ICES Journal of Marine Science

ICES Journal of Marine Science (2016), 73(8), 1947–1954. doi:10.1093/icesjms/fsw132

Introduction to the Symposium: '*Marine Acoustics Symposium*'

Introduction

Observing the ocean interior in support of integrated management

Verena M. Trenkel[1],*, Nils Olav Handegard[2], and Thomas C. Weber[3]

[1]*Ifremer, Rue de l'île d'Yeu, BP 21105, 44311 Nantes cedex 03, France,*
[2]*Institute of Marine Research, P.O. Box 1870, Nordnes, Bergen 5817, Norway and*
[3]*University of New Hampshire, 24 Colovos Road, Durham, NH 03824, USA*

**Corresponding author: tel. + 33 240374157; e-mail: verena.trenkel@ifremer.fr*

Trenkel, V. M., Handegard, N. O., and Weber, T. C. Observing the ocean interior in support of integrated management. – ICES Journal of Marine Science, 73: 1947–1954.

Received 24 May 2016; revised 22 June 2016; accepted 22 June 2016; advance access publication 31 July 2016.

Active- and passive-acoustic methods are widely used tools for observing, monitoring, and understanding marine ecosystems. From 25 to 28 May 2015, 214 scientists from 31 nations gathered for an ICES symposium on Marine Ecosystem Acoustics (SoME Acoustics) to discuss three major themes related to acoustic observations of marine ecosystems: (i) recent developments in acoustic and platform technologies; (ii) acoustic characterisation of aquatic organisms, ecosystem structure, and ecosystem processes; and (iii) contribution of acoustics to integrated ecosystem assessments and management. The development of, and access to new instruments, such as broad bandwidth systems, enables insightful ecological studies and innovative management approaches. Unresolved ecological questions and the increasing move towards ecosystem based management pose further challenges to scientists and instrument developers. Considering the SoME Acoustics presentations in the context of three previous ICES symposia on fisheries acoustics, topics increasingly emphasize ecosystem studies and management. The continued expansion of work and progress in marine ecosystem acoustics is due to the cross-disciplinary work of fisheries acousticians, engineers, ecologists, modellers, and others. An analysis of the symposium co-authorship network reveals a highly connected acoustic science community collaborating around the globe.

Keywords: acoustics, broadband, multi-frequency, passive and active acoustics, ecosystem approach to management, ecosystem monitoring, pelagic ecosystem, echosounder, sonar.

Introduction

Acoustic methods are widely used tools for observing, assessing, monitoring, and understanding marine ecosystems. These tools are key contributors of data needed for operational Ecosystem Based Management (EBM) (Trenkel *et al.*, 2011). The full potential of acoustic methods can only be realized with systematic cross-disciplinary collaboration, joining expertise in fields like fisheries acoustics, physics, engineering, biology, oceanography, ecology, and ecosystem modelling. This special issue of the *ICES Journal of Marine Science* contains 15 articles stemming from the 2015 ICES Symposium on Marine Ecosystems Acoustics (2015 SoME Acoustics). The papers cover the three major themes of the symposium, including: (i) recent developments in acoustics and platform technologies; (ii) acoustic characterisation of aquatic organisms, ecosystem structure, and ecosystem processes; and (iii) contribution of acoustics to integrated ecosystem assessments and management. The abstracts of all the symposium contributions are available as Supplementary Materials.

SoME Acoustics was the seventh symposium on fisheries acoustics and technology for aquatic ecosystem investigations sponsored by ICES. All of the symposia have addressed acoustic estimations of marine fish distributions and abundances. The acoustic technologies and their applications have evolved from aids to fishing (1955), echo-integration estimates of fish biomass (1973), single-frequency target classification and calibrated dual-beam target strength (TS) estimation (1982), split-beam TS



Figure 1. Time line for the development of the marine ecosystem acoustics. The right part of the figure depicts the general trend, important milestones in the development of fisheries acoustics are shown on the left hand side with an emphasis on the uptake of technologies by the general fisheries community. (a) Sund (1935) (b) Dragesund and Olsen (1965); (c) Holliday (1977); (d) Foote *et al.* (1987); (e) Foote (1983); (f) Brierley *et al.* (1998) Kloser *et al.* (2002); Korneliussen and Ona (2003); (g) Trenkel *et al.* (2008); (h) Stanton *et al.* (2010) (i) MacLennan (1990); Simmonds and MacLennan (2005) (j) Benoit-Bird and Lawson (2016). Figures reprinted with permissions.

estimation (1987 and 1995), multi-frequency target classification (2002), multi-beam sonar imaging (2008), to broad bandwidth target classification (2015) (Figure 1). Over the years, while the ICES fisheries acoustics community continued developing acoustic technologies, the community focus has shifted toward characterizing fish, their ecosystems, and their management. The symposium further demonstrated this trend.

