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#### Abstract

Probabilistic maturation reaction norms (PMRNs) are an important tool for studying fisheries-induced evolution and environmental effects on life history. To date there has been no way to fit a PMRN to population-level fisheries data; instead individuallevel data must be used. This limits the stocks and time periods that can be studied.

We introduce a Bayesian method for fitting PMRNs to population-level data. The method is verified against both an existing result and simulated data, and applied to historical Barents Sea cod data which combines observations of population-level variation in age, size and maturity status from Russia and Norway.


The method shows a clear and rapid trend towards greater probability of maturation at smaller lengths in the Barents Sea cod.

The new model fitting algorithm allows us to study historic changes in life history despite the lack of individual-level data seen in much long term data. Access to more data will aid the study of evolutionary hypotheses in a wide range of organisms.

## 1. Introduction

Quantifying life history variables as reaction norms is critical to proper management because it affects stock assessment. Especially, expressing maturity as a function of size and age (the probabilistic maturation reaction norm, PMRN, Heino et al 2002b) has proven valuable in accounting for demographic effects on the maturity ogive, and in diagnosing fisheries induced evolution towards earlier maturation (see, for example, Heino et al 2002a, Heino et al 2002c, Grift et al 2003, Olsen et al 2004, Kuparinen and Merilä 2007).

A range of techniques for fitting PMRNs to different types of data are available, following a gradient from those requiring specialized data (Heino et al. 2002b) to those dealing with data collected routinely for other purposes (Barot et al. 2004a, Scott and Heikkonen 2012). Heino et al (2002b) constructed PMRNs for a cohort using logistic regression on age and size data from two sub-components of the cohort:
those individuals who matured in the past year and individuals who are immature (individuals that matured in previous years are irrelevant to the calculation). This type of data will be available if animals are studied through their lives in laboratory experiments, and can sometimes be extrapolated from scale-ring or otolith studies of wild fish. Long-term databases describing maturation in commercial fish stocks typically lack sufficient resolution to specify the exact age and size that the individuals became mature. To circumvent this problem, variations on the original model fitting approach have been developed. Heino et al (2002a) dealt with data sets that describe the sizes and ages of maturing fish (those that matured in the past year), but lack information on immature fish. Data of this form can occur if sampling omits immature fish, for example if they have a different spatial distribution. The method first back-projects the sizes of immature fish using independently obtained maturity ogives, and then uses logistic regression on the resultant data set. Barot et al (2004a) examined data sets in which maturing fish are not distinguished from mature fish (that matured more than a year ago). This form of data is typically obtained during surveys or by sampling commercial catches. The method first constructs a size- and agebased maturity ogive and from this extrapolates the proportion of fish maturing at each size and age, finally logistic regression is applied to yield a PMRN. These techniques have led to a proliferation of studies applying the PMRN approach to commercial stocks and the majority have found results consistent with FIE (Dieckmann and Heino 2007). These existing methods share the common requirement of individual-level data about size, age and maturity status. There remains a wealth of data, much of it associated with routine surveys (e.g. DATRAS database http://datras.ices.dk/), that could produce insights into FIE but are not amenable to individual-level methods.

This paper aims to complement the existing repertoire of tools by providing a Bayesian method based on simulation of growth and maturation, to be used when such traits are described at a population-level only. Such data can arise if different variables are measured on different individuals during different surveys. We demonstrate the new method by testing whether there is evidence for FIE in Northeast Arctic (NEA) cod Gadus morhua using a long term database (1946-1989 cohorts).
The data were obtained from both Norwegian and Russian sources. The database covers a larger geographical extent than previous PMRN studies of the stock (Heino
et al. 2002c, Heino et al. 2002a). For much of the period of interest, individual-level data are not available from Russian sources which necessitates a method that can be applied to population-level data. The method is also validated against an independent existing result obtained by Grift et al (2003) for North Sea plaice, and a synthetic data set based on the NEA cod.

