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#### Abstract

: Fisheries dynamics can be thought of as the reciprocal relationship between an exploited population and the fishers and/or managers determining the exploitation patterns. Sustainable production of protein of these coupled human-natural systems requires an understanding of their dynamics. Here, we characterized the fishery dynamics for 173 fisheries from around the globe by applying general additive models to estimated fishing mortality and spawning biomass from the RAM Legacy Database. GAMs specified to mimic production models and more flexible GAMs were applied. We show observed dynamics do not always match assumptions made in management using 'classical' fisheries models and the suitability of these assumptions varies significantly according to large marine ecosystem, habitat, variability in recruitment, maximum weight of a species, and minimum observed stock biomass. These results identify circumstances in which simple models may be useful for management. However, adding flexibility to classical models often did not substantially improve performance, which suggests in many cases considering only biomass and removals will not be sufficient to model fishery dynamics. Knowledge of the suitability of common assumptions in management should be used in selecting modeling frameworks, setting management targets, testing management strategies, and developing tools to manage data-limited fisheries. Effectively balancing expectations of future protein production from capture fisheries and risk of undesirable outcomes (e.g. 'fisheries collapse') depends on understanding how well we can expect to predict future dynamics of a fishery using current management paradigms.
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## Introduction

Approximately twenty percent of worldwide dietary protein is derived from the sea (FAO, 2016). Global population is projected to increase to over 9 billion by 2050 (from a current population of $\sim 7$ billion; UN-DESA, 2015), but production from capture fisheries stabilized at $85-95$ million metric tonnes (mmt) in the 2000s (FAO, 2016). Fisheries managers are often tasked with ensuring the fish and invertebrate populations that support these fisheries remain productive and attempt to do so by modeling the dynamics of exploited populations to determine sustainable catches. Models of fishery dynamics often assume the number of individual fish entering a population is related to spawning biomass ( SB ) and that decreases in spawning biomass occur due to natural mortality and fishing mortality (F). Most management strategies for fisheries are predicated on the assumption that management can manipulate fishing pressure to achieve changes in a fished population. However, shifts in population dynamics over time (Szuwalski et al. 2015) can influence the response of a population to fishing and these responses likely vary by region and species (Neubauer et al., 2013; Thorson et al. 2012). Effectively balancing expectations of future protein production and risk of undesirable outcomes (e.g. 'fisheries collapse') requires an ability to understand and predict the dynamics of a fishery.
'Fisheries dynamics' are defined here as the manner in which F and SB change at different levels of F and SB . Changes in F can be seen as the response of management or fishers to changes in the population and the perceived level of exploitation; changes in SB can be seen as the response
of the population to exploitation, density-dependence (i.e. the existence of a 'carrying capacity'), and/or environmental forcing. Fisheries managers make assumptions about the way SB and F change when developing strategies for management. For example, SB is expected to decrease on average when F increases, and F might be assumed to decrease when SB is low due decreases in the profitability of fishing (Thorson et al., 2014) or management action. The validity of these assumptions and the predictability of fishery dynamics can influence the performance of a given management strategy, but these assumptions are not often checked.

Here we characterize the fishery dynamics for 173 stocks from the RAM Legacy Stock Assessment Database (Ricard et al, 2012) by fitting generalized additive models to estimates of SB and F. Using these fitted models, we ask, "If today's SB and F are known, can changes in SB and F next year be predicted based on the past responses of the fishery?" We then link stock characteristics to a measure of predictability and identify stocks with expected fishery dynamics given common assumptions of density-dependence, stationary dynamics, active management, and/or cost-based constraints on fishing effort. Finally, we discuss implications for management and potential strategies for coping with different levels of predictability and unexpected fishery dynamics.

