LIME underestimated SPR for the medium- and longer-lived life history types and overestimated SPR for the short-lived life history type. However, in most of the non-equilibrium scenarios, LIME performed better than LBSPR. We also found in most of the scenarios considered that LIME estimated a lower SPR than LBSPR for this medium-lived albacore tuna. Also, we showed how, even under equilibrium conditions, that different OMs structures can show biases in the performance of the estimation models (Table S3 in the Supplementary material).

Based on our results, we recommend that, when there are multiple fleets with different selectivity patterns targeting one stock, and the length-based estimator assumes asymptotic selectivity, length-based models should be applied to the length data coming from the fleet that targets the broadest range of sizes including adults, but not restricted only to the adult portion of the catch. In particular, it is important to include juveniles because SPR estimates improve when the catch length sample is representative of the length composition of the entire exploited population.

### **Small scombrids stock status**

LBSPR estimates of SPR, selectivity parameters, and the ratio of fishing mortality to natural mortality ( $F/M$ ) are independently determined each year. However, LIME includes length composition data available for multiple years in the same model to estimate a single selectivity curve for all years, but fishing mortality and recruitment can vary among years. Therefore, assumptions and model structure are different between LIME and LBSPR, leading, unsurprisingly, to different results on the proxy of the stock status for small scombrids.

We did not find a specific pattern in exploitation status among regions (Figure 4) as regions in the Atlantic Ocean showed comparable stock status. Although some combinations of stock assessment model and natural mortality rate resulted in differing estimates of stock status, the approaches agreed under the base scenario with median  $M$  that two stocks out of ten are overfished: the little tunny in the Southeast and wahoo in the Northwest.

### *Little tunny*

The length composition data for little tunny in the Northeast and Northwest Atlantic from purse-seiners were very similar and both assessment methods indicated that these stocks are above stock status targets ( $SPR > 0.4$ ). On the other hand, for little tunny in the Southeast, most of the fish caught were below the length at maturity and, in most of the scenarios, this stock was estimated to be overfished. These results agree with a preliminary qualitative risk assessment analysis performed for small scombrids in the Atlantic Ocean considering two populations, north and south. The southern stock was found at high risk, while the northern population was found at moderate risk (Lucena-Frédu<sup>o</sup> *et al.*, 2017b). This species has an estimated maximum age between 8 and 10 years (Cayre and Diouf, 1980) and an estimate of  $L_{\infty}$  between 86 and 117 cm. Adults of this species ( $> 60$  cm) in the Southeast are scarce in the length composition leading to low estimates of SPR. Along with bonito and frigate tuna, this species is one of the most captured among all small scombrids in the Atlantic Ocean (ICCAT, 2018).

### *Bonito*

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

In the base-case scenario, bonito in the Northeast was estimated to have a SPR below target reference points ( $\text{SPR} < 0.4$ ) with LBSPR, but not with LIME. The opposite was observed in the Mediterranean, where LIME estimated a lower SPR than LBSPR. Rudd and Thorson (2018) found that LIME generally estimated a higher SPR than the truth for short-lived fish in a yearly time-step. A monthly time-step could be considered in the future for this species to test for sensitivity to this assumption since the life span for this species is 5 years (Baibat *et al.*, 2016).

Previous data-limited assessment methods were applied for bonito in the Northeast using Morocco landings data between 2012 and 2014. A Powell–Wetherall plot approach was used to explore changes in total mortality based on length samples and catch-curve analysis using lengths converted to age and cohort slicing (Ahmed *et al.*, 2015). Assuming  $M = 0.2$ , they found that fishing mortality is twice this value and suggested that this stock might be fully exploited. The  $M$  values used in the present study were  $> 0.2$  in all cases, so using such a low value for  $M$  could give similar results as in Ahmed *et al.* (2015). However, for this short-lived species, we assume natural mortality should be  $> 0.2$  (as is typical for other short-lived species).

This species is the most captured among all small scombrids (ICCAT, 2018), but the biological information as well as the length composition data available are highly fragmented and variable. Our results should be analyzed with caution; as better data becomes available, these stocks should be re-evaluated. This should be a high priority item for ICCAT.

#### *Frigate tuna*

In almost all scenarios, the stocks were estimated to be  $> 40\%$  SPR. However, assessments for the Northeast stock always estimated lower SPR values than for the one in the Southeast. Again, these results matched the preliminary risk assessment for small scombrids in the Atlantic Ocean, where stocks in the south are at lower risk than the ones in the north (Lucena-Frédon *et al.*, 2017b). However, both  $F$  and SPR estimates in the Southeast should be considered with caution, since some of the results are in the low-right quadrant at  $F$ , close to 0 and SPR close to 1 with very high uncertainty. In particular, for LIME, this could indicate an unconverged model (Figure S8 in the Supplementary material). If  $F$  was estimated to be close to 0, it is likely that the life history information is inaccurate because we know the  $F$  is not 0 since a fishery is occurring.  $L_\infty$  might be too low, so both models would estimate no fishing if the observed lengths are very close to the asymptotic length. The growth parameters should be discussed again at the next small tuna group meeting in order to consider different life history values for this stock.

#### *Wahoo*

Both LIME and LBSPR estimated low SPR values for the Northwest stock, suggesting that this stock is overfished. In the Northeast, only LIME in the base case and low  $M$  scenarios estimated that this stock is overfished, but not LBSPR. In the South Atlantic, wahoo has been categorized as high risk, and no assessments are available for this stock. This species, along with bonito, should be considered as a priority to assess by ICCAT.

#### **Future directions**

We estimated for the first time a proxy of current stock status for ten stocks of the small scombrid group of species in the Atlantic Ocean. This is a very important starting point in the estimation of stock status for these species, but the wide uncertainty in estimates combined with differences in results between LBSPR and LIME demonstrate that data-poor methods are not substitutes for more data-intensive assessment techniques. ICCAT still needs to support the

1  
2  
3 collection of improved life history information, length data from all fishing gears, and total  
4 removals for these stocks and associated fishing data. While collecting such information in small  
5 coastal fisheries is challenging, particularly for catch and effort data, it is important to develop  
6 indices of abundance. A full assessment might return estimates with higher precision, although it  
7 does not mean that it would be more accurate than the estimates provided here. Data collection  
8 should focus on filling gaps and improving existing biological information, particularly for  
9 stocks such as little tunny in the Southeast Atlantic, where data were borrowed from the  
10 Northwest Atlantic stock. Also, ICCAT should emphasize the importance of obtaining length  
11 data across the different gears, particularly those that cover a broad range of sizes. For example,  
12 wahoo in the Southwest Atlantic were excluded from the analysis because they are targeted by  
13 multiple fleets, but length data are available only for one gear (gillnets) and using only this data  
14 could bias the results.

15 LBSPR and LIME, like all age- or length-based methods, are sensitive to  
16 misspecifications of the inputs of life information (Hordyk *et al.*, 2015; Kokkalis *et al.*, 2017;  
17 Rudd and Thorson, 2018). Sensitivity tests in these studies demonstrated the impact of the  
18 misspecification of biological parameters. Quantification of uncertainty is one of the next steps  
19 in the evaluation of these small scombrid stocks, not only for  $M$ , but for other growth and  
20 maturity parameters, to provide support for local biological studies of these species. To account  
21 for the uncertainty in the biological parameters with the current information available in the  
22 Scombridae database (Juan-Jordá *et al.*, 2016), a Monte Carlo algorithm could be applied in  
23 specifying prior distributions for life history parameters (Prince *et al.*, 2015) for this group of  
24 species.

25 Small scombrid fisheries in the Atlantic Ocean are medium- to small-scale, data-limited,  
26 and generally unassessed, with a lack of management and enforcement, with the exception of  
27 some regions in the Northwest Atlantic, such as in the US. Determining stock status is the first  
28 step to protect these stocks from being overfished and to apply management measures to rebuild  
29 overfished stocks. Since stock status for these species is highly uncertain, simulation testing is  
30 needed to evaluate different management procedures accounting for data and model uncertainty  
31 in a management strategy framework. Management strategy evaluation (MSE) could be used to  
32 develop robust management frameworks for such stocks, e.g. using the data-limited-methods  
33 toolkit (DLMtool, Carruthers and Hordyk, 2018).

## 34 **Conclusions**

35 The present study analyzed different approaches using length-based, data-limited assessments  
36 when length composition data come from fisheries with multiple gears with different selectivity  
37 patterns. An aim of this study was to evaluate how to use length composition data from  
38 multifleet fisheries to estimate stock status for small scombrids. We recommend that length-  
39 based models should be applied to the length data coming from the fleet that targets the broadest  
40 range of sizes, including juveniles and adults when the data are available. Even though the  
41 results observed here can be applied to other multifleet fisheries, the results show biases under  
42 different selectivity assumptions for the simulated albacore population, so further simulation  
43 testing for data-poor, multifleet fisheries with variable life history, selectivity, and exploitation  
44 patterns should be explored.

45 Small tunas are an important social and economic resource for many coastal  
46 communities; however, most of these stocks have not been assessed, and their status is unknown.  
47 This work is, therefore, an important first step in developing management plans, particularly as

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

the evaluation of uncertainty recognizes where data are needed to identify stock status and reduce risks of overfishing. Little tunny in the Southeast and wahoo in the Northwest are undergoing overfishing, despite the method and  $M$  used, which confirms the previous perception of ICCAT. These species have already been assigned priority, given their social-economic importance and also considering that they were two of the top three stocks at risk in the Atlantic Ocean, hence deserving most of the managers' attention (SCRS, 2018). For the Southeast little tunny, life history parameters for the given "stock" are not available, and data used within this study were borrowed from other areas, which may hamper our analysis. This species should be certainly considered as a priority for data collection within the small tuna group within ICCAT. For the Northwest wahoo, although life history parameters are available, length composition is only available for rod and reel, which may not include the majority of size classes. For both species, ICCAT has already developed a research programme to address knowledge gaps regarding size data and biological parameters (both from biological sampling and tagging programmes).

## Supplementary information

The Supplementary material available at the *ICESJMS* online version of this paper includes Figures S1–S10 and Tables S1–S3.

## Acknowledgments

We acknowledge funding by the Walton Family Foundation and International Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF) for MP. In addition, we acknowledge the ICCAT Small Tunas Working Group for providing the information about life history traits for the small scombrid species. Laurence Kell's involvement was funded by the Irish Exchequer and the European Maritime and Fisheries Fund (EMFF) under the MyDas project.

## References

- Ahmed, B. S., Abid, N., Palma, C., and Kell, L. 2015. A length based assessment for Atlantic Bonito (*Sarda sarda*). Collective Volume of Scientific Papers of ICCAT, 72: 2208–2220.
- Alverson, D. L., and Carney, M. J. 1975. A graphic review of the growth and decay of population cohorts. *Journal du Conseil International pour l'Exploration de la Mer*, 36: 133–143.
- Baibat, S., Malouli, I., Abid, N., and Benazzouz, B. 2016. Study of the reproduction of Atlantic bonito (*Sarda sarda*) in South Atlantic Ocean of Morocco. *Aquaculture, Aquarium, Conservation & Legislation - International Journal of the Bioflux Society*, 9: 954–964.
- Beverton, R. J. H., and Holt, S. J. 1957. On the dynamics of exploited fish populations. *Fishery Investigations* (Great Britain, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Food), London. 536 pp.
- Brooks, E. N., Powers, J. E., and Cortés, E. 2010. Analytical reference points for age-structured models: Application to data-poor fisheries. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 67: 165–175.
- Cabrera, M. A., Defeo, O., Aguilar, F. and Martínez, J. D. D. 2005. La pesquería de bonito (*Euthynnus alletteratus*) del noreste del banco de Campeche, México. *Proceedings of the Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute*, 46: 744–758.
- Carruthers, R. T., and Hordyk, A. R. 2018. The Data-Limited Methods Toolkit (DLMtool): An R package for informing management of data-limited populations. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 9(12): 2388–2395, doi: 10.1111/2041-210X.13081.

