

On the pile-up effect and priors for Linf and M/K: Response to a Comment by Hordyk et al. on "A new approach for estimating stock status from length frequency data"

Journal:	<i>ICES Journal of Marine Science</i>
Manuscript ID	ICESJMS-2018-547
Manuscript Types:	Reply
Date Submitted by the Author:	25-Nov-2018
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Froese, Rainer; GEOMAR, Helmholtz Centre for Ocean Research, Marine Ecology Winker, Henning; South African National Biodiversity Institute, Kirstenbosch Research Centre Coro, Gianpaolo; CNR, ISTI Demirel, Nazli; Istanbul Universitesi, Institute of Marine Sciences and Management; Istanbul University Tsikliras, Athanassios; Aristotle University of Thessaloniki Faculty of Sciences, Biology Dimarchopoulou, Donna; Aristotle University of Thessaloniki Faculty of Sciences, Biology Scarcella, Giuseppe; CNR-ISMAR, Probst, Wolfgang Nikolaus ; Thünen Institute of Sea Fisheries Dureuil, Manuel; Dalhousie University, Biology Pauly, Daniel; University of British Columbia,</p>
Keyword:	biomass depletion, data-poor stocks, healthy size structure, length frequency analysis, M/K, proxies for MSY, MSFD

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

ICESJMS-2018-547 (EA) Response article

On the pile-up effect and priors for L_{inf} and M/K : Response to a Comment by Hordyk *et al.* on “A new approach for estimating stock status from length frequency data”

Rainer Froese^{1*}, Henning Winker^{2,3}, Gianpaolo Coro⁴, Nazli Demirel⁵, Athanassios C. Tsikliras⁶, Donna Dimarchopoulou⁶, Giuseppe Scarcella⁷, Wolfgang Nikolaus Probst⁸, Manuel Dureuil^{9,10}, and Daniel Pauly¹¹

¹ GEOMAR Helmholtz Centre for Ocean Research, Düsternbrooker Weg 20, 24105 Kiel, Germany

² DAFF - Department of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries, Private Bag X2, Vlaeberg, South Africa

³ Centre for Statistics in Ecology, Environment and Conservation, Department of Statistical Sciences, University of Cape Town, Private Bag X3 Rondebosch, South Africa

⁴ Institute of Information Science and Technologies "A. Faedo" - National Research Council of Italy (ISTI-CNR), via Moruzzi 1, 56124 Pisa, Italy

⁵ Institute of Marine Sciences and Management, Istanbul University, Istanbul 34134, Turkey

⁶ Laboratory of Ichthyology, School of Biology, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 54124 Thessaloniki, Greece

⁷ Institute of Marine Science - National Research Council of Italy (ISMAR-CNR), L.go Fiera della Pesca, 60125 Ancona, Italy

⁸ Thünen Institute of Sea Fisheries, Herwigstraße 31, 27572 Bremerhaven, Germany

⁹ Department of Biology, Dalhousie University, 1355 Oxford St., PO BOX 15000, Halifax, NS, B3H 4R2, Canada

¹⁰ Sharks of the Atlantic Research and Conservation Centre, Halifax, NS, B3L 2Y5, Canada

¹¹ Sea Around Us, Institute for the Ocean and Fisheries, University of British Columbia, 2202 Main Mall, Vancouver, BC, V6T 1Z4, Canada

*Corresponding author: tel: +49 431 600 4579; fax: +49 431 600 1699; e-mail: rfroese@geomar.de

In a comment on “A new approach [(LBB)] for estimating stock status from length frequency data” by Froese *et al.* (2018), Hordyk *et al.* (2018) propose (i) that the master equation of LBB is incomplete because it does not correct for the pile-up effect in length frequency bins, (ii) that LBB is highly sensitive to equilibrium assumptions and wrongly uses maximum observed length (L_{max}) for guidance when setting a prior for the estimation of asymptotic length (L_{inf}), and (iii) that the default prior used by LBB for the ratio between natural mortality and somatic growth rate (M/K) of 1.5 ($s.d. = 0.15$) is inadequate for many exploited species. In our response, we show that (i) the assumptions by Hordyk *et al.* (2018) about the pile-up effect are not realistic for most stocks and sampling schemes and that the proposed correction actually worsens results obtained for 34 real-world stocks, (ii) L_{max} values do provide reasonable priors for L_{inf} , and (iii) the default prior of $M/K = 1.5$ ($s.d. = 0.15$) is appropriate for species whose longevity coincides with their approaching L_{inf} .

Keywords: Please provide some keywords

Introduction

There is a recognized need for new methods with modest data requirements to provide preliminary estimates of stock status for data-limited stocks (e.g. Rudd and Thorson, 2018). Froese *et al.* (2018) provide such a method, which derives estimates of relative stock size from length frequency (LF) data of exploited stocks. They show that their length-based Bayesian biomass estimation method (LBB) can reproduce the “true” parameters used in simulated data and can approximate the relative stock size as estimated independently by more data-demanding methods in 34 real stocks.

