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Table 1: Data collected in Raberinary and Benbow 2012.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| T | Stage1 | Stage2 | Stage3 | Stage4 | Total |
| 1 | 10.40119 | 5.200594 | 0.000000 | 1.1144131 | 16.71620 |
| 2 | 76.52303 | 27.860327 | 2.228826 | 1.8573551 | 108.46954 |
| 3 | 57.57801 | 37.890045 | 1.857355 | 0.0000000 | 97.32541 |
| 4 | 40.49034 | 50.891531 | 3.343239 | 0.0000000 | 94.72511 |
| 5 | 71.69391 | 16.716196 | 8.172363 | 1.1144131 | 97.69688 |
| 6 | 121.09955 | 28.974740 | 5.572065 | 2.2288262 | 157.87519 |
| 7 | 119.98514 | 52.005944 | 6.686478 | 0.7429421 | 179.42051 |
| 8 | 78.75186 | 41.604755 | 14.487370 | 1.1144131 | 135.95840 |
| 9 | 118.87073 | 53.491828 | 14.487370 | 1.1144131 | 187.96434 |
| 10 | 119.98514 | 39.004458 | 10.772660 | 1.1144131 | 170.87667 |
| 11 | 73.55126 | 26.374443 | 4.457652 | 2.2288262 | 106.61218 |
| 12 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |
| 13 | 83.58098 | 111.069837 | 21.545320 | 1.1144131 | 217.31055 |

1 **1 Data**

2 Table [1](#_bookmark0) shows data used to parameterize matrix model from Raberinary and Benbow (2012). Data was

3 extracted from Figure 7 of this paper using WebPlotDigitizer (h[ttps://automeris.io/WebPlotDigitizer/)](https://automeris.io/WebPlotDigitizer/)

# 4 2 Stability and Elasticity analysis

5 Sensitivity analysis (Figure [1)](#_bookmark1) showed that within each stage, the growth parameters (*G*1 - *G*3) had the largest

6 effect on this growthrate compared to the parameters indicating staying within a stage (*P*1-*P*4). However, as

7 all the parameters represent proportions of individuals in a stage and must necessarily be between 0 and 1

8 with the exception of the *F*4 parameter, elasticity analysis provides an interpretation that weights all stages

9 equally. The result of this analysis shows that percent changes in the fecundity metric can be as beneficial

10 to the overall population growth as changes in the G parameters (Figure [2).](#_bookmark2) Further, this analysis indicates

11 that of all the stages, stage 1 has the most overall influence on the overall population growth.

12 Elasticity analysis shows that conservation of both the growth and reproductive parameters would have equal
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Figure 1: Sensitivity analysis of our matrix model - the change in the eigenvalue (*λ*) as a result of a unit change of each parameter in the model.
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Figure 2: Elasticity analysis of our matrix model - the change in the eigenvalue (*λ*) as a result of a proportional change of each parameter in the model.

13 effect on the overall population growth, with the most influential parameter being the survival of stage 1

14 individuals. The sensitivity and elasticity analysis indicate which stages will have the greatest effect on the

15 population if they are targeted for preservation practices. Previous research has indicated that catch size

16 limits are very effective in preserving stocks of species with rapid growth and high death rates, but this is

17 only if individuals do not enter the fishery until they have reached maturity (Nowlis 2000). However, the

18 fishing method most commonly employed by the local people is spearfishing, where harvesters will search

19 out octopus dens and spear the den to probe out the octopus (Benbow et al. 2014). Because of this, fishing

20 method does not discriminate based on stage, this is not an applicable suggestion for conservation practices.

21 For this reason, even though our analysis of different stage survivabilities indicates that conserving immature

22 individuals would be an effective tool for fostering population growth, this is not a realistic management

23 practice in this fishery for most harvesters.

# 24 3 Per-stage management scenarios

25 **3.1 METHODS**

26 Examined how increasing the chance of survival of individuals in each stage class would contribute to

27 population health. This was achieved by isolating the growth (*Gi*) and in-stage survival (*Pi*) for each

28 stage i. We then increased these parameters by 1% and recalculated the overall eigenvalue of the matrix. We

29 then incorporated into different scenarios with different frequencies of fishing restrictions to examine how

30 temporary closures on blue octopus in certain stages would affect the population.