- 1  
2  
3 Cayré, P., Amon Kothias, J. B., Diouf, T., and Stretta, J. M. 1993. Biology of tuna. In Resources,  
4 Fishing and Biology of the Tropical Tunas of the Eastern Central Atlantic. Ed. by A.  
5 Fonteneau, and J. Marcille. FAO Fisheries Technical Paper No. 292. FAO, Rome, Italy.  
6 354 pp.  
7  
8 Cayré, P., and Diouf, T. 1980. Croissance de la thonine (*Euthynnus alletteratus*) (Rafinesque,  
9 1810) etablie a partir de coupes tranversales du premier rayon de la nageoire dorsale.  
10 Collected Volume of Scientific Papers of ICCAT, 15: 337–345.  
11  
12 Chen, S., and Watanabe, S. 1989. Age dependence of natural mortality coefficient in fish  
13 population dynamics. Nippon Suisan Gakkaishi, 55: 205–208.  
14 Chrysafi, A., and Kuparinen, A. 2016. Assessing abundance of populations with limited data:  
15 Lessons learned from data-poor fisheries stock assessment. Environmental Reviews, 1: 1–  
16 44.  
17 Clark, W. G. 2002.  $F_{35\%}$  revisited ten years later. North American Journal of Fisheries  
18 Management, 22: 251–257.  
19 Claro, R. 1994. Características generales de la ictiofauna, (Ecología de los peces marinos de  
20 Cuba). Instituto de Oceanología Academia de Ciencias de Cuba and Centro de  
21 Investigaciones de Quintana Roo, Quintana Roo, México.  
22 Collette, B. B., and Nauen, C. E. 1983. FAO Species Catalogue, Vol. 2 Scombrids of the World.  
23 An annotated and illustrated catalogue of tunas, mackerels, bonitos and related species  
24 known to date. FAO Fisheries Synopsis, 125(2). 137 pp.  
25 Collette, B. B., Carpenter, K. E., Polidoro, B. A., Juan-Jordá, M. J., Boustany, A., Die, D. J.,  
26 Elfes, C., et al. 2011. High Value and Long Life—Double Jeopardy for Tunas and Billfishes.  
27 Science, 333: 291–292.  
28 Cope, J. M. 2017. Natural Mortality Estimators - The Barefoot Ecologist's Toolbox.  
29 http://barefootecologist.com.au/shiny\_m.  
30 Diouf, T. 1980. Peche et biologie de trois Scombridae exploités au Sénégal: *Euthynnus*  
31 *alletteratus*, *Sarda sarda* et *Scomberomorus tritor*. Thèse de doctorat 3ème cycle,  
32 Université de Bretagne Occidentale, France. 159 pp.  
33 Dowling, N. A., Wilson, J. R., Rudd, M. B., Babcock, E. A., Caillaux, M., Cope, J., Dougherty,  
34 D., et al. 2016. FishPath: A Decision Support System for Assessing and Managing Data-  
35 and Capacity- Limited Fisheries. In Assessing and Managing Data-Limited Fish Stocks, pp.  
36 59–96. Ed. by T. J. Quinn II, J. L. Armstrong, M. Baker, J. Heifetz, and D. Witherell.  
37 Alaska Sea Grant Program, University of Alaska, Fairbanks.  
38 FAO. 2016. The State of World Fisheries and Aquaculture 2016. Contributing to food security  
39 and nutrition for all. Rome. 200 pp.  
40 Frotta, L. O., Costa, P. A. S., and Braga, A. C. 2004. Length-weight relationships of marine fishes  
41 from the central Brazilian coast. Naga, WorldFish Center Quarterly, 27: 20–26.  
42 Goodyear, C. P. 1993. Spawning stock biomass per recruit in fisheries management: foundation  
43 and current use. In Risk Evaluation and Biological Reference Points for Fisheries  
44 Management, pp. 67–82. Ed. by S. J. Smith, J. J. Hunt, and D. Rivard. Canadian Special  
45 Publication of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 120. 442 pp.  
46 Grudtsev, M. E., and Korolevich, L. I. 1986. Studies of frigate tuna *Auxis thazard* (Lacepede)  
47 age and growth in the eastern part of the Equatorial Atlantic. Collective Volume of  
48 Scientific Papers of ICCAT, 25: 269–274.  
49 Hajjej, G., Hattour, A., Hajjej, A., Cherif, M., Allaya, H., Jarboui, O. and Bouain, A. 2012. Age  
50 and growth of little tunny, *Euthynnus alletteratus* (Rafinesque, 1810), from the Tunisian  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Mediterranean coasts. *Cahiers de Biologie Marine*, 53: 113–122.  
4 Hansen, J. E. 1987. Aspectos biológicos y pesqueros del bonito del Mar Argentino (Pisces,  
5 Scombridae, *Sarda sarda*). Collective Volume of Scientific Papers of ICCAT, 26: 441–  
6 442.  
7 Hattour, A. 2000. Contribution a l'étude des poissons pelagiques des eaux Tunisiennes. Thèse de  
8 Doctorat, Faculté des Sciences de Tunis, Université d'El Manar II. 327 pp.  
9 Hattour, A. 2009. Les thons mineurs tunisiens: étude biologiques et pêche. Collective Volume of  
10 Scientific Papers of ICCAT, 64: 2230–2271.  
11 Hogarth, W.T. 1976. Life history aspects of the wahoo *Acanthocybium solandri* (Cuvier and  
12 Valenciennes) from the coast of North Carolina. Ph.D. Dissertation. North Carolina State  
13 University, Raleigh, NC, USA. 119 pp.  
14 Hordyk, A. R. 2017. LBSPR: Length-Based Spawning Potential Ratio. R package version 0.1.3.  
15 <https://github.com/AdrianHordyk/LBSPR>.  
16 Hordyk, A. R., and Carruthers, T. R. 2018. A quantitative evaluation of a qualitative risk  
17 assessment framework: Examining the assumptions and predictions of the Productivity  
18 Susceptibility Analysis (PSA). *PLoS ONE* 13(6): e0198298.  
19 Hordyk, A., Ono, K., Valencia, S., Loneragan, N., and Prince, J. 2015. A novel length-based  
20 empirical estimation method of spawning potential ratio (SPR), and tests of its performance,  
21 for small-scale, data-poor fisheries. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 72: 217–231.  
22 ICCAT. 2014. Report of the 2013 ICCAT North and South Atlantic Albacore stock assessment  
23 meeting. Collective Volume of Scientific Papers of ICCAT, 70: 830–995.  
24 ICCAT. 2017. Report of the 2017 Small Tunas Species Group Intersessional Meeting, Miami,  
25 United States, 24–28 April 2017. Collective Volume of Scientific Papers of ICCAT, 74(1):  
26 1–75.  
27 ICCAT. 2018. Report of the 2018 ICCAT Small Tuna Species Group Intersessional Meeting,  
28 Madrid, Spain 2–6 April, 2018. Collective Volume of Scientific Papers of ICCAT, 75(1):  
29 1–67.  
30 IGFA. 2011. World Record Game Fishes. International Game Fish Association, Dania Beach,  
31 Florida, USA.  
32 Jenkins, K. L. M., and McBride, R. S. 2009. Reproductive biology of wahoo, *Acanthocybium*  
33 *solandri*, from the Atlantic coast of Florida and the Bahamas. *Marine and Freshwater*  
34 *Research*, 60: 893–897.  
35 Jensen, A. L. 1996. Beverton and Holt life history invariants result from optimal trade-off of  
36 reproduction and survival. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 53: 820–  
37 822.  
38 Jensen, A. L. 1997. Origin of the relation between K and  $L_{inf}$  and synthesis of relations among  
39 life history parameters. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 54: 987–989.  
40 Juan-Jordá, M. J., Mosqueira, I., Cooper, A. B., Freire, J., and Dulvy, N. K. 2011. Global  
41 population trajectories of tunas and their relatives. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*  
42 *Sciences of USA*, 108: 20650–20655.  
43 Juan-Jordá, M. J., Mosqueira, I., Freire, J., and Dulvy, N. K. 2015. Population declines of tuna  
44 and relatives depend on their speed of life. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*  
45 *Sciences*, 282: 20150322.  
46 Juan-Jordá, M. J., Mosqueira, I., Freire, J., Ferrer-Jordá, E., and Dulvy, N. K. 2016. Global  
47 scombrid life history dataset. *Ecology*, 97: 809–809.  
48 Kahraman, A. E., Göktürk, D., Yıldız, T., and Uzer, U. 2014. Age, growth, and reproductive

- 1  
2  
3 biology of Atlantic bonito (*Sarda sarda* Bloch, 1793) from the Turkish coasts of the Black  
4 Sea and the Sea of Marmara. *Turkish Journal of Zoology*, 38: 614–621.  
5 Kokkalis, A., Eikeset, A. M., Thygesen, U. H., Steingrund, P., and Andersen, K. H. 2017.  
6 Estimating uncertainty of data limited stock assessments. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*,  
7 74: 69–77.  
8 Kristensen, K., Nielsen, A., Berg, C. W., Skaug, H., and Bell, B. 2015. TMB: Automatic  
9 Differentiation and Laplace Approximation. <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1509.00660.pdf> (Accessed  
10 15 June 2018).  
11 Lucena-Frédu, F., Frédu, T., and Ménard, F. 2017b. Preliminary Ecological Risk Assessment  
12 of small tunas of the Atlantic Ocean. *Collective Volume of Scientific Papers of ICCAT*, 73:  
13 2663–2678.  
14 Lucena-Frédu, F., Kell, L., Frédu, T., Gaertner, D., Potier, M., Bach, P., Travassos, P., *et al.*  
15 2017a. Vulnerability of teleosts caught by the pelagic tuna longline fleets in South Atlantic  
16 and Western Indian Oceans. *Deep-Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography*,  
17 140: 230–241.  
18 Majkowski, J. 2007. Global fishery resources of tuna and tuna-like species. *FAO Fisheries  
19 Technical Paper No. 483*. Rome, FAO. 54 pp.  
20 McBride, R. S., Richardson, A. K., and Maki, K. L. 2008. Age, growth, and mortality of wahoo,  
21 *Acanthocybium solandri*, from the Atlantic coast of Florida and the Bahamas. *Marine and  
22 Freshwater Research*, 59: 799–807.  
23 Methot, R. D., and Wetzel, C. R. 2013. Stock synthesis: A biological and statistical framework  
24 for fish stock assessment and fishery management. *Fisheries Research*, 142: 86–99.  
25 Methot, R. D., Wetzel, C. R., and Taylor, I. 2018. Stock Synthesis User Manual. V3.30.10: 1–  
26 186. NOAA Fisheries, Seattle, WA  
27 Nadon, M. O., Ault, J. S., Williams, I. D., Smith, S. G., and DiNardo, G. T. 2015. Length-based  
28 assessment of coral reef fish populations in the main and northwestern Hawaiian Islands.  
29 *PloS ONE*, 10: e0133960.  
30 Pitcher, T. J., Watson, R., Forrest, R., Valtýsson, H., and Guénette, S. 2002. Estimating illegal  
31 and unreported catches from marine ecosystems: two case studies. *Fish and Fisheries*, 3:  
32 317–339.  
33 Pons, M. 2018. Stock Status and Management in Tuna Fisheries: From Data-rich to Data-poor.  
34 University of Washington, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2018. 10846859. 186 pp.  
35 <https://search.proquest.com/docview/2126689812?accountid=14784>.  
36 Pons, M., Branch, T. A., Melnychuk, M. C., Jensen, O. P., Brodziak, J., Fromentin, J. M.,  
37 Harley, S. J., *et al.* 2017. Effects of biological, economic and management factors on tuna  
38 and billfish stock status. *Fish and Fisheries*, 18: 1–21.  
39 Pons, M., Melnychuk, M. C., and Hilborn, R. 2018. Management effectiveness of large pelagic  
40 fisheries in the high seas. *Fish and Fisheries*, 19(2): 260–270.  
41 Prince, J., Victor, S., Kloulchad, V., and Hordyk, A. 2015. Length based SPR assessment of  
42 eleven Indo-Pacific coral reef fish populations in Palau. *Fisheries Research*, 171: 42–58.  
43 R Core Team. 2017. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for  
44 Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>.  
45 Ramírez-Arredondo, I. 1993. Aspectos reproductivos de la carachana pintada, *Euthynnus  
46 alletteratus* (Pisces:Scombridae) de los alrededores de la Isla de Picua, Estado Sucre,  
47 Venezuela. *Boletín del Instituto Oceanográfico de Venezuela*, 32: 69–78.  
48 Ramírez-Arredondo, I., Silva, J. and Marchán, F. 1996. Relación longitud peso y factor de  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

- condición en *Euthynnus alletteratus* (Rafinesque 1810), (Pisces: Scombridae) de los alrededores de las Islas los Testigos, Venezuela. Boletín del Instituto Oceanográfico de Venezuela, 35: 63–68.
- Rudd, M. B. 2018. LIME V1.0. Github. <https://github.com/merrillrudd/LIME>.
- Rudd, M. B., and Thorson, J. T. 2018. Accounting for variable recruitment and fishing mortality in length-based stock assessments for data-limited fisheries. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 75: 1019–1035.
- Saber, S., Ortiz de Urbina, J., Lino, P. G., Gómez-Vives, M. J., Coelho, R., Lechuga, R., and Macias, D. 2017. Biological samples collection for growth and maturity studies EU Portugal and Spain: Northeastern Atlantic and Western Mediterranean. ICCAT, Madrid. 41 pp.
- Santana, J. C., Delgado de Molina, A., and Ariz, J. 1993. Estimación de una ecuación talla-peso para *Acanthocybium solandri* (Cuvier, 1832), capturado en la Isla de el Hierro (Islas Canarias). Collective Volume of Scientific Papers of ICCAT, 40: 401–405.
- SCRS. 2018. Report of the Standing Committee on Research and Statistics (SCRS) (Madrid, Spain – 1 to 5 October 2018). ICCAT, Madrid. 469 pp.
- SEDAR. 2014a. SEDAR 38 Stock Assessment Report. South Atlantic King Mackerel. Southeast, Data, and Assessment Review Stock Assessment Report. 502 pp. [http://sedarweb.org/docs/sar/SEDAR\\_38\\_SA\\_SAR.pdf](http://sedarweb.org/docs/sar/SEDAR_38_SA_SAR.pdf)
- SEDAR. 2014b. SEDAR 38 Stock Assessment Report. Gulf of Mexico King Mackerel. Southeast, Data, and Assessment Review Stock Assessment Report. 465 pp. [http://sedarweb.org/docs/sar/SEDAR\\_38\\_Gulf\\_SAR.pdf](http://sedarweb.org/docs/sar/SEDAR_38_Gulf_SAR.pdf)
- Sinović, G., Franičević, M., Zorica, B., and Čikes-Keč, V. 2004. Length-weight and length-length relationships for 10 pelagic fish species from the Adriatic Sea (Croatia). Journal of Applied Ichthyology, 20: 156–158.
- Then, A. Y., Hoenig, J. M., Hall, N. G., and Hewitt, D. A. 2015. Evaluating the predictive performance of empirical estimators of natural mortality rate using information on over 200 fish species. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 72: 82–92.
- Viana, D., Branco, I., Fernandes, C., Fischer, A., Carvalho, F., Travassos, P., and Hazin, F. 2013. Reproductive biology of the wahoo, *Acanthocybium solandri* (Teleostei: Scombridae) in the Saint Peter and Saint Paul Archipelago, Brazil. International Journal of Plant and Animal Sciences, 2: 49–57.

**Table 1.** OM biological inputs parameters for North Atlantic albacore (ICCAT, 2014).

Biological information	Symbol	Value
Maximum age (years)	$T_{max}$	15
Length where 50% of the fish are mature (cm)	$L_{50}$	90
Length where 95% of the fish are mature (cm)	$L_{95}$	100
Length-weight scaling parameter (g)	$a$	$1.34 \times 10^{-5}$
Length-weight allometric parameter (g)	$b$	3.107
von Bertalanffy Brody growth coefficient	$k$	0.209
von Bertalanffy asymptotic length (cm)	$L_\infty$	122
Theoretical age at length 0	$t_0$	-1.3
Variability of length at age	$CVL_\infty$	0.1
Recruitment deviations	$\sigma_R$	0.4
Steepness	$h$	0.9

**Table 2.** Life history parameters used as inputs to assess stock status of small scombrids in the Atlantic Ocean using length-based data limited methods. \* $M$  was estimated empirically through different methods. The first quantile, median, and third quantile are presented. For the same species: <sup>A</sup>information borrowed from the Northwest stock, <sup>B</sup>information borrowed from the Northeast stock, <sup>C</sup>information borrowed from the Southeast stock, and <sup>D</sup>information borrowed from the Southwest stock. Please provide this table in an editable format, i.e. not as a figure.

