ICES Journal of Marine Science December 2017, Volume 74, Issue 9, Pages 2415-2426 <u>http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsx092</u> <u>http://archimer.ifremer.fr/doc/00387/49805/</u> © International Council for the Exploration of the Sea 2017. All rights reserved. For Permissions, please email: journals.permissions@oup.com 1

Inferring the annual, seasonal, and spatial distributions of marine species from complementary research and commercial vessels' catch rates

Bourdaud Pierre^{1,*}, Travers-Trolet Morgane¹, Vermard Youen¹, Cormon Xochitl¹, Marchal Paul¹

* Corresponding author : Pierre Bourdaud, email address : pierre.bourdaud@ifremer.fr

Abstract :

The objective of this study is to analyse at fine scale the annual, seasonal and spatial distributions of several species in the Eastern English Channel (EEC). On the one hand, data obtained from scientific surveys are not available all year through, but are considered to provide consistent yearly and spatially resolved abundance indices. On the other hand, on-board commercial data do cover the whole year, but generally provide a biased perception of stock abundance. The combination of scientific and commercial catches per unit of effort (CPUEs), standardized using a delta-generalized linear model, allowed to infer spatial and monthly dynamics of fish distributions in the EEC, which could be compared with previous knowledge on their life cycles. Considering the scientific survey as a repository, the degree of reliability of commercial CPUEs was assessed with survey-based distribution using the Local Index of Collocation. Large scale information was in agreement with literature, especially for cuttlefish. Fine scale consistency between survey and commercial data was significant for half of the 19 tested species (e.g. whiting, cod). For the other species (e.g. plaice, thornback ray), the results were inconclusive, mainly owing to poor commercial data coverage and/or to particular aspects of the species biology.

Keywords : commercial data, Eastern English Channel, seasonality, spatial distribution, survey data.

31 **1. Introduction**

32 Ecosystem-Based Fisheries Management (EBFM) requires enhancing knowledge of ecosystem functioning, therefore allowing forecasting the impact of fisheries on salient 33 ecosystem components (Long et al., 2015) and to design future management plans and tools 34 including Marine Protected Areas (Meyer et al., 2007) or fishing closures (Hunter et al., 35 2006). This necessitates a stepwise approach, the first tier of which, and one of the most 36 37 important, is to gain fine scale knowledge on the seasonal and geographic distribution of marine organisms, in general, and fish stocks in particular (Booth, 2000). 38 Scientific surveys have been implemented for decades to derive spatially- and yearly-resolved 39 40 abundance indices of commercial fish and shellfish species (e.g. van Keeken et al., 2007). Surveys provide abundance indices, derived from standardized and controlled protocols, 41 which allow for a wide spatial coverage associated with a weak selectivity (Verdoit *et al.*, 42 43 2003). Survey data, however, are costly to obtain and therefore rarely provide for adequate seasonal coverage of the resource distribution. In contrast, information derived from 44 45 commercial fisheries are generally available all year through. Consequently, the catch per unit of effort (CPUE), the most common and easily collected fishery-dependent index of 46 abundance (Maunder and Punt, 2004), has the potential to reflect fish distributions. However, 47 48 commercial CPUEs can generally not be used directly as abundance indicators. This is because fishers target rather than sample fish densities, and continuously adapt their activities 49 to prevailing conditions, through technological development and tactical adaptations (Marchal 50 et al., 2006), including discarding practices on which information is often limited (Rijnsdorp 51 et al., 2007). 52 53 A major challenge for fisheries scientists is then to reconcile fisheries-independent and -

54 dependent information into abundance indices that consistently mirror the annual, seasonal

and spatial dynamics of commercial marine species. Kristensen et al. (2014) have

reconstructed spatial and seasonal cohorts of cod (*Gadus morhua*) in Skagerrak by kriging, in both time and space, data provided by survey and also by fisheries subject to a survey-like sampling protocol. To our best knowledge, however, no method has yet been developed to estimate spatio-temporal distributions of fish at high resolution, by combining survey and true commercial fisheries data.

The main objective of this paper is to provide detailed annual, seasonal and spatial 61 62 distributions of major Eastern English Channel (EEC) commercial fisheries resources, using a novel approach combining fisheries-independent and -dependent information. The gain in 63 knowledge on fine scale temporal and spatial fish distribution in the EEC will expand the 64 65 scope of earlier results (e.g. Vaz et al., 2007), and strengthen the science support to an EBFM in this area. To that purpose, we (i) inferred the seasonal and spatial abundance distribution 66 based on survey and commercial abundance data for several species in the EEC, (ii) 67 68 investigated the degree of similarity of fine scale spatial distributions derived from these two data sources and (iii) investigated abundance indices derived from these data sources. 69

70

71 **2. Material and methods**

72 **2.1. Study area**

The Eastern English Channel (ICES subdivision VIId) is delimited by latitudes 49.3°N and
51°N and longitudes 2°W and 2°E (Figure 1). This shallow area constitutes a corridor
between the northeast Atlantic Ocean and the North Sea, and a strategic region in the
northeast Atlantic, as it hosts a very intense maritime traffic and human activities such as
mixed fisheries, aggregate extraction and wind farms (Dauvin, 2012). This area is also
important for several commercially important migratory species, e.g. red mullet (*Mullus surmuletus*) (Mahé *et al.*, 2005), cuttlefish (*Sepia officinalis*) (Royer *et al.*, 2006), mackerel

80 (Scomber scombrus) (Eltink et al., 1986), herring (Clupea harengus) (ICES, 2015), or

81 European seabass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) (Pawson *et al.*, 2007).

Fishing is a key socio-economic activity in the region (Carpentier *et al.*, 2009), which has also
generated a strong pressure on its marine ecosystem (Molfese, 2014).

84 **2.2. Data**

85 This study is supported by two main data sources: a scientific survey (the Channel Ground

86 Fish Survey – CGFS; Coppin and Travers-Trolet, 1989) and observations on-board

87 commercial vessels (hereby referred to as the OBSMER French programme; Cornou *et al.*,

88 2015).

89 The CGFS has sampled the entire EEC demersal community annually since 1988. The survey occurs every year in October, with a systematic fixed sampling design of 88 trawling stations 90 located between 49.3°N and 51.3°N. The sampling gear is a GOV trawl with 3 m vertical 91 92 opening, 10 m horizontal opening and a 20 mm codend. For each haul, all fish caught are sorted, identified and measured to the nearest inferior centimetre. In case of large catch, 93 random subsampling is performed while ensuring representativeness of species and length 94 distributions. For the current study only survey data from 1998 to 2014 were retained as this 95 period corresponds to a relatively stable state of the community structure with no detected 96 97 regime shift in species spatial distributions (Auber et al., 2015). The CGFS provides information for a large panel of economically valuable demersal fishes 98 and cephalopods, i.e. European seabass, red mullet, cod, whiting (Merlangius merlangus), 99 plaice (Pleuronectes platessa), cuttlefish, squids (Loligo spp.) and thornback ray (Raja 100 *clavata*). Other commercially important species such as common sole (*Solea solea*), herring 101

102 or sardine (*Sardina pilchardus*), are poorly sampled by the GOV trawl (Carpentier *et al.*,

103 2009), and thus have not been considered in this study.