A more detailed view of the changes in focus of the ICES fisheries acoustics community is obtained by comparing the topics of talks and posters presented in 2015 with those of three previous ICES acoustic symposia (2008, 2002, and 1987). For this we analysed the list of the 25 most common words in the abstracts of each symposium (titles only for 1987) (Figure 2a).

The 10 most common words in the abstracts (or titles in 1987) of all four symposia include: *measur*ement, *survey*s, *distribut*ion, *abund*ance, *estim*ation, *targets*, *fish*, *school*s, and *sea*.

Additionally, titles from the 1987 symposium often included the root words *behaviour* and *river*, indicating an emphasis on animal behaviour, especially in the riverine environment. The root words *species* has been commonly used since 2002, but *ecosystem* appeared more frequently since 2008 and *process* and *characteris** since 2015 indicating that acoustic methods have been increasingly applied in ecological and ecosystem investigations for fisheries management. In 2015 the word *marin*e was used more frequently, indicating the focus on oceanic environments. A multivariate analysis was also performed on the 50 most common words found in the abstracts (or titles in 1987) of the four symposia (Figure 2b). The first major trend (abscissa) contrasts studies focusing on acoustic layers and migrations as well as studies in rivers (right hand side) from those focused on schools, individual species (capelin, anchovy), and zooplankton (left hand side). The second major axis distinguishes technological related studies of signals and sonars (top) from ecological studies of spatial distributions, krill, but also management issues (bottom). The inset in Figure 1b reveals significant temporal variation (randomization test, $p = 0.001$) with an overall temporal trajectory of symposia contributions towards more species-oriented studies and more emphasis on ecosystem and management aspects with increasing focus on zooplankton/krill, assessment, management, and spatial distributions.

We also analysed the structure of the research community that participated in the 2015 symposium. The co-authorship network (talks and posters) was built and then analysed to identify groups of co-authors. Based on the Integrated Completed Likelihood criterion, 14 groups of co-authors were identified (Figure 3). Remarkably, only 7% of contributions had a single author (isolated dots in Figure 3) while 21% had six or more co-authors (1987: 43% and 0.7%; 2002: 8% and 9%; 2008: 7% and 14%), demonstrating the high degree of collaboration within the acoustic community forged over many years and indicating a state of maturity of the field. Two large meta-communities emerged from the analysis. The first meta-community consisted of three



Figure 2. Text mining of the abstracts of four recent ICES acoustic symposia (titles only for 1987). **(a)** Visualization of the 25 most frequent words using a Venn diagram. The ten root words common to all symposia are: *abund*, *distribut*, *estim*, *fish*, *measur*, *school*, *sea*, *survey*, *system*, and t*arget*. **(b)** Semantic variations across symposia found among the 50 most common words of the abstracts and titles identified by a non-symmetric correspondence analysis [implemented in R package ade4; Dray *et al.* (2007)] In the factorial map the size of labels is proportional to the contribution of each word to the first two axes representing 9% of the overall variation. Inset: 90% convex hulls of symposia based on the scores of their abstracts.



Figure 3. Network of 2015 symposium co-authorships (talks and posters) obtained using a stochastic block model [R package blockmodels, Leger (2015)]. Each vertex represents a contributor. The linked vertices indicate the clusters detected by a stochastic block model analysis. The size of each vertex is proportional (on log-scale) to the number of co-authors.

groups of Asian authors (center top at top of in Figure 3). The core of the second meta-community (centre of graph) was formed by seven groups with authors from the traditional ICES acoustics community in Europe, America, Australia, and New Zealand.

Recent developments in acoustic sensor and platform technologies

The symposium began with oral presentations describing recent developments in acoustic sensor and platform technologies, and one quarter (9 out of 36) of these presentations described developments in broad bandwidth acoustic technologies. The use of broad bandwidth acoustic signals, defined here as signals with a bandwidth that is ∼1/2 or more of the center frequency, may result in increased signal-to-noise and range resolution, using pulse compression, and improved target classification, e.g. fish with swim bladder versus plankton, using the target frequency response. Although field observations of the broadband frequency response of fishes are not new (e.g. Holliday, 1972) recent efforts by Lavery *et al.* (2010) and Stanton *et al.* (2010) using commercially available echo sounder equipment have reinvigorated this type of approach amongst both practitioners and manufacturers. At the same time, progress towards calibration procedures has been made (Chu and Eastland, 2015). The challenges associated with broadband acoustics include transducer technologies, observing targets near boundaries, susceptibility to noise, and species classification. It is, perhaps, too early to say what the impact of these new broadband approaches will have for stock assessment and ecosystem characterization, including what benefit they will have over current multi-frequency approaches (e.g. De Robertis *et al.* 2010), but given the high level of interest it seems likely that the impact will be felt soon.

