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#### Abstract

Pollack in ICES subarea 8 and division 9a is considered a Data-Limited Stock and classified by ICES in category 5.2. The insufficient data for this stock prevented to perform an analytical assessment with a traditional model. Three length-based approaches were tested for assessing the status of pollack stock: Length-Based Indicators, Length Based Spawning Potential Ratio, and Length-based Integrated Mixed Effects. The three model results indicated that pollack stock was slightly overexploited in 2019 (F > Ftarget) and the SPR is below the SPR target. There is a high uncertainty in the estimation of stock status using these models and, due to their sensitive to input parameters, more sensitivity analysis should be conducted.


## 1 Introduction

The pollack, Pollachius pollachius Linneo, 1758 is a gadid species, that is restricted to the Northeast Atlantic with a main distribution from the Portuguese continental coast northwards around the British Isles, into the Skagerrak and along the Norwegian coast where it is fairly common up to the Lofoten Islands. Juvenile of pollack inhabits in shallow waters and adults migrate to deeper areas 40-100 meters). During the spawning season, adults create groups of high density. The pollack in ICES subarea 8 and division 9a, pol.27.8.9a, is mainly exploited by France, responsible for more than $70 \%$ of commercial landings, following by Spain and Portugal. The management advice for this stock is provided on a precautionary approach basis, and considering the trend on commercial landings. Latest ICES advice for pol.27.8.9a recommended that commercial catches in each of the years 2020 and 2021 should be no more than 1131 tones.

In data-limited stocks, length-frequency data from commercial catches are often the primary data type that are collected because to its ease and low cost of being collected. As a result, numerous length-based methods have been recently developed. The overall objective of this study is to analyse the suitability of length-based methods to assess the stock status of pol.27.8.9a.

## 2. Material and Methods

A set of length compositions of commercial landings, annual and gear-combined, for the period 2010-2019 was considered for three length based approaches (Figure 1). The life history parameters used as input data in the models and their source are presented in Table 1.

The length-based approaches used for this analysis are described below:

Length Based Indicators (LBI)

A set of length-based indicators representing the conservation of large and immature individuals, optimal yield and maximum sustainable yield were defined at WKLIFE2015 (ICES, 2015), and are presented in Table 2. Length-frequency data are often available for exploited stocks, and it was proposed to use them for estimating indicators that reflect size-selective fishing pressure. Indicators of status are compared to reference points that are derived from lifehistory parameters and ecological theory. The suite of indicators with corresponding reference points, indicator ratio and expected value are shown in Table 2.

The data requirements to estimate LBI are indicated in Table 1. The main assumptions of the LBI theory are that the fishing gear selectivity is asymptotic and the population is in equilibrium: constant selection, fishing mortality and recruitment over time. Analyses were conducted using the R script utilities.R available at ICES github repository: https://github.com/ices-tools-dev/LBIndicator_shiny.

Length based spawning potential ratio (LB-SPR)

LB-SPR model uses the characteristics of two life history ratios: $\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{K}$ and $\mathrm{L} 50 / \mathrm{L} \infty$, to analyse the shape of adult length-frequency distributions and to estimate the selectivity ogive, relative fishing pressure ( $\mathrm{F} / \mathrm{M}$ ) applied to stocks, and the resulting spawning potential ratio (SPR). SPR is defined as the proportion of the unfished reproductive potential left at any given level of fishing pressure (Hordyk et al., 2015). SPR is $100 \%$ in an unexploited stock, and $0 \%$ in a stock with no spawning. LB-SPR model relies on many assumptions listed in the referenced papers, being some of them: the assumption of equilibrium conditions, that the length composition data is representative of the exploited population, and a logistic-type selectivity. The input data to LB-SPR are indicated in Table 1. The length-structured version of the LB-SPR model, using growth-type-groups (GTG) to account for size-based selectivity, was applied for pollack stock. The analyses were conducted using the R package LBSPR v0.1.5 (Hordyk, 2019).

## Length-based integrated mixed effects (LIME)

LIME model relaxes the equilibrium assumptions of LBSPR method, accounting for timevarying recruitment and fishing mortality while assuming constant selectivity for the whole time series (Rudd and Thorson, 2018). Length data and biological information are used to estimate $F$ and SPR. LIME uses automatic differentiation and Laplace approximations to calculate the marginal likelihood for the mixed-effects. LIME has the same data-requirements as LB-SPR plus assumed uncertainty for recruitment and fishing mortality (Table 1). The LIME analysis was performed using the R package LIME v2.1.3. (Rudd and Thorson, 2018).

## 3. Results

The results presented here are not the final versions and they are showed with the purpose of serving as initial point to consider new assessment methods for pol.27.8.9a.