On-board observer programmes allow estimating catch and effort for a sample of fishing 104 105 operations. Unlike other fisheries data collection programmes, e.g. building on port sampling and/or mandatory logbooks, observer's data are precisely geo-referenced and allow inferring 106 107 the total catch, including the discarded fraction, and more accurate measurements of effective fishing effort. Although on-board fisheries data can generally not be collected for all the 108 vessels belonging to a given fleet, and although the presence of observers may be perceived as 109 110 overly intrusive to fishers, they offer an opportunity to derive CPUE-based abundance indicators, at a fine spatial and temporal scale. 111 The OBSMER programme covers the period 2003-2015. It was developed to better estimate 112

the discards' quantity and assess catch composition. Precise information on ship

114 characteristics (e.g. homeport, length, engine power), fishing activity (time, latitude,

115 longitude, gear, fishing effort, targeted species assemblage) and catch composition (landings

and discards of fish and commercial invertebrates) are collected for each fishing operation by

scientific observers. For each fishing operation, a subsample of the catch (including both the

118 part to be landed and the part to be discarded) is sorted, identified and measured. This data

119 compilation has already been operated to characterize pressures exerted on communities,

discarded fractions of catches, or discarding drivers (Fauconnet *et al.*, 2015).

121 Spatio-temporal species distributions estimated using OBSMER data are primarily expected

to corroborate previous knowledge on these species' life cycles. In addition, they could reflect

species distributions as observed using scientific surveys (considered as a reference) in

124 converging time lapse. However, because species' spatial distributions are dynamic and vary

125 from one time step to another, and because fishers continuously adapt to prevailing conditions

126 (Eigaard et al., 2014), time and spatial variations in CPUE reflect two entangled signals

127 prompted by fisher's plasticity and stock fluctuations. Using CPUEs to reflect time changes in

stock abundance therefore requires to preliminarily filter out the skipper effect signal itoriginally contains (Maunder and Punt, 2004).

130 2.3. Standardizing survey and commercial catch rates

Surveys and commercial fisheries operate at different temporal and spatial scales, with different gears and strategies, thereby targeting dissimilar species assemblages and/or size ranges. The first step of this study was to identify common temporal and spatial scales, then to select a common pool of representative species and size ranges, and finally to standardize survey and commercial catchabilities using a delta- Generalized Linear Model (GLM) approach.

137 The temporal scale retained is the month, while the spatial scale considered is cells of 0.3° x 0.3° (~ 700 km²). These seasonal and spatial scales result from a trade-off between having a 138 sufficient amount of data and maintaining a sufficient level of precision, as described further. 139 140 Based on these small-scale spatio-temporal units, a mean CPUE index in number of individuals caught per hour is calculated separately from OBSMER data for each month and 141 142 from CGFS data (only for October) for a set of demersal species (Table 1). These species have been selected based on their economic importance, relative abundance and/or 143 catchability by the survey gear being considered. Survey data were only kept from 2005 to 144 2014 for the cephalopods (i.e. Sepia officinalis and Loligo spp.), as no length information is 145 available for these species before 2005. To harmonize the survey and commercial gears' 146 selectivities of the species being considered, we used a common length threshold (L_s) above 147 which a species is considered to be correctly selected by the different gears (Table 1). L_s was 148 graphically determined from length distribution for each species following the method used 149 by Ravard et al. (2014): in commercial data most of the length-frequency were unimodal and 150 L_s was approximately set for each species at the length of the highest mode of the different 151 gears combined. In our study, L_s mainly corresponded to the official minimum landing sizes 152

for the few species concerned. The potential case of a different selectivity of large individuals
to particular gears (e.g. Bertignac *et al.*, 2012) is not considered in this study.

155 OBSMER data were filtered to avoid abundance overestimation. Thus, for each species and

156 each size, only hauls with all the subsamples representing at least 5% of the total catch

157 weights each were kept for further calculations. Furthermore, to obtain a clear overview of

abundance for each demersal species being studied, only fishing gears sufficiently represented

159 (i.e. > 10 observations for a given species) were kept in the analysis.

160 Finally, we adjusted the remaining catchability differences by standardizing CPUE values

derived from both OBSMER and survey data. This was operated by applying a delta-GLM to

the CPUEs of each species under consideration. The delta-GLM first fits the probability of

163 observing a zero catch as a function of the explanatory variables, and then fits another GLM

to the non-zero catches (Maunder and Punt, 2004; Meissa *et al.*, 2008; among others).

165 The probability of presence is based on the binomial distribution after a binary recoding

166 (0=absence and 1=presence). For hauls with positive CPUE a logarithmic transformation was

167 first applied on data in order to homogenize variances and to transform the multiplicative

168 effects into additive effects (Meissa *et al.*, 2008).

169 The delta-GLM for OBSMER data contains a maximum of six explanatory variables:

170
$$logit(p_{i,a,m,y}^{>0}) = \beta_a \delta_m + \lambda_y + \rho_g \tau + \upsilon_s \quad (1)$$

171
$$log(IA_{i,a,m,y}) = \beta_a \delta_m + \lambda_y + \rho_g \tau + \upsilon_s + \varepsilon_{i,a,m,y}$$
(2)

172 where $p_{i,a,m,y}^{>0}$ is the mean presence probability and IA_{i,a,m,y} the CPUE of a species caught by 173 vessel *i* of length τ rigged with gear *g* (e.g. bottom otter trawl, trammel net), fishing in (0.3° x 174 0.3°) area *a*, year *y* and month *m*. βa is the area effect of the fishing operation (treated as 175 factor), δ_m is the month effect of the fishing operation, ρ_g is the gear effect, λ_y is the annual 176 effect, v_s is the sediment effect, which accounts for small scale habitat variability and is

decomposed into five categories s: mud, fine sand, coarse sand, gravel and pebble, based on a 177 sediment map of EEC from Larsonneur *et al.* (1982), and $\varepsilon_{i,a,m,v}$ a term of residual error. 178 Sediments are kept because they proved to have the strongest influence on the distribution of 179 species in the shallow Eastern English Channel, compared with, e.g. depth, temperature and 180 salinity (see Carpentier et al., 2009). Engine power information was also available but only 181 vessel length was kept as these two variables are usually highly correlated for bottom otter 182 183 trawlers (r = 0.94 using OBSMER data), the main size-varied vessels of the available commercial data. 184

185 CGFS survey data are always collected in October (i.e. no month effect) with the same
186 research vessel (i.e. no vessel or gear effects), hence the previous formula was reduced to the
187 following, with a maximum of three explanatory variables:

188
$$logit(p_{a,y}^{>0}) = \beta_a + \lambda_y + \upsilon_s$$
 (3)

 $189 \qquad log(IA_{i,a,m,y}) = \beta_a + \lambda_y + \upsilon_s + \epsilon_{a,y} \qquad (4)$

Models' retained explanatory variables were selected for each species based on Akaike
information criterion (AIC). Model selection was largely influenced by the previous choice of
the spatial resolution for *area* variable.

In none of the models (1-4) an interaction term between area (or area-by-month) and year
effects was considered. This requires some clarifications, given such an interaction term could
potentially reveal spatial shifts in fish distribution over time.

196 In the analysis of commercial CPUE indices, spatio-temporal interactions were partly covered

197 by introducing an area-by-month term. It was, however, not possible to explore the effect of

198 introducing the higher-ranked interaction area-by-month-by-year, partly owing to the limited

