

## Testing the effect of soak time on catch damage in a coastal gillnetter and the consequences on processed fish quality - DTU Orbit (08/11/2017)

### Testing the effect of soak time on catch damage in a coastal gillnetter and the consequences on processed fish quality

This study aims at testing how to improve catch quality aboard a coastal gillnetter by looking at an easily controllable parameter known to have an effect on the degree of fish damage, soak time, and investigating if the registered damages on whole fish have an effect on processed products such as fillets. Plaice (*Pleuronectes platessa*) was captured with commercial gillnets soaked for 12 and 24 hours. Damages were assessed using semi-quantitative indices of individual fish condition gathered in a Catch-damage-index for onboard fish and a Processed fish-damage-index for whole, skinned and filleted plaice processed at a land-based factory. Cumulative link mixed modelling allowed the estimation of the size of effects. Damage in fish was significantly more likely for longer soak times but effects were comparable to those of fish length and between-sets, making a change in soak time not so substantial for improving plaice quality in coastal gillnetting. Damage in fish was significantly more likely for whole than filleted fish, but there was substantial heterogeneity among fish. Severe damage in whole fish may not matter in filleted fish whereas some damage may only be visible at the fillet level

### General information

State: Published

Organisations: National Institute of Aquatic Resources, Section for Ecosystem based Marine Management, Section for Marine Living Resources

Authors: Savina, E. (Intern), Karlsen, J. D. (Intern), Frandsen, R. (Intern), Krag, L. A. (Intern), Kristensen, K. (Intern), Madsen, N. (Intern)

Pages: 310-317

Publication date: 2016

Main Research Area: Technical/natural sciences

### Publication information

Journal: Food Control

Volume: 70

ISSN (Print): 0956-7135

Ratings:

BFI (2017): BFI-level 1

Web of Science (2017): Indexed yes

BFI (2016): BFI-level 1

Scopus rating (2016): CiteScore 3.86 SJR 1.462 SNIP 1.719

Web of Science (2016): Indexed yes

BFI (2015): BFI-level 1

Scopus rating (2015): SJR 1.509 SNIP 1.72 CiteScore 3.65

Web of Science (2015): Indexed yes

BFI (2014): BFI-level 1

Scopus rating (2014): SJR 1.389 SNIP 1.718 CiteScore 3.27

Web of Science (2014): Indexed yes

BFI (2013): BFI-level 1

Scopus rating (2013): SJR 1.273 SNIP 1.745 CiteScore 3.14

ISI indexed (2013): ISI indexed yes

Web of Science (2013): Indexed yes

BFI (2012): BFI-level 1

Scopus rating (2012): SJR 1.264 SNIP 1.916 CiteScore 3.1

ISI indexed (2012): ISI indexed yes

Web of Science (2012): Indexed yes

BFI (2011): BFI-level 1

Scopus rating (2011): SJR 1.2 SNIP 1.726 CiteScore 2.9

ISI indexed (2011): ISI indexed yes

Web of Science (2011): Indexed yes

BFI (2010): BFI-level 1

Scopus rating (2010): SJR 1.214 SNIP 1.683

Web of Science (2010): Indexed yes

BFI (2009): BFI-level 1

Scopus rating (2009): SJR 1.193 SNIP 1.685

Web of Science (2009): Indexed yes  
BFI (2008): BFI-level 1  
Scopus rating (2008): SJR 1.136 SNIP 1.394  
Web of Science (2008): Indexed yes  
Scopus rating (2007): SJR 0.89 SNIP 1.549  
Web of Science (2007): Indexed yes  
Scopus rating (2006): SJR 0.776 SNIP 1.323  
Scopus rating (2005): SJR 0.584 SNIP 1.244  
Scopus rating (2004): SJR 0.566 SNIP 1.074  
Scopus rating (2003): SJR 0.426 SNIP 0.678  
Scopus rating (2002): SJR 0.314 SNIP 0.85  
Scopus rating (2001): SJR 0.441 SNIP 0.836  
Web of Science (2001): Indexed yes  
Scopus rating (2000): SJR 0.43 SNIP 0.534  
Web of Science (2000): Indexed yes  
Scopus rating (1999): SJR 0.379 SNIP 0.491  
Original language: English  
Electronic versions:

**Postprint**

DOIs:

[10.1016/j.foodcont.2016.05.044](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2016.05.044)

Publication: Research - peer-review › Journal article – Annual report year: 2016