## 2. Theory and Calculation

### 2.1 Probabilistic Maturation Reaction Norms

Mathematically, a PMRN is a function taking a description of fish state as arguments, and returning the probability that the fish will have matured within the last year. Typically, probability follows a logistic relation to size with different coefficients for every age of fish as in eqn 1 :
$\operatorname{logit}(p(a, s))=c_{a, 1}+c_{a, 2} s$
where $p(a, s)$ is the probability that a previously immature fish of age $a$ and size $s$ will have matured in the last year. An example using results about North Sea plaice in Grift et al (2003) is shown in Figure 1. The model is represented by contours of constant probability of maturation. If a plaice is 30 cm at age 3 then it will have approximately $25 \%$ chance of having matured; if it does not mature at age 3 and grows to 35 cm by age 4 then it will have a $50 \%$ probability of maturing. The probability of a fish being mature is the cumulative probability of maturing at each annual point on its growth curve. In this case, there is a $62.5 \%$ probability of maturing by age 4 .

Variants of the model use different functions of $s$ and $a$. Most models (e.g. in Figure 1) have distinct coefficients for each age of fish. Coefficients for each age in these models are fitted using data on the fraction maturing only from that age. In this paper, however, data from all ages is used to fit a smaller number of coefficients which apply to all ages. Specifically, we use models with linear coefficients of age, so contours are straight parallel lines
$\operatorname{logit}(p(a, s))=c_{1} a+c_{2} s+c_{3}$

Linear models are chosen as a convenient approximation of the true shape of PMRNs. Theoretical and laboratory-based work (Stearns and Crandall 1984, Stearns and Koella 1986, Reznick 1990, Ernande et al. 2004, Plaistow et al. 2004) suggests that contours should be L-shaped curves, so that there is low (or zero) probability of maturity when very young, regardless of size. Existing work on NEA cod (Heino et al. 2002c, Heino et al. 2002a) suggests that this stock has contours with a slight dome and overall upward gradient. Linear models are chosen for this study because they have only three parameters to estimate and because they roughly approximate both the asymptote of an L-shaped curve or a shallow curve as depicted in Figure 1.

### 2.2 Bayesian Analysis

Existing logistic-regression-based methods for fitting PMRNs cannot be used with the combined Russian-Norwegian Barents Sea cod data set because it lacks individuallevel information relating size to maturity status. The data available, instead, consist of length distribution at each age and fraction mature at each age, for every cohort. In our Bayesian method model parameters are drawn from prior distributions and assigned an estimate of likelihood by repeatedly simulating observations of the maturity status of fish and recording the fraction of simulations that match the actual observations (which estimates $P$ (observations | parameters) ). Bayes' law then allows these likelihoods to be converted into the posterior distribution of the parameters, $P$ (parameters | observations).

In the method, each simulated fish is assigned a maturity status according to its length and age. In order to do this, the probability of the fish being mature must be calculated from the probability of becoming mature at each prior age. A PMRN gives the probability, $p(a, s)$, of a fish maturing at age $a$ and length $s$. The probability of an individual being mature at $a$ and $s$ can be calculated using eqn 3 (based on eqn 2 in (Barot et al. 2004a)).

$$
\begin{align*}
P\left(\text { mature } \mid a, s_{a}\right) & =P\left(\text { mature } \mid a-1, s_{a-1}\right)+P\left(\text { immature } \mid a-1, s_{a-1}\right) \times p(a, s)  \tag{3}\\
& =P\left(\text { mature } \mid a-1, s_{a-1}\right)+\left(1-P\left(\text { mature } \mid a-1, s_{a-1}\right)\right) \times p(a, s)
\end{align*}
$$

The equation is derived from the fact that a mature fish was either mature last year, or was immature last year and matured within the last year. Since all age 0 fish are considered to have zero probability of being mature, the equation can be used recursively provided that there is a way of back-calculating $s_{a-1}$, the length of the fish the previous year. We use an empirical growth model that assumes each fish maintains its position within the cohort (e.g. a cod at the $87^{\text {th }}$ percentile of length in its cohort at age 6 will still be at the $87^{\text {th }}$ percentile at age 7). All simulated lengths are the midpoint of 5 cm length classes. This makes the implicit assumption that the effect of length on mortality within classes is negligible. Similar assumptions are made in other methods for fitting PMRNs (Heino et al. 2002a) and any bias in the results caused by these assumptions will be similar and will not prevent results from this method being compared with other methods.