However, in a comment on LBB, Hordyk *et al.* (2018) claim (i) that the master equation of LBB is incomplete because it does not correct for the pile-up effect caused by aggregating length measurements into length classes or “bins”, (ii) that LBB is highly sensitive to equilibrium assumptions and wrongly uses maximum observed length (L_{max}) for guidance in setting a prior for the estimation of asymptotic length (L_{inf}), and (iii) that the default prior used by LBB for the ratio between natural mortality and somatic growth rate (M/K) of 1.5 ($s.d. = 0.15$) is inadequate for many exploited species. These comments are addressed below.

Understanding the pile-up effect

To understand the pile-up (Baranov, 1918) of abundance observations in length classes used as bins in LF analyses (van Sickle, 1977; Pauly, 1984; Hordyk *et al.*, 2018), let us consider a thought experiment where 1000 post-larval fish of 0.5 cm length at 0.1 years of age are released in a pond. All individuals are assumed to have identical growth, with $L_{inf} = 100$ cm, $K = 0.133$ year⁻¹ and $t_0 = -0.0624$ year. Natural mortality in the pond is assumed as a constant $M = 0.2$ year⁻¹ over all life stages. Fishing is conducted continuously with a gear of trawl-like selectivity retaining 50% of individuals of 50 cm length and 95% of individuals of 55 cm length. Mortality caused by fishing is set at $F = 0.2$ year⁻¹. Two hypothetical sampling strategies are applied which obtain accurate counts of the numbers of individuals that are vulnerable to the fishing gear without harming or removing individuals. The first sampling strategy involves taking samples at time-intervals of 0.1 year and is called “fixed-time” sampling. The second strategy takes samples at intervals corresponding to the time required by the fish to grow through a length class and is called “fixed-length” sampling. If the numbers obtained by these two sampling strategies are plotted over length and the observations are connected by smoothed curves, they give identical continuous representations of vulnerable individuals at length (see Figure 1a, where the fixed-length-based measurements are represented by a curve and the fixed-time-based measurements are represented by dots which exactly overlay the curve).

For practical reasons, it is common to aggregate frequencies that fall within a certain length range, i.e. a length class or bin. If, for example, observed fixed-length-based frequencies are summed up in bins of 2 cm width, then four observations of 0.5 cm difference in lengths will fall into the same bin. The resulting histogram is shown in Figure 1b, and its shape is a good representation of the continuous LF represented by the thin overlaid age-based curve.

However, if the same aggregation is done with the fixed-time-based observations, then fewer than four observations will fall into length bins at lower length, and increasingly more than four observations will fall into bins at larger lengths. This leads to a distortion of the true LF distribution, as indicated by the dots in Figure 1b. Applying the correction proposed by Hordyk *et al.* (2018) to the fixed-time-based frequencies sampled in steps of 0.5 cm does indeed account for this pile-up effect, as can be seen in Figure 1c, where the corrected continuous frequency curve provides a good fit for dots resulting from the uneven accumulation of fixed-time-based frequencies in length bins of the same width.

1
2
3
4 Thus, the “continuous time population model” proposed by Hordyk *et al.* (2018) as
5 universally applicable to LF data assumes frequent sampling at small time-intervals. If such
6 sampling is done across cohorts instead of following a single cohort, then the continuous time
7 population model also assumes continuous recruitment.

8 But, is continuous sampling a good and general representation of the real sampling
9 effort behind available length frequency data? For example, if the cohort in the thought
10 experiment is sampled only once per year, the pile-up effect disappears and the frequencies
11 reflect the original unbiased distribution (Figure 1d). Applying a correction for pile-up to
12 these data would introduce a bias that overestimates exploitation rate and thus biases the
13 assessment of stock status.

14
15 In the real world, sampling across cohorts is the standard, and both sampling schemes
16 and recruitment are usually not continuous. Also, fish growth and mortality in the real world
17 are not deterministic, and different assumptions about the covariation of L_{inf} , K , and M lead to
18 different distributions of length-at-age and consequently to different survival schemes under
19 length-based gear selection. Simulated data that reflect the assumptions of the model will
20 always result in better fits than data generated with deviating assumptions (e.g. Hordyk *et al.*
21 2016). In other words, while simulations are important to verify that a model can reproduce
22 the “true” parameter values and to test for sensitivities and limits of applicability, real-world
23 data are needed to best evaluate the usefulness of a model in comparison with results
24 obtained with other, data-rich models.

25
26 Tables S1 and S2 in the Supplementary material show an evaluation of exploitation
27 and stock status based on (a) the original LBB master equation, (b) the LBB equation with
28 pile-up correction, and (c) the LBSPR method of Hordyk *et al.* (2016) proposed by Hordyk *et al.*
29 2018) as an alternative to LBB, with all compared to respective estimates provided by
30 independent assessments. The results are summarized in Table 1. As can be seen, both the
31 LBB with pile-up correction and the LBSPR method gave less satisfactory results than the
32 original (uncorrected) LBB master equation.