- amount of observations available but also to opportunistic fisher's behaviour, which in
- 200 combination resulted in a variable inter-annual coverage of the OBSMER dataset. In the
- analysis of survey abundance indices, only area-by-year effects could potentially be

considered, since the CGFS is operated in October only. Auber et al. (2015) concluded that 202 203 although October EEC fish communities were subject to a substantial spatial shift in 1997, no significant change was observed during 1998-2014, i.e. the period being considered in this 204 205 analysis. Still, we did investigate a model including a spatio-annual effect. According to the AIC none of the presence/absence models and only 3 out of the 19 abundance models showed 206 improved goodness of fit performances when an area-by-year interaction term was added 207 208 (poor cod, starry smooth-hound and thornback ray), without statistically significant differences in the distribution outputs (Table S1 and S2). Furthermore, 14 out of the 19 209 presence/absence models did not converge with an area-by-year interaction term. 210 211 Final predictions are obtained by the product of presence probabilities and CPUE. Knowing the sediment characteristics of each area, the total abundance in each cell is computed by 212 reallocating the environmental effects in proportions to sediment types coverage. 213 214 Finally a limit of 10 observations per cell in both OBSMER and CGFS was determined as the threshold above which the square was kept in the analysis, resulting from a trade-off between 215 a sufficient coverage of the EEC and a consistent number of observations (Figure 2). By 216 applying this limit and our spatial resolution to survey data, 88% of the EEC is covered (for 217 OBSMER data this percentage is variable among month and species). In comparison, using 218 cells of 0.4° x 0.4° instead of 0.3° x 0.3° leads to the representation of 90% of the Eastern 219 English Channel, while using smaller cells of 0.2° x 0.2° only allows representing 68% of the 220 Eastern English Channel. Thus our choice seems to be the best trade-off between precision 221 222 and coverage. Importantly, the explained variables presented above are likely to include inherent spatial 223 dependence (spatial autocorrelation SAC; Legendre, 1993), owing to the nature of the data at 224 hand. As a result, the values of the dependent variables are unlikely to be conditionally 225

independent as assumed in these models. The SAC inherent to both CGFS and OBSMER data

was here accounted for by applying the Moran's Eigenvectors (MEV) mapping method 227 228 following the protocol described by Cormon et al. (2014) with R packages {spdep} (Bivand et al., 2013), {spacemakeR} (Dray, 2013) and {packfor} (Dray et al., 2013). The concept of 229 this method is to allow the translation of the spatial arrangement of the data into a set of 230 explanatory variables through the eigenvector decomposition of data coordinate connectivity 231 232 matrix previously built (Dormann et al., 2007). For OBSMER data, MEV are computed and 233 selected for each month separately, and then integrated in the whole model set of parameters. Temporal dependencies were not examined in the study. 234

235 2.4. Assessing the similarity between fisheries- and survey-based spatial abundance
236 The data treatment described above allows to produce monthly maps of species abundance

distribution. While the global seasonal patterns obtained can be compared with disparate
knowledge available for some species, the degree of reliability of the fine scale spatial
distribution derived from commercial data can be addressed through comparison to surveybased maps.

To quantitatively determine how similar spatial distribution derived from commercial and
survey data are at fine scale, we estimated, for October, the local overlap between
distributions, using the geostatistical index Local Index of Collocation (LIC, Woillez *et al.*,
2009):

245
$$\operatorname{LIC} = \frac{\sum z_{obsmer}(i) z_{survey}(i)}{\sqrt{\sum z_{obsmer}^2(i) \times \sum z_{survey}^2(i)}}$$
(5)

where $z_{obsmer}(i)$ and $z_{survey}(i)$ are the computed abundances in area *i*, as provided by OBSMER and CGFS data, respectively. LIC was computed using R package {RGeostats} (Renard *et al.*, 2014). This spatial indicator is considered appropriate to assess local overlapping between two densities of population, without taking the mean abundance into account (Woillez *et al.*, 2009). 251 This index theoretically ranges between 0, showing absolutely no match between the two

- spatial distributions $(z_{obsmer}(i) = 0 \text{ if } z_{survey}(i) > 0, z_{survey}(i) = 0 \text{ if } z_{obsmer}(i) > 0, \forall i)$, and 1,
- demonstrating a perfect match between them $(z_{obsmer}(i) = z_{survey}(i), \forall i)$.
- 254 The significance of index values was assessed using random permutations of OBSMER
- abundance values against constant CGFS ones. This procedure is repeated 5000 times, and the
- spatial distributions derived from commercial data were considered to overlap spatial
- distributions derived from the CGFS survey when the actual LIC value was above the 95th
- 258 percentile of the LIC randomly permutated values.
- 259 The Horn's index (Horn, 1966) was also tested for the study, but it provides approximately
- the same results and is less efficient with extreme values of abundance, thus only results
- 261 based on LIC are presented.
- Finally, to assess the sensitivity of our results to the set of areas being considered, a jackknife
- resampling was operated for all species, by removing sequentially each area, and by
- evaluating its impact on LIC significance.

265 **2.5.** Comparing yearly abundance indices

Additionally to the spatial abundance, the model provides a year effect that can be used to derive an inter-annual abundance index in both survey and OBSMER data following the method of Lo *et al.* (1992). The time series ranges from 1998 to 2014 for survey data (2005-2014 for cephalopods series) and from 2003 to 2015 for OBSMER data. It is obtained by varying only the year parameter on the computation of CPUEs, and taking the mean of all areas in natural space to avoid variance disparities. Pearson's correlation index was computed to quantify the correlation between abundance indices from the two data sources.

273

274 **3. Results**

275 **3.1. Monthly spatial distribution patterns**

In the delta-GLM applied to commercial CPUEs, every parameters were kept, with an 276 277 exception for the sediment parameter in the presence/absence model of cuttlefish (Table S3). However, area-by-month was replaced by month alone in the presence/absence models of 278 279 starry smooth-hound, flounder and John Dory. In the delta-GLM applied to survey CPUEs, the parameters selection is more variable (Table S4). For example, the year parameter is not 280 kept in both presence/absence and abundance models for tub gurnard, and the sediment one is 281 282 not kept for three species: cod, pouting and tub gurnard. The area parameter was always significant and kept. The monthly spatial distribution of cuttlefish derived from the delta-283 GLM models applied to commercial and survey CPUEs is presented in Figure 3. This species 284 285 has been chosen for illustration because it is one of the main species in terms of yields in the EEC (Royer et al., 2006). These maps are partial and do not cover the same areas over all 286 months, owing to varying fisheries distributions. The map presented for October results from 287 288 survey-based information, hence explaining its wider spatial coverage. Some informative spatial patterns can be evidenced for cuttlefish: their quasi-absence in the EEC from January 289 290 to March, a coastal aggregation along the French coast in May-June, and a more offshore distribution in October-November indicate the existence of a seasonal migration pattern for 291 292 this species.

3.2. Comparison of fine scale spatial distributions from survey data and commercial data

The fine scale match between the spatial abundances estimated from fisheries and survey has been quantified for each species by computing the LIC value, and testing its significance with 5000 random permutations of CPUE abundances. Of the 19 tested species, 9 had a LIC significance above 95%, 6 between 75% and 95%, and only 4 under 75% (Figure 4). Considering 95% significance threshold, survey- and fisheries-based spatial distributions were therefore found to overlap for half of the species under investigation. Although the distribution of LIC values resulting from the permutation tests is variable among species, the
results highlight that almost all species with a LIC above 0.6 showed high significance
(except John Dory for which the LIC value of 0.67 falls just below the third quartile of
permutations), while species with a LIC value smaller than 0.6 showed no significant overlap
(except cod with a LIC of 0.52). It can also be noted that John Dory, the only species showing
no significant overlap despite a LIC above 0.6, shows a very low variability of LIC in the

308 Thornback ray, poor cod, plaice and pouting had the lowest LIC values, under 0.4.

309 Cephalopods species, cuttlefish and squids, had intermediate LIC values of 0.50 and 0.54,

respectively, and both were between the median and the 95th percentile. Finally, of the four

311 flatfish species, i.e. common dab, lemon sole, European flounder and plaice, only common

312 dab and lemon sole had a significant LIC.

313 **3.3. Sensitivity to areas**

In order to assess the sensitivity of the results obtained, a jackknife resampling was performed and results were analysed in regard to some characteristics of sensitive areas (Table 2). Of the 10 species for which no overlap could be evidenced, red mullet was the only one for which LIC became significant by removing one area. Red mullet original LIC significance value compared with permutations was close to 0.05, and dropped below that threshold with the removal of either the first or second top abundance areas as derived from CGFS information (ranked 8th and 4th building on OBSMER data).