Estimating likelihood for a particular set of model parameters for a single cohort uses the algorithm in Table 1. The model is a linear probabilistic reaction norm with three parameters: $S_{6}$, the size for $50 \%$ probability of maturation at age 6 (age 6 is chosen as a typical age to mature, other species may require other ages, this controls the intercept of the $50 \%$ contour, $\mathrm{S}_{0}$ ) $S^{\prime}$, the slope of the contours; and $W$, the width between contours (difference in length between a fish with $25 \%$ probability of maturation, and one with $50 \%$ probability). The equation for the model is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{logit}(p(a, s))=\frac{\operatorname{logit}(0.75)}{W}\left(s-a \times S^{\prime}-S_{0}\right) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where $\mathrm{S}_{0}=\mathrm{S}_{6}-6 \mathrm{~S}^{\prime}$ and the sigmoidal logistic function is defined in the usual way $\operatorname{logit}(p)=\log (p /(1-p))$
The method simulates the growth of a number, $F$, of fish of each age class, and is repeated for a number, $R$, of replicates. Preliminary trials showed that $F=15$ fish of each age per simulation and $R=150$ simulations per age class yielded reasonably consistent probabilities for each model. Larger numbers of replicates improve accuracy, but greatly reduce the fraction of simulations that match observations and thus require more simulations and computation time.

Every tested set of model parameters is drawn independently from the joint prior distribution. There is no chain of estimates converging on a solution as in Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods. This means that there is no need to choose a length of model run or thinning frequency in order to ensure the model has converged and does not suffer from autocorrelation. It also simplifies implementation and makes it easier to run several parallel processes (we used 6 processes, each testing 2000 independent parameter sets).

The parameters for cod were drawn from uniform priors chosen on the basis of existing work on cod (Heino et al. 2002a, Heino et al. 2002b, Barot et al. 2004b, Barot et al. 2004a, Olsen et al. 2004): $0 \leq S_{6} \leq 300 \mathrm{~cm},-20 \leq S^{\prime} \leq 20 \mathrm{~cm} \mathrm{y}^{-1}$ and $10 \leq W \leq 20$ cm . The same 12000 sets of parameters were tested for every cohort. This number was chosen as it allowed patterns to be clearly distinguished, without requiring too much computation time. The result of applying our method to the cod data is a posterior distribution for the PMRN parameters. All candidate parameters are assigned relative probabilities, $P$ (parameters | observations), of how likely they are to be correct, given the observations. The probabilities sum to 1 and directly reflect the fraction of all successful replicates for which the model was responsible. Estimates of model parameters and their Bayesian confidence intervals are obtained from the posterior distribution. The maximum likelihood model is the one with greatest $P$ (model | observations).

## 3. Methods and Materials

### 3.1 Northeast Arctic cod

Temporal trends in maturation of the NEA cod have been previously analysed using a Norwegian database about the fraction of the stock on spawning grounds around Lofoten from 1932 (Jørgensen 1990). Early applications of PMRNs used both historical data (1926 cohort) and contemporary survey data (1981-1990 cohorts) for NEA cod (Heino et al. 2002c, Heino et al. 2002a), but the individual-level observations were based only on the portion of the stock fished by Norway. To date, there has been no continuous reconstruction of PMRNs that has used both Norwegian and Russian maturity data.

Our data combines surveys from both Russia and Norway. The data is structured into cohorts (fish spawned in the same year) from 1946--1989 and age classes from 3-13. Older and younger fish are all mature or immature respectively, and do not affect a study of maturation. The data consists of age-based maturity ogives, and age-length keys, illustrated for a single cohort in Figure 2 and described below. These are two types of data commonly available for many commercial fish stocks.

The maturity ogive (AFWG 2006) records the fraction of fish mature in every age class of every cohort. Maturity data are based on visual examination of ovary state. A mature fish skipping spawning (e.g. due to malnutrition) may appear to be immature. Because of this, the proportion of mature fish in some cohorts appears to decline from one age to the next. Similar artefacts can be caused by sampling error or increased mortality of mature fish. Such problems are likely to be typical of other data sets and no attempt has been made to correct for these errors before fitting the models.