## Materials and methods

## Global fisheries data

Time series' of SB and F from the RAM Legacy Stock Assessment Database were used based on the criteria that the recruitment estimates for the years extracted must not come directly from a stock-recruit curve (i.e. predictions of F and SB derived deterministically from assumed structure of stock assessment models were not used) and at least 18 contiguous years of F and SB were available. The RAM Database is the most up-to-date compilation of stock assessments for stocks fished worldwide. Exploring relationships between potentially dependent, model-derived quantities can be fraught with statistical pitfalls (Thorson et al., 2015). However, these are the best available estimates of F and SB and fisheries management is routinely conducted using these estimates as accurate representations of reality. Therefore, assumptions made about fisheries dynamics by managers should be consistent with the dynamics compiled in this database. In total, 173 stocks were included in the analysis and time series' of SB were rescaled
from 0 to 1 before analysis to improve comparability. Rescaling was not done for F because fishing mortality already represents a rate that is approximately comparable among stocks (differences in selectivity will impact the comparability of Fs (Cordue 2011), but selectivities were not reported in the RAM database).

## Population dynamics, GAMs, and predictability

Dynamies of the SB and F of a population can be characterized as:

$$
B_{t+1}, F_{t+1}=B_{t}, F_{t}+f\left(B_{t}, F_{t}\right)+N(0, \Sigma)
$$

Eq 1a
where $B_{t}$ and $B_{t+1}$ are SB in years $t$ and $t+1, F_{t}$ and $F_{t+1}$ are fishing mortality in years $t$ and $t+1$, $f\left(B_{t}, F_{t}\right)$ represents the coupled natural and human dynamics of SB and F , and $N(0, \Sigma)$ is a multivariate normal "process error" arising from our model $f\left(B_{t}, F_{t}\right)$ failing to include all relevant processes. We seek to estimate $f($ ), and take the first difference of F and SB :

$$
B_{t+1}, F_{t+1}-B_{t}, F_{t}=f\left(B_{t}, F_{t}\right)+N(0, \Sigma)
$$

Given the assumption that $\Sigma$ is diagonal, we can decompose these dynamics into two independent equations:


$$
\begin{gather*}
B_{t+1}-B_{t}=g\left(B_{t}, F_{t}\right)+N\left(0, \sigma_{B}^{2}\right) \\
F_{t+1}-F_{t}=h\left(B_{t}, F_{t}\right)+N\left(0, \sigma_{F}^{2}\right)
\end{gather*}
$$

where $g()$ represents "population dynamics" and $h()$ represents "effort dynamics" (Thorson et al., 2013). Both $g$ and $h$ can be estimated using non-parametric models given the assumption that $F_{t}$ and $B_{t}$ are known without error. We used two strategies to fit the fishery dynamics data (Eq. 1c) here. First, we estimated $g()$ and $h()$ using generalized additive models (GAMs), but restricted the number of knots allowed for each to a maximum of 3 . Three knots allowed for quadratic models to be fit, which represents the prevailing dynamics assumed by most fisheries models (i.e. the dynamics between SB and F can be described by at most a dome-shaped curve). Second, we again estimated $g()$ and $h()$ using GAMs, but the number of knots was increased to 5 . Five was chosen to offer more flexibility in estimation, but also increased the potential for overfitting with some of the shorter time series.

Predictability of changes in F and SB for both methods was evaluated by excluding the last year of data, fitting the GAMs, predicting the excluded year using the fitted models and calculating the absolute relative error of the observed vs. the prediction. This process was repeated for each of the last five years of data and the mean absolute relative error over those five years (MARE) is used here to represent the predictability of changes in F and SB. Excluding the last year from the analysis and predicting the change mimics the management process in which SB is estimated one year out and a target F is set. MARE was recorded for the 'traditional' dynamics models (i.e. restricted to quadratic relationships between F and SB ) and the 'flexible' dynamics model (i.e. the model in which the number of knots allowed was increased).

## Fishery dynamics and expectations

Each of the fitted relationships between SB and F represent a different 'process effect' in the human-natural coupled system of a fishery. Models fit to changes in F describe the way in which fishers and fisheries managers perceive and interact with a stock, while models fit to changes in SB describe how the stock responds to exploitation as well as density-dependent and environmental changes.