Data storage and processing techniques are an area of continual development for all sensor-types and applications. Renfree and Demer (2016) propose an algorithm for dynamically adapting the data logging range and transmit-pulse interval, which can increase the horizontal resolution and reduce the data volume. Cutter *et al.* (2016) explore ways to improve acoustic seabed classification by combining information from ship-mounted multi-frequency split-beam echosounders with remotely operated vehicle-mounted cameras.

The use of multiple beam sonars, including both multibeam echo sounders [MBES, e.g. Trenkel *et al.* (2008)] and omni-sonars (Simmonds and MacLennan, 2005) for quantitative estimates of fish biomass and behavior has been maturing (see, e.g. Colbo *et al.*, 2014; Melvin, 2016), including the integration of traditional single and split-beam echosounders with MBES. Developments of quantitative methods with omni-sonars, including calibration, use, and post-processing techniques, are also ongoing. Although omni-sonars have been used previously for scientific studies of fish abundance and behaviour (e.g. Soria *et al.*, 1996; Gerlotto *et al.*, 1999, 2004; Stockwell *et al.*, 2013), they have typically suffered from a lack of quantitative calibration and processing methods. Several symposium presentations suggested that these roadblocks to the quantitative use of omni-sonars will likely be soon overcome.

Whether the acoustic sensor is passive (listening only) or active (emitting and receiving), it requires a platform for its deployment. Although traditional ship-based sensor deployments are still prevalent, new platforms include moorings, robotic vehicles, and fish tags. These platforms are being developed rapidly and are becoming increasingly available to this community. These new platforms increase the diversity and often the quantity of data available, as evidenced by long-time-series measurements from moorings, e.g. Stauffer *et al.* (2015) and close-range high-resolution measurements from underwater vehicles (Moline *et al.*, 2015). Although the potential seems high, one of the main challenges in the use of these new platforms is how the data from these platforms can be transformed into science and management advice in similar fashion to what is typically done with the traditional acoustic-trawl survey (Simmonds and MacLennan, 2005).

Acoustic characterisation of aquatic organisms, ecosystem structure, and ecosystem processes

There has been a shift from technology developments for informing single species stock assessments to using acoustics to resolve ecosystem structure and processes (Figure 1) (Godø *et al.*, 2014; Benoit-Bird and Lawson, 2016). Whereas the traditional fisheries acoustics approach has been directed to measuring abundance and distribution of species as input to fish stock assessments, recently the emphasis has expanded to studying structure, e.g. the distribution of different taxonomic groups in relation to the physical environment, and processes, e.g. species overlap and potential species interactions, to gain understanding of the underlying processes. This direction is further strengthened by improved spatial, temporal and taxonomic resolution of the new platforms and instruments as described above (Figure 1).

Acoustics have improved in taxonomic resolution. A prerequisite for this is a thorough understanding of species- or group-specific acoustic properties, i.e. the frequency response discussed above. Understanding frequency response is important both for traditional multi-frequency methods (Trenkel and Berger, 2013; Sato *et al.*, 2015) and state-of-the-art broad bandwidth systems (Ito *et al.*, 2015). It also plays a role for TS studies of species monitored with acoustic-trawl surveys (Doray *et al.*, 2016) and for the observation (Scoulding *et al.*, 2015) and modelling (Jech *et al.*, 2015) of acoustic properties of individuals across taxa, ensonification angles and frequencies. A related approach is to measure the emergent acoustic properties of fish aggregations and use those properties to classify the backscatter to taxa, e.g. Fallon *et al.* (2016). This usually involves using auxiliary information for ground truthing and validation of the acoustic classifications (Fernandes *et al.*, 2016).

Acoustics offer capabilities to observe large scale distributions of various taxa when deployed on platforms covering larger areas (Trenkel and Berger, 2013; Petitgas *et al.*, 2014). Combined with the improved taxonomic resolution, the spatial distribution, both horizontally and vertically, can be much better resolved compared with other methods. An example is the mapping of zooplankton distributions (Simonsen *et al.*, 2016), which is often not the primary objective of vessel-based acoustic-trawl surveys. The different acoustic signature relative to, e.g. fish, makes it possible to generate indices of krill abundance from historical data (Ressler *et al.*, 2012, 2015), and the results are indices of important prey species that augment the data of the survey at very limited extra costs.