Species	Parameter	Northeast	Southeast	Mediterranean	Northwest	Southwest
<i>Sarda sarda</i> (RON)	$L_{\infty}$ (cm)	73 (Babai et al., 2016)		70 (Kahraman et al., 2014)		
	$k$ ( $\text{years}^{-1}$ )	0.31 (Babai et al., 2016)		0.44 (Kahraman et al., 2014)		
	$t_0$ (years)	-2.45 (Babai et al., 2016)		-1.33 (Kahraman et al., 2014)		
	$T_{max}$ (years)	5 (Babai et al., 2016)		5 (Cayré et al., 1993)		
	$L_{50}$ (cm)	42.6 (Babai et al., 2016)		39.9 (Saber et al., 2017)		
	$M^*$ ( $\text{years}^{-1}$ )	0.43; 0.78; 1.11		0.60; 0.83; 1.09		
	$WL_a$ (g)	$5.0 \times 10^6$ (Babai et al., 2016)		$6.3 \times 10^6$ (Saber et al., 2017)		
	$WL_b$	2.79 (Babai et al., 2016)		3.21 (Saber et al., 2017)		
<i>Insufficient length data</i>						
<i>Euthynnus alleteratus</i> (LTA)	$L_{\infty}$ (cm)	86 (Cabrera et al., 2005) <sup>A</sup>	86 (Cabrera et al., 2005) <sup>A</sup>	117 (Iattouer, 2009)	86 (Cabrera et al., 2005)	
	$k$ ( $\text{years}^{-1}$ )	0.26 (Cabrera et al., 2005) <sup>A</sup>	0.26 (Cabrera et al., 2005) <sup>A</sup>	0.19 (Iattouer, 2009)	0.26 (Cabrera et al., 2005)	
	$t_0$ (years)	-0.32 (Cabrera et al., 2005) <sup>A</sup>	-0.32 (Cabrera et al., 2005) <sup>A</sup>	-1.13 (Iattouer, 2009)	-0.32 (Cabrera et al., 2005) <sup>B</sup>	
	$T_{max}$ (years)	8 (Cayré and Douf, 1980)	8 (Cayré and Douf, 1980)	10 (Iattouer, 2009)	8 (Cayré and Douf, 1980) <sup>B</sup>	
	$L_{50}$ (cm)	42.0 (Douf, 1980)	42.0 (Douf, 1980) <sup>B</sup>	51.1 (El Hajji et al., 2012)	39.7 (Ramírez-Arredondo, 1993)	
	$M^*$ ( $\text{years}^{-1}$ )	0.4; 0.53; 0.68	0.4; 0.53; 0.68	0.29; 0.43; 0.54	0.4; 0.53; 0.68	
	$WL_a$ (g)	$1.4 \times 10^5$ (Douf, 1980)	$1.4 \times 10^5$ (Douf, 1980) <sup>B</sup>	$1.2 \times 10^6$ (Saber et al., 2017)	$2.1 \times 10^5$ (Ramírez-Arredondo, 1996)	
	$WL_b$	3.04 (Douf, 1980)	3.04 (Douf, 1980) <sup>B</sup>	3.06 (Saber et al., 2017)	2.96 (Ramírez-Arredondo, 1996)	
<i>Insufficient length data</i>						
<i>Scadichthys stellifer</i> (WHT)	$L_{\infty}$ (cm)	179.7 (Viana et al., 2013) <sup>A</sup>			179.7 (Viana et al., 2013)	
	$k$ ( $\text{years}^{-1}$ )	0.32 (McBride et al., 2008) <sup>A</sup>			0.32 (McBride et al., 2008)	
	$t_0$ (years)	-1.91 (McBride et al., 2008) <sup>A</sup>			-1.91 (McBride et al., 2008) <sup>B</sup>	
	$T_{max}$ (years)	9 (McBride et al., 2008) <sup>A</sup>			9 (McBride et al., 2008) <sup>B</sup>	
	$L_{50}$ (cm)	92.5 (Jenkins and McBride, 2009) <sup>A</sup>			92.5 (Jenkins and McBride, 2009)	
	$M^*$ ( $\text{years}^{-1}$ )	0.43; 0.49; 0.60			0.43; 0.49; 0.60	
	$WL_a$ (g)	$2.8 \times 10^4$ (Santana et al., 1993)			$2.0 \times 10^6$ (Beerkircher 2005)	
	$WL_b$	2.72 (Santana et al., 1993)			3.24 (Beerkircher 2005)	
<i>Stock not defined</i>						
<i>Anisotremus albus</i> (FRU)	$L_{\infty}$ (cm)	52 (Gradushev and Korolevich, 1986)	52 (Gradushev and Korolevich, 1986)			
	$k$ ( $\text{years}^{-1}$ )	0.32 (Gradushev and Korolevich, 1986) <sup>C</sup>	0.32 (Gradushev and Korolevich, 1986)			
	$t_0$ (years)	-0.83 (Gradushev and Korolevich, 1986) <sup>C</sup>	-0.83 (Gradushev and Korolevich, 1986) <sup>C</sup>			
	$T_{max}$ (years)	4 (Gradushev and Korolevich, 1986) <sup>C</sup>	4 (Gradushev and Korolevich, 1986) <sup>C</sup>			
	$L_{50}$ (cm)	30 (Cayré et al., 1993) <sup>C</sup>	30 (Cayré et al., 1993) <sup>C</sup>			
	$M^*$ ( $\text{years}^{-1}$ )	0.48; 1.01; 1.37	0.48; 1.01; 1.37			
	$WL_a$ (g)	$8.9 \times 10^4$ (Frota et al., 2004) <sup>D</sup>	$8.9 \times 10^4$ (Frota et al., 2004) <sup>D</sup>			
	$WL_b$	3.17 (Frota et al., 2004) <sup>D</sup>	3.17 (Frota et al., 2004) <sup>D</sup>			
<i>Insufficient length data</i>						
<i>Insufficient length data</i>						

**Table 3.** Summary of stock status for small scombrids in the Atlantic Ocean. SPR is shown for both models, LBSPR and LIME, with the lower (CI\_low) and upper (CI\_up) confidence interval for the base model (median  $M$ ).

Species	Stock	LBSPR			LIME		
		SPR	CI_low	CI_up	SPR	CI_low	CI_up
Little tunny	Southeast	0.13	0.12	0.13	0.27	0.03	0.51
Bonito	Northeast	0.23	0.20	0.27	0.71	0.37	1.06
Wahoo	Northwest	0.37	0.23	0.51	0.29	0.27	0.31
Wahoo	Northeast	0.55	0.48	0.62	0.38	0.34	0.43
Bonito	Mediterranean	0.59	0.47	0.70	0.22	0.15	0.28
Little tunny	Mediterranean	0.66	0.57	0.74	0.62	0.54	0.71
Little tunny	Northwest	0.66	0.60	0.72	0.48	0.40	0.56
Frigate tuna	Southeast	0.79	0.78	0.80	0.53	0.49	0.57
Frigate tuna	Northeast	0.83	0.81	0.84	0.46	0.44	0.48
Little tunny	Northeast	0.90	0.83	0.96	1.00	1.00	1.00

1

2

3

**Figure captions**

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

**Figure 1.** (a) Selectivity patterns included in the operating model (OM) for each fleet. (b) Catch time-series included in the OM by fleet in the last 15 years (1997–2011) taken from the North Atlantic albacore assessment (ICCAT, 2013). Fleets A, B, and C are combination of fleets described in the main text. **Label to two graphs as (a) and (b) instead of as A and B. On graph (a), rotate the y-axis numbers 90° clockwise. On graph (b), change the y-axis numbers to 10, 20, 30, and 40 and change the caption to “Catch (‘000 t)”.**

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

**B2 Performance of length-based data-limited methods in a multi-fleet context**



## Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences

### Comparing performance of catch-based and length-based stock assessment methods in data-limited fisheries

Journal:	<i>Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences</i>
Manuscript ID	cjfas-2019-0276.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	26-Nov-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Pons, Maite; University of Washington, Aquatic and Fishery Sciences Cope, Jason; National Marine Fisheries Service - NOAA, Northwest Fisheries Science Center Kell, Laurie; Comision Internacional para la Conservacion del Atun Atlantico
Keyword:	data-limited assessment methods, depletion, life-history, harvest rates
Is the invited manuscript for consideration in a Special Issue? :	Not applicable (regular submission)

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1           Comparing performance of catch-based and length-based stock  
2           assessment methods in data-limited fisheries

3           Maite Pons <sup>1\*</sup>, Jason M. Cope <sup>1,2</sup>, and Laurence T. Kell <sup>3</sup>

4

5       <sup>1</sup> School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences, University of Washington, Box 355020, Seattle, Washington 98195-  
6       5020, USA. Email: [mpons@uw.edu](mailto:mpons@uw.edu)

7       <sup>2</sup> National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries, Northwest Fisheries Science Center, Fishery  
8       Resource Analysis and Monitoring Division, 2725 Montlake Boulevard East, Seattle, Washington 98112-2097,  
9       USA. Email: [jason.cope@noaa.gov](mailto:jason.cope@noaa.gov)

10     <sup>3</sup> Centre for Environmental Policy, Imperial College London, London SW7 1NE, UK. Email: [laurie@kell.es](mailto:laurie@kell.es)

11     \* Corresponding author: School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences, University of Washington, Box 355020,  
12     Seattle, Washington 98195-5020, USA. Email: [mpons@uw.edu](mailto:mpons@uw.edu). Telephone number: +1 206 883 5102.

13

14     **Abstract**

15       The quantity of data from many small-scale fisheries is insufficient to allow for the  
16       application of conventional assessment methods. Even though in many countries they are  
17       moving to close-loop simulations to assess the performance of different management  
18       procedures in data limited situations, managers in most developing countries are still  
19       demanding information on stock status. In this study we use the common metric of harvest  
20       rate to evaluate and compare the performance of the following catch-only and length-only  
21       assessment models: Catch-Maximum Sustainable Yield (Catch-MSY), Depletion Based  
22       Stock Reduction Analysis (DBSRA), Simple Stock Synthesis (SSS), an extension of Catch-  
23       MSY (CMSY), Length Based Spawning Potential Ratio (LBSPR), Length-Based Integrated  
24       Mixed Effects (LIME), and Length-Based Bayesian (LBB). In general, results were more  
25       biased for slightly depleted than for highly depleted stocks, and for long-lived than for short-

26 lived species. Length-based models, such as LIME, performed as well as catch-based  
27 methods in many scenarios and, among the catch-base models the one with the best  
28 performance was SSS.

29

30 Keywords: data-limited assessment methods, depletion, life-history, harvest rates

31

Draft

32      INTRODUCTION

33            Major commercial fish species usually have substantial sets of data that can be  
34   integrated by complex stock assessment models (e.g., Methot and Wetzel 2013); these data  
35   may include time series of total removals, catch-at-length or -age, relative or absolute  
36   abundance indices, fishing effort, and information on life-history parameters. Such datasets  
37   are typically unavailable for most of the small-scale fisheries and by-catch species around the  
38   world. Fisheries and stocks lacking comprehensive datasets are commonly known as “data-  
39   poor” or “data-limited” fisheries (Costello et al. 2012; Dowling et al. 2015). Recently, many  
40   data-limited approaches have been developed to meet an increasing demand for science-  
41   based fisheries management of unassessed fisheries where data and resources are limited  
42   (Wetzel and Punt 2011; Costello et al. 2012; Dowling et al. 2015, 2016; Chrysafi and  
43   Kuparinen 2016; Rosenberg et al. 2017).

44            Assessing stocks using only catch and life-history data started many years ago with  
45   the development of Stock Reduction Analysis (SRA; Kimura and Tagart 1982; Kimura et al.  
46   1984). Since then, SRA has been extended to estimate productivity and reconstruct historical  
47   abundance trends by making assumptions about final biomass relative to unfished or initial  
48   biomass (i.e., stock depletion; Thorson and Cope 2015). SRA has been further extended to  
49   incorporate stochastic variability in population dynamics (Stochastic-SRA; Walters et al.  
50   2006), a flexible shape for the production function (Depletion-Based SRA; Dick and MacCall  
51   2011), prior information regarding resilience and population abundance at the start of the  
52   catch time series (Catch-Maximum Sustainable Yield, Catch-MSY; Martell and Froese  
53   2013), bayesian approaches (CMSY, Froese et al. 2017), and age-structured population  
54   dynamics (Simple Stock Synthesis, SSS; Cope 2013). Despite these differences, this family  
55   of catch-only models share a common dependence on prior assumptions about final stock  
56   depletion. Simulation testing has previously indicated that these methods perform well only

57 when assumptions regarding final relative abundance are met (Wetzel and Punt 2015).  
58 Unsurprisingly, because final stock depletion is a prior assumption, the methods perform  
59 differently under different stock depletion levels (i.e., highly depleted or slightly depleted  
60 stocks, Walters et al. 2006) or under different harvest history or catch trends.

61 For many small-scale fisheries, obtaining reliable time series on historical total catch  
62 is difficult, whereas sampling lengths from the catch is easier. Mean-length mortality  
63 estimators (Beverton and Holt 1957) assume that fishing mortality directly influences the  
64 mean length of the catch under equilibrium conditions. This basic method has been extended  
65 by length-based spawning potential ratio (LBSPR, Hordyk et al. 2015a), length-based  
66 Integrated Mixed Effects (LIME, Rudd and Thorson 2017) and Length-Based Bayesian  
67 approach (LBB, Froese et al. 2018) models, among others. These allow for the estimation of  
68 instantaneous fishing mortality ( $F$ ) and spawning potential ratio (SPR) when basic biological  
69 parameters are known. In contrast to LBSPR and LBB, LIME does not assume equilibrium  
70 conditions. The mixed-effects aspect of LIME extends length-based methods by estimating  
71 changes in recruitment and separating them from fishing mortality over time (Rudd and  
72 Thorson 2018).

73 It is good practice to simulation test the performance of assessment methods before  
74 applying them in practice (Cope 2008). This can be done using a variety of approaches,  
75 though it is most often accomplished using an Operating Model (OM) to generating pseudo-  
76 data with error to fit an assessment model (Punt et al. 2016). Simulation can either be an open  
77 loop or a closed loop with feedback. Carruthers (2016), using closed loop simulations, found  
78 that data-limited methods using observations of stock depletion offer the best overall  
79 performance across life history types, data quality and autocorrelation in recruitment strength.  
80 However, these management procedures are based on setting catch limits and were designed  
81 for use in data-limited fisheries for which annual catch data are available, sometimes together

82 with a relative abundance index (Carruthers et al. 2014). In many data poor fisheries,  
83 measuring total removals is difficult, as is enforcing catch limits. Recently, Hordyk et al.  
84 (2015b) tested some harvest strategies using a simulation approach to assess the utility of  
85 LBSPR as a tool for management in data-limited fisheries using an effort-based harvest  
86 control rule. They found that the LBSPR assessment model with an iterative effort-based  
87 harvest control rule can be used to rebuild an overfished stock to sustainable levels or fish  
88 down a stock to the target SPR. So far, these two approaches, output-based limits versus  
89 input/effort-based limits, have not been directly tested.

90 In addition, there are some studies comparing the performance in determining stock  
91 status of catch-based (Wetzel and Punt, 2015; Rosenberg et al. 2017) and length-based  
92 assessment models (Chong et al. 2019). However, a comparison of the performance of both  
93 length-based and catch-based methods to estimate stock status is needed. Unfortunately,  
94 finding a common metric between catch-based and length-based stock status metrics is  
95 difficult; the former measures overfishing via fishing rates and the latter biomass-based catch  
96 limits.

97 Even though many countries are moving to close-loop simulations or Management  
98 Strategy Evaluation (MSE) to assess the performance of different management procedures  
99 (i.e., the combination of analytical method and control rule) for data-limited fisheries  
100 (Harford and Carruthers, 2017), it remains a need to understand how the individual analytical  
101 methods perform. Therefore, this study used a simulation approach to better estimate relative  
102 bias and precision of a range of data-limited methods so researchers can choose which one  
103 could be more appropriate to use for the fishery they need to assess, with the results  
104 providing general information needed to construct an appropriate control rule for a given  
105 method's performance.