31 **3.2 RESULTS**

32 Our within stage analysis showed that Stage 1 needed the smallest percent increase in survival to result in

33 overall population growth (Figure [3).](#_bookmark3) Stage 4 and larval survivability would be the highest needed increase,

34 with stage 4 needing a 25% increase and larval needing a 15% increase in order for the overall population

35 to be stable. Further, when examining the different frequencies of fishing closures, we found that, for any

36 scenario, no closure would be effective if it was less frequent than every other month. As exemplified by

37 the previous analysis, closures focusing on either stage 4 or larval individuals required the most increase in

38 survivorship and highest frequencies of closures in order to result in population growth.

### 39 3.3 DISCUSSION

40 The results of our per-stage analysis showed that focusing on protecting individuals in stage 1 would be the

41 most effective form of management if size could be determined before capture in this fishery. It is a common

42 trend that individuals that survive long larval stages that have high death rates are the most valuable in

43 terms of contributions to overall population growth. However, this is not a realistic management suggestion,

44 as it is difficult to assess the size of octopus before catch, which is often fatal to the individual. This could

45 suggest, however, that the establishment of aquaculture of *Octopus cyanea* could have benefits to the overall

46 population if octopus are reared until passing this first stage of development. However, further research is

47 needed on cephalopod aquaculture in order to be effective and reduce pollutants in the surrounding waters

48 (Jacquet et al. 2023).
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Figure 3: Different fishing scenarios based on increasing survivability of one stage. Note: because of the high survivability of stage 1 individuals, only a 10% increase in survivability is biologically possible given the larval output.

Table 2: Life table of *O. cyanea* as calculated from our Lefkovitch matrix.

Age (months)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| cohort dying | |  |  | survival | pectancy | reproduc- tion rate | of offspring |
| 0 1.0000000 | 0.0951997 | 0.0999577 | 0.0951997 | 0.9048003 | 3.546039 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 |
| 1 0.9048003 | 0.2107642 | 0.2636471 | 0.2329401 | 0.7670599 | 2.866532 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 |
| 2 0.6940360 | 0.1996469 | 0.3359857 | 0.2876607 | 0.7123393 | 2.585199 | 0.0000000 | 0.0000000 |
| 3 0.4943891 | 0.1567056 | 0.3766632 | 0.3169681 | 0.6830319 | 2.427255 | 0.1801271 | 0.0890529 |
| 4 0.3376835 | 0.1130954 | 0.4022801 | 0.3349152 | 0.6650848 | 2.321617 | 0.4417776 | 0.1491810 |
| 5 0.2245882 | 0.0778436 | 0.4192659 | 0.3466059 | 0.6533941 | 2.238925 | 0.7077949 | 0.1589624 |
| 6 0.1467446 | 0.0520106 | 0.4307673 | 0.3544291 | 0.6455709 | 2.161373 | 0.9405289 | 0.1380175 |
| 7 0.0947340 | 0.0340773 | 0.4386006 | 0.3597150 | 0.6402850 | 2.073494 | 1.1279077 | 0.1068513 |
| 8 0.0606568 | 0.0220360 | 0.4439266 | 0.3632896 | 0.6367104 | 1.957489 | 1.2709528 | 0.0770919 |
| 9 0.0386208 | 0.0141236 | 0.4475285 | 0.3656983 | 0.6343017 | 1.789093 | 1.3761398 | 0.0531476 |
| 10 0.0244972 | 0.0089981 | 0.4499474 | 0.3673119 | 0.6326881 | 1.532303 | 1.4513443 | 0.0355539 |
| 11 0.0154991 | 0.0057097 | 0.4515599 | 0.3683858 | 0.6316142 | 1.131614 | 1.5039407 | 0.0233097 |
| 12 0.0097895 | 0.0097895 | 2.0000000 | 1.0000000 | 0.0000000 | 0.500000 | 1.5400772 | 0.0150765 |
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# 49 4 Rage package analysis

### 50 4.1 Age specific Calculations

51 Table [2](#_bookmark4) shows age specific life-history traits of *Octopus cyanea* as calculated by the Rage package from our

52 matrix. Expected number of offspring is reported per original cohort number.
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