Among the nine species for which the LIC was significant for all areas being considered, the LIC of seven species became not significant when removing one area (Table 3). The LIC of tub gurnard, common dab, lemon sole, starry smooth-hound and lesser-spotted dogfish were thus sensitive to the absence of one particular area, ranked first or second in abundance. The LIC of cod and black seabream became not significant with the removal of one area among a list of 6 and 8, respectively. Their original p-values, close to the 0.05 threshold (i.e. 0.046 and
0.043), can partially explain the high number of sensitive areas.

328 **3.4. Rebuilding of yearly abundance index**

329 The year effect derived from each delta-GLM analysis can be considered as a yearly abundance index for each species. Figure 5 displays two examples of different levels of fit 330 between survey and commercial data, ranging from good visual fit, for cod, to poor fit for 331 332 black seabream. Cod abundance index shows consistent fluctuations in both survey and commercial data, with higher abundance from 2007 to 2009 followed by 4 years of lower 333 abundance. Black seabream abundance index derived from survey displayed a general 334 335 decrease from 2004 until 2014. in contrast, the index derived from commercial CPUEs shows an increase over this period. The Pearson's correlation index was computed to quantify the 336 link between the two abundance indices produced for each species (Table 4). The results 337 338 indicated that spatial overlap represented by LIC's significance is not necessarily related to concordant abundance indices time series, as most of the species with a significant LIC value 339 have an intermediate correlation (Figure S1). Black seabream, with a significant LIC, has 340 even the third lowest value for Pearson's correlation metrics. 341

342

343 4. Discussion

344 Seasonal distribution patterns of the main fishing resources in the EEC

Our results show the usefulness of fisheries data to infer, in combination with surveys, the spatial and seasonal distributions of several species. The spatial and seasonal distribution of cuttlefish, one of the main commercial species for French fleets (Royer *et al.*, 2006), is in agreement with literature. Indeed, from the examination of landings data, cuttlefish adults are known to start migrating in October to spend winter in the Central and Western English Channel, and to be inshore in the Eastern English Channel during summer for feeding and

reproduction (Royer *et al.*, 2006). Other remarkable life distribution can be derived from the 351 352 maps (see Figures S2-S19), like the high winter abundance of squids in the EEC, confirming previous knowledge (Royer et al., 2002), or the quasi-absence of red mullet in the East of the 353 354 EEC in the beginning of the year while it concentrates in the East central part of the EEC in the end of the year, which adheres to the conclusions of Mahé et al. (2005) based on fishers' 355 interviews. On the contrary the spatial distribution of other species remains more stable 356 357 through the year, e.g. red gurnard in the centre of the EEC, or European flounder inshore except during the winter period, as described by Skerritt (2010). Finally punctual abundance 358 or absence can be detected, like the high concentration of cod along the English coast in June 359 360 and in the Dover Strait in November, or the high presence of black seabream in the centre of the EEC in February, contrasting with its absence in the eastern part, consistent with Pawson 361 (1995). 362

363 Coherence between fisheries-dependent and -independent abundance indices

In addition to the accordance between the global seasonal pattern produced here and the 364 available literature, our results also show that half of the species' spatial distributions 365 exhibited good coherence at fine scale across the two data sources. This conclusion built on 366 an analysis of the LIC overlap metric, the statistical significance of which was quantified 367 368 using a permutation test. Prior to this study, LIC values were compared with and have been found very close to Horn index values. The Horn index is another overlap metric that is 369 commonly used in trophic ecology, and for which a value > 0.6 is usually considered 370 significant, without further testing (Scrimgeour and Winterbourn, 1987). Our results cross-371 checked this approach. Except for John Dory (i.e. LIC = 0.67) and cod (i.e. LIC = 0.52), every 372 species' distribution with a LIC above 0.6 were significant. The unexpected outcome obtained 373 for John Dory reveals a shortcoming of the method we applied to assess overlap significance. 374 Indeed, when abundance is homogeneously spread in the entire study area (here the EEC), 375

LIC can be above 0.6 and still non-significant when compared with values resulting from the
permutation test. Actually, the LIC (as well as the Horn index) random permutation test can
only be efficient with areas of contrasted abundance, as demonstrated by lemon sole or
common dab with one area of high abundance contrasting with relatively low values.
Therefore, for the evenly distributed John Dory spatial distributions derived from survey and
fisheries data can be considered to be close.

382 Concerning the remaining half of species with lower coherence, a number of reasons can be invoked to explain the discrepancies observed. The results of jackknife analysis demonstrated 383 the impact of some influential areas on the result of the LIC, which cannot be observed 384 385 depending on the fishers' spatial distribution in October, and highlight the sensitivity of using fine scale comparison when high abundance areas are not available. Another issue is a 386 possible non-proportionality between CPUE and abundance (Hilborn and Walters, 1992). 387 388 Indeed, commercial fisheries are expected to concentrate their activities into attractive areas (Gillis, 2003). This issue was addressed by standardizing CPUEs using a delta-GLM, and by 389 390 filtering out spatial auto-correlation. Owing to the limited amount of data, however, SAC correlations could not be computed separately for each year. This could be a concern, as 391 species presence in a precise area/season may vary from one year to another. Thus, a more 392 393 realistic approach could consist of computing SAC separately for each year, which could not be achieved in this study owing to the low number of observations in the dataset. For similar 394 reasons, the CPUE delta-GLM could not be applied to each gear separately. Instead, 395 396 observations from the different gears were analysed through the same model, where gear type was treated as an explanatory variable. This approach allowed to estimate the overall impact 397 of gears on CPUE. However, more specific effects of gear types on CPUEs (e.g. selectivity, 398 saturation) could not be fully addressed. In particular, the selectivity of large individuals 399 could be a challenge, as the trawl selectivity ogive is sigmoid-shaped, while that of gillnets 400

401 could be bell-shaped, or bi-normal, reducing the catch of larger individuals (Dickson *et al.*,
402 1995). Among other potential limits, the soaking time of gillnets is much longer compared
403 with trawls, and it is more subject to saturation effect, which could result in an asymptotic
404 relationship between catches and fishing time (Hickford and Schiel, 1996).

Still, the lack of overlap between the spatial distributions derived from fisheries-dependent 405 and -independent abundance indices for some species could also be explained by their actual 406 biological and ecological characteristics. These could have strong impact on abundance 407 estimations, particularly if only few observations are available within an area. Based on a 408 scientific protocol, the CGFS sampling strategy is fixed and the timing of the survey almost 409 410 does not vary from one year to the other. However, the EEC ecosystem constitutes for several species a migration path between the North Sea and the Atlantic Ocean, and this can lead to 411 biased estimates of abundance based on survey conducted at a fixed period. For example, red 412 413 mullet migrates during fall from the southern part of the North Sea to the Western English Channel (Mahé et al., 2005), but its migration timing appears variable across years 414 415 (Carpentier et al., 2009), which could lead to high variance in some areas and thus causes difficulties to obtain a clear static mean distribution. 416

Pouting, poor cod, thornback ray and plaice have the lowest LIC in our results. Various 417 418 species are known to change their behaviour between day and night (Pitcher, 1992), which may affect our results (Fréon et al., 1993). Indeed, pouting are known to have diel activity 419 patterns, forming shoals near wrecks or rocks during the day and disperse during the night for 420 feeding (Jensen et al., 2000). Thornback rays predate also at night and burry in the sand 421 during the day (Wilding and Snowden, 2008). There is evidence that poor cod is mainly 422 caught at night (Gibson et al., 1996). Concerning plaice, differences in catches between day 423 and night are less clear and vary across studies (De Groot, 1971; Arnold and Metcalfe, 1995). 424 Surveys like CGFS occur only during daylight, while about half of the fishing operations are 425

conducted during the night. Including explicitly the time of the day in our model would be a 426 427 way forward, which would require a larger set of data (Benoît and Swain, 2003). Finally, variability in species distribution can occur by environmentally-driven spatial and annual 428 429 shifts (Verdoit et al., 2003). As previously evoked, with sufficient data, dealing with these shifts would require interaction parameters, introduced by fixed effects (with associated 430 restrictions, e.g. Thorson and Ward, 2013) or random effects (with corresponding bias-431 432 correction, e.g. Thorson and Kristensen, 2016). The high number of presence/absence models that did not converge with an area-by-year interaction can be explained by the small number 433 of observations for each occurrence (i.e. on average 2 per area-by-year), often 0 or 1 for a 434 435 substantial part of the new parameters. Increasing the number of iteration failed to improve model convergence. 436

In the coming years, the growing collection of data may allow for accommodating such
processes, but also fine-scale targeting (e.g. Thorson *et al.*, in press), and hence lead to more
reliable abundance estimates per area for a broader coverage of the EEC. A next step could
then be to derive spatially-explicit estimations of fish lengths, building on innovative
approaches (e.g. Petitgas *et al.*, 2011; Nielsen *et al.*, 2014). These could help to distinguish
between mature and non-mature individuals, which are driving fish movement (Pittman and
McAlpine, 2001).