The age-length keys (ALKs) partition the fish into 5 cm length classes (Marshall et al. 2004). For every cohort-age-length class the ALK records the fraction of fish from the cohort-age class that were that length. Because of sampling artefacts, some cohorts have some smaller fish in older age classes than in younger ones; again no attempt is made to correct the data prior to model fitting. When combined, the ALK and maturity ogive do not reveal the different sizes of mature and immature fish, and do not give information about any individual.

### 3.2 Validating simulation-based method with North Sea plaice data

In order to validate the algorithm, data were obtained to which an existing method (Barot et al 2002) had been applied. These data described two cohorts of female North Sea plaice from Grift et al (2003). These data were chosen to provide a test completely independent of the NEA cod, and for which previous results have been published. The data contained age, length, and maturity status of individual fish. In total, there were 45 observations of fish from the 1960 cohort, and 264 from 1990. Observations were made of fish from ages 2 to 6 years. Sampling was based on market size categories (lengths ranged from 25.2 to 52.1 cm ) so the lengths of
observed fish are not representative of the population. The data were summarised to a form analogous to the NEA cod data: fraction of mature fish of each sampled cohort-age group; and cohort, age and length of each observed fish. The information relating maturity status to length was discarded (to make it comparable with the NEA cod data in which this was not present).

The plaice data differs from the cod data because the sampled fish are not representative (with respect to length) of the population. This means that a different method is required to back-calculate the length of observed fish in the previous year, $s_{a-1}$. Grift et al (2003) used otolith measurements to calculate the change in length each year, but we did not have access to this data. Instead, we obtained an ALK for North Sea plaice (WGSSDS 2006). This gave the mean and standard-deviation of length for each cohort-age class ( $\hat{S}_{c, a}$ and $\sigma_{c, a}$, respectively). The length of a fish at age $a$ can be expressed as $s_{a}=\hat{s}_{c, a}+k \times \sigma_{c, a}$. Assuming that the coefficient $k$ is constant throughout the fish's life (i.e. the fish maintains its position in the population, as in the cod case), the length in the previous year is $s_{a-1}=\hat{s}_{c, a-1}+k \times \sigma_{c, a-1}$.

There was a slight difference in the procedure used to calculate likelihood. This was because the precise number of mature plaice out of a is known (rather than the fraction mature in a sample of unknown size). For this reason, each replicate for the plaice data consists of fish of exactly the lengths sampled, rather than drawing lengths randomly from the age ALK (i.e. the loop on line 5 of the algorithm in Table 2 is "for every actual length sampled"). The number of fish in each replicate varied between 2 and 24. As larger replicates have a lower probability of success, the number of replicates, $r$, was raised to 200 (from 150 for the cod). 12000 linear models were tested, with parameters drawn from uniform priors such that $0 \leq S_{4} \leq 60,-7 \leq S^{\prime} \leq 7$ and $0 \leq W \leq 15$, based on the maximum length of plaice ( 52.1 cm in the data set).

### 3.3 Validating Fitting of PMRN Slope

Initial investigation of the method led to concern that it could not distinguish correctly between different slopes of PMRN, in particular that it was biased towards selecting steep negative slopes. This is a particular concern for NEA cod as previous research has found an overall slight positive slope ( 9 cm over 5 years from Fig 5 c of Heino et
al. (2002c)). In order to test whether bias exists, two example linear PMRNs with parameters $S_{6}=100, S^{\prime}=4, W=15$ (positive slope) and $S_{6}=100, S^{\prime}=-4, W=15$ (negative slope) were selected. Synthetic maturity ogives were created by simulating the maturation of a cohort of cod following the 1980 cohort ALK and each of the two selected PMRNs. The model fitting method for cod was applied to the actual 1980 ALK and each synthetic maturity ogive.

## 4. Results

### 4.1 North East Arctic Cod

Figure 3 shows both (a) the single best model found for the 1980 cohort, and (b) the models that accounted for $95 \%$ of all successful replicates (the $95 \%$ Bayesian confidence interval of the posterior). Figure 3a is the usual presentation or PMRNs (as in Figure 1), 3b allows visualisation of the uncertainties in model fitting. It can be seen that as the cod grow through the contours of the PMRN, maturity rises. Furthermore, the fraction mature starts to rise when the largest fish are reaching the $25 \%$ probability of maturation contour, and most of the fish are mature once they lie in the region between $25 \%$ and $75 \%$ of maturation. It can also be seen that the uncertainty is greater in regions for which there is little data, e.g. all age 12 fish are mature, so there is no information about where the $50 \%$ contour should be at age 12 .