106        We used OMs (here considered just as a simulated population model) to represent  
107        the main sources of uncertainty and to generate data for use in data-limited stock assessment  
108        methods and to evaluate how well the methods perform when the data and knowledge  
109        requirements are met. A common metric is then used for comparison across model types,  
110        namely exploitation or harvest rates, to evaluate the performance of both catch-based and  
111        length-based models in a simulation context. We evaluate performance considering three fish  
112        populations with contrasting life-history strategies, under three different harvest trends, and  
113        three different levels of final stock depletion.

114        METHODS

115        Simulation studies commonly make different operating model assumptions from those  
116        of the methods being tested to allow the evaluation of robustness; in some cases, however,  
117        the same population model is used for both simulation and estimation, i.e. self-testing  
118        (Deroba et al., 2015). Using the same model structure for simulation and estimation can result  
119        in more optimistic results that might not be true under many scenarios (Francis, 2012) since it  
120        is not possible to explore the impact of model assumptions when the model used for  
121        simulation and estimation is the same. If a method performs poorly, however, when the  
122        assumptions in the OM are the same as the assessment model, it is unlikely to perform well in  
123        practice. To evaluate robustness to model structure our approach evaluated multiple data-  
124        limited assessment methods with a range of assumptions about population and fishery  
125        dynamics using an OM decoupled from the tested methods.

126        Twenty-seven different OMs were created using a factorial design comprising 3  
127        harvest rates, 3 life-history types, and 3 depletion scenarios. The different harvest rates  
128        scenarios, each considered a 20-year time series of fishing, correspond to fishing mortality  
129        histories commonly seen in many fisheries. In harvest rate scenario 1, fishing mortality

130 increases until it reaches a maximum and starts declining afterwards. This is commonly seen  
 131 once management measures are implemented to reduce fishing pressure. Harvest rate  
 132 scenario 2 assumes that fishing mortality increases and remains constant after reaching a  
 133 maximum. This harvest rate profile could result from the implementation of catch or effort  
 134 management limits. Harvest rate scenario 3 has constantly increasing fishing mortality, which  
 135 would occur for fisheries that are still developing (Figure 1a).

136 Three life history types of varying longevity and somatic growth rate were simulated,  
 137 namely (i) a short-lived fast-growing species, Pacific chub mackerel (*Scomber japonicus*), (ii)  
 138 a medium-lived medium-growing fish, albacore tuna (*Thunnus alalunga*), and (iii) a longer-  
 139 lived slow-growing species, canary rockfish (*Sebastodes pinniger*) (Table 1). Finally, the  
 140 following three final depletion levels (D) were considered: (i) heavily fished ( $D = 0.2$ ; *i.e.*  
 141 stock biomass in the last year is 20% of virgin biomass), (ii) moderately fished ( $D = 0.4$ ) and  
 142 (iii) lightly fished ( $D = 0.6$ ).

143 *Operating model specifications*

144 The OM was developed to simulate resource dynamics under the different fishing  
 145 scenarios, life histories and final depletion levels. The OMs consist of an age-structured  
 146 population with numbers at age over time modelled as follows:

147

$$148 N_{a,t} = \begin{cases} R_t, & a = 0 \text{ and } t = 0 \\ \frac{N_{a-1,t} e^{(-M - F_t S_{a-1})}}{1 - e^{(-M - F_t S_{a-1})}}, & 0 < a < A \text{ and } t = 1 \\ \frac{N_{a-1,t-1} e^{(-M - F_t S_{a-1})}}{(N_{a-1,t-1} + N_{a,t-1}) e^{(-M - F_{t-1} S_{a-1})}}, & 0 < a < A \text{ and } t > 1 \\ & a = A \text{ and } t > 1 \end{cases}$$

149         $R_t$  is the number of age-0 animals at the start of year  $t$ ,  $N_{a,t}$  is the number of fish of  
150        age  $a$  at the start of the year  $t$ ,  $S_a$  is the selectivity at age,  $F_t$  is the instantaneous fishing  
151        mortality rate during year  $t$ ,  $M$  is the instantaneous rate of natural mortality, and  $A$  is the age  
152        of the plus group. Fishing mortality deviations were included as  $F_t \sim \text{lognormal}(F_{t-1}, \sigma_F^2)$ . A  
153        Beverton–Holt spawner–recruitment function (Beverton and Holt 1957) and annual normally  
154        distributed recruitment deviations  $N(0, \sigma_R)$  were assumed (Table 1).

155        The biomass in each year  $t$  was calculated as  $B_t = \sum_{a=1}^A N_{a,t} w_a$  where  $w_a = \alpha L_a^\beta$   
156        (parameters in Table 1). In addition, the predicted total catch by year ( $C_t$ ) was calculated as  $C_t$   
157         $= \sum_{a=0}^A C_{a,t}$  with:

$$C_{a,t} = \frac{F_t S_a}{M + F_t S_a} N_{a,t} (1 - e^{(-M - F_t S_a)})$$

159        For each OM (N=27), 100 time series of fishing mortality were simulated, and the  
160        harvest rate per year ( $U_t$ ) as  $C_t/B_t$  calculated (Figures S1 to S3). Each simulated population  
161        began at the unfished biomass level and all fishing trend scenarios terminate at the specified  
162        depletion level (Appendix Figures A1 to A27).

163        To condition the OM, published life-history parameter values (Table 1) reported in  
164        formal stock assessments were used (Crone and Hill 2015 for the short-lived Pacific chub  
165        mackerel; Anon 2014 for the medium-lived albacore tuna; and Thorson and Wetzel 2015 for  
166        long-lived canary rockfish). Each population was assumed to be targeted in a single area, by  
167        one fleet with a selectivity pattern (Table 1) that was logistic and constant through time.

168        Length bins were defined as they were in their respective assessments; every 2 cm  
169        (Crone and Hill 2015; Anon 2014; Thorson and Wetzel 2015). To obtain the catch length  
170        frequency, the probability ( $p$ ) of being in a length bin ( $j$ ) given age ( $a$ ) was calculated as:

$$171 \quad p_{j,a} = \begin{cases} \emptyset \left( \frac{j - L_a}{L_a CV_L} \right), & j = 1 \\ \emptyset \left( \frac{j - L_a}{L_a CV_L} \right) - \emptyset \left( \frac{j - 1 - L_a}{L_a CV_L} \right), & 1 < j < J \\ 1 - \emptyset \left( \frac{j - 1 - L_a}{L_a CV_L} \right), & j = J \end{cases}$$

172 With the predicted probability of harvest by length bin being:

$$173 \quad \pi_j = p_{j,a} \frac{\sum_{a=0}^A N_{a,t} S_a}{N_t}$$

174 One thousand fish per year were drawn using a multinomial distribution with a  $\pi_j$

175 probability (Rudd and Thorson 2018).

176 *Comparing methods outputs*

177 One of the challenges when comparing catch-based and length-based methods is that  
 178 they produce different model outputs. Catch-only models calculate total and/or spawning  
 179 stock biomass and MSY, whereas length-based models estimate exploitation and transient  
 180 SPR, which can be used to infer stock status. These are fundamentally different measures of  
 181 the population status. As a result, our performance metric is defined as the error relative (RE)  
 182 to the OM, where  $RE = (U_{Method} - U_{OM}) / U_{OM}$ . This allows for a measure of uncertainty, in  
 183 both bias and precision, for all methods under each scenario, and is used as a standardized  
 184 metric of model performance. Bias in this study is how far, on average, the performance  
 185 measure from each estimation model is from the OM. Imprecision is related to the variability  
 186 (variance) around the central tendency.

187 We used  $U$  as a common measure for comparisons between each data limited method  
 188 and the OM. For catch-only approaches it is defined as the ratio catch/biomass; while for the  
 189 length-based models, the estimated  $F$  was transformed to an exploitation rate via  $U = 1 - exp$

190 (-  $F$ ). In addition, we present the average RE across the last five years of the time series, not  
191 along the entire time series of data, because we are interested in the estimation of the current  
192 exploitation rates. Also, multiple studies have shown that catch-based methods might be  
193 appropriate to predict sustainable catch at the end of the time series, but not to reconstruct a  
194 biomass time series (Carruthers et al. 2012; Wetzel and Punt 2015).

195 *Estimation models*

196 All simulations, and data-limited model calculations, were conducted using the open-  
197 source statistical software R (R Core Team 2018). Each catch-based and length-based method  
198 evaluated here are summarized below.

199 *Catch-based data-limited methods*

200 **Catch-MSY** (Martell and Froese 2013) is a SRA approach that assume a Schaefer  
201 biomass dynamic model. Inputs are a time series of removals, priors for the population rate of  
202 increase at low population size ( $r$ ), carrying capacity ( $K$ ), and a range of stock depletion in  
203 the final year (Table 1). Values of  $r$  and  $K$  are randomly sampled using a Monte Carlo  
204 approach to detect ‘viable’  $r$ - $K$  pairs. A parameter pair is considered ‘viable’ if the  
205 corresponding biomass trajectories calculated from a production model are compatible with  
206 the observed catches, so that the population abundance never falls below 0, and is compatible  
207 with the prior assumption of relative biomass (i.e., stock depletion; Martell and Froese 2013).  
208  $r$ - $K$  pairs are drawn from uniform prior distributions and the Bernoulli distribution is used as  
209 the likelihood function for accepting each  $r$ - $K$  pair. Catch-MSY uses catch and productivity  
210 to estimate MSY. Here we use the modified version of Catch-MSY (Rosenberg et al. 2017) to  
211 extract biomass trends from all viable  $r$ - $K$  pairs using the R package *datalimited* version 0.1.0  
212 (Anderson et al. 2016). The biomass trajectory is calculated as the median of all viable  
213 biomass trajectories generated under the Monte Carlo process. We decided to include Catch-

214 MSY in this performance comparison analysis since it is a method that has become very  
215 popular in developing countries because of its easy implementation through R libraries.

216       **CMSY** (Froese et al. 2017) extends Catch-MSY by using a Monte-Carlo filter  
217 (instead of the SIR algorithm) that fixes systematic biases in the Catch-MSY method. It also,  
218 explicitly incorporates process error and estimates target reference points ( $MSY$ ,  $F_{MSY}$ ,  $B_{MSY}$ )  
219 as well as relative stock size ( $B/B_{MSY}$ ) and exploitation ( $F/F_{MSY}$ ) from catch data and priors  
220 for  $r$  and depletion at the beginning and the end of the time series. CMSY has an inbuilt  
221 piecewise "hockey-stick" to prevent over-estimating of rebuilding potential at very low  
222 abundance  $B < 0.25B_0$ . The CMSY package implements a Bayesian state-space  
223 implementation of the Schaefer surplus production model (Winker 2019). CMSY was  
224 included in this paper because it has been described as an unbiased version of Catch-MSY  
225 and it has been already implemented in different parts of Europe (Froese et al. 2018) and  
226 explored by Regional Fisheries Management Organizations such as the International  
227 Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas, ICCAT (Winker et al. 2017, ICCAT  
228 2017). We included a prior for depletion in this method (see Table 1).

229       **DBSRA** (Dick and MacCall 2011) modifies the SRA approach by using Monte Carlo  
230 draws from four parameter distributions ( $M$ ,  $F_{MSY}/M$ ,  $B_{MSY}/B_0$ , and depletion) and age at  
231 maturity ( $A_{mat}$ ) to separate the total biomass into immature and mature biomass (fishery  
232 selectivity is also assumed to have an identical pattern to the age-at-maturity ogive). It uses a  
233 delay-difference production model with a time lag for recruitment and mortality as:

$$B_{t+1} = B_t + P(B_{t-A_{mat}}) - C_t$$

234 where  $B_t$  is the biomass at the start of year  $t$ ,  $P(B_{t-A_{mat}})$  is the latent annual production  
235 based on a function of adult biomass in year  $t-A_{mat}$  and  $C_t$  is the catch in year  $t$ . Biomass in  
236 the first year ( $B_0$ ) is assumed to be equal to  $K$ . The package *fishmethods* version 1.10-3 was  
237 used to perform this analysis (Nelson 2017). For DBSRA we used the  $A_{mat}$  and  $M$  as fixed

239 inputs and three priors: final stock depletion,  $F_{MSY}/M$ , and  $B_{MSY}/B_0$  (distributions in Table 1).  
240 Each of these is assigned a distribution from which the Monte Carlo draws are taken. We  
241 chose DBSRA to be included in our analysis because it is currently used for providing  
242 fisheries management advice on the US West Coast.

243       **SSS** is based on the Stock Synthesis age-structured stock assessment model (Methot  
244 and Wetzel 2013). SSS fix all parameters in the Stock Synthesis model except for initial  
245 recruitment ( $\ln R_0$ ). It also sets up an artificial index of abundance that represents the relative  
246 stock biomass. The first value of the index is always 1, and the value in the final year  
247 represents the percent of the population left in that year (final depletion). The values of  
248 steepness ( $h$ ) and the final year of the abundance survey are all randomly drawn from a  
249 specified distribution using a Monte Carlo approach (Cope 2013) and  $\ln R_0$  is then estimated.  
250 Benefits of this approach are that it retains the same modelling framework as the data-rich  
251 stock assessments, but still allows for flexibility in a variety of parameter and model  
252 specifications, if desired. The input priors used for SSS were relative stock status and  
253 steepness and selectivity was matched to the OM (Cope 2019). We chose SSS to be included  
254 in our analysis because it is gaining use as a flexible platform to incorporate more data as it is  
255 collected, as well as providing an age-based alternative to the other catch-only models.

256       *Length-based data-limited methods*

257       SPR is the proportion of the unfished reproductive potential per recruit under a given  
258 level of fishing pressure (Goodyear 1993). In **LBSPR**, SPR in an exploited population is  
259 calculated as a function of the ratio of fishing mortality to natural mortality ( $F/M$ ), selectivity,  
260 and the two life-history ratios  $M/k$  and  $L_m/L_\infty$ ;  $k$  is the von Bertalanffy growth coefficient,  $L_m$   
261 is the size of maturity and  $L_\infty$  is asymptotic size (Hordyk et al. 2015a). The inputs of LBSPR  
262 are  $M/k$ ,  $L_\infty$ , the variability of length-at-age ( $CVL_\infty$ ), which is normally assumed to be around

263 10%, and the length at maturity specified in terms of  $L_{50}$  and  $L_{95}$  (the size at which 50% and  
264 95% of a population matures). Given the assumed values for  $M/k$  and  $L_\infty$  and that length  
265 composition data come from an exploited stock, the LBSPR model uses maximum likelihood  
266 methods to estimate the selectivity ogive, which is assumed to be of a logistic form defined  
267 by the selectivity-at-length parameters  $S_{50}$  and  $S_{95}$  (the size at which 50% and 95% of a  
268 population is retained by the fishing gear), and  $F/M$ . The selectivity ogive and relative  
269 fishing mortality are then used to calculate SPR (Hordyk et al. 2015a, 2015b). Estimates of  
270 SPR are primarily determined by the length of fish relative to  $L_{50}$  and  $L_\infty$ , but it also depends  
271 on life history parameters such as fecundity-at-age/length and selectivity. LBSPR is an  
272 equilibrium based method with the following assumptions: (i) asymptotic selectivity, (ii)  
273 growth is adequately described by the von Bertalanffy equation, (iii) a single growth curve  
274 can be used to describe both sexes which have equal catchability, (iv) length at-age is  
275 normally distributed, (v) rates of natural mortality are constant across adult age classes, (vi)  
276 recruitment is constant over time, and (vii) growth rates remain constant across the cohorts  
277 within a stock (Hordyk et al. 2015a). Analyses were conducted using the LBSPR package,  
278 version 0.1.3 in R (Hordyk 2018). We used the Rauch-Tung-Striebel smoother function  
279 available in the LBSPR package to smooth out the multi-year estimates of  $F$ . We decided to  
280 include LBSPR in the analysis as its easy implementation through R libraries and online apps  
281 have made it a popular, widespread choice.