Before applying the GAMs described above to the observed data, they were fitted to data drawn from simulated populations to understand 1) what fishery dynamics are 'expected' given a common model of fishery dynamics used in fisheries management (e.g. Beverton and Holt, 1957) and 2) how well the GAMs could be expected to reflect the underlying dynamics of a system. A production model (equation 2) undergoing an exploitation history in which 'effort dynamics' (equation 3; Thorson et al., 2013) determine fishing mortality was used to simulate data. The effort dynamics model defines a point at which economic equilibrium is reached (i.e. profits $=$ costs) and posits an unregulated fishery will converge upon this point. The dynamics of a system driven by effort dynamics (i.e. a spiral in F vs. SB phase space converging on a target over time) are very similar to those observed in a system managed to a reference point like $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{MSY}}$. Once a stock target is specified in management (e.g. $\mathrm{B}_{\mathrm{MSY}}$ ), managers endeavor to maintain the stock at that point. However, due to errors in the management process (e.g. implementation, process, or observation), the realized fishing mortality rarely equals the target. Consistent course correction through management action would therefore be expected to produce a spiral path through F vs.

SB space, and, consequently, the effort dynamics model is also appropriate to apply to managed stocks (i.e. all those in this analysis). Models (Eq. 1c) were fit to the changes in F and SB from data sets simulated for different numbers of observed years and beginning observation of the fishery at different time in the exploitation.


The predictability of fisheries as a coupled human-natural system (measured as MARE for predictions based on Eq. 1c) may vary among stocks based on life history characteristics of the species, or for other reasons. We therefore conduct a post-hoc analysis of predictability based on biological and fishery characteristics. To do so, we use 'random forest', which is an efficient statistical method for estimating nonlinear responses and interactions among many potential predictors (Brieman, 2001). Random forests boast high classification accuracy, can model nonlinear relationships between predictor and response variables, can model complex interactions among predictor variables, and provide a method for determining variable importance (Cutler et
al., 2007). Random forests were an appropriate choice for analysis here because functional forms and interactions for the variables tested here were not obvious, nor was the analysis balanced. When compared to other methods, such as generalized linear models, random forests are able to reveal more complicated relationships (De'ath and Fabricius, 2000). Random forests were implemented here using the R package "randomForest" (Breiman et al. 2013).

## Data for classification

Maximum weight, maximum length, maximum age, and habitat type were drawn from FishBase (Froese and Pauly, 2015; references 39-68 were used to fill gaps in FishBase) and large marine ecosystem, managing body, phylogenetic order, average F, minimum observed spawning biomass, and length of time series were drawn or calculated from the RAM Legacy Database (Ricard et al. 2012) to be tested as explanatory variables for predictability of changes in F and SB (Table 1). The Spearman's cross-correlation (1904) between spawning biomass and recruitment (where the zero lag correlation represent the influence of spawning biomass on recruitment and the largest correlation of the negatively lagged correlations represents the influence of recruitment on spawning biomass), the average length of recruitment regimes, and the coefficient of variation in recruitment were taken from Szuwalski et al. (2015).

Variables important for determining the predictability of stocks were identified using a stepwise method similar to Genuer et al. (2010). Random forests were fit to the data using all identified predictor variables (table 1) and the variance explained (a 'pseudo-r') was calculated as 1-mean square error divided by the variance of the response variable. The predictor with the lowest importance score was dropped and random forests were fit to the data again. The resulting trajectory of percent variance explained can be used to indicate which variables are important. A vector of random numbers was also included as a predictor in each random forest to aid in the identification of important variables. Variables that performed more poorly than the random number vectors were not considered for inclusion in the final model.

## Results

Simulation and defining expected fishery dynamics

Consistent patterns arose in the estimated relationships between F and SB when GAMs were fit to data simulated from surplus production and effort-dynamics models (Eq. 2-3) regardless of the number of data points included. These consistent patterns form the basis for the 'expected dynamics' against which the RAM Legacy data will be compared. For example, the influence of F on changes in SB (which tracks the impact of fishing on the population) shows an inverse relationship (i.e. as F increases, SB decreases for the simulated data sets; solid lines; Figure 1). Consequently, we defined expected dynamics for this model class as only negative monotonic relationships. If this expectation is violated (i.e., no influence of F on SB ) then this implies that fisheries management cannot affect SB by changing F , which would render fisheries management ineffective.