33
34 Froese *et al.* (2018) stress that “LBB estimates represent the average F/M over the
35 past years, back to when the fish now in the largest length class became vulnerable to
36 fishing” and F/M estimates are, therefore, “not recommended as reliable proxies for current
37 fishing pressure.” Also, in the independent stock assessments used in the comparison, F_{msy} is
38 often larger than M , thus explaining, in part, the significant positive differences found in 56%
39 of the cases when LBB estimates of F/M were compared to independent estimates of F/F_{msy}
40 (Table 1 and Table S2 in the Supplementary material). The target result of LBB is stock
41 status as expressed by current biomass relative to unexploited biomass (B/B_0) or relative to
42 the biomass that can produce maximum sustainable yields (B/B_{msy}). These LBB estimates are
43 similar to the independent stock status estimates in 86% of the cases (Table 1 and Table S2 in
44 the Supplementary material). In contrast, for the corrected LBB, 57% of the stock status
45 estimates were similar, and for LBSPR, less than half (48%). Note that LBSPR gives
46 estimates of spawning potential ratio (SPR), where values below 0.2 ($\approx 0.5 B/B_{msy}$) indicate
47 depletion and values above 0.4 ($\approx 1.0 B/B_{msy}$) indicate good stock status. Note also that the
48 95% confidence limits provided by LBSPR are unrealistically narrow, sometimes close to
49 deterministic, which partly explains their very low matching score.

50
51 The 34 stocks used in the evaluation were temperate and subtropical species with
52 annual peaks in recruitment and often seasonal rather than continuous sampling schemes
53 (Table S1 in the Supplementary material). Results may have been different if tropical species
54 with more continuous recruitment (Pauly and Navaluna, 1983) and sampling schemes had
55 been analyzed.

56
57 The new LBB version that is available from <https://oceanrep.geomar.de/>, therefore,
58 contains three options: (i) use the original LBB equation, (ii) correct for the pile-up effect, or
59

(iii)) let the Bayesian model determine the degree of correction based on the best fit to the available data.

Sensitivity of LBB results to assumed or estimated values of L_{inf}

Hordyk *et al.* (2018) correctly note that LBB results, similar to other length-based methods, are sensitive to assumptions about asymptotic length L_{inf} , and that unrealistically high values of L_{inf} lead to an overestimation of exploitation rate, and vice versa. In LBB, asymptotic length is not a required input, but is estimated by the Bayesian model. A default prior for L_{inf} is derived by a least-squares regression of the fully-selected LF data aggregated across years. Alternatively, “[i]f a good estimate of L_{inf} is available from an independent study, this value can be introduced by the user, [...]” (Froese *et al.* 2018, p. 2). Care must then be taken to perform this potentially subjective selection of L_{inf} as guided by pre-established, objective criteria, such as taking the median of existing studies for the area from FishBase (Froese and Pauly, 2018), ignoring studies previously marked by FishBase staff as questionable.

Hordyk *et al.* (2018) suggest that the maximum length observed in LF data provides “an upward-biased estimator” of L_{inf} and that, as a rule, L_{inf} should be smaller than L_{max} . As stated above, LBB does not require a fixed value of L_{inf} as input, but rather estimates L_{inf} from the available data, while considering a prior derived either from aggregated LF data or provided by the user. Comparing 199 estimates of L_{inf} derived from length-at-age data with observed L_{max} for the respective stocks for 155 species in 51 countries shows that L_{max} is actually a reasonable predictor of L_{inf} (Figure 2), accounting for 96% of the variability in the data, with slope and intercept not significantly different from a 1:1 line. In other words, these data, which comprise all stocks in FishBase 06/2018 (Froese and Pauly, 2018), where sex, country, locality, and length-type were identical for independent estimates of L_{inf} and L_{max} , refute the claim by Hordyk *et al.* (2018) that L_{max} is an upward-biased estimator of L_{inf} . While the prior for L_{inf} does influence the results of LBB, this is actually welcome, because reasonable prior information about L_{inf} is much easier to obtain than, for example, prior information on growth or mortality rates. However, to better reflect the distribution of L_{max} values around the 1:1 line in Figure 2, the new version of LBB uses the median L_{max} across the analyzed years rather than the overall maximum length as the starting value for the least-squares regression that estimates the prior for L_{inf} and Z/K .

On the variability of M/K

Hordyk *et al.* (2018) claim that Froese *et al.* (2018) misrepresent the analysis of potential M/K values in Hordyk *et al.* (2015). While that study indeed explores a very wide range of hypothetical M/K values, it clearly states (p. 226) that “[f]or a species that conforms to the Beverton–Holt invariant $M/K \approx 1.5$, the maximum size (L_{max} ; i.e. the length at t_{max}) is 0.95 L_{inf} .” This confirms the rule of thumb proposed in Froese *et al.* (2018, p. 6) that “[...] in LF distributions where only few individuals survive to approximate L_{inf} , it is reasonable to assume an M/K prior of 1.5.”