282 **LIME** uses length composition of the catch and biological information to estimate  $F$   
283 and SPR. LIME has the same data requirements as LBSPR, but does not assume equilibrium  
284 conditions. The mixed effects aspect of LIME extends length-based methods by estimating  
285 changes in recruitment and fishing mortality separately over time (Rudd and Thorson 2018).  
286 LIME uses automatic differentiation and Laplace approximations as implemented in  
287 Template Model Builder (TMB; Kristensen et al. 2016) to calculate the marginal likelihood

288 for the mixed-effects. All other assumptions are the same as LBSPR but LIME estimates one  
289 selectivity curve for the entire time series of length data while LBSPR estimates one  
290 selectivity curve for each year since each time step estimation in LBSPR is independent  
291 (Hordyk et al. 2015a). The inputs to LIME (Rudd 2019) are:  $M$ ,  $k$ ,  $L_\infty$ ,  $t_0$ ,  $CVL_\infty$ ,  $L_{50}$ ,  $L_{95}$ ,  $h$ ,  
292 and the parameters of the length-weight relationship  $a$  and  $b$  (Table 1). We decided to include  
293 LIME in our analysis because it is the only length-based method that allows for recruitment  
294 deviations and it has not been widely tested.

295 **LBB** is a simple and fast method for estimating relative stock size that uses a  
296 Bayesian Monte Carlo Markov Chain (MCMC) approach (Froese et al. 2018). In contrast to  
297 other length-based methods, LBB uses pre-specified priors on parameters, and thus,  
298 technically does not require further inputs in addition to length frequency data, if the user is  
299 willing to accept the life history defaults. However, it provides the user the option to specify  
300 priors for the inputs  $L_\infty$ , length at first capture ( $L_c$ ), and relative natural mortality ( $M/k$ ). We  
301 specified the true  $M/k$  value and we let the model calculate  $L_c$  (length where 50% of the  
302 individuals are retained by the gear) and  $L_\infty$ , which is approximated by the maximum  
303 observed length  $L_{max}$ . In addition,  $F/M$  is estimated as means over the age range represented  
304 in the length-frequency sample. We decided to include LBB because it has not been widely  
305 tested and compared with other length-based assessments methods. As well as CMSY, LBB  
306 is gaining consideration as a plausible method in some international commissions such as  
307 ICCAT (Anon, 2019).

308 During our simulation testing, we assumed that length models had the correct values  
309 for the von Bertalanffy length-at-age relationship,  $L_\infty$ ,  $k$  and  $t_0$ , length-weight parameters  $\alpha$   
310 and  $\beta$ ,  $M$ , and the parameters  $L_{50}$  and  $L_{95}$  from a logistic maturity-at-length curve. We did not  
311 evaluate misspecifications in life history parameters inputs. The objective is only to  
312 compare the performance of different data-limited methods under different scenarios, not to

313 evaluate each of them under different parameters misspecifications, which has already been  
314 done in the original publications of each method.

315 **RESULTS**

316 Large variability is seen in model performance across harvest scenarios, life-history  
317 types, and depletion levels (Figure 1b-d, Figure 2). Figures 1 and 2 can be used to search for  
318 the best model, i.e. to identify the least biased and least imprecise method based on the life  
319 history of the species, harvest trends, and knowledge of final depletion. The imprecision of  
320 each method is shown in the variability around those estimations in Figure 1 and the specific  
321 values in Figure 2. A robust method would show low bias and high precision for all life  
322 history and harvest scenarios; for example, among all catch-based methods, SSS appears to  
323 be the most robust method (Figure 2).

324 In general, catch-based methods tended to be more biased at relatively higher stock  
325 sizes ( $D=0.6$ ) and for long-lived species (Figures 1 and 2). Catch-MSY tended to perform  
326 poorly across a range of scenarios. Among the length-based models, all were less biased and  
327 more precise for the medium-lived species (Figure 2) without a clear different performance  
328 among harvest scenarios. The most biased length-based method was LBSPR although more  
329 precise than LIME and LBB (Figure 2). Overall, LIME and SSS were the most robust  
330 methods.

331 *Catch-only methods*

332 It was to be expected that the various catch-based models considered in this study  
333 would perform differently among them because they have different model structure and  
334 assumptions. SSS performed best in most cases estimating unbiased exploitation rates across  
335 different scenarios of harvest trends, final stock depletion and life histories (Table 2).  
336 However, it tended to underestimate harvest rates by 30% for medium and short-lived species

337 at relatively high stock sizes ( $D=0.6$ ). For long-lived species the estimations were slightly  
338 overestimated for moderately fished stock sizes ( $D=0.4$ ), but SSS was always the model that  
339 was least biased. DBSRA was the most precise but it underestimated harvest rates in general,  
340 and in contrast to the other catch-based methods, it was less biased for stocks at relatively  
341 high stock sizes ( $D=0.6$ , Figure 2). Catch-MSY was the most biased of the catch-based  
342 models tested, overestimating harvest rates in particular for stocks lightly fished ( $D=0.6$ ). It  
343 was less biased to itself for medium-lived species and produced non-biased estimates of MSY  
344 for highly depleted ( $D=0.2$ ) medium-lived or short-lived species at moderate stock sizes  
345 ( $D=0.4$ ) (Table A1). CMSY was less biased in the relatively medium to high stock sizes  
346 ( $D=0.4$  and  $D=0.6$ ) and for medium-lived species (Table 2). In general, catch-based models  
347 were less biased and more precise when stocks were at relatively low stock sizes (i.e. using a  
348 prior centered around 0.2, Figure 1). In general, estimation models in harvest scenario 1  
349 (ramp shaped) produced the most variable estimations in harvest rates (Figure 1, Table 2).  
350 The catch-based methods performed the best for the medium-lived species.

351

#### 352 *Length-based methods*

353 In many cases, length-based models gave a less biased estimation of  $U$  than catch-  
354 based models (Figure 1). LIME was the least biased length-based method (Table 3).  
355 However, in general, LIME did not converge around 10% of the time. The three length-based  
356 methods used here (LIME, LBSPR and LBB) produced more variable estimations in harvest  
357 scenario 1, where the fishing intensity decreased at the end of the time series (Figure 1) but  
358 no clear pattern was observed in terms of harvest scenarios in bias (Figure 2). LBSPR in  
359 general underestimated harvest rates. Compared to itself, LBB performed better in scenarios  
360 where the stocks have relatively low to medium stock sizes ( $D=0.2$  and  $D=0.4$ ) and for  
361 medium-lived species (Figure 2). Both, LBB and LIME were highly variable for long-lived

362 species and harvest scenario 1 (Figure 1). Multiple modes for harvest scenario 1 may suggest  
363 poor convergence. Overall, length-based models were less biased for the medium-lived  
364 species.

365 *Short-lived species*

366 For the short-lived life-history strategy, SSS was the least biased and most precise  
367 among the catch-based methods. The second most precise method was CMSY, but this  
368 method was positively biased for lightly fished or relatively high stock sizes ( $D=0.6$ ). Among  
369 the three length-based models, LIME had better overall performance than LBSPR and LBB.  
370 However, LBSPR was less biased in harvest scenario 1. LBB was the one model that  
371 presented the most variability in harvest-rate estimations for the short-lived species.

372 *Medium-lived species*

373 Both catch-based and length-based models gained more precision as the stocks were  
374 more depleted. Among the catch-based methods, CMSY was the less biased followed by  
375 SSS, although SSS was more precise. DBSRA was highly negatively biased particularly for  
376 relatively low stock sizes ( $D=0.2$ ). Catch-MSY was highly positively biased but less so for  
377 highly depleted stocks (Figure 1c). Between the length-based models, LIME showed very  
378 good performance with regards to bias for harvest scenarios 2 and 3 under the three depletion  
379 levels, although it was slightly biased for harvest scenario 1. LBSPR and LBB showed  
380 similar performance but LBSPR was more precise (Figure 1c).

381 *Long-lived species*

382 Both catch-based and length-based methods were less precise (more variability in RE)  
383 as the long-lived stocks had relatively higher stock sizes ( $D=0.6$ ), as they did for the other  
384 life-history strategies. Among the catch-based methods, SSS was the most precise and least

385 biased method except in harvest scenario 1 and D=0.2 where CMSY was the least biased.  
386 SSS underestimated harvest rates in scenarios 2 and 3, where the catch history is constant or  
387 increases at the end of the time series. Among assessment methods, a less biased and more  
388 precise estimation was observed for medium depleted stocks (D=0.4) than for other depletion  
389 levels. LBSPR and DBSRA was negatively biased in all cases (Figure 1d). LIME was highly  
390 imprecise in harvest scenario 1, but the least biased among the other length-based methods  
391 (Figure 1c, Figure 2).

392

393 DISCUSSION

394 It is to be expected that the various methods would perform differently. Rosenberg et  
395 al. (2017) used four catch-based data-limited models and found that models frequently  
396 disagreed about population status estimations, with no model showing overall good  
397 performance, i.e. high precision and low bias across all case studies. When scenarios  
398 represent specific resource dynamics or particular stocks or fisheries, it may be difficult to  
399 draw any overall conclusions. Therefore, we chose scenarios that represented different  
400 fishing intensity trends, depletion levels, and life histories. We found that model performance  
401 is highly dependent on all these factors. More imprecision occurred where fishing pressure  
402 decreases at the end of the time series (harvest scenario 1), in comparison with harvest  
403 scenarios where  $F$  was either stable or increasing (harvest scenarios 2 and 3) that performed  
404 similarly in terms of bias and imprecision. In addition, most bias was found when relative  
405 stock abundance is high and/or for the slow-grow long-lived life history.

406 In particular, catch-based models performed better (i.e. were less biased and more  
407 precise) for stocks that were medium to highly depleted than for lightly depleted stocks.  
408 Walters et al. (2006) suggested that for SRA, stocks that have experienced extensive

409 historical depletion gain precision due to a high rate of rejected parameter draws. The SSS  
410 approach, which tracks age-structure population dynamics, performed better than the models  
411 that are based on lumped biomass production functions such as Catch-MSY, CMSY, and  
412 DBSRA, even when priors for depletion were centered on the true values for all methods.  
413 Although SSS seems to be the least biased catch-based model, unlike other catch-based  
414 models, more detailed life-history information (e.g., age and growth estimates) are required  
415 by SSS to define age structure and remove catch according to age-/size-based selectivity  
416 patterns (Cope, 2013). So, when this information is highly uncertain, sensitivity analysis to  
417 parameter misspecifications is strongly recommended.

418 Catch-MSY performed poorly in all scenarios, overestimating harvest rates even  
419 when given a prior for depletion close to the true value. A key point of Catch-MSY is the  
420 ability to define a reasonable prior range for the parameters of the Schaefer model, in  
421 particular  $K$ . In our case, we have arbitrarily chosen 100 times the maximum catch as the  
422 upper bound for  $K$  based on Martell and Froese (2013). Other priors for  $K$  could be explored  
423 to see if this improves the outcome, but it remains a difficult parameter to specify under most  
424 conditions.

425 CMSY on the other hand performed particularly well with respect to bias and  
426 precision for medium-lived species, even better than SSS for medium to low depleted stocks  
427 (Figure 2). Also, CMSY was more accurate than the original Catch-MSY method (Martell  
428 and Froese, 2013). The difference is that Catch-MSY was designed to select the most  
429 probable  $r$ - $K$  pair as the geometric mean of this distribution, but CMSY searches not in the  
430 center of the distribution but rather near the right tip of viable pairs. According to Froese et  
431 al. (2017) since  $r$  is defined as the maximum net productivity, the right tip of the distribution  
432 of  $r$ - $K$  pairs is where these parameters should be found. So, between Catch-MSY and CMSY,  
433 CMSY is preferred, though its overall poor performance is noted.

434 Hordyk et al. (2015a) explained how LBSPR relies on detecting the signal of fishing  
435 mortality in the right-hand side of the length composition. Consequently, fishing is not likely  
436 to have a visible impact on the length composition until fishing mortality is very high and  
437 stocks are highly depleted. This is why LBSPR was less biased for more depleted populations  
438 and in fishing scenario 1.

439 Our study found that LIME was highly imprecise for long-lived species. Rudd and  
440 Thorson (2017) also showed that LIME is more imprecise for long lived species. The model  
441 is trying to track cohorts through the length data to estimate recruitment deviations and this is  
442 likely difficult for long-lived species when time series of length data are short or much of the  
443 population is found near the asymptotic size (Rudd and Thorson 2017).

444 Hordyk et al. (2019) suggested that LBB has not been sufficiently simulated tested  
445 and it can produce biased estimates of fishing mortality. We found that LBB was the most  
446 biased and imprecise length-based method, although for the less depleted stocks it generally  
447 performed better than LBSPR. One of criticisms of LBB by Hordyk et al. (2019) is that it *a*  
448 *priori* assumes that  $M/k = 1.5$ , however here, we specified the true  $M/k$  value. So, the main  
449 bias was associated with the estimations of  $L_\infty$  due to the approximation using maximum  
450 observed length  $L_{max}$ . There are many reasons why the maximum length may be a biased  
451 measure of  $L_\infty$ . In addition to  $L_\infty$ ,  $L_c$  was always overestimated by the LBB assessment model  
452 (see Table A2), likely due to the bias in the  $L_\infty$  estimates.

453 In general, all catch-based and length-based methods seem to perform worse for long-  
454 lived life-history types, where there is likely to be less contrast in the dynamics over time  
455 (few years relative to their life span), than for medium and short-lived. The length of the time  
456 series for the long-lived canary rockfish is therefore probably too short in comparison to the  
457 age they reach the maximum length (64 years), to capture the true dynamics of the population  
458 and the response to different harvest rates.

459        The present study did not look at parameter misspecification but correctly specified  
460        (i.e., unbiased values) the life-history parameters. As we mentioned before, parameters  
461        misspecification testing was performed in the original publications for each method. With  
462        accurate prior information, length-based models showed better performance in many cases  
463        than some catch-based models, as the latter were more sensitive to the catch history scenarios  
464        and depletion levels.