The influence of SB on changes in SB reflects density-dependent effects manifested in the endogenous dynamics of the population. The relationship between changes in SB and SB was negative and monotonic for most simulated data sets (dot and dash line; Figure. 1). The mechanism behind this relationship can stem from different sorts of density dependence (e.g. direct cannibalism or competition for resources). Depensation at low stock sizes could also result in a concave relationship, but there is little evidence for depensation in fished marine stocks (Liermann, et al., 2001). Still, for the purposes of this analysis, expected relationships are defined as negative monotonic or concave relationships between changes in SB and SB.

The influence of SB on the change in F indicates how managers (or fishers) change F based on the perceived size of the stock. The change in F decreased as SB decreased in the simulated data sets (dotted line; Figure 1). This is conceptually intuitive because, even in the absence of management, as SB decreases the profitability of the fishery should decrease with a decreasing CPUE. If management is active, its primary job is to decrease $F$ when SB decreases past a certain point. However, hyperstability in the CPUE resulting from schooling behavior may allow F to remain high as SB decreases in open access situations and some management strategies eschew biomass-based metrics for constant fishing mortality rates. For this analysis, the 'expected' dynamic between changes in F and SB is one in which F decreases at low SB sizes because it is most consistent with management goals and open-access-however the size at
which this decrease occurs can be different between unregulated effort-dynamics and active fisheries management.

The influence of F on the change in F indicates the way in which managers (or fishers) change F in response to a perceived level of exploitation. For the simulated data sets, this relationship is either flat or convex with respect to SB (dashed line; Figure 1). However, any relationship between F and changes in F could be plausible, depending on the history of fishing and management. Consequently, we have placed no expectations on this relationship in this analysis (i.e. all forms of the relationship can be 'expected').

The results of this simulation exercise show that the GAMs can be used to estimate the relationship between SB and F , given the underlying dynamics of the system follow those that are most often assumed by fisheries managers. Predictions of changes in SB and F were nearly perfect for the longest simulated time series ( 60 years; RMSE $<0.001$ for both) using only the 'traditional dynamics' models from above (i.e. those in which the number of knots was construed to be 3 or fewer). This exercise also produced a baseline for 'expected dynamics' given a 'traditional' management paradigm.

## Application to global fisheries

For each stock, the functions $g()$ and $h()$ that describe the population and effort dynamics were estimated from the data with varying degrees of explanatory power. The predictability of changes in F and SB based on these fitted models varied significantly across large marine ecosystem (LME), recruitment variability, maximum weight of the species fished and the ratio of minimum and maximum observed SB , as indicated by the applied random forests (see Table 1 for a description of tested variables). Predictability of changes in SB also varied across maximum length of the species fished, while predictability of changes in F also varied among habitat types. In general, changes in SB were more predictable than changes in F, but there was a larger variety in predictability of F ( 0.17 vs . 0.73 MARE ; compare top rows of figure 2 ). The average F over the history of the fishery also influenced the predictability of changes in SB to some extent and the influence of recruitment on SB influenced the predictability of changes in F (figure 3).

Observed fishery dynamics often did not match the classical assumptions of fishery dynamics. Sixty-two percent of stocks displayed one of three patterns in fishery dynamics: $22 \%$ displayed all expected dynamics, $21 \%$ showed density dependence, but SB did not decrease as F increased, and $19 \%$ showed density dependence, but F did not increase as SB increased. In total, dynamics consistent with density-dependence appeared in $73 \%$ of stocks, and SB decreased as F increased for $54 \%$ of stocks. The proportion of stocks that displayed all expected dynamics varied significantly according to LME, the influence of recruitment on spawning biomass (as seen through the most significant lagged cross correlation), variability in recruitment, and average F (figure 4). Predictability did not markedly improve when moving from models with 3 knots to 5 knots (figure 5).