If users of LBB have strong evidence for M/K values outside of the assumed default range of 1.2–1.8, they can easily provide their own M/K prior value. Froese *et al.* (2018, p. 4 and 9) state explicitly that LBB shall only be used on “[s]uitable LF samples that show an asymmetric pattern” similar to the examples given in that paper and that LBB shall explicitly not be used on LF samples that “show an unusual normal distribution of high frequencies around reasonable estimates of L_{inf} ”, because such distribution violates the assumption of continuous growth. Thus, the upper and lower left frequency patterns shown in Figure 1 of Hordyk *et al.* (2018), which incidentally are not supported by any real-world data that the authors of this study are aware of, were already explicitly excluded from LBB analysis.

Consideration of recruitment in LBB

Hordyk *et al.* (2018) incorrectly suggest that the relative biomass estimates of LBB do not account for reduced recruitment at depleted stock sizes and that “[LBB] estimates of F_{msy} are equivalent to estimates of F_{max} from a conventional yield-per-recruit model [...]” Instead, LBB assumes a hockey-stick stock–recruitment relationship (Barrowman and Myers, 2000; Froese *et al.*, 2016), where relative yield per recruit and thus productivity declines linearly with biomass if predicted biomass is less than half of the proxy used for B/B_{msy} . Also, Froese *et al.* (2018) warned (even in their abstract) that LBB results will be misleading “if length frequencies resulting from the interplay of growth and mortality are masked by strong recruitment pulses.” Finally, LBB does not estimate F_{msy} or F_{max} , but F/M .

Summary

In summary, we thank Hordyk *et al.* (2018) for pointing out a typographical error in one of our equations, which has meanwhile been fixed in the online version of Froese *et al.* (2018) and addressed in a corrigendum for the printed version. We agree with Hordyk *et al.* (2018) that accounting for the pile-up effect in binned length frequency samples may be appropriate in, for example, tropical species with continuous reproduction, and we have provided for such correction as an option in the latest version of the LBB software. We note, however, that this correction as well as the LBSPR method of Hordyk *et al.* (2016) proposed by Hordyk *et al.* (2018) as an alternative to LBB leads to strong overestimation of exploitation and underestimation of stock status when compared with independent assessments of 34 real stocks from temperate and subtropical areas.

As for the points raised by Hordyk *et al.* (2018) with regard to default priors for L_{inf} and M/K , we maintain that these defaults are adequate for a wide range of exploited species. They can be easily replaced by users if better information is available. Warnings not to use LBB if LF samples do not show the typical asymmetric pattern were already provided in the original LBB paper and are repeated here.

Supplementary material

The Supplementary material available at the *ICESJMS* online version of this paper contains a detailed description of the material and methods used when comparing the original LBB master equation with its corrected version and with LBSPR. It also contains two tables with the results of that exercise.

Acknowledgements

RF acknowledges support from the German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety on behalf of the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (FKZ 3512- 82-0300). DP acknowledges support from the Sea Around Us, funded by several philanthropic foundations.

References

- Baranov, F. I. 1918. On the question of the biological basis of fisheries. Nauchnyĭ Issledovatelskiĭ Iktiologicheskiĭ Institut, Izvestiĭa, 1: 81–128. (In Russian)
- Barrowman, N. J., and Myers, R. A. 2000. Still more spawner-recruitment curves: the hockey stick and its generalizations. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, 57: 665–676.
- Froese, R., Coro, G., Kleisner, K., and Demirel, N. 2016. Revisiting safe biological limits in fisheries. *Fish and Fisheries*, 17:193–209.