465        We note that bias is not symmetrically interpretable, as it could, depending on  
466        management objectives, be better or worse to be biased high or low. In data-limited  
467        management, maximum sustainable yield is often hard to pinpoint, thus a more precautionary  
468        pretty good yield (Hilborn 2010) is likely a better target. When measuring exploitation rates,  
469        this would translate to being biased high as a preferable way of being wrong rather than  
470        underestimating the exploitation rate and possibly increasing the fishing rate above the true  
471        target. The consideration of asymmetric management significance when measuring bias is an  
472        important consideration when using the results presented here to develop control rules.

473        Bias and precision are both important factors to consider when assessing fish stocks.  
474        Bias reflects how close an estimate is to a known value; precision reflects reproducibility of  
475        the estimate. For example, if an assessment is to be re-conducted every year to monitor the  
476        impact of a management measure, a precise but biased method would be able to detect a trend  
477        better than an unbiased but imprecise method. Like a scientific instrument, this trade-off  
478        requires calibration to correct for the bias, and such calibration can be explored using closed-  
479        loop simulations such as management strategy evaluation, where the choice of parameters  
480        and reference points in a management procedure are tuned (i.e. calibrated) to meet the desired  
481        management objectives as represented by the operating model. Thus, a biased method (e.g.,  
482        DBSRA) may be preferable to one that is less biased, but more imprecise (e.g., LIME).  
483        Alternatively, imprecision can be addressed through the choice of the percentile (e.g., median

484 being the 50% percentile value) for the derived model output used by management (e.g.,  
485 catch or SPR); assuming that the true value is contained within the parameter distribution.  
486 For example, instead of taking the median value, one could instead use the derived model  
487 output associated with the 40<sup>th</sup> percentile to incorporate risk tolerance as reflected in the  
488 calculated imprecision. Such an approach (Ralston et al. 2011) is used in fisheries  
489 management systems to directly incorporate scientific uncertainty (both bias and  
490 imprecision), and can also be explored and tuned using MSE.

491       *Recommendations*

492       To provide estimates of stock status for unassessed fisheries where data are limited,  
493 but reconstructing time series of catch is possible, SSS is recommended. The performance of  
494 SSS hinges on the correct specification of the input parameters such as stock depletion,  
495 productivity, maturity, and growth parameters. Knowledge about some of these parameters,  
496 especially stock depletion, is likely to be poor for data-limited stocks, resulting in  
497 misspecification of these parameters. Meta-analyses may offer some starting values for life  
498 history parameters (e.g., Myers 2001, Thorson et al. 2012, and Zhou et al. 2012, 2017),  
499 however other inputs remain difficult to specify (Chrysafi and Cope *in press*).

500       For fisheries where the time series of catch are unavailable or catches are not  
501 consistently monitored and managed, using length-composition data can provide good  
502 approximations of the status of the stock, in particular for medium-lived species. It has been  
503 shown here that in some cases, length-based models such as LIME can provide the same or  
504 less biased estimates of exploitation status than catch-based models. However, growth  
505 parameters are even more important for length-based than for any catch-based method, so it  
506 is important to have good estimates of those parameters before using any length-based  
507 assessment.

508        Making recommendations on which models should be applied to estimate exploitation  
509        intensity in different fisheries is challenging because model choice is dependent on data  
510        availability, trends in fishing intensity, and the biology of the species. If possible, simulation  
511        studies testing different data-limited methods with OMs based on the focus species and the  
512        dynamics of the fishery can greatly inform which method is most appropriate. Likewise,  
513        decision support tools such as FishPath (Dowling et al. 2015) can also help one weigh the  
514        input requirements and assumptions to identify the most appropriate methods given data and  
515        life history. Based on the OMs used in this study, we conclude that when only catch data is  
516        available, SSS should be considered. When only length data is available, LIME may be less  
517        biased than LBSPR and LBB if recruitment variability is an important consideration.  
518        However, Pons et al. (2019) found that neither LBSPR or LIME are good in all situations,  
519        and thus, both should be considered and compared for inconsistent results. LIME sometimes  
520        undergoes convergence issues and has difficulties separating changes in recruitment from  
521        changes in fishing mortality (Pons 2018; Pons et al. 2019).

522        For long-lived species it is necessary to have longer time series of data to draw more  
523        conclusions. However, Pons (2018) recommended SSS and LBSPR when long time series  
524        (i.e. 80 years) of data are available for a species that lives more than 60 years to evaluate  
525        changes in fishing intensity.

526        If both catch and length data are available, models that integrate both data types  
527        should be considered. LIME, although primarily length based, allows for the inclusion of  
528        catch data as well as an index of abundance if one is available. Moreover, integrated  
529        assessment models (that use catch as well as length information) like Stock Synthesis could  
530        also be considered (Methot and Wetzel 2013). Length information can therefore be added to  
531        the SSS data file, with the possibility of freeing up the stock status assumption input, and

532 running the model more like a traditional statistical-catch-at-age model (Cope 2013; Thorson  
533 and Cope 2015).

534 For the scenarios analyzed here, including the specific life-histories considered, we do  
535 not recommend Catch-MSY for estimating exploitation rates, even with a good estimate of  
536 stock depletion. This method will however, as it was originally created to do, produce  
537 unbiased estimates of MSY, in particular for short and medium-lived and highly depleted  
538 species (Table A1).

539 *Future directions*

540 Dowling et al. (2019) in a review of data limited methods, noted the dangers in the  
541 indiscriminate use of generic methods (i.e., methods that are either imported as solutions or  
542 considered just because no others are understood, but are not rigorously considered for  
543 appropriateness given data and assumptions) and recommended obtaining better data, using  
544 care in acknowledging and interpreting uncertainties, developing harvest strategies (including  
545 control rules) that are robust to these higher levels of uncertainty and tailoring them to the  
546 species and fisheries specific data and context. Management actions to regulate fishing can be  
547 based on changes in harvest rates, mainly when catch limits are not an option. The steps, for  
548 each fishery, would include i) developing reference points, ii) identifying monitoring and  
549 assessments options, and iii) a qualitative and possibly quantitative (e.g., closed-loop  
550 simulation) evaluation of how to adjust harvest strategies and paired control rules to meet  
551 management objectives (Dowling et al. 2008). Control rules linked to methods explored in  
552 this work can be tailored and tested based on the bias and imprecision found in this study.

553 In addition, these data-limited methods could be tested using a fully-specified MSE  
554 with stakeholder input to specify the management objectives in order to determine  
555 management procedures to help ensure robust and sustainable fisheries management. This

556 evaluation includes the benefits of adaptive improvement of the harvest strategy and  
557 management of the fishery.

558 This study provides steps to the above closed-loop simulation by way of conditioning  
559 OMs and generating pseudo data for use by the management procedure. Having a common  
560 metric (exploitation rate) to compare methods that are often decoupled in performance testing  
561 allows for a comparison of the components of uncertainty, bias and imprecision.

562 Understanding the comparative degree each of these methods express component uncertainty  
563 under control simulation testing benefits the next steps of closed-loop performance testing if  
564 management procedures. The importance of considering assessment methods as part of a  
565 management procedure is that a method that provides biased, yet precise results could, if  
566 calibrated correctly, provide useful advice, whereas unbiased estimates with high imprecision  
567 would need specific consideration on how to manage the risk inherent in imprecision.

568 ***Acknowledgments***

569 MP was funded by the Walton Family Foundation (#2018-51) and International  
570 Seafood Sustainability Foundation (ISSF). LK's involvement was funded through the MyDas  
571 project under the Marine Biodiversity Scheme which is financed by the Irish government and  
572 the European Maritime & Fisheries Fund (EMFF) as part of the EMFF Operational  
573 Programme for 2014-2020. We want to acknowledge Trevor Branch, Victor Restrepo, Dave  
574 Fluharty, Jim Ianelli and Ray Hilborn for their significant comments in the early stages of this  
575 study. We also want to acknowledge Merrill Rudd, Chantel Wetzel and Ian Taylor for their  
576 help with SS, r4ss, and other packages and models used in this study and Nicole Baker and  
577 Kelli Johnson for proofreading the final version of the manuscript.

578

579 REFERENCES

- 580 Anderson, S.C., Afflerbach, Jamie Cooper, A.B., Dickey-Collas, M., Jensen, O.P., Kleisner,  
581 K.M., Longo, C., Osio, G.C., Ovando, D., Minte-Vera, C., Minto, C., Mosqueira, I.,  
582 Rosenberg, A.A., Selig, E., Thorson, J.T., and Walsh, J.C. 2016. *datalimited*: Stock  
583 Assessment Methods for Data-limited Fisheries. R package version 0.1.0. Available  
584 from <https://github.com/datalimited/datalimited>.
- 585 Anderson, S.C., Cooper, A.B., Jensen, O.P., Minto, C., Thorson, J.T., Walsh, J.C.,  
586 Afflerbach, J., Dickey-Collas, M., Kleisner, K.M., Longo, C., Osio, G.C., Ovando, D.,  
587 Mosqueira, I., Rosenberg, A.A., and Selig, E.R. 2017. Improving estimates of  
588 population status and trend with superensemble models. *Fish Fish.* **18**(4): 732–741.  
589 doi:10.1111/faf.12200.
- 590 Anon. 2014. Report of the 2013 ICCAT North and South Atlantic Albacore stock assessment  
591 meeting. *Collect. Vol. Sci. Pap. ICCAT.* **70**(3): 830–995.
- 592 Anon. 2017. Report of the 2017 ICCAT Albacore species group intersessional meeting  
593 (including assessment of Mediterranean Albacore). *Collect. Vol. Sci. Pap. ICCAT.*  
594 **76**(5): 1–43. Anon. 2019. Report of the 2019 ICCAT working group on stock assessment  
595 methods meeting (WGSAM). *Collect. Vol. Sci. Pap. ICCAT.* **70**(3): 830–995.
- 596 Beverton, R.J.H., and Holt, S.J. 1957. On the Dynamics of Exploited Fish Populations.  
597 Fishery Investigations (Great Britain, Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Food),  
598 London.
- 599 Carruthers, T.R., Walters, C.J., and McAllister, M.K. 2012. Evaluating methods that classify  
600 fisheries stock status using only fisheries catch data. *Fish. Res.* **119**: 66–79.  
601 doi:10.1016/j.fishres.2011.12.011.
- 602 Carruthers, T.R., Punt, A.E., Walters, C.J., MacCall, A., McAllister, M.K., Dick, E.J., and  
603 Cope, J. 2014. Evaluating methods for setting catch limits in data-limited fisheries. *Fish.*  
604 *Res.* **153**: 48–68. Elsevier B.V. doi:10.1016/j.fishres.2013.12.014.

- 605 Carruthers, T. R., Kell, L. T., Butterworth, D. D. S., Maunder, M. N., Geromont, H. F.,  
606 Walters, C., McAllister, M. K., *et al.* 2016. Performance review of simple management  
607 procedures. ICES J. Mar. Sci. **73**(2): 464–482. doi: 10.1093/icesjms/fsv212.
- 608 Chong, L., Mildnerger, T.K., Rudd, M.B., Taylor, M.H., Cope, J.M., Branch, T.A., Wolff,  
609 M., and Staibler, M. 2019. Performance evaluation of data-limited, length-based stock  
610 assessment methods. ICES J. Mar. Sci. doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsz212.
- 611 Chrysafi, A., and Kuparinen, A. 2016. Assessing abundance of populations with limited data:  
612 Lessons learned from data-poor fisheries stock assessment. Environ. Rev. **1**: 1–44.  
613 doi:10.1017/CBO9781107415324.004.
- 614 Chrysafi, A., and J.M. Cope. in review. Testing methods of determining relative stock  
615 abundance priors when setting catch recommendations using data-limited approaches.  
616 Fish. Res. under review.
- 617 Cope, J.M. 2008. Issues and Advances in Data-Limited Stock Assessment: Experimentation  
618 through Simulation. Diss. - Dr. Philos. degree: 1–235.
- 619 Cope, J.M. 2013. Implementing a statistical catch-at-age model (Stock Synthesis) as a tool  
620 for deriving overfishing limits in data-limited situations. Fish. Res. **142**: 3–14. Elsevier  
621 B.V. doi:10.1016/j.fishres.2012.03.006.
- 622 Cope, J. M. 2019. Simple Stock Synthesis code and examples. Available at  
623 <https://github.com/shcaba/SSS>.
- 624 Costello, C., Ovando, D., Hilborn, R., Gaines, S.D., Deschenes, O., and Lester, S.E. 2012.  
625 Status and solutions for the world's unassessed fisheries. Science **338**(6106): 517–20.  
626 doi:10.1126/science.1223389.
- 627 Crone, P.R., and Hill, K.T. 2015. Pacific mackerel (*Scomber japonicus*) stock assessment for  
628 USA management in the 2015-16 fishing year. Pacific Fish. Manag. Counc. 7700 NE  
629 Ambasad. Place, Suite 101, Portland, Oregon 97220, USA (May): 131.