444 Uses of data collected on-board commercial vessels

Another objective of this study was to provide annual series of abundance indices. The
comparison between fisheries-dependent and -independent time series suggested contrasted
results across species.

448 For species like cod (Figure 5a) and lemon sole, both the spatial and annual abundance

distributions derived from fisheries and survey data were reasonably consistent. However,

450 consistent annual trends across the two data sources were not necessarily linked with spatially

451 overlapping distributions, e.g. cuttlefish or red mullet. Potential reasons for the lack of spatial452 overlap for such species were discussed above.

For other species, a good spatial overlap between fisheries-dependent and -independent 453 abundance distributions was not necessarily associated with synchronous time series (e.g. 454 black seabream, Figure 5b). This could be owing to data limitations, but also to some 455 hyperstable relationship between abundance and CPUE (Hilborn and Walters, 1992), that 456 457 could not be completely filtered out by our standardization approach. In addition, the species which present a good spatial overlap can be subject to intra-annual fluctuations of abundance 458 owing to high exploitation, migrations and recruitment (Gillis and Peterman, 1998), that could 459 460 strongly impact the mean annual abundance value.

Finally, abundance indices derived from fisheries data could be an appropriate source of 461 information to provide seasonal and spatial distributions, particularly during periods where 462 463 surveys do not operate. A better overview of species migrations is first a progress in current knowledge on species ecology, which could further be linked with seasonally-explicit abiotic 464 and biotic environmental conditions. Secondly such information could be linked with fishers' 465 movement throughout year, which could enhance our knowledge on fishers-resource 466 interactions. Thirdly, seasonally- and spatially-resolved information such as that output from 467 468 this study could also serve to calibrate complex end-to-end models such as Atlantis (Fulton et al., 2007), OSMOSE (Shin and Cury, 2001), ISIS-Fish (Pelletier et al., 2009) or Ecospace 469 (Walters et al., 1999), and enhance their capacity to evaluate ecosystem-based management 470 strategies (e.g. closed areas and seasons). Finally, further studies could validate the 471 assumptions that on-board commercial data give a better overview of spatial distributions than 472 survey for a small portion of species (e.g. pouting). However, the distributions derived for 473 species presenting strong variability in selectivity or behavioural pattern (e.g. diel variations 474 or migrations) should be interpreted with caution. 475

In addition to spatial distributions, annual abundance indices derived from fisheries data could
potentially complement the survey-based series used in stock assessments. This would
require, as a follow-up to this study, to structure those fisheries-based annual indices by
length and/or age, and perhaps to try to obtain such indices on a shorter duration than year.
Previously, fisheries-based abundance indices should be closely examined, on a case-by-case
basis, cognisant of the life cycle and exploitation features of the species under investigation.

482

483 **5.** Conclusion

This study shows the potential of combining fisheries-dependent and -independent data to 484 485 increase our knowledge on the seasonal and spatial distribution of several marine species. Even if the comparisons realized during this study showed that fisheries-dependent data did 486 not always mirror the time and spatial survey-based distribution of some species, they still 487 488 remain a valid source of information. Fisheries-dependent data are relatively abundant, opportunistic and cheaper than survey data, and their use should be encouraged, especially to 489 490 reflect abundance distributions in areas and seasons that are not covered by surveys. Moreover, some species are poorly sampled by surveys owing to their diel behaviour, and the 491 use of at-night observations on-board commercial vessels could help better inferring their 492 493 spatial distributions. The method we used here is relatively simple compared with, e.g. log-Gaussian Cox model method developed by Kristensen et al. (2014). Still, the quality of the 494 resulting outputs we presented was assessed, and these provide valuable information on 495 spatial and temporal species distributions, which concur with existing ecological knowledge. 496 This approach would benefit from a better spatial representation along the English coastline, 497 and further cooperation, data sharing and on-board observation program strengthening could 498 499 substantially enhance our understanding of the spatio-temporal distribution of marine species in the Eastern English Channel. 500

501 Supplementary material

- 502 The following supplementary material is available at ICESJMS online: one table for
- 503 parameters of survey data models incorporating spatio-temporal interactions, one table for
- 504 comparison between models with and without spatio-temporal interactions and two tables of
- 505 parameters chosen for each species in the commercial data and survey data Delta-GLM. It
- also contains additional abundance index from the two sources of data. Finally it contains
- additional maps of the 18 species not presented in the study.

508 Acknowledgments

509 This study was partly funded by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation

- 510 programme under Grant Agreement No 633680 (project DiscardLess). We are grateful to the
- 511 "Système d'Information Halieutique" (SIH), the "Marine Fisheries and Aquaculture
- 512 Administration"(DPMA) and all the persons involved in collecting and compiling survey
- 513 (CGFS) and on-board data (OBSMER program). The authors would also like to acknowledge
- the Pôle Métropolitain de la Côte d'Opale for their financial supports. We also thank Antoine
- 515 Balazuc (Comité Régional de Pêches Maritimes du Nord Pas de Calais-Picardie) for his
- valuable inputs. Finally we wish to thank James Thorson, the anonymous referees and editor
- 517 for helping us the improve manuscript.

519 **References**

- 520 Arnold, G.P. and Metcalfe, J.D. 1995. Seasonal migrations of plaice (*Pleuronectes platessa*)
- through the Dover Strait. Marine Biology, 127: 151-160.
- 522 Auber, A., Travers-Trolet, M., Villanueva, M.C., and Ernande, B. 2015. Regime Shift in an
- 523 Exploited Fish Community Related to Natural Climate Oscillations. PLoS ONE 10(7):
- 524 e0129883. doi:10.1371/journal. pone.0129883
- 525 Benoît, H.P., & Swain, D.P. 2003. Accounting for length- and depth-dependent diel variation
- 526 in catchability of fish and invertebrates in an annual bottom-trawl survey. ICES Journal of
- 527 Marine Science, 60: 1298-1317.
- 528 Bertignac, M., Fernández, C., and Methot, R. 2012. Preliminary Spatially Disaggregated
- 529 Stock Assessment of Northern Hake, A Widely Distributed Stock of the Northeast Atlantic.
- 530 ICES CM.
- 531 Bivand, R., Altman, M., Anselin, L., Assuncaõ, R., Berke, O., Bernat, A., Blanchet, G., et al.
- 532 2013. spdep: Spatial Dependence: Weighting Schemes, Statistics and Models. CRAN—R
- 533 package version 0.5-68.
- Booth, A. 2000. Incorporating the spatial component of fisheries data into stock assessment
- 535 models. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 57: 858–865.
- 536 Carpentier A., Martin, C.S., and Vaz, S. (Eds.). 2009. Channel Habitat Atlas for marine
- 537 Resource Management, final report / Atlas des habitats des ressources marines de la Manche
- orientale, rapport final (CHARMphase II). INTERREG 3a Programme, IFREMER,
- 539 Boulogne-sur-Mer, France. 626 pp. & CD-rom.
- 540 Coppin, F., Travers-Trolet, M. 1989. CGFS : Channel Ground Fish Survey,
- 541 http://dx.doi.org/10.18142//11
- 542 Cormon, X., Loots, C., Vaz, S., Vermard, Y., and Marchal, P. 2014. Spatial interactions
- 543 between saithe (*Pollachius virens*) and hake (*Merluccius merluccius*) in the North Sea. ICES