The LBI results are compared to suggested reference points in the traffic light table (Table 3). The conservation parameters for immature were only green ( $L_{25 \%} / L_{m a t}, \mathrm{Lc} / \mathrm{Lmat}$ ) during 20112013. Large fish constitute a small part of landings (Pmega < 0.13). The optimizing yield indicator (Lmean/Lopt) has been below the desirable values of 0.9, showing that the fish caught may be too small. The MSY indicator ( $\mathrm{Lc} / \mathrm{L}_{(\mathrm{F}=\mathrm{M})}$ ) was $>1$ in 2017 and 2018, but in 2019 it decreased to 0.97. There is not strong evidence of important overexploitation. The time-series of indicators and indicators ratios (Figure 2) show that the levels of conservation and maximum sustainable yield indicators have been relatively stable throughout the last ten years.

Figure 3 shows annual selectivity curves fitted by the LB-SPR model and the maturity ogive, no particular trend of length in the catch has been detected in recent years. The LB-SPRT smooth results indicated that SPR values were below the SPR 30-40\% range in all years (Figure 4) and therefore can be considered to be below proxies that would be consistent with high long-term yields. Except in 2015 and 2017, the $\mathrm{F} / \mathrm{M}$ ratios were above $\mathrm{F} / \mathrm{M}=1$, what implies an exploitation above $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{MSY}}$ (Table 4). In 2019 the raw $\mathrm{F} / \mathrm{M}$ was 1.03 , slightly above the proxy for Fmsy.

LIME model fits an unique selectivity ogive for the whole time series, and for pollack L50 and L95 were estimated at 39 and 50 cm , respectively (Table 5). LIME estimated SPR in 2019 to have been 0.32 , but with high uncertainty ( $95 \%$ CI: $0.03-0.61$ ). Fishing mortality estimates were above $\mathrm{F}_{40 \%}$ reference point $(0.25)$ for the whole time series, indicating that the pollack stock has been overfished (Figure 5).

Figure 6 compares the SPR estimates obtained from LIME and LB-SPR methods for 2019. Both estimates were below the SPR target 0.4, although the LIME SPR2019 estimate is more optimistic than the LB-SPR 0.24 ( $95 \% \mathrm{CI}: 0.21-0.27$ ).

## 4. Conclusions

The performance of the length-based models indicates that these methods may be a good approach to assess the stock status of pollack. Sensitivity analysis should be conducted to evaluate the impact of input parameter in the results.
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Table 1. Input data for pollack in 8 and 9a (pol.27.89a) for the three length-based models tested.

| Parameter | symbol | value | source | LBI | LBSPR | LIME |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Length-frequency data | LD |  | Annual, gear-combined |  |  |  |
| Length were $50 \%$ of the fish are mature | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{L}_{50} \\ & (\mathrm{~cm}) \end{aligned}$ | 42.3 | Alonso et al., 2013 |  |  |  |
| Length were $95 \%$ of the fish are mature | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { L95 } \\ (\mathrm{cm}) \end{array}$ | 58 | Alonso et al., 2013 |  |  |  |
| von Bertalanffy growth parameter | K | 0.182 | Alemany, 2017 |  |  |  |
| Von Bertalanffy asymptotic Length | $\mathrm{L}^{\infty}$ | 92.8 | Alemany, 2017 |  |  |  |
| Theoretical age at length $=0$ | to <br> (years) | -0.935 | Alemany, 2017 |  |  |  |
| Length-weight relationship parameter a | a | $1.09 \mathrm{e}^{-5}$ | Leauté et al., 2018 |  |  |  |
| Length-weight relationship parameter b | b | 3.0044 | Leauté et al., 2018 |  |  |  |
| Natural Mortality (fixed) | M <br> (year ${ }^{-1}$ ) | 0.32 | M-metanalysis |  |  |  |
| M/K invariant | M/K | 1.8 | M/K |  |  |  |
| Coefficient of variation of von Bertalanffy asymptotic le | CV Linf | 0.1 | Assumed |  |  |  |
| Steepness | h | 0.7 | Assumed |  |  |  |
| Recruitment deviation | OR | 0.4 | Assumed |  |  |  |
| Fishing mortality deviation | OF | 0.1 | Assumed |  |  |  |

Table 2. Length-based indicators to assess the stock status. Reference, IndicatorRatio and expected values are indicated.

| Property | Indicator | Calculation | Reference | IndicatorRatio | ExpectedValue |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Conservation Large individuals | Lmax5\% | Mean length of largest 5\% | Linf | Lmax5\% / Linf | $>0.8$ |
|  | L95\% | $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile | Linf | L95\% / Linf | $>0.8$ |
|  | Pmega | Proportion of individuals above Lopt + 10\% | 0.3-0.4 | Pmega | $>0.3$ |
| Conservation Immatures | L25\% | 25th percentile of length distribution | Lmat | L25\% / Lmat | >1 |
|  | LC | Length at first catch (length at 50\% of mode) | Lmat | Lc / Lmat | >1 |
| Optimal yield | Lmean | Mean length of individuals > Lc | Lopt $=2 / 3 \operatorname{Linf}$ | Lmean/Lopt | -1 |
|  | Lmaxy | Length class with maximum biomass in catch | Lopt $=2 / 3$ Linf * | Lmaxy / Lopt | -1 |
| MSY | Lmean | Mean length of individuals > Lc | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{LF}=\mathrm{M}= \\ & (0.75 \mathrm{Lc}+0.25 \mathrm{Linf})^{*} \end{aligned}$ | Lmean / LF=M | >=1 |