- 1
2
3 Froese, R., and Pauly, D. (Eds). 2018. FishBase. World Wide Web electronic publication.
4 www.fishbase.org, (06/2018).
- 5 Froese, R., Winker, H., Coro, G., Demirel, N., Tsikliras, A. C., Dimarchopoulou, D.,
6 Scarcella, G., *et al.* 2018. A new approach for estimating stock status from length
7 frequency data. ICES Journal of Marine Science, doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsy078.
- 8 Hordyk, A. R., Ono, K., Prince, J. D., and Walters, C. J. 2016. A simple length-structured
9 model based on life history ratios and incorporating size-dependent selectivity:
10 application to spawning potential ratios for data-poor stocks. Canadian Journal of
11 Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 73: 1787–1799.
- 12 Hordyk, A., Ono, K., Valencia, S., Loneragan, N., and Prince, J. 2015. A novel length-based
13 empirical estimation method of spawning potential ratio (SPR), and tests of its
14 performance, for small-scale, data-poor fisheries. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 72:
15 217–231.
- 16 Hordyk, A. R., Prince, J. D., Carruthers, T. R., and Walters, C. J. 2018. Comment on “A new
17 approach for estimating stock status from length frequency data” by Froese *et al.*
18 (2018). ICES Journal of Marine Science.
- 19 Pauly, D. 1984. Fish population dynamics in tropical waters: a manual for use with
20 programmable calculators. International Center for Living Aquatic Resources
21 Management, Manila, Philippines, ICLARM Studies and Reviews, 8. 325 pp.
- 22 Pauly, D., and Navaluna N. A. 1983. Monsoon-induced seasonality in the recruitment of
23 Philippine fishes. *In* Proceedings of the expert consultation to examine changes in
24 abundance and species composition of neritic fish resources, San José, Costa Rica, 18–
25 29 April 1983, pp. 823–833. Ed. by G. D. Sharp, and J. Csirke. FAO Fisheries Report
26 No. 291, Vol. 2–3. 1224 pp.
- 27 Rudd, M. B., and Thorson, J. T. 2018. Accounting for variable recruitment and fishing
28 mortality in length-based stock assessments for data-limited fisheries. Canadian Journal
29 of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 75(7): 1019–1035.
- 30 van Sickle, J. 1977. Mortality rates from size distributions: the application of a conservation
31 law. *Oecologia*, 27: 311–318.
- 32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Table 1.** Performance comparison of three length-based methods against estimates from
51 independent stock assessments. Non-overlapping 95% confidence limits were used as
52 indication of significantly different estimates and are shown as numbers and percentage. Note
53 that 40%SPR was taken as a proxy for B_{msy}/B_0 and, accordingly, SPR estimates of LBSPR
54 were multiplied by 2.5 to attain B/B_{msy} . F/M estimates produced by the three models were
55 used as proxy for the comparison with F/F_{msy} estimates provided by the independent models.

Method	F/F_{msy} (%)	B/B_{msy} (%)
LBB	18 of 32 (56.3)	3 of 21 (14.3)
LBB (corr.)	25 of 32 (78.1)	9 of 21 (42.8)




Figure 1. Length frequencies for a hypothetical cohort, showing the effects of different sampling and aggregation schemes. Panel (a) shows the frequencies observed at sampling intervals of 0.5 cm, represented by the black curve, and frequencies observed at 0.1 year intervals, represented by dots. In panel (b), the histogram represents the fixed-length-interval frequencies aggregated in bins of 2 cm width. The histogram matches the original frequencies shown in panel (a), as indicated by the overlaid curve. The dots indicate the aggregation of the fixed-time-interval frequencies. Panel (c) shows a replication of panel (b), but with an overlaid curve that accounts for the pile-up effect in the fixed-time-interval frequencies. Panel (d) replicates the histogram of panel (b). The dots indicate accumulated frequencies based on fixed-time-interval samples that were taken annually over the life span of the cohort, where bins without circle did not contain observations. Note that, in this case, there is

no bias caused by the pile-up effect. Please label the four panels as (a), (b), (c), and (d) instead of A, B, C, and D.




Figure 2. Scatterplot of asymptotic length (L_{inf}) as a function of maximum length (L_{max}), for 199 stocks of 155 species, where L_{inf} and L_{max} were reported independently for the same sex, length-type, country, and locality. A linear regression gives $\log_{10} L_{inf} = 0.0345 + 0.991 \times \log_{10} L_{max}$, $r^2 = 0.955$, with 95% confidence limits of the slope (0.961–1.02) including 1.0 and 95% confidence limits of the intercept (–0.0158 to 0.0848) including zero, i.e., the regression is not significantly different from the dashed 1:1 line. The dotted lines indicate 0.5:1 and 1.5:1, respectively, to put the log-scale in perspective.

Supplementary material: ICES Journal of Marine Science, 75

On the pile-up effect and priors for L_{inf} and M/K : Response to a Comment by Hordyk *et al.* on “A new approach for estimating stock status from length frequency data

Rainer Froese, Henning Winker, Gianpaolo Coro, Nazli Demirel, Athanassios C. Tsikliras, Donna Dimarchopoulou, Giuseppe Scarcella, Wolfgang Nikolaus Probst, Manuel Dureuil, and Daniel Pauly

Introduction

This is a supplement to Froese *et al.* (2018) “On the pile-up effect and priors for L_{inf} and M/K : Response to a Comment by Hordyk *et al.* (2018) on: A new approach for estimating stock status from length frequency data”. It contains a detailed description of the material and methods used when comparing the original LBB master equation with its corrected version and with LBSPR. It also contains two tables with the results of that exercise.

Material and methods

The length frequencies (LF) of the 34 stocks analyzed in this study are the same as in Froese *et al.* (2018). Note that a slightly updated version of the original LBB was used where the starting value for the least-squares estimation of the prior for L_{inf} uses the across-years median of maximum lengths instead of the absolute maximum length. This updated LBB version also contains an option to apply the correction for the pile-up effect, as proposed by Hordyk *et al.* (2018), and is available from <https://oceanrep.geomar.de/>. The same LF data were also analyzed with the Shiny installation of LBSPR, accessed from <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/LBSPR/vignettes/LBSPR.html> in November 2018.