- Journal of Marine Science, 71: 1342–1355.
- 545 Cornou A.-S., Quinio-Scavinner M., Delaunay D., Dimeet J., Goascoz N., Dube B.,
- 546 Fauconnet L., and Rochet M.-J. 2015. Observations à bord des navires de pêche
- 547 professionnelle. Bilan de l'échantillonnage 2014. http://dx.doi.org/10.13155/39722
- 548 Dauvin, J.-C. 2012. Are the eastern and western basins of the English Channel two separate
- 549 ecosystems? Marine Pollution Bulletin, 64: 463-471.
- 550 Dickson, W., Smith, A., and Walsh, S., 1995. Methodology manual: measurement of fishing
- 551 gear selectivity. The Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canada.
- 552 Dormann, C.F., McPherson, J.M., Araújo, M.B., Bivand, R., Bolliger, J., Carl, G., Davies,
- 553 R.G., et al. (2007). Methods to account for spatial autocorrelation in the analysis of species
- distributional data: a review. Ecography, 30: 609–628.
- 555 Dray, S. 2013. spacemakeR: Spatial Modelling. R-Forge—R package version 0.0-5.
- 556 Dray, S., Legendre, L., and Blanchet, F. 2013. packfor: Forward Selection with permutation
- 557 (Canoco p.46). R-Forge—R package version 0.0-8.
- 558 Eigaard, O., Marchal, P., Gislason, H., and Rijnsdorp, A.D. 2014. Technological development
- and fisheries management. Reviews in Fisheries Science & Aquaculture, 22: 156-174.
- 560 Eltink, A., Warmerdam, M., and Heinen, A. 1986. Origin, migration and spawning of
- southern North Sea mackerel with respect to the overspill of Western mackerel to the North
- 562 Sea stock. ICES C.M. 1986/H:49, 15 pp.
- 563 Fauconnet, L., Trenkel, V.M., Morandeau, G., Caill-Milly, N., and Rochet, M.-J. 2015.
- 564 Characterizing catches taken by different gears as a step towards evaluating fishing pressure
- on fish communities. Fisheries Research, 164: 238–248.
- 566 Fréon, P., Gerlotto, F., and Misund, O.A. 1993. Consequences of fish behaviour for stock
- assessment. ICES Marine Science Symposia, 196 : 190-195.

- 568 Fulton, E.A., Smith, A.D.M., and Smith, D.C. 2007. Alternative Management Strategies for
- 569 Southeast Australian Commonwealth Fisheries: Stage 2: Quantitative Management Strategy
- 570 Evaluation. Australian Fisheries Management Authority Report.
- 571 Gibson, R.N., Robb, L., Burrows, M.T., and Ansell, A.D. 1996. Tidal, diel and longer term
- 572 changes in the distribution of fishes on a Scottish sandy beach. Marine Ecology Progress
- 573 Series, 130: 1-17.
- 574 Gillis, D.M., and Peterman, R.M. 1998. Implications of interference among fishing vessels
- and the ideal free distribution to the interpretation of the CPUE. Canadian Journal of Fisheries
- and Aquatic Sciences, 55: 37-46.
- 577 Gillis, D.M. 2003. Ideal free distributions in fleet dynamics: a behavioral perspective on
- vessel movement in fisheries analysis. Canadian Journal of Zoology. 81: 177-187.
- 579 Groot, S.J. de. 1971. On the interrelationship between morphology of the alimentary tract,
- 580 food and feeding behavior in flatfishes (Pisces: Pleuronectiformes). Netherlands Journal of
- 581 Sea Research, 5: 121-196.
- 582 Hickford, M.J.H., and Schiel, D.R. 1996. Gillnetting in southern New Zealand: duration
- 583 effects of sets and entanglement modes of fish. Fishery Bulletin, 94: 669–677.
- 584 Hilborn, R., and Walters, C.J. 1992. Quantitative fisheries stock assessment: Choice,
- dynamics and uncertainty. Chapman and Hall. 570 pp.
- 586 Horn, H.S. 1966. Measurement of "Overlap" in Comparative Ecological Studies. The
- 587 American Naturalist, 100: 419-424.
- 588 Hunter, E., Berry, F., Buckley, A.A., Stewart, C., and Metcalfe, J.D. 2006. Seasonal migration
- 589 of thornback rays and implications for closure management: Ray migration and closure
- 590 management. Journal of Applied Ecology, 43: 710–720.
- 591 ICES. 2015. Report of the Herring Assessment Working Group for the Area South of 62°N
- 592 (HAWG), 10-19 March 2015, ICES HQ, Copenhagen, Denmark. ICES CM 2015/ACOM:06.

593 850 pp.

- Jensen, A.C., Collins, K.J., and Lockwood, A.PM. (Eds.) 2000. Artificial reefs in European
 seas. Kluwer Academic, Netherlands, 508 pp.
- 596 Kristensen, K., Thygesen, U.H., Andersen, K.H., and Beyer, J.E. 2014. Estimating spatio-
- 597 temporal dynamics of size-structured populations. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic
- 598 Sciences, 71: 326–336.
- Larsonneur, C., Bouysse, P., and Lauffret, J-P. 1982. The superficial sediments of the English
 Channel and its Western Approaches. Sedimentology, 29: 851-864.
- Legendre, P. 1993. Spatial autocorrelation—trouble or new paradigm? Ecology, 74: 1659–
 1673.
- 603 Lo, N.C., Jacobson, L.D., and Squire, J.L. 1992. Indices of relative abundance from fish
- spotter data based on Delta-Lognormal Models. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic
 Sciences, 49: 2515–2526.
- 606 Long, R.D., Charles, A., and Stephenson, R.L. 2015. Key principles of marine ecosystem-
- based management, Marine Policy, 57: 53–60.
- Mahé K., Destombes A., Coppin F., Koubbi P., Vaz S., Leroy D. and Carpentier A. 2005. Le
- rouget barbet de roche *Mullus surmuletus* (L. 1758) en Manche orientale et mer du Nord, 186
 pp.
- 611 Marchal, P., Andersen, B., Bromley, D., Iriondo, A., Mahévas, S., Quirijns, F., Rackham, B.,
- 612 Santurtun, M., Tien, N., and Ulrich, C. 2006. Improving the definition of fishing effort for
- 613 important European fleets by accounting for the skipper effect. Canadian Journal of Fisheries
- and Aquatic Sciences, 63: 510-533.
- Maunder, M.N., and Punt, A.E. 2004. Standardizing catch and effort data: a review of recent
- approaches. Fisheries Research, 70: 141–159.