* If $M / K$ ! $=1.5$ : Lopt=3? Linf/(3+(M/k)) ; L(F=M) = (1 ? a) *Lc + a *Linf; $a=1 / 2 *(M / k)+1$

Table 3. LBI results. Output table with indications of status compared to reference points for pol.27.8.9a. Green cell: indicator suggests that the stock is in a desirable state relative to the reference; red cell: negative state.

| Year | Conservation |  |  |  | Optimizing | MSY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Lc/Lmat | L25/Lmat | Lmax5/Linf | Pmega | Lmean/Lopt | Lmean/LFeM |
| 2010 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.72 | 0.03 | 0.69 | 0.89 |
| 2011 | 1.18 | 1.18 | 0.80 | 0.07 | 0.94 | 0.95 |
| 2012 | 1.18 | 1.18 | 0.80 | 0.11 | 0.98 | 0.99 |
| 2013 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 0.79 | 0.12 | 0.92 | 0.98 |
| 2014 | 0.80 | 0.99 | 0.77 | 0.10 | 0.86 | 1.10 |
| 2015 | 0.71 | 0.80 | 0.74 | 0.04 | 0.72 | 0.99 |
| 2016 | 0.80 | 0.90 | 0.71 | 0.03 | 0.74 | 0.94 |
| 2017 | 0.80 | 0.90 | 0.80 | 0.09 | 0.82 | 1.04 |
| 2018 | 0.80 | 0.99 | 0.82 | 0.11 | 0.89 | 1.14 |
| 2019 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 0.76 | 0.04 | 0.76 | 0.97 |

Table 4. LBSPR annual raw estimates of selectivity (SL50, SL95), fishing pressure (F/M) and spawning potential ratio (SPR).

| Year | SL50 | SL95 | FM | SPR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010 | 31.5 | 33.4 | 2.00 | 0.12 |
| 2011 | 50.3 | 61.7 | 2.42 | 0.26 |
| 2012 | 52.0 | 64.9 | 1.87 | 0.32 |
| 2013 | 44.6 | 52.9 | 1.34 | 0.31 |
| 2014 | 62.7 | 88.9 | 4.25 | 0.27 |
| 2015 | 26.9 | 31.9 | 0.96 | 0.24 |
| 2016 | 35.0 | 40.1 | 1.93 | 0.14 |
| 2017 | 34.9 | 49.8 | 0.90 | 0.31 |
| 2018 | 54.5 | 78.9 | 1.93 | 0.32 |
| 2019 | 30.5 | 35.3 | 1.03 | 0.24 |

Table 5. LIME estimates of selectivity (SL50, SL95), fishing pressure ( $\mathrm{F} / \mathrm{F} 40 \%$ ) and spawning potential ratio (SPR).

| Year | SL50 (cm) | SL95 (cm) | F/F40\% | SPR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2010 | 39.1 | 49.9 | 1.24 | 0.34 |
| 2011 | 39.1 | 49.9 | 1.33 | 0.32 |
| 2012 | 39.1 | 49.9 | 1.55 | 0.29 |
| 2013 | 39.1 | 49.9 | 1.70 | 0.27 |
| 2014 | 39.1 | 49.9 | 1.71 | 0.26 |
| 2015 | 39.1 | 49.9 | 1.46 | 0.30 |
| 2016 | 39.1 | 49.9 | 1.34 | 0.32 |
| 2017 | 39.1 | 49.9 | 1.29 | 0.33 |
| 2018 | 39.1 | 49.9 | 1.35 | 0.32 |
| 2019 | 39.1 | 49.9 | 1.35 | 0.32 |



Figure 1. Length frequency distribution of Pollack landings from 2010 to 2019.


Figure 2. LBI results. Time-series indicators (left side) and indicators ratios (right side).


Figure 3. LBSPR results. Maturity at length and selectivity curves for pol.27.8.9a.


Figure 4 LBSPR results. Proxy of stock status for pol.27.89a stock.


Figure 5. LIME estimates for pollack fishing mortality, recruitment, mean length, relative spawning biomass, and selectivity (blue line: mean-length of catches, red line=Linf) using the annual length composition data.


Figure 6. Comparison of SPR estimates obtained by LIME and LB-SPR.