LBSPR requires as input values of L_{inf} , M/K , L_{m50} , and L_{m95} . For L_{inf} and M/K , the estimates provided by LBB with the correction active were used. For L_{m50} , values from stock assessments or from the literature were used. For L_{m95} , a difference of +10% was assumed, as done in Hordyk *et al.* (2016; their Table 1). The list of species, stocks, L_{inf} , M/K , L_{m50} , and L_{m95} is shown in Table S1.

For simplicity, non-overlapping 95% confidence limits were used to indicate significant differences between estimates. LBSPR gives stock status estimates as spawning potential ratio (SPR), where values below 0.2 ($\approx 0.5 B/B_{msy}$) indicate depletion and values above 0.4 ($\approx 1.0 B/B_{msy}$) indicate good stock status. For test of overlap, the confidence limits of SPR were multiplied with 2.5 before comparison. For independent estimates of F/F_{msy} and B/B_{msy} without 95% confidence limits, a CV of ± 0.2 was assumed.

Table S2 shows an evaluation of exploitation and stock status based on (a) the original LBB master equation, (b) the LBB equation with pile-up correction, and (c) the LBSPR method compared to respective estimates provided by independent assessments based on the last available year with LF data.

Table S1. Scientific names, stock identifier, asymptotic length (L_{inf}), mortality–growth ratio (M/K), length at 50% maturity (L_{m50}), and length at 95% maturity (L_{m95}) for 34 stocks in five regions. [LBB_UBC_5.R; Stock_ID_5.csv]

Species	Stock	L_{inf} (cm)	M/K	L_{m50} (cm)	L_{m95} (cm)
Northwest Atlantic					
<i>Amblyraja radiata</i>	Thorny skate	92.4	1.64	53	58.3
<i>Leucoraja ocellata</i>	Winter skate	103	1.52	75	82.5
<i>Squalus acanthias</i>	Spiny dogfish	100	1.43	82.1	90.3
North Sea					
<i>Clupea harengus</i>	her.27.3a47d	34	1.7	24.1	26.5
<i>Melanogrammus aeglefinus</i>	had.27.46a20	74.2	1.24	33	36.3
<i>Pleuronectes platessa</i>	ple.27.420	58.6	1.42	22.1	24.3
<i>Pollachius virens</i>	pok.27.3a46	119	1.54	55	60.5
<i>Scophthalmus maximus</i>	tur.27.4	77	1.52	28	30.8
<i>Solea solea</i>	sol.27.4	47.9	1.3	18.8	20.7
Mediterranean					
<i>Aristeus antennatus</i>	ARA-GSA01	7.4	1.49	1.5	1.65
<i>Aristeus antennatus</i>	ARA-GSA05	6.63	1.5	1.5	1.65
<i>Aristaeomorpha foliacea</i>	ARS-GSA18-19	5.56	1.25	3.3	3.63
<i>Engraulis encrasicolus</i>	ANE-GSA06	16.2	1.47	12	13.2
<i>Engraulis encrasicolus</i>	ANE-GSA17-18	18.1	1.77	10	11
<i>Engraulis encrasicolus</i>	Eengr_Aegean	18.4	1.5	11	12.1
<i>Merluccius merluccius</i>	HKE-GSA09	82.6	1.44	35	38.5
<i>Merluccius merluccius</i>	HKE-GSA17-18	69.7	1.18	33	36.3
<i>Merluccius merluccius</i>	Mmer_Aegean	90.6	1.66	30	33
<i>Merluccius merluccius</i>	Mmer_Ionian	73.1	1.44	30	33
<i>Mullus barbatus</i>	MUT-GSA25	26.4	1.57	9	9.9
<i>Mullus barbatus</i>	MUT-GSA6	27.5	1.3	12	13.2
<i>Mullus barbatus</i>	Mbar_Aegean	29.9	1.36	13	14.3
<i>Mullus barbatus</i>	Mbar_Ionian	34.7	1.51	13	14.3
<i>Parapenaeus longirostris</i>	DPS-GSA10	3.74	1.18	2.5	2.75
<i>Sardina pilchardus</i>	Spil_Aegean	19.3	1.46	12	13.2
<i>Sepia officinalis</i>	CTC-GSA17	26.7	1.44	10	11
Black Sea					
<i>Merlangius merlangus</i>	Whiting_BS	19.2	1.37	14.5	16.0
<i>Sprattus sprattus</i>	Spr_BS	12.2	2.01	7.8	8.58
<i>Trachurus mediterraneus</i>	MHMackerel_BS	20	1.6	12.5	13.8
South Africa					
<i>Argyrozona argyrozona</i>	CRPN-S	62.3	1.62	26.7	29.4
<i>Argyrozona argyrozona</i>	CRPN-SE	58.4	1.49	26.7	29.4
<i>Argyrosomus inodorus</i>	KOB-S	125	1.58	37.5	41.3
<i>Argyrosomus inodorus</i>	KOB-SE	124	1.53	37.5	41.3
<i>Chrysoblephus puniceus</i>	SLNG-E	42.7	1.48	24	26.4