- 630 Deroba, J.J., Butterworth, D.S., Methot Jr, R.D., De Oliveira, J.A.A., Fernandez, C., Nielsen,  
631 A., Cadrin, S.X., Dickey-Collas, M., Legault, C.M., Ianelli, J. and Valero, J.L., 2014.  
632 Simulation testing the robustness of stock assessment models to error: some results from  
633 the ICES strategic initiative on stock assessment methods. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* **72**(1): 19–  
634 30. doi: 10.1093/icesjms/fst237.
- 635 Dick, E.J., and MacCall, A.D. 2011. Depletion-Based Stock Reduction Analysis: A catch-  
636 based method for determining sustainable yields for data-poor fish stocks. *Fish. Res.*  
637 **110**(2): 331–341. Elsevier B.V. doi:10.1016/j.fishres.2011.05.007.
- 638 Dowling, N.A., Smith, D.C., Knuckey I., Smith, A.D.M., Domaschenz P., Patterson, H.M.  
639 and Whitelaw, W. 2008. Developing harvest strategies for low-value and data-poor  
640 fisheries: Case studies from three Australian fisheries. *Fish. Res.* **94**: 380–390.
- 641 Dowling, N.A., Dichmont, C.M., Haddon, M., Smith, D.C., Smith, A.D.M., and Sainsbury,  
642 K. 2015. Empirical harvest strategies for data-poor fisheries: A review of the literature.  
643 *Fish. Res.* **171**: 141–153. Elsevier B.V. doi:10.1016/j.fishres.2014.11.005.
- 644 Dowling, N., Wilson, J., Rudd, M., Babcock, E., Caillaux, M., Cope, J., Dougherty, D.,  
645 Fujita, R., Gedamke, T., Gleason, M., Guttierrez, M., Hordyk, A., Maina, G., Mous, P.,  
646 Ovando, D., Parma, A., Prince, J., Revenga, C., Rude, J., Szuwalski, C., Valencia, S. and  
647 Victor, S., 2016. FishPath: A Decision Support System for Assessing and Managing  
648 Data- and Capacity- Limited Fisheries, in: Quinn II, T., Armstrong, J., Baker, M.,  
649 Heifetz, J., Witherell, D. (Eds.), *Assessing and Managing Data-Limited Fish Stocks*.  
650 Alaska Sea Grant, University of Alaska Fairbanks.  
651 <https://doi.org/10.4027/amdlfs.2016.03>
- 652 Dowling, N. A., Smith, A. D. M., Smith, D. C., Parma, A. M., Dichmont, C. M., Sainsbury  
653 K., Wilson, J. R., Dougherty, D. T. and Cope, J. M. 2019. Generic solutions for  
654 data-limited fishery assessments are not so simple. *Fish Fish.* **20**(1): 174–188. doi:

- 655            10.1111/faf.12329.
- 656       Francis, C. 2012. Reply to “The reliability of estimates of natural mortality from stock  
657            assessment models.” *Fish. Res.* **119–120**: 133–134. Elsevier B.V.  
658            doi:10.1016/j.fishres.2012.02.015.
- 659       Free, C.M, Jensen, O.P., Wiedenmann, J., and Deroba, J.J. 2017. The refined ORCS approach:  
660            A catch-based method for estimating stock status and catch limits for data-poor fish  
661            stocks. *Fish. Res.* **193**: 60–70. doi: 10.1016/j.fishres.2017.03.017
- 662       Froese, R., Demirel, N., Coro, G., Kleisner, K.M., and Winker, H. 2017. Estimating fisheries  
663            reference points from catch and resilience. *Fish Fish.* **18**(3): 506–526.  
664            doi:10.1111/faf.12190.
- 665       Froese, R., Winker, H., Coro, G., Demirel, N., et al. 2018. A new approach for estimating  
666            stock status from length frequency data, *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* **75**(6). 2004–2015. doi:  
667            10.1093/icesjms/fsy078.
- 668       Goodyear, C.P. 1993. Spawning stock biomass per recruit in fisheries management:  
669            foundation and current use. In Risk evaluation and biological reference points for  
670            fisheries management. Edited by S.J. Smith, J.J. Hunt, and D. Rivard. *Can. Spec. Publ.*  
671            Fish. Aquat. Sci. No. 120.
- 672       Harford, W.J., and Carruthers, T.R. 2017. Interim and long-term performance of static and  
673            adaptivemanagement procedures. *Fish. Res.* **190**: 84–94.
- 674       Hilborn, R. 2010. Pretty Good Yield and Exploited Fishes. *Marine Policy* **34**(1): 193–96.  
675            <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2009.04.013>.
- 676       Hordyk, A., Ono, K., Valencia, S., Loneragan, N., and Prince, J. 2015a. A novel length-based  
677            empirical estimation method of spawning potential ratio (SPR), and tests of its  
678            performance, for small-scale, data-poor fisheries. *72*(1): 217–231.
- 679       Hordyk, A.R., Loneragan, N.R., and Prince, J.D. 2015b. An evaluation of an iterative harvest

- 680 strategy for data-poor fisheries using the length-based spawning potential ratio  
681 assessment methodology. *Fish. Res.* **171**: 20–32. Elsevier B.V.  
682 doi:10.1016/j.fishres.2014.12.018.
- 683 Hordyk A. R. 2018. LBSPR: Length-Based Spawning Potential Ratio. R package version  
684 0.1.3. <https://github.com/AdrianHordyk/LBSPR>.
- 685 Hordyk, A. R., Prince, J. d., Carruthers, T. R. and Walters, C. J. 2019. Comment on “A new  
686 approach for estimating stock status from length frequency data” by Froese et al. (2018).  
687 *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* **76**(2): 457–460. doi: 10.1093/icesjms/fsy168.
- 688 Kimura, D.K., and Tagart, J.V. 1982. Stock reduction analysis, another solution to the catch  
689 equations. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **39**: 1467–1472. doi: 10.1139/f82-198.
- 690 Kimura, D.K., Balsiger, J.W., and Ito, D.H. 1984. Generalized stock reduction analysis. *Can.*  
691 *J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **41**: 1325–1333. doi: 10.1139/f84-162.
- 692 Kristensen, K., Nielsen, A., Berg, C.W., Skaug, H., and Bell B.M. 2016. TMB: Automatic  
693 Differentiation and Laplace Approximation. *J. Stat. Software*. **70**(5), 1-21.  
694 doi:10.18637/jss.v070.i05.
- 695 Martell, S., and Froese, R. 2013. A simple method for estimating MSY from catch and  
696 resilience. *Fish Fish.* **14**(4): 504–514. doi:10.1111/j.1467-2979.2012.00485.x.
- 697 Methot, R.D., and Wetzel, C.R. 2013. Stock synthesis: A biological and statistical framework  
698 for fish stock assessment and fishery management. *Fish. Res.* **142**: 86–99.  
699 doi:10.1016/j.fishres.2012.10.012.
- 700 Myers, R.A., 2001. Stock and recruitment: generalizations about maximum reproductive rate,  
701 density dependence, and variability using meta-analytic approaches. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.*  
702 **58**(5): 937–951 doi:10.1006/jmsc.2001.1109.
- 703 Nelson, G.A. 2017. fishmethods: Fishery Science Methods and Models in R. R package  
704 version 1.10-3. : <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=fishmethods>.

- 705 Pons, M. 2018. Stock Status and Management in Tuna Fisheries: From Data-rich to Data-  
706 poor. University of Washington, ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2018: 10846859.  
707 186 pp. <https://search.proquest.com/docview/2126689812?accountid%414784> (last  
708 accessed 15 November 2018).
- 709 Pons, M., Kell, L., Rudd, M. B., Cope, J. M., and Lucena Fredou, F. 2019. Performance of  
710 length-based data-limited methods in a multifleet context: application to small tunas,  
711 mackerels, and bonitos in the Atlantic Ocean. *ICES J. Mar. Sci.* **76**(4): 960–973,  
712 doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsz004.
- 713 Punt, A. 2008. Refocusing stock assessment in support of policy evaluation. *Fish. Glob.*  
714 *Welf. Environ.* 5th World Fish. Congr. (January 2008): 139–152. Available from  
715 <http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:Refocusing+Stock+A>  
716 *ssessment+in+Support+of+Policy+Evaluation#0%5Cnhttp://scholar.google.com/scholar*  
717 *?hl=en&btnG=Search&q=intitle:Refocusing+stock+assessment+in+support+of+policy+*  
718 *evaluation#0.*
- 719 Punt, A.E., Butterworth, D.S., de Moor, C.L., De Oliveira, J.A.A., Haddon, M., 2016.  
720 Management strategy evaluation: best practices. *Fish Fish.* **17**, 303–334. doi:  
721 10.1111/faf.12104.
- 722 R Core Team. 2018. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R  
723 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna. <https://www.R-project.org>.
- 724 Ralston, S., Punt, A.E., Hamel, O.S., DeVore, J.D., Conser, R.J. 2011. A meta-analytic  
725 approach to quantifying scientific uncertainty in stock assessments. *Fish. Bull.* **109**(2):  
726 217–232.
- 727 Rosenberg, A.A., Kleisner, K.M., Afflerbach, J., Anderson, S.C., Dickey-Collas, M., Cooper,  
728 A.B., Fogarty, M.J., Fulton, E.A., Gutiérrez, N.L., Hyde, K.J.W., Jardim, E., Jensen,  
729 O.P., Kristiansen, T., Longo, C., Minte-Vera, C. V., Minto, C., Mosqueira, I., Osio,

- 730 G.C., Ovando, D., Selig, E.R., Thorson, J.T., Walsh, J.C., and Ye, Y. 2017. Applying a  
731 New Ensemble Approach to Estimating Stock Status of Marine Fisheries Around the  
732 World. *Conserv. Lett.* **00**(April): 1–9. doi:10.1111/conl.12363.
- 733 Rudd, M.B., and Thorson, J.T. 2018. Accounting for variable recruitment and fishing  
734 mortality in length-based stock assessments for data-limited fisheries. *Can. J. Fish.  
735 Aquat. Sci.* **75**(7): 1019–1035. doi:10.1139/cjfas-2017-0143.
- 736 Rudd, M. B. 2019. Length-based integrated mixed effects model code. Available at:  
737 <https://github.com/merrillrudd/LIME>.
- 738 Thorson, J. T., Cope, J. M., Branch, T. A., Jensen, O. P., and Walters, C. J. 2012. Spawning  
739 biomass reference points for exploited marine fishes, incorporating taxonomic and body  
740 size information. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **69**(9): 1556–1568. doi: 10.1139/f2012-077.
- 741 Thorson, J.T., and Wetzel, C. 2015. The status of canary rockfish (*Sebastodes pinniger*) in the  
742 California Current in 2015. *Pacific Fish. Manag. Coun. (June)*: 22.
- 743 Thorson, J.T., and Cope, J.M. 2015. Catch curve stock-reduction analysis: An alternative  
744 solution to the catch equations. *Fish. Res.* **171**: 33–41. Elsevier B.V.  
745 doi:10.1016/j.fishres.2014.03.024.
- 746 Walters, C.J., Martell, S.J.D., and Korman, J. 2006. A stochastic approach to stock reduction  
747 analysis. *Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci.* **63**(1): 212–223. doi:10.1139/f05-213.
- 748 Wetzel, C.R., and Punt, A.E. 2011. Model performance for the determination of appropriate  
749 harvest levels in the case of data-poor stocks. *Fish. Res.* **110**(2): 342–355.  
750 doi:10.1016/j.fishres.2011.04.024.
- 751 Wetzel, C.R., and Punt, A.E. 2015. Evaluating the performance of data-moderate and catch-  
752 only assessment methods for U.S. west coast groundfish. *Fish. Res.* **171**: 170–187.  
753 Elsevier B.V. doi:10.1016/j.fishres.2015.06.005.
- 754 Winker, H., Carvalho, F., Sharma, R., Parker, D., and Kerwath, S. Initial results for North

755 and South Atlantic Shortfin Mako (*Isurus oxyrinchus*) stock assessment using the  
756 Bayesian Surplus Production Model JABBA and the Cacth-Resilience method CMSY.  
757 Collect. Vol. Sci. Pap. ICCAT. **74**(4): 1836–1866.

758 Winker, Henning. 2019. The CMSY method for data-limited stock assessment. Package  
759 available at <https://github.com/Henning-Winker/cmsy>.


760 Zhou, S., Yin, S., Thorson, J.T., Smith, A.D.M., Fuller, M., and Walters, C.J. 2012. Linking  
761 fishing mortality reference points to life history traits: an empirical study. Can. J. Fish.  
762 Aquat. Sci. **69**(8): 1292–1301. doi:10.1139/f2012-060.

763 Zhou, S., Punt, A.E., Ye, Y., Ellis, N., Dichmont, C.M., Haddon, M., Smith, D.C. and Smith,  
764 A.D. 2017. Estimating stock depletion level from patterns of catch history. Fish and  
765 Fisheries. **18**(4): 742–751. doi: 10.1111/faf.12201.

766

767

Draft



- 1 Table 1. Life-history information and priors for the three species used in the study. Notation is as follows: *Lognormal* ( $\mu$ ,  $\sigma^2$ ); Uniform  $U(a, b)$ .
- 2 Priors for  $K$  were Uniform between the maximum catch in the time series and 100 times the maximum catch. For the Catch-MSY method, the
- 3 depletion priors were Uniform centered on the true value with a minimum of *true* - 0.1 and a maximum of *true* + 0.1.

Operating model inputs	Symbol	Short-lived	Medium-lived	Long-lived
Maximum age	$Age_{max}$	10	15	64
Age at 50% maturity (years)	$A_{mat}$	3	5	16
Length where 50% of the fish are mature (FL cm)	$L_{50}$	29	90	55
Length where 95% of the fish are mature (FL cm)	$L_{95}$	34	100	57
Length-weight scaling parameter	$\alpha$	$2.73 \times 10^{-6}$	$1.34 \times 10^{-5}$	$1.80 \times 10^{-5}$
Length-weight allometric parameter	$\beta$	3.444	3.107	3.094
Von Bertalanffy Brody growth coefficient (1/years)	$k$	0.40	0.21	0.14
Von Bertalanffy asymptotic length (cm)	$L_\infty$	38.2	122.2	60.0
Theoretical age at length=0	$t_0$	-0.6	-1.3	-1.9
Coefficient of variation of length at age for all ages	$CVL$	0.1	0.1	0.1
Natural mortality (1/years)	$M$	0.60	0.30	0.05
Steepness	$h$	0.5	0.9	0.8
Selectivity at 50% (cm)	$S_{50}$	25	60	45
Selectivity at 95% (cm)	$S_{95}$	30	75	50
Recruitment deviations	$\sigma_R$	0.3	0.4	0.5
Fishing mortality deviations	$\sigma_F$	0.2	0.2	0.2
<b>Estimation models prior distributions</b>				
Depletion (used for all catch-based models)	$XB_0$	<i>Lognormal</i> (true, 0.1) $U(\max(\text{catch}), \max(\text{catch}) \times 100)$	<i>Lognormal</i> (true, 0.1) $U(\max(\text{catch}), \max(\text{catch}) \times 100)$	<i>Lognormal</i> (true, 0.1) $U(\max(\text{catch}), \max(\text{catch}) \times 100)$
Carrying capacity (used for Catch-MSY, CMSY and SSCOM)	$K$			
Population rate of increase (used for Catch-MSY, CMSY and SSCOM)	$r$	$U(0.8, 1.2)$	$U(0.2, 0.6)$	$U(0.05, 0.4)$
Steepness (used for SSS)	$h$	<i>Normal</i> (0.5, 0.1)	<i>Normal</i> (0.9, 0.1)	<i>Normal</i> (0.8, 0.1)
Vulnerability (used for DBSRA)	$F_{MSY}/M$	$U(0, 2)$	$U(0, 2)$	$U(0, 2)$
Compensation (used for DBSRA)	$B_{MSY}/B_0$	$U(0, 1)$	$U(0, 1)$	$U(0, 1)$




Table 2 Bias in performance for the catch-based models. The values in between brackets are the