## Case studies

Predictability was often relatively high when a fishery responded as expected to changes in F and SB (and hence identifying and managing toward a target level of SB and $F$ was possible). Sablefish (Anoplopolma fimbria, Anoplopmatidae) in the eastern Bering Sea presented a good example of expected fishery dynamics (figure 6). SB began relatively high while F was low, SB decreased as $F$ increased, then $F$ decreased as SB declined further, after which SB subsequently rebounded. The resulting spiral in F vs. SB phase space was centered around the management target for the stock (Hanselman et al. 2013). Survey and CPUE data do not start until 1979, so the early part of the time series' of F and SB do not have informative data driving them. However, they could be removed and the same spiral (though a truncated version of it) would be seen in F vs. SB phase space. This spiral is what produces the 'predictability' of the system with classical models. Errors in predictions of changes in SB were $4 \%$ on average for the last 5 years of data ( $88^{\text {th }}$ percentile out of all stocks); errors in predicted Fs were $6 \%$ on average $\left(97^{\text {th }}\right.$ percentile),

Prediction was very difficult for some stocks, particularly short-lived species with variable recruitment. Pacific herring (Clupea pallasii, Clupeidae) in the Gulf of Alaska, was a good example of a stock with poor predictability ( $2^{\text {nd }}$ percentile and $1^{\text {st }}$ percentile for predictability in SB and F, respectively). A relatively long history of exploitation was captured in the assessment
for herring and large swings in abundance and fishing pressure were observed, during which much of the F vs SB phase space was explored (figure 6). However, the responses in a given area of the phase space were not consistent through the history of the fishery, which translated to poor predictive performance.

Some stocks were fished to low levels and never rebounded, even when fishing pressure was relaxed (a "one-way trip"). Ten percent of stocks in the analysis showed one-way trips, but determining if shifts in population dynamics or overfishing caused the collapses is often difficult. Walleye pollock (Theragra chalcogramma, Gadidae; figure 6) around the Aleutian Islands exhibits a 'one-way trip' hailed by some as the "most spectacular fishery collapse in North American history" and was attributed to overfishing (Bailey, 2011). However, changes in F for pollock were as expected (i.e. F decreases when SB was low), SB did not respond as expected (i.e. increase when F was low). Although changes in F were as expected, the timing of these changes was not immediate-there were several years during which SB was low, but F was still high, which suggests a lagged management response.

Counter-intuitive responses to fishing were common. For example, changes in F for skipjack tuna (Katsuwonus pelamis, Scombridae) in the Pacific Ocean produced very little change in SB—spawning biomass actually increased with increases in F (figure 6). This could be a result of relatively light fishing pressure and changes in the environment, but European plaice (Pleuronectes platessa, Pleuronectidae) on the Celtic-Biscay Shelf experienced relatively high and steady $F$ and showed similarly counter-intuitive patterns-SB changed independently of $F$ (figure 6). Responses like these run counter to the assumptions of most management strategies and corroborate evidence that population dynamics for many exploited species are influenced more strongly by the factors other than SB over the range of observed stock sizes (Szuwalski et al. 2015). Plots for all fisheries included in the analysis and supplementary references can be found in the supplementary materials.

## Discussion

Quantified gradients of predictability

Gradients of predictability imply gradients in both manageability and the appropriate precaution to be taken when calculating sustainable catches. This may be particularly important for stocks that have little management or are poorly understood, particularly when attempting to manage under the traditional paradigm of fishery dynamics. Quantifying and placing fishery dynamics in a global context (as we have done here) will allow for more appropriate incorporation of uncertainty in the study and management of exploited populations. The Precautionary Approach (i.e. when estimates of spawning biomass are uncertain, err on the side of conserving the stock; FAO 1996) is often invoked to address some of the uncertainty in estimates of SB and F due to model misspecification and process error, but there is no standardized way of determining an appropriate amount of precaution (although forecasting error may sometimes be a useful proxy; Ralston et al, 2011). Our finding suggest less-predictable stocks should be evaluated with greater caution than more-predictable stocks, given that SB or F is more likely to change unexpectedly for unpredictable stocks.

Climate change and increased variability has the potential to drastically influence the predictability of stocks. Fisheries managers' main sources of information when managing stocks are time series of catch, indices of abundance, and samples of the age and size distribution, from which the productivity and response of a population to exploitation can sometimes be inferred. However, if stock productivity is influenced by factors other than SB and large environmental changes occur, past observations of catch and estimates of abundance will be less informative about expected future productivity (Szuwalski and Hollowed, 2016). Changing trophic interactions over time may have similar influences on the predictability (Szuwalski et al., 2016). Under all the myriad influence, one-way trips (and the opposite circumstance in which productivity increases; e.g. Arrowtooth flounder in the Gulf of Alaska, Figure S6) may become more prevalent as the oceanic environment continues to change (Doney et al., 2012).