Table S2. Comparison of estimates provided by LBB, LBB (cor.) with correction for pile-up, and LBSPR against independent estimates (subscript ind) from regular stock assessments (gray columns). The estimates (every first row) and 95% confidence intervals (every second row) are based on the last year of the indicated range of years. Bold numbers indicate that these estimates are significantly different from the independent assessment. Note that for LBSPR, B/B_{msy} was approximated as $2.5 \times SPR$. [LBB_UBC_5.R; Stock_ID_5.csv]

Stock/years	<i>F/M</i>				<i>B/B_{msy}</i>			
	<i>F/F_{msy}</i> ind	LBB	LBB (cor.)	LBSPR	<i>B/B_{msy}</i> ind	LBB	LBB (cor.)	LBSPR
Northwest Atlantic								
ThornySkate	–	3.3	4.2	4.6	–	0.44	0.36	0.66
2000		2.7–4.3	3.4–5.6	3.8–5.4		0.32–0.60	0.25–0.50	0.59–0.72
WinterSkate	–	0.36	0.8	2.7	0.35	1.8	1.3	0.66
1995–2004		0.19–0.57	0.54–1.2	1.5–3.9		0.24–1.2	0.69–2.1	0.45–0.88
Spiny dogfish	0.15–0.21	0.87	1.5	2.6	0.86	1.3	0.92	0.42
2001–2006		0.52–1.2	1.2–1.8	2.4–2.7		0.61–1.9	0.65–1.2	0.40–0.44
North Sea								
her.27.3a47d	0.67	2.5	3.5	7	0.65	0.7	0.54	1.3
2010–2014	0.54–0.82	2.1–3.0	2.7–4.3	6.5–7.5	0.57–0.75	0.53–0.90	0.37–0.70	1.27–1.33
had.27.46a20	1.55	3.2	3.7	4.8	0.69	0.43	0.37	0.64
2010–2014	1.24–1.91	2.4–4.4	2.8–4.8	4.3–5.2	0.60–0.77	0.28–0.61	0.25–0.51	0.60–0.68
ple.27.420	0.95	2.9	3.4	2.4	1.4	0.33	0.17	0.21
2010–2014	0.81–1.1	2.0–3.8	2.5–4.2	2.2–2.5	1.2–1.6	0.19–0.55	0.12–0.23	0.19–0.23
pok.27.3a46	0.89	1.2	1.6	2.6	0.69	0.62	0.49	0.2
2010–2014	0.64–1.2	0.95–1.7	1.2–2.2	2.4–2.7	0.55–0.88	0.43–0.91	0.34–0.71	0.19–0.22
tur.27.4	0.63	0.62	1.5	2	1.18	1.1	0.49	0.35
2010–2014	0.48–0.84	0.40–0.89	1.1–2.3	1.4–2.7	0.87–1.61	0.59–1.7	0.32–0.79	0.23–0.47
sol.27.4	1.5	1.7	2.4	3.7	0.57	0.63	0.47	0.64
2011–2014	1.15–1.8	1.3–2.4	1.8–2.8	3.3–4.1	0.46–0.69	0.42–0.93	0.34–0.60	0.60–0.67
Mediterranean								
ARA–GSA01	1.9	1.5	1.9	2	–	0.47	0.34	0.37
2005–2015		1.1–1.8	1.4–2.5	1.9–2		0.30–0.61	0.22–0.46	0.36–0.39
ARA–GSA05	1	0.56	1	1.3	–	1.2	0.74	0.58
2002–2015		0.28–1.1	0.69–1.5	1.2–1.4		0.38–2.4	0.41–1.2	0.56–0.60
ARS–GSA18–19	1.1	4.7	5	2.1	–	0.16	0.15	0.33
2009–2014		3.5–6.4	3.7–6.7	2.1–2.1		0.10–0.23	0.10–0.21	0.32–0.34
ANE–GSA06	0.9	1.5	2.6	2.2	1.1	0.78	0.52	0.75
2005–2015		0.88–2.3	1.8–3.2	2.1–2.2		0.35–1.3	0.33–0.74	0.74–0.75
ANE–GSA17–18	1.8	1.9	2.8	5	–	0.74	0.54	0.92
2005–2015		1.3–2.5	2.2–3.7	5.0–5.0		0.44–1.0	0.37–0.74	0.92–0.93
Eengr_Aegean	1.5	4.6	5.4	5.7	0.44	0.3	0.25	0.55
2003–2008		3.6–6.3	3.8–7.0	5.7–5.7		0.20–0.43	0.16–0.36	0.55–0.55
HKE–GSA09	3.8	4.4	5	4.8	–	0.04	0.03	0.01
2006–2015		3.5–6.0	4.1–6.5	4.7–4.9		0.02–0.05	0.02–0.04	0.01–0.01
HKE–GSA17–18	2.6	11	11	5.6	–	0.03	0.02	0.02
2009–2015		8.0–15	8.0–15	5.5–5.7		0.02–0.04	0.01–0.03	0.02–0.02
Mmer_Aegean	4.68	3.3	3.8	3.9	–	0.1	0.08	0.05
2004–2014		2.6–4.1	3.2–5.1	3.4–4.4		0.07–0.13	0.05–0.10	0.04–0.07
Mmer_Ionian	2.62	14	15	8.9	0.34	0.03	0.03	0.06
2014–2016		11–18	12–21	6.8–11		0.02–0.04	0.02–0.04	0.04–0.08