Figure 4 shows the parameter space for the PMRNs, parameters that were tested, and parameters that matched four cohorts through the time series. Several features are of interest. Firstly, $S_{6}$ and $S^{\prime}$ are correlated. Secondly the correlation between $S_{6}$ and $S^{\prime}$ accounts for most of the within cohort variation in parameter estimates. Thirdly, the cohorts shown have very little overlap in the joint model parameters. This means that the maturation reaction norms for these cohorts are quantitatively distinct. In addition, there is a trend in the parameters over time corresponding to smaller size at maturation between 1946 and 1974. Figure 5 shows the PMRNs for the same cohorts in detail. The trend towards maturation at smaller sizes is seen from the fact that the contours for later cohorts are lower on the graph than for earlier cohorts. From 1974 to 1989 , the change is in the slope of the contours, with the 1974 fish having steeper
contours and, hence, a more sudden rise in maturity with age as seen in the inset maturity graph.

To summarise changes in maturation patterns over time by focusing on a single age class Figure 6 shows the length a 6 year old fish born in each year would have to be to have a $50 \%$ chance of maturing and can be regarded as a summary of the effect of all the model parameters. It shows an irregular decline in length. Note that although the graph is for 6 year old fish, it is based on models derived using all age classes. Similar patterns are seen with other age classes, in particular the dip between 1972 and 1976 is always present.

The rate of phenotypic change can be measured from Figure 6. Taking the trait as size for $50 \%$ probability of maturation at age 6, gives -12 000 darwins (relative change per million years) or -0.68 haldanes (standard deviations of change per generation). Values were obtained using weighted linear regression on point estimates produced by the tested parameters weighted by posterior probability.

### 4.2 Validation of method

Figure 7 shows that the linear PMRNs from the simulation-based method are a reasonable approximation of the curves obtained for decade-long periods including 1955-1964 and 1985-1994 by Grift et al (2003) using the method in Barot et al (2004a). The fit has clear differences (especially for 1990), but this is to be expected for two reasons. Firstly, the model fit using our method is based on slightly different data (a single cohort, rather than a decade of cohorts). Secondly, the original model fitting was not restricted to linear models, so an exact match between methods is not possible.

Results of fitting PMRNs to synthesised maturity ogives created with different sloped linear PMRNs are shown in Figure 8. When the real slope of the PMRN is negative, then the model fitting performs well (Figures 8 a and 8 c ). When the real slope of the PMRN is positive, then the model fitting selects slopes that are smaller than the actual
slope or more negative (Figures 8 b and 8 c ). These show bias towards negative slopes, but that it can distinguish between maturity ogives generated by differently sloped PMRNs (the "A" and "B" marks in Figure 8c are non-overlapping). Hence, the method makes the correct qualitative comparison between the cohorts even if the values are not precisely estimated.

The model fitting shows that a more negative slope must have a higher intersect (correlation between $S^{\prime}$ and $S_{0}$ in Figure 8c). There is a clear geometric reason for this correlation, as steeper slopes passing through the same region will necessarily have higher intercepts. In models like this, the probability of maturation is determined more by age than size. The model fitting is biased to select models like this as the data only provides indirect evidence of the influence of size on maturation. The use of priors for model parameters excludes biologically unrealistically steep slopes.

## 5. Discussion

The analyses described in this paper are informative both from a methodological point of view in assessing the new algorithm and the PMRN approach, and an ecological point of view in revealing patterns in the biology of the cod stock. The method opens up the possibility of studying maturation trends in many more fish stocks and other organisms with suitable population-level data. The results suggest some limitations and possible refinements of the technique. First the effectiveness of the algorithm is discussed, as all other discussion rests upon this.