## Drivers of predictability

In general, variables identified by this analysis as important for predicting changes in SB and F make intuitive sense. Longer maximum lengths and higher maximum weights (which both are related to older maximum ages) buffer against large inter-annual changes in SB and therefore improve predictability of changes in SB. Higher CVs of recruitment can make predicting F and

SB more difficult, particularly if recruitment comprises a relatively large fraction of exploitable biomass. The influence of habitat on predictability of changes in F may stem from differential selectivity of gear types used in different habitats and differences in management (consider the targeting ability of a demersal trawl fishery and a pelagic purse seine fishery). LME was important for both changes in F and SB , perhaps due to differences in fisheries management or environmental forcing by geographic area. Higher minimum observed SB improved predictability in F and SB , perhaps because relatively low SB is correlated with increased variability in recruitment and hence less-predictable biomass dynamics (Minto et al. 2008). Stocks with all 'expected' fishery dynamics were more likely to have lower minimum observed SB, higher CVs around recruitment and a higher average F. These are all factors that predispose a stock to explore the F vs SB phase space more thoroughly.

## Implications for model suitability

We show 'classical’ production models do not effectively predict the dynamics of a large fraction of global fisheries, but many fisheries have sufficient data to perform assessments that incorporate age-at-length sampling data, tagging data, or other information. Additional biological information may improve predictability for changes in SB in many cases and the stock assessments from which the estimated time series of F and SB were drawn would likely predict changes in SB better than the presented models. For example, age-composition information will inform estimates of past recruitment and provide information regarding somatic growth in a given year (Ono et al., 2015; however, incorporation of additional biological data does not always decrease uncertainty in management quantities, Kell et al. 2016). Similarly, information regarding fishery characteristics (profitability, management changes, nominal effort) may increase predictability for F (Sethi et al, 2010; Menychuk, et al., 2013). Nevertheless, our results provide a lower-bound on predictability and can be used to identify relatively unpredictable stocks, which could then be managed with greater precaution. Furthermore, the concept encapsulated by our analysis (e.g. testing the predictability of a given modeling framework for both simulated and real data) should occupy a central point of any management effort.

Upwards of $80 \%$ of worldwide fisheries are unassessed and minimally managed, and interest is high in improving assessment and management for these fisheries (Thorson et al., 2012; Costello
et al., 2012). However, data for assessment are often few. Methods that only require catch time series are being explored to assess and manage fisheries (Martell and Froese, 2012; MacCall, 2009), but the debate concerning the information content of catch time series' is ongoing (Hilborn and Branch, 2013 vs. Pauly, 2013). Catch only methods can be justified if fisheries dynamics match the assumed dynamics of the prevailing fisheries paradigm (Thorson et al., 2013), yet this match is only apparent in $22 \%$ of assessed fisheries in our analysis. This suggests that, although there is a subset of stocks for which catch-only methods might be possible, catch is often not a reliable indicator of biomass in the larger scale fisheries examined here (this may not be the case for small scale and subsistence fisheries).

## Implications for management strategies

Simulation frameworks (e.g. management strategy evaluation, Smith et al, 1999) are often used to test harvest strategies under a variety of assumed population and effort dynamics. However, simulation testing requires speculation about what scenarios are plausible or likely (Carpenter, 2002; Rochet and Rice, 2009). Region-specific meta-analysis may provide improved baselines for simulating scenarios, but our study shows that unpredictable fishery dynamics are more the rule than the exception, and hence rapid changes in F or SB independent of the current level of F or SB should be explored. Similarly, environmental and/or regime shift scenarios for biomass dynamics are common in the populations analyzed here and management strategies should be explored that are robust to these changes (e.g. Szuwalski and Punt, 2013). For many of the unassessed stocks globally, collection of data required for assessment can be prohibitively expensive. Simulation studies are increasingly being suggested for use to identify management strategies that are robust to a range of fishery dynamics (Bentley and Stokes, 2009; Punt, 2008), but have been criticized for the lack of variety in the assumed simulation dynamics (Rochet and Rice, 2009). We therefore recommend that future simulation studies explore both predictable dynamics (i.e., density dependent population dynamics combined with endogenous effort dynamics), unpredictable dynamics (i.e., regime-based population dynamics combined with rapid shifts in fishing pressure), and non-linear dynamics (as those suggested by Glaser et al., 2015).