Stock/years	<i>F/M</i>				<i>B/B_{msy}</i>			
	<i>F/F_{msy}</i> ind	LBB	LBB (cor.)	LBSPR	<i>B/B_{msy}</i> ind	LBB	LBB (cor.)	LBSPR
MUT-GSA25	1	1.5	2.2	2.1	–	0.63	0.43	0.72
2005–2015		1.0–2.0	1.7–2.8	1.6–2.5		0.4–0.9	0.32–0.57	0.63–0.80
MUT-GSA6	1.6	2.8	3.4	2.0	–	0.34	0.26	0.72
2006–2015		2.0–4.1	2.5–6.1	1.9–2		0.2–0.52	0.13–0.48	0.63–0.80
Mbar_Aegean	1.18	3.4	4.8	2.8	0.91	0.22	0.14	0.29
2003–2006		2.4–5.6	3.5–7.1	2.5–3.1		0.12–0.38	0.09–0.22	0.26–0.32
Mbar_Ionian	1.5	3.8	4.6	4	–	0.18	0.14	0.21
2005–2014		3.1–4.8	3.5–6.0	3.4–4.5		0.13–0.24	0.09–0.19	0.18–0.24
DPS-GSA10	2	2.1	2.7	2.7	–	0.4	0.3	0.1
2009–2015		1.6–3	2.0–3.9	2.7–2.7		0.26–0.60	0.19–0.45	0.1–0.1
Spil_Aegean	1.7	2.3	3.1	3.5	0.34	0.56	0.43	0.78
2004–2008		1.9–2.7	2.7–3.6	3.5–3.5		0.43–0.69	0.35–0.53	0.78–0.78
CTC-GSA17	0.8	2.8	3.5	3.4		0.19	0.13	0.15
2006–2016		2.3–3.7	2.8–4.3	3.2–3.5		0.15–0.27	0.1–0.18	0.14–0.16
Black Sea								
Whiting_BS	1.5	1.3	2.1	1.4	0.54	0.78	0.54	0.44
2016–2016	1.1–2.2	1.0–1.7	1.8–2.4	1.4–1.4	0.36–0.74	0.54–1.1	0.43–0.65	0.44–0.45
Spr_BS	0.83	2.4	3.9	2	1.1	0.56	0.34	0.85
2008–2015	0.7–1.1	1.9–3.7	3.1–5.1	2–2	0.8–1.3	0.38–0.90	0.24–0.48	0.85–0.86
MHMackerel_BS	7	4.8	5.7	6.3	0.11	0.09	0	0
2016–2016	5–9	4.1–6.1	4.6–7.0	6.3–6.4	0.09–0.15	0.06–0.11	0–0	0–0.01
South Africa								
CRPN-S	0.26	0.88	1.5	1.8	1.21	1	0.68	0.76
2008–2010	0.14–0.42	0.54–1.3	1.1–2.2	1.4–2.1	0.67–1.8	0.51–1.58	0.4–1	0.68–0.84
CRPN-SE	0.38	1.3	2	2	1.08	0.81	0.57	0.9
2008–2010	0.29–0.47	0.9–1.9	1.6–3.1	1.7–2.3	0.70–1.51	0.5–1.2	0.4–0.9	0.84–0.96
KOB-S	1.11	1.3	1.8	2	0.51	0.68	0.49	0.49
2008–2010	0.94–1.30	0.7–1.7	1.1–2.3	1.8–2.1	0.37–0.65	0.3–1	0.27–0.72	0.46–0.52
KOB-SE	0.78	1.5	2	2	0.61	0.59	0.43	0.47
2008–2010	0.65–0.91	1.1–2.1	1.64–2.89	1.8–2.3	0.46–0.78	0.39–0.87	0.30–0.63	0.42–0.53
SLNG-E	0.86	1.1	1.7	2.1	0.95	0.95	0.68	0.83
2008–2010	0.62–1.15	0.7–1.8	1.3–2.3	1.8–2.3	0.56–1.45	0.46–1.6	0.45–0.97	0.78–0.88