### 5.1 Data Analysis

Comparison with Grift et al's (2003) results and testing against synthetic data show that the method has a slight tendency to overestimate the downward slope of the PMRN contours, meaning that the effect of age on maturation is overestimated. This can be controlled by choosing appropriate prior distributions for the model parameters. For most commercial fish species, existing work on maturation will suggest values for these priors, although in the case of suspected FIE it is important to choose conservative priors and to use the same priors for all time periods to prevent the prior from biasing results. Even when models produced by the new method differ from other methods, the trends in maturation that they show are the same. As it is the presence of a trend that is typically of interest, rather than the precise model
parameters, the new method is equally suited to testing for a change in maturation dynamics.

We conclude that the method is effective at fitting PMRNs because the new method shows the same qualitative differences between cohorts as the original analysis and allows the same conclusion regarding FIE to be drawn.

Bayesian methods typically use MCMC methods to overcome the problem of large parameter spaces to search and to focus search on the resulting posterior distribution rather than the (much more dispersed) prior parameter distribution. In the case of these PMRN models, there are few parameters and the prior distribution is relatively constrained (because it can be linked to well known features such as the size of the fish). This meant that it was not necessary to use MCMC methods, but just to perform a brute-force search of the prior parameter space. This avoids several problems with MCMC methods: they are somewhat more complex to implement as a computer program; and the modeller must ensure that the chain length is sufficiently long to ensure convergence, enough of the initial run-in period is discarded, and the chain is 'thinned' sufficiently to avoid autocorrelation. It was also easy to take advantage of the multiple processors found on modern desktop computers by running several separate processes each testing a different set of model parameters.

We fitted models that used $S_{6}(\operatorname{cod})$ or $S_{3}$ (plaice) as parameters for the intercept of the PMRN contours. Qualitatively similar results were obtained using $S_{0}$ (results not shown) but as this is not biologically meaningful (there is zero chance of an age 0 fish maturing at any viable size), and it increases the correlation between the intercept parameter and slope, we favour the approach of using the intercept at an older age.

### 5.2 Northeast Arctic Cod

The analysis of Northeast Arctic cod data reveals a long trend of decline in size at maturation. The trend is rapid and comparable with other studies of cod (Olsen et al. 2004) including this stock (Heino et al. 2002c, Heino et al. 2002b). The rate of change, measured in either darwins or haldanes, is close to the fastest rates cited by Hendry and Kinnison (1999) but less than the maximum rates measured by Devine et al 2012. Rates of these magnitudes have only been seen in phenotypic studies of
organisms over very short periods of time (e.g. change in colour spots of guppies Poecilia reticulata measured over three generations by Endler (1980)). The rapidity of the change suggests that evolution may not be the sole cause. The time series in Figure 6 also shows a possible discontinuity in the late 1970s and other evidence in the form of weight-length-maturity relationships supports this notion of a shift between two time periods for this stock (Marshall and McAdam 2007), other aspects of stock dynamics also shifted abruptly for these cohorts (Marshall et al. 2006). For this particular stock, we hypothesise that longterm changes in the prey availability or temperature (Yndestad 2003) may have altered maturation in a way that age-and-length-based PMRNs cannot account for. Although this study shows a clear phenotypic change, like other PMRN-based studies, it is not capable of conclusively establishing whether this is a result of plasticity or evolution.

### 5.3 Broader application of Bayesian Methods

We have shown that a Bayesian method based on simulation can be used to model one aspect of a fish stock's life history, even though the data are not suitable for analysis with other methods. It is likely that similar methods can be found for other aspects of life history such as growth and fecundity, and other examples such as Scott and Heikkonen's (2012) method for fitting PMRNs based on inflection points in growth curves already exist for particular forms of data. There is increasing concern about climate change and prolonged high levels of fishing mortality impacting on the life history of our fish stocks (e.g. see Law and Grey 1989, Law 2000, Stokes and Law 2000, Conover and Munch 2002, Kenchington et al 2003, Jorgensen et al 2007), but with the wealth of historic data available on fisheries, we are hopeful that new analytic methods can be used to give a clearer long-term view of the state of our fisheries.
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Table 1: Simulation-based algorithm for finding likelihood $P$ (observations | parameters) where the model is a probabilistic reaction norm, $p(a, s)$, parametrised by intercept, $S_{-} 0$, slope, $S^{\prime}$, and width, $W$, and the observations are a single cohort of cod data consisting of length distribution at age and age based ogive (fraction mature at age $\left\{\mathrm{m} \_a \mid \mathrm{a} \_\right.$recruit <= $\left.\mathrm{a}<=\mathrm{a} \_\max \right\}$ ).