- 617 Meissa, B., Rivot, E., and Gascuel, D. 2008. Analysis of CPUE data series through
- 618 Generalized Linear Models and Delta method to derive annual series of abundance indices
- 619 Application to the Mauritanian demersal fishery. Scientific report European project ISTAM,
- 620 Deliverable D.3.2, Agrocampus Ouest, Rennes. 13 pp.
- 621 Meyer, C.G., Holland, K.N., and Papastamatiou, Y.P. 2007. Seasonal and diel movements of
- 622 giant trevally *Caranx ignobilis* at remote Hawaiian atolls: implications for the design of
- 623 marine protected areas. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 333: 13-25.
- 624 Molfese, C., Beare, D., and Hall-Spencer, J. 2014. Overfishing and the Replacement of
- 625 Demersal Finfish by Shellfish: An Example from the English Channel. PLoS ONE 9(7):
- 626 e101506. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0101506.
- 627 Nielsen, J.R., Kristensen, K., Lewy, P., and Bastardie, F. 2014. A Statistical Model for
- 628 Estimation of Fish Density Including Correlation in Size, Space, Time and between Species
- from Research Survey Data. PLOS ONE 9(6): e99151. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0099151.
- 630 Pawson, M.G. 1995. Biogeographical identification of English Channel fish and shellfish
- 631 stocks. Technical report 99, MAFF, Directorate of Fisheries Research, Lowesoft, 72 pp.
- 632 Pawson, M. G., Pickett, G. D., Leballeur, J. Brown, M., and Fritsch, M. 2007. Migrations,
- 633 fishery interactions, and management units of sea bass (*Dicentrarchus labrax*) in Northwest
- Europe. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 64: 332–345.
- 635 Pelletier D., Mahevas S., Drouineau H., Vermard Y., Thebaud O., Guyader O., and Poussin
- B. 2009. Evaluation of the bioeconomic sustainability of multi-species multi-fleet fisheries
- under a wide range of policy options using ISIS-Fish. Ecological Modelling, 220(7): 1013-
- 638 1033.
- 639 Petitgas, P., Doray, M., Masse, J., and Grellier, P. 2011. Spatially explicit estimation of fish
- length histograms, with application to anchovy habitats in the Bay of Biscay. ICES Journal of
- 641 Marine Science, 68: 2086–2095.

- Pitcher, T.J. 1992. The Behaviour of Teleost Fishes (ed. T.J. Pitcher). London:Chapman andHall. 716 pp.
- Pittman, S.J., and McAlpine, C.A. 2001. Movements of marine fish and decapods
 crustaceans: Process, theory and application. Advance in Marine Biology, An Annual
 Review, 44: 206-295.
- Ravard, D., Brind'Amour, A., and Trenkel, V.M. 2014. Evaluating the potential impact of
- fishing on demersal species in the Bay of Biscay using simulations and survey data. Fisheries
 Research, 157: 86–95.
- 650 Renard, D., Bez, N., Desassis, N., Beucher, H., and Ors, F. 2014. RGeostats: Geostatistical
- 651 Package. R Package version 10.0.8. MINES-ParisTech / ARMINES. Free download from:
- 652 http://cg.ensmp.fr/rgeostats
- 653 Rijnsdorp, A.D., Daan, N., Dekker, W., Poos, J.J., and Van Densen, W.L.T. 2007. Sustainable
- use of flatfish resources: Addressing the credibility crisis in mixed fisheries management.
- Journal of Sea Research, 57: 114–125.
- 656 Royer, J., Périès, P., and Robin, J.-P. 2002. Stock assessments of English Channel loliginid
- squids: updated depletion methods and new analytical methods. ICES Journal of MarineScience, 59: 445-457.
- Royer, P., Pierce, G.J., Foucher, E., and Robin, J.-P. 2006. The English Channel stock of
- 660 Sepia officinalis: Modelling variability in abundance and impact of the fishery. Fisheries
- 661 Research, 78(1): 96-106.
- 662 Scrimgeour, G.J., and Winterbourn, M.J. 1987. Diet, food resource partitioning and feeding
- 663 periodicity of two riffle-dwelling fish species in a New Zealand river. Journal of Fish
- 664 Biology, 31: 309–324.
- 665 Shin, Y.-J., and Cury, P. 2001. Exploring fish community dynamics through size-dependent
- trophic interactions using a spatialized individual-based model. Aquatic Living Resources, 14:

667 65–80.

- 668 Skerritt, D.J. 2010. A review of the European flounder *Platichthys flesus* biology, life
- 669 history and trends in population. Eastern Sea Fisheries Joint Committee report. Newcastle
- 670 University. 13 pp.
- 671 Thorson, J.T., and Ward, E. 2013. Accounting for space-time interactions in index
- standardization models. Fisheries Research, 147: 426–433. doi:10.1016/j.fishres.2013.03.012.
- 673 Thorson, J.T., Fonner, R., Haltuch, M.A., Ono, K., and Winker, H. In press. Accounting for
- 674 spatiotemporal variation and fisher targeting when estimating abundance from multispecies
- fishery data. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 73: 1-14.
- 676 Thorson, J.T., and Kristensen, K. 2016. Implementing a generic method for bias correction in
- 677 statistical models using random effects, with spatial and population dynamics examples.
- 678 Fisheries Research, 175: 66–74. doi:10.1016/j.fishres.2015.11.016.
- Van Keeken, O.A., van Hoppe, M., Grift, R.E., and Rijnsdorp, A.D. 2007. Changes in the
- 680 spatial distribution of North Sea plaice (*Pleuronectes platessa*) and implications for fisheries
- management. Journal of Sea Research, 57: 187-197.
- 682 Vaz, S., Carpentier, A., and Coppin, F., 2007. Eastern English Channel fish assemblages:
- 683 measuring the structuring effects of habitats on distinct sub-communities. ICES Journal of
- 684 Marine Science, 64: 271-287.
- 685 Verdoit, M., Pelletier, D., and Bellail, R. 2003. Are commercial logbook and scientific CPUE
- data useful for characterizing the spatial and seasonal distribution of exploited populations?
- The case of the Celtic Sea whiting. Aquatic Living Resources, 16: 467–485.
- 688 Walters, C., Pauly, D., and Christensen, V. 1999. Ecospace: prediction of mesoscale spatial
- 689 patterns in trophic relationships of exploited ecosystems, with emphasis on the impacts of
- 690 marine protected areas. Ecosystems, 2: 539–554.
- 691 Wilding., C., and Snowden., E. 2008. *Raja clavata*. Thornback ray. Marine Life Information

- 692 Network: Biology and Sensitivity Key Information Sub-programme [on-line]. Plymouth:
- Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom. [cited 25/11/2011]. Available from:
- 694 http://www.marlin.ac.uk/speciesinformation.php?speciesID=4229
- 695 Woillez, M., Rivoirard, J., and Petitgas, P. 2009. Notes on survey-based spatial indicators for
- 696 monitoring fish populations. Aquatic Living Resources, 22: 155–164.

- **Table 1.** List of species considered in this study, with their minimum total length L_s (cm),
- above which individuals are considered to be equally selected by survey and commercial
- gears, and Minimum Landing Size (MLS) during the 2003-2014 period in Eastern English
- 701 Channel when relevant.

species	L _s (cm)	MLS (cm)	Common name
Chelidonichthys cuculus	22	-	Red gurnard
Chelidonichthys lucerna	26	-	Tub gurnard
Dicentrarchus labrax	36	36	European seabass
Gadus morhua	35	35	Atlantic cod
Limanda limanda	21	-	Common dab
Loligo spp.	14 ^a	-	Squids
Merlangius merlangus	24	27	Whiting
Microstomus kitt	25	-	Lemon sole
Mullus surmuletus	20	-	Red mullet
Mustelus asterias	60	-	Starry smooth-hound
Platichthys flesus	29	-	European flounder
Pleuronectes platessa	25	27	European plaice
Raja clavata	49	-	Thornback ray
Scyliorhinus canicula	54	-	Lesser-spotted dogfish
Sepia officinalis	13 ^a	-	Common cuttlefish
Spondyliosoma cantharus	17	-	Black seabream
Trisopterus luscus	25	-	Pouting
Trisopterus minutus	13	-	Poor cod
Zeus faber	21	-	John Dory

702

^a mantle length

703

Table 2. Jackknife results and main data attributes for species that did not initially 705 demonstrate significant overlap between OBSMER and Channel Ground Fish Survey (CGFS) 706 distributions. LIC: original value of Local Index of Collocation. p-value: situation of the LIC 707 value related to the distribution of permutation tests (values below 0.05 indicate significant 708 709 overlap). JK: number of areas which prevented from having significant overlap (with total number of areas). % abundance OBSMER & CGFS: percentage of abundance represented by 710 these sensitive areas among all OBSMER and CGFS areas respectively (with ranking among 711 712 all areas).