Successful fisheries management requires an understanding of a population's response to exploitation and changes in the environment, if not on a mechanistic level, at least on a predictive level. Some failures in fisheries management can be traced to incorrect assumptions about population dynamics (e.g. Walters and Maguire, 1999). Consequently, regular checks that the dynamics of F and SB (and recruitment dynamics) in a population are operating as assumed should become a regular part of assessment and management. The ability of capture fisheries to continue to support global protein needs depends on our ability to sustainably manage exploited populations; fisheries managers must more thoroughly examine the way in which they expect a population to behave to ensure sustainable harvest.
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| Predictor | Description |
| :---: | :---: |
| Maximum length | Maximum body length achieved by a species |
| Maximum weight | Maximum body weight achieved by a species |
| Maximum age | Maximum age achieved by a species |
| Habitat | Major habitat occupied by a species (e.g. coral reef, pelagic, demersal) |
| LME | Large marine ecosystem |
| Management | Managing body for the stock (e.g. DFO, NMFS, ICCAT) |
| Assessment | Method of assessment (e.g. VPA, SCAA, Production model) |
| Order | Phylogenetic order (e.g. Scorpaeniformes) |
| Average F | Average estimated fishing mortality experienced of the period of assessment |
| Ratio of minimum and maximum $\qquad$ observed | Minimum estimated spawning biomass over the period of assessment, calculated as a fraction of the maximum observed spawning biomass |
| SB |  |
| Lagged CCF | Most significant negatively lagged crosscorrelation between spawning biomass and recruitment (indicates the influence of recruitment on SB) |
| Recruitment Drivers | Drivers of recruitment dynamics as indicated by Szuwalski et al. 2015 |
| Length | Length of the time series for a given stock in this analysis |
| Zero CCF | Magnitude of the Spearman's correlation of between spawning biomass and recruitment |
| Coefficient of | Quantifies the variability in recruitment |

Figure 1. Simulated fishing mortality (F. mort), spawning biomass (Sp.Bio.) from a production model with effort dynamics determining catch. The middle row plots the trajectory of the stock through F and SB phase space; white are the oldest observations, black are the newest. The bottom row plots the fitted relationship between changes in F or SB to current F or SB. Each column represents a different number of years of simulated data and/or starting observation at different points in the exploitation history.

Figure 2. Variables identified as important in predicting changes in F and SB via random forest. Changes in F or SB are increasingly predictable (measured in mean absolute relative error [MARE]) towards the right of the graph. LMEs for which data for at least 5 stocks were included in the LME plot.

Figure 3. Percent variability explained for changes in fishing mortality ( F ) and spawning biomass (SB) via random forest as terms are removed from the model. Vertical dashed line in each represents the random number vector and the variables to the right were retained in the models presented.

Figure 4. Frequency of combinations of fishery dynamics and probability of all expected dynamics. Below the histogram of observed dynamics (top), the probability of observing all expected dynamics (i.e. active management and stationary, density-dependent population dynamics) given 4 variables identified as important by random forests (lagged CCF indicates the most significant negatively lagged cross correlation). Shaded areas represent $95 \%$ confidence intervals.


Figure 5. Changes in root mean square error (RMSE) when moving from estimating the dynamics of SB and F using GAMs with 3 knots to 5 knots. A decrease in RMSE indicates improved predietive ability.

Figure 6. Example stocks on the spectrum of predictability. Estimated fishing mortality (F mort), spawning biomass (Sp.Bio.) and recruits are in the top row. The middle row plots the trajectory of the stock through F and SB phase space; white are the oldest observations, black are the
newest. The bottom row plots the fitted relationship between changes in F or SB to current F or SB.
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