1. For each age class, $a$, a_recruit $<=\mathrm{a}<=\mathrm{a} \_$max
2. Repeat $R$ replicates for this age, recording numberthat are successful
3. Expected number of mature fish comes from $m_{a}$ in the ogive $F_{\text {exp }}=$ $\operatorname{round}\left(F m_{a}\right)$
4. $\quad$ Draw $F$ fish lengths, $\left\{\mathrm{s} \_\mathrm{i} \mid 0<=\mathrm{i}<\mathrm{F}\right\}$ from the length distribution for age $a$
5. $\quad$ For each of these $F$ simulated fish
6. Calculate probability $P\left(\right.$ mature $\left.\mid a, s_{-} i\right)$ of this fish being mature using back-calculating lengths for earlier ages (eqn 3)
7. Assign the fish a maturity status according to a single Bernoulli trial with $P\left(\right.$ mature $\left.\mid a, s_{-} i\right)$
8. If the fish is mature, then increment count $F_{\text {sim }}$ of mature fish at this age
9. If $F_{\text {sim }}=F_{\text {exp }}$ then this trial is successful at age $a$
10. Likelihood at this age, $\mathrm{P}\left(\right.$ observations a|S_0, $\left.\mathrm{S}^{\prime}, \mathrm{W}\right)$, is fraction of the $R$ replicates that were successful
11. Likelihood over all ages is the product of the likelihood for each age,
$P\left(\right.$ observations $\left.\mid S \_0, S^{\prime}, W\right)=\operatorname{PROD}(\mathrm{FOR}$ ALL $a)(\mathrm{P}($ observations a|S_0, S', W) $)$

Figure 1: PMRNs for North Sea plaice 1955-1964 cohorts (redrawn from values in Grift et al (2003)). Solid line is 50\% probability of maturation; dotted lines are $25 \%$ and $75 \%$.


Figure 2: All data about the 1980 NEA cod cohort. Boxes show the fraction of each age-class that is within each 5 cm size class. The graph at the bottom shows how the fraction of fish mature varies with age from 0 to $100 \%$ (limits marked with horizontal dotted lines).
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Figure 3: NEA cod. (a) Single best model, and (b) $95 \%$ bayesian confidence interval for 1980 cohort (the models that accounted for $95 \%$ of all matches between a simulation and observations, line denity indicative of posterior probability). Solid lines are the $50 \%$ probability of maturation contour. Dotted lines are $25 \%$ and $75 \%$ probability. Lines are cropped to cover only age-length combinations of NEA cod that have been observed. Other features as Figure 2.


Figure 4: Parameter space for PMRNs for NEA cod, and results for four evenlyspaced cohorts. Grey dots are tested models, letters indicate the 95\% Bayesian confidence interval for each cohort, A 1946, B 1960, C 1974, D 1989.



Figure 5: Plots of the PMRNs from Figure 4 (a) 1946, (b) 1960, (c) 1974, (d) 1989. Presentation as in Figure 3b.


Figure 6: Size at which a 6 year old NEA cod has a $50 \%$ probability of maturing for each cohort. Values were sampled from the models according to their posterior probability to obtain median (solid line) and $95 \%$ confidence intervals (dotted lines).


Figure 7: North Sea plaice. $50 \%$ contours from simulation-based model fitting (grey) superimposed on curves from previous work (black): (a) new model fit for 1960 against 1955-1964 cohorts from Grift et al (2002), (b) 1990 against 1985-1994.


Figure 8: Validation of selection of slope parameter. PMRN contours from new algorithm overlaid on synthesised data (presentation as in Figure 3b) and actual PMRN (black) for (a) actual positive slope of $4 \mathrm{~cm} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$, (b) actual negative slope of -4 $\mathrm{cm} \mathrm{yr}^{-1}$. (c) bayesian $95 \%$ confidence interval of model parameters for (A) negative slope and (B) positive slope, actual model parameters marked by crosses, dots are tested parameters (as in Figure 4).