Scenarios	Life-history	Harvest trend	Final depletion	SSS (RE = 0.17)	DBSRA (RE = 0.63)
1	Short-lived (RE = 1.15)	Scenario 1 (RE = 1.53)	0.2	<b>-0.06</b>	-0.75
2			0.4	<b>0.17</b>	-0.88
3			0.6	<b>0.04</b>	-0.66
4		Scenario 2 (RE = 0.97)	0.2	<b>-0.09</b>	-0.68
5			0.4	0.14	-0.84
6			0.6	<b>-0.27</b>	-0.57
7		Scenario 3 (RE = 0.95)	0.2	<b>-0.25</b>	-0.48
8			0.4	<b>0.11</b>	-0.77
9			0.6	<b>-0.29</b>	-0.42
10	Medium-lived (RE = 0.50)	Scenario 1 (RE = 0.57)	0.2	<b>-0.06</b>	-0.67
11			0.4	0.15	-0.77
12			0.6	-0.24	-0.59
13		Scenario 2 (RE = 0.46)	0.2	<b>-0.08</b>	-0.60
14			0.4	0.13	-0.72
15			0.6	-0.24	-0.51
16		Scenario 3 (RE = 0.47)	0.2	<b>-0.09</b>	-0.49
17			0.4	0.11	-0.65
18			0.6	-0.24	-0.41
19	Long-lived (RE = 1.33)	Scenario 1 (RE = 1.10)	0.2	<b>0.13</b>	-0.63
20			0.4	0.28	-0.66
21			0.6	<b>0.09</b>	-0.60
22		Scenario 2 (RE = 1.44)	0.2	<b>0.15</b>	-0.60
23			0.4	0.30	-0.65
24			0.6	<b>0.11</b>	-0.57
25		Scenario 3 (RE = 1.43)	0.2	<b>0.17</b>	-0.58
26			0.4	0.28	-0.62
27			0.6	<b>0.13</b>	-0.57

Draft

mean absolute relative error per factor: harvest rates scenarios, species and final de		
Catch-MSY (RE = 1.62)	CMSY (RE = 0.71)	Absolute mean RE
2.57	0.17	1.36
2.07	-0.33	1.05
3.69	1.15	2.19
1.75	0.36	0.79
1.52	<b>-0.10</b>	0.60
2.85	1.59	1.52
2.37	0.53	0.95
1.32	0.15	0.52
2.61	1.82	1.37
0.95	0.28	0.47
0.48	<b>-0.05</b>	0.38
1.54	<b>0.16</b>	0.86
0.84	0.31	0.41
0.35	<b>-0.01</b>	0.36
1.70	<b>0.18</b>	0.62
1.04	0.32	0.45
0.36	<b>0.03</b>	0.35
1.97	<b>0.19</b>	0.60
1.34	-0.12	0.72
0.41	-0.78	0.48
2.31	1.87	2.11
1.33	0.46	0.85
0.34	-0.74	0.46
2.87	2.72	3.03
1.84	1.27	1.60
0.55	-0.40	0.38
2.76	3.20	2.31

Draft

Draft

Table 2 Bias in performance for the length-based methods. The values in between brackets are t

Scenarios	Life-history	Harvest trend	Final depletion	LBSPR (RE = 0.51)	LIME (RE = 0.15)
1	Short-lived (RE = 0.80)	Scenario 1 (RE = 0.39)	0.2	-0.42	<b>0.25</b>
2			0.4	-0.69	<b>0.05</b>
3			0.6	-0.80	<b>-0.06</b>
4		Scenario 2 (RE = 0.69)	0.2	-0.66	<b>0.34</b>
5			0.4	-0.85	<b>-0.13</b>
6			0.6	-0.92	<b>-0.06</b>
7		Scenario 3 (RE = 1.29)	0.2	-0.92	<b>0.55</b>
8			0.4	-0.97	<b>0.15</b>
9			0.6	-0.98	<b>-0.05</b>
10	Medium-lived (RE = 0.31)	Scenario 1 (RE = 0.23)	0.2	-0.10	0.28
11			0.4	-0.40	<b>0.02</b>
12			0.6	-0.48	<b>-0.05</b>
13		Scenario 2 (RE = 0.26)	0.2	<b>-0.09</b>	0.26
14			0.4	-0.44	-0.02
15			0.6	-0.57	<b>-0.11</b>
16		Scenario 3 (RE = 0.46)	0.2	<b>-0.14</b>	0.20
17			0.4	-0.50	<b>-0.09</b>
18			0.6	-0.62	<b>-0.14</b>
19	Long-lived (RE = 0.28)	Scenario 1 (RE = 0.23)	0.2	0.27	<b>0.20</b>
20			0.4	-0.26	<b>0.01</b>
21			0.6	-0.40	<b>-0.04</b>
22		Scenario 2 (RE = 0.27)	0.2	0.38	<b>0.22</b>
23			0.4	-0.25	<b>0.01</b>
24			0.6	-0.45	<b>-0.04</b>
25		Scenario 3 (RE = 0.32)	0.2	0.39	0.52
26			0.4	-0.28	<b>-0.01</b>
27			0.6	-0.51	<b>0.01</b>

Draft

the mean absolute relativ

LBB (RE = 0.73)	Absolute mean RE
1.00	0.56
0.10	0.28
-0.16	0.34
2.41	1.14
0.68	0.56
0.18	0.39
4.71	2.06
2.04	1.05
1.26	0.76
<b>0.01</b>	0.13
-0.36	0.26
-0.37	0.30
0.64	0.33
<b>-0.01</b>	0.16
0.16	0.28
1.64	0.66
0.54	0.38
0.31	0.36
0.33	0.27
-0.23	0.17
-0.35	0.26
0.54	0.38
-0.19	0.15
-0.41	0.30
0.60	0.50
<b>-0.10</b>	0.13
-0.41	0.31

Draft


**Appendix**

Figure A1. Time series for each simulated fast-grow chub mackerel population for harvest scenario 1 and depletion = 0.2. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A2. Time series for each simulated fast-grow chub mackerel population for harvest scenario 1 and depletion = 0.4. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A3. Time series for each simulated fast-grow chub mackerel population for harvest scenario 1 and depletion = 0.6. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A4. Time series for each simulated fast-grow chub mackerel population for harvest scenario 2 and depletion = 0.2. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A5. Time series for each simulated fast-grow chub mackerel population for harvest scenario 2 and depletion = 0.4. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A6. Time series for each simulated fast-grow chub mackerel population for harvest scenario 2 and depletion = 0.6. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A7. Time series for each simulated fast-grow chub mackerel population for harvest scenario 3 and depletion = 0.2. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A8. Time series for each simulated fast-grow chub mackerel population for harvest scenario 3 and depletion = 0.4. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A9. Time series for each simulated fast-grow chub mackerel population for harvest scenario 3 and depletion = 0.6. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A10. Time series for each simulated medium-grow albacore tuna population for harvest scenario 1 and depletion = 0.2. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A11. Time series for each simulated medium-grow albacore tuna population for harvest scenario 1 and depletion = 0.4. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A12. Time series for each simulated medium-grow albacore tuna population for harvest scenario 1 and depletion = 0.6. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A13. Time series for each simulated medium-grow albacore tuna population for harvest scenario 2 and depletion = 0.2. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A14. Time series for each simulated medium-grow albacore tuna population for harvest scenario 2 and depletion = 0.4. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A15. Time series for each simulated medium-grow albacore tuna population for harvest scenario 2 and depletion = 0.6. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A16. Time series for each simulated medium-grow albacore tuna population for harvest scenario 3 and depletion = 0.2. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A17. Time series for each simulated medium-grow albacore tuna population for harvest scenario 3 and depletion = 0.4. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A18. Time series for each simulated medium-grow albacore tuna population for harvest scenario 3 and depletion = 0.6. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A19. Time series for each simulated slow-grow canary rockfish population for harvest scenario 1 and depletion = 0.2. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A20. Time series for each simulated slow-grow canary rockfish population for harvest scenario 1 and depletion = 0.4. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A21. Time series for each simulated slow-grow canary rockfish population for harvest scenario 1 and depletion = 0.6. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A22. Time series for each simulated slow-grow canary rockfish population for harvest scenario 2 and depletion = 0.2. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A23. Time series for each simulated slow-grow canary rockfish population for harvest scenario 2 and depletion = 0.4. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A24. Time series for each simulated slow-grow canary rockfish population for harvest scenario 2 and depletion = 0.6. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A25. Time series for each simulated slow-grow canary rockfish population for harvest scenario 1 and depletion = 0.2. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A26. Time series for each simulated slow-grow canary rockfish population for harvest scenario 3 and depletion = 0.4. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.




Figure A27. Time series for each simulated slow-grow canary rockfish population for harvest scenario 3 and depletion = 0.6. The black solid lines represent the mean value for all runs.

Table A1. Mean and standard deviation of relative error (RE) between the maximum sustainable yield (MSY) estimated by the operating model (OM) and the MSY estimated by the CMSY method. Values are proportions. Positive values mean that the MSY was overestimated and negative values that it was underestimated.

Species	Harvest Scenario	Mean ± Standard deviation		
		Depletion level		
		0.2	0.4	0.6
Mackerel	Scenario 1	0.37 ± 0.08	0.18 ± 0.09	-0.13 ± 0.15
	Scenario 2	0.28 ± 0.08	0.03 ± 0.09	-0.22 ± 0.13
	Scenario 3	0.33 ± 0.11	0.05 ± 0.11	-0.26 ± 0.14
Albacore	Scenario 1	-0.07 ± 0.02	-0.18 ± 0.03	-0.46 ± 0.02
	Scenario 2	-0.25 ± 0.02	-0.42 ± 0.02	-0.42 ± 0.02
	Scenario 3	-0.12 ± 0.02	-0.24 ± 0.02	-0.43 ± 0.02
Rockfish	Scenario 1	1.61 ± 0.27	1.13 ± 0.31	0.80 ± 0.32
	Scenario 2	1.67 ± 0.26	1.27 ± 0.33	0.86 ± 0.34
	Scenario 3	1.77 ± 0.33	1.29 ± 0.45	0.94 ± 0.45

Table A2. True OM and LBB estimated values for  $L_{\infty}$  and  $S_{50}$  ( $\sim L_c$ ). LCL is the lower confidence limit and UCL the upper confidence limit for the estimated values.

Scenarios	Life-history	Harvest trend	Final depletion	True $L_{\infty}$	True $S_{50}$	Estimated $L_{\infty}$	Estimated LCL $L_{\infty}$	Estimated UCL $L_{\infty}$	Estimated $L_c$	Estimated LCL $L_c$	Estimated UCL $L_c$
1	Short-lived	Scenario 1	0.2	38.2	25	44.5	44.0	45.1	16.9	16.5	17.4
2			0.4	38.2	29	43.6	43.3	44.0	15.6	15.5	15.8
3			0.6	38.2	29	45.1	44.6	45.6	20.1	19.5	20.7
4		Scenario 2	0.2	38.2	29	44.7	44.2	45.2	18.0	17.4	18.6
5			0.4	38.2	29	43.7	43.4	44.1	15.7	15.5	15.8
6			0.6	38.2	29	45.3	45.0	45.8	20.3	19.7	20.9
7		Scenario 3	0.2	38.2	29	45.5	45.2	46.0	20.3	19.8	21.0
8			0.4	38.2	29	44.5	44.0	45.1	15.9	15.7	16.1
9			0.6	38.2	29	45.7	45.4	46.2	20.7	20.1	21.3
10	Medium-lived	Scenario 1	0.2	122.2	60	142.5	141.4	143.6	62.4	61.7	63.2
11			0.4	122.2	60	141.4	140.1	142.5	60.4	59.7	61.0
12			0.6	122.2	60	143.2	142.7	143.9	64.1	63.2	64.9
13		Scenario 2	0.2	122.2	60	143.0	141.8	143.9	62.8	62.0	63.6
14			0.4	122.2	60	141.9	141.1	143.3	60.7	60.0	61.4
15			0.6	122.2	60	143.3	143.0	144.0	64.6	63.8	65.4
16		Scenario 3	0.2	122.2	60	143.3	143.0	144.0	63.3	62.5	64.1
17			0.4	122.2	60	142.5	141.4	143.7	61.1	60.4	61.8
18			0.6	122.2	60	143.5	143.1	144.3	65.4	64.5	66.3
19	Long-lived	Scenario 1	0.2	60.0	60	76.7	76.0	77.6	50.4	49.9	51.0
20			0.4	60.0	45	75.3	74.5	76.3	47.0	46.5	47.4
21			0.6	60.0	45	76.9	76.2	77.8	51.2	50.7	51.8
22		Scenario 2	0.2	60.0	45	76.5	75.8	77.4	50.5	50.0	51.1
23			0.4	60.0	45	75.4	74.6	76.4	47.8	47.2	48.3
24			0.6	60.0	45	77.0	76.3	78.0	51.4	50.8	52.0
25		Scenario 3	0.2	60.0	45	76.8	76.1	77.7	51.0	50.4	51.6
26			0.4	60.0	45	76.0	75.3	76.9	49.5	49.0	50.1
27			0.6	60.0	45	77.1	76.3	78.0	51.7	51.1	52.2

*B21 ROC*

# Proxy $MSY$ Reference Points for data poor stocks

Power of length based indicators to detect overfishing.

*L Kell*

*21 November, 2019*

## Summary

- The OM has been rerun where  $F$  after recovery is  $0.7F_{MSY}$ .
- The reference period is 61:120 and the period of overfishing is 80:109. this gives 60 years for which 30 are overfished.
- The biomass indicator  $L_{maxy}$  has been added.
- Figures aren't final but hopefully show the types of plots we might want to include
- Figure 7 is new and shows the "best performance", i.e. point closest to  $TPR=1$  and  $FPR=0$ , this could be the entry point to the regression tree.

*B22 Pareto*

# Pareto Frontiers - Multiple Objective Trade-offs

Pollack

L Kell

14 November, 2019

## Summary of simulations and analyses

- The random MSE has been run to derive the calibration regressions and pareto frontiers, based on these the “final” MSEs have been run.
- The OM is the same as for the ROC paper, however, only one stock was run, pollack, as a single example is interesting enough
- There are factors for CPUE CV with three levels (0.1, 0.2, 0.3) and number of years in the HCR regression (3, 5, 7).
- The MP is an empirical HCR, where K1 is how much you decrease TAC for a -ve trend in CPUE and K2 how much you increase TAC for a +ve trend

Catches are increased when the trend in an index is positive, and decreased if the trend is negative

$$TAC_{y+1}^1 = TAC_y \times \begin{cases} 1 - k_1|\lambda| & \text{for } \lambda < 0 \\ 1 + k_2\lambda & \text{for } \lambda \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

where  $\lambda$  is the slope in the regression of  $\ln I_y$  for the most recent  $n$  years,  $k_1$  and  $k_2$  are *gain* parameters and  $\gamma$  actions asymmetry so that decreases in the index do not result in the same relative change as as an increase.

## Figures

- Fig 1, Example OM
- Fig 2, shows that the stock collapses if K1<K2
- Fig 3,4,5 Calibration regressions, showing K1 and K2 as a function of yield and AAV. These shows that there is a trade-off between yield and AAV, i.e. fix K1 at 1 and keep K2 ~1 if you want high yield, if you want to reduce AAV at the expense of yield then decrease K2.
- Fig 5 for the 7 year regression may look a bit wonky, but I think I can explain it. If the stock varies as a sin wave with a wavelength < 14 year, when you start at the minimum you have <7 years with an upward trend. As you move forward they will be a tipping point and the regression slope will suddenly change sign. If you allow big changes in catch increases (k2) you will get high yield but at the expense of high variability. If you only allow small changes in k2 then you will lose yield.
- Fig 6 are the Pareto frontiers, which shows the trade-offs between yield and AAV
- Fig 7 are the MSE summaries that confirm the calibrations