	LIC	p-value	JK	% abundance OBSM	% abundance CGFS
Seabass	0.49	0.156	0 (24)	/	/
Squids	0.54	0.440	0 (20)	/	/
Red mullet	0.58	0.063	2 (23)	5.8 (4/23) 3.7 (8/23)	12.4 (2/23) 19.2 (1/23)
Flounder	0.47	0.118	0 (21)	/	/
Plaice	0.32	0.194	0 (24)	/	/
Thornback ray	0.22	0.703	0 (22)	/	/
Cuttlefish	0.50	0.248	0 (21)	/	/
Pouting	0.39	0.108	0 (23)	/	/
Poor cod	0.10	0.768	0 (21)	/	/
John Dory	0.67	0.259	0 (24)	/	/

713

715	Table 3. Jackknife results and main data attributes for species that did initially demonstrate
716	significant overlap between OBSMER and Channel Ground Fish Survey (CGFS)
717	distributions. LIC: original value of Local Index of Collocation. p-value: situation of the LIC
718	value related to the distribution of permutation tests (values below 0.05 indicate significant
719	overlap). JK: number of areas which allowed having significant overlap (with total number of
720	areas). % abundance OBSMER & CGFS: percentage of abundance represented by these
721	sensitive areas among all OBSMER and CGFS areas respectively (with rank among all areas).

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					%	%
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		LIC	p-value	JK	abundance	abundance
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $					OBSM	CGFS
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Red gurnard	0.83	6e-04	0 (24)	/	/
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Tub gurnard	0.79	0.016	1 (24)	11.1 (2/24)	11.3 (1/24)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					1.9 (2/24)	0.7 (19/24)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$				6 (24)	0.0 (23/24)	1.2 (14/24)
Court 0.32 0.040 0 (24) 0.2 (20/24) 0.5 (20/24) 3.8 (7/24) 2.3 (12/24) 0.0 (24/24) 3.4 (10/24) 0.0 (24/24) 1.0 (20/24) 0.0 (24/24) 1.0 (20/24) 1.0 (20/24) 1.0 (20/24) 1.0 (20/24) 1.0 (20/24) 1.0 (20/24) 1.0 (20/24) 1.0 (20/24) 1.0 (20/24) 1.0 (20/24) 1.0 (20/24) 1.0 (20/24) 1.0 (20/24) 1.0 (20/24) 1.0 (20/24) 1.0 (20/24) 1.0 (20/24) 1.0 (20/24)	Cod	0.52	0.046		45.3 (1/24)	10.6 (2/24)
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Cod	0.52	0.040	0 (24)	0.2 (20/24)	0.5 (20/24)
0.0 (24/24) 3.4 (10/24) Common dab 0.66 0.019 1 (23) 22.2 (1/23) 43.1 (1/23) Whiting 0.71 0.030 0 (23) / / Lemon sole 0.65 0.021 1 (22) 25.5 (1/22) 27.1 (1/22) Starry smooth-hound 0.62 0.046 1 (22) 14.9 (3/22) 25.9 (1/22)					3.8 (7/24)	2.3 (12/24)
Common dab0.660.0191 (23)22.2 (1/23)43.1 (1/23)Whiting0.710.0300 (23)//Lemon sole0.650.0211 (22)25.5 (1/22)27.1 (1/22)Starry smooth-hound0.620.0461 (22)14.9 (3/22)25.9 (1/22)					0.0 (24/24)	3.4 (10/24)
Whiting 0.71 0.030 0 (23) / / Lemon sole 0.65 0.021 1 (22) 25.5 (1/22) 27.1 (1/22) Starry smooth-hound 0.62 0.046 1 (22) 14.9 (3/22) 25.9 (1/22)	Common dab	0.66	0.019	1 (23)	22.2 (1/23)	43.1 (1/23)
Lemon sole0.650.0211 (22)25.5 (1/22)27.1 (1/22)Starry smooth-hound0.620.0461 (22)14.9 (3/22)25.9 (1/22)	Whiting	0.71	0.030	0 (23)	/	/
Starry smooth-hound 0.62 0.046 1 (22) 14.9 (3/22) 25.9 (1/22)	Lemon sole	0.65	0.021	1 (22)	25.5 (1/22)	27.1 (1/22)
	Starry smooth-hound	0.62	0.046	1 (22)	14.9 (3/22)	25.9 (1/22)
Lesser-spotted dogfish 0.63 0.020 1 (24) 27.9 (1/24) 12.2 (2/24)	Lesser-spotted dogfish	0.63	0.020	1 (24)	27.9 (1/24)	12.2 (2/24)
0.2 (18/23) 1.0 (17/23)					0.2 (18/23)	1.0 (17/23)
0.0 (20/23) 0.1 (22/23)	Black seabream				0.0 (20/23)	0.1 (22/23)
0.0 (21/23) 0.1 (21/23)					0.0 (21/23)	0.1 (21/23)
Black seebreem 0.67 0.043 $8(23)$ $0.2(17/23)$ $0.3(20/23)$		0.67	0.043	8 (23)	0.2 (17/23)	0.3 (20/23)
0.0 (22/23) 0.0 (23/23) 0.0 (23/23)		0.07			0.0 (22/23)	0.0 (23/23)
7.8 (5/23) 12.6 (3/23)					7.8 (5/23)	12.6 (3/23)
0.0 (23/23) 1.6 (13/23)					0.0 (23/23)	1.6 (13/23)
14.8 (2/23) 12.7 (2/23)					14.8 (2/23)	12.7 (2/23)

Table 4. Correlation between Channel Ground Fish Survey (CGFS) and OBSMER annual725abundance indices assessed by Pearson's correlation index (Pearson). LIC values are also726reported for 18 species Eastern English Channel species. Tub gurnard is not represented727because the year effect was not significant (p > 0.05) in the survey model. * emphasizes728species for which spatial overlap was significant (p < 0.05).

Common name	Pearson	LIC
Poor cod	0.81	0.10
Cod	0.72	0.52*
John Dory	0.71	0.67
Red mullet	0.66	0.58
Plaice	0.65	0.32
Lemon sole	0.63	0.65*
Cuttlefish	0.51	0.50
Common dab	0.24	0.66*
Red gurnard	0.20	0.83*
Whiting	-0.01	0.71*
Starry smooth-hound	-0.05	0.62*
Thornback ray	-0.08	0.22
Squids	-0.12	0.54
Pouting	-0.13	0.39
Lesser-spotted dogfish	-0.22	0.63*
Black seabream	-0.23	0.67*
Flounder	-0.27	0.47
Seabass	-0.50	0.49



Figure 1. Study area of the Eastern English Channel, corresponding to the ICES division



733

730



Figure 2. Mean percentage of cells kept in the analysis according to the minimal threshold of
hauls set per cell. Dotted lines represent the standard deviation along the 19 species. Dashed
vertical line represents the chosen limit of 10 observations.



cuttlefish. 'X' represents areas where no cuttlefish was ever fished during a month in the

742 database.



Figure 4. Actual Local Index of Collocation of the 19 species investigated in the Eastern
English Channel (bold black line), compared to the distribution of 5000 randomly simulated
LICs (permutation test). Minimum and maximum simulated LIC are represented by the short
segments. Grey boxes represent Q1, median and Q3 ranges of simulated LICs. The white box
represents the range of values between Q3 and the 95th percentile of simulated LICs.



Figure 5. Annual abundance index estimated from Channel Ground Fish Survey (CGFS;

dotted line) and OBSMER (solid line) for A) cod and B) black seabream.