Mesopelagic organisms, or the ubiquitous deep sound scattering layers (DSLs) has drawn increasing attention in the acoustic community lately. Acoustics transects at basin scales have been reported (Davison *et al.*, 2015), including comparisons between biogeographic provinces (Irigoien *et al.*, 2014). In addition to the desire to understand the species composition of this layer, the interest is also driven by the potentially large amounts of biomass represented by mesopelagic fish. Mesopelagic species differ in their vertical migrations. Using acoustic data collected at multiple frequencies, theoretical scattering models and net trawls, the behavioural differences can be used to differentiate between the different layers. An important challenge when using acoustics to resolve mesopelagic fish at this depth is the swimbladder resonance (Godø *et al.*, 2009; Kloser *et al.*, 2016) and small gas bearing organisms like siphonphores; the resonance can also be utilized for sizing (Stanton *et al.*, 2010). This needs to be kept in mind when further investigating the distribution and composition of the DSL using acoustics. Despite the challenges, acoustic measurements offer great potential to help understand the global mesopelagic habitat, where continued detailed regional studies and better acoustic coverage are needed.

Acoustic instrumentation is increasingly being used to observe fine scale (of the order of several meters) processes of *in situ* organisms or those in controlled mesocosm experiments. The applications range from behavioural processes and distribution patterns, such as overlap between predator and prey distributions (Benoit-Bird *et al.*, 2004; Bertrand *et al.*, 2014; Ressler *et al.*, 2015), to investigations of the effect of marine protected areas, subsea structures, noise and other anthropogenic stressors. Fine scale social behaviours have been observed by both high frequency sonar (Handegard *et al.*, 2012) and split-beam echo sounders (Kaartvedt *et al.*, 2015). Importantly, individual swimming behaviour affects TS values (Tomiyasu *et al.*, 2016) and provides clues on species composition of fish schools. Acoustics can thus be used to study fine scale patterns as well as utilize these patterns for classification and TS estimation.

Part of the marine ecosystem in which fishes and marine mammals reside is the underwater soundscape. Passive-acoustic monitoring of this soundscape offers potential clues about the presence and behavior of animals. Examples presented in this issue include the study of fish vocalisations (Parsons *et al.*, 2016), the interaction between cetaceans and forage fish (Lawrence *et al.*, 2016) and the timing of the migration of fin whales (Tsujii *et al.*, 2016).

The contribution of acoustics to integrated ecosystem assessments and management

Traditionally active acoustics have been used for abundance estimation of targeted species (Simmonds and MacLennan, 2005). Though abundance estimation is still an important application of acoustics for fisheries management and new applications continue to emerge (O'Driscoll *et al.*, 2012), the use of acoustic methods has been enlarged to encompass the assessment of a wider range of ecosystem components (e.g. plankton, micronekton), characteristics (e.g. diversity) and dynamics (e.g. predator-prey), at different spatial and temporal scales (Trenkel *et al.*, 2011; Godø *et al.*, 2014).

This wider view of the use of acoustics is essential for integrated ecosystem assessments, which encompass the biological ecosystem, human activities and ecosystem services (fundamental services such as regulating food web dynamics and recycling nutrients and human demand-derived services such as production of food and supply of recreational activities). The first steps of an integrated assessment are to define the elements of the system to assess and identify achievable management objectives, in collaboration with society and stakeholders (Trenkel *et al.*, 2015). Major challenges are the easy wide availability and accessibility of acoustics data (Wall *et al.*, 2016), conversion of information (data) into knowledge and appropriate methods for the integration of partial assessments. For acoustics many steps and assumptions are needed to turn the physical signal into knowledge.

Acoustic-based abundance estimates result from the combination of various data sources and parameters including TS, length distributions, age-length keys, identification of echo sources and the vertical and spatial distribution of backscattered energy (Simmonds and MacLennan, 2005). There are no standard methods for propagating resulting uncertainties (systematic and random error) to stock abundance estimates, but progress is being made using Bayesian hierarchical models (Sullivan and Rudstam, 2016). A major unresolved issue is accounting for the correlation between error sources.

Acknowledging that acoustic biomass estimates can be imprecise (Stenevik *et al.*, 2015), one active domain of research is the combination of several observation methods (echosounder, sonar, video, photographs) (Ryan and Kloser, 2016). Population biomass estimates can also be improved by adapting the acoustic transect design to the spatial distribution (Demer *et al.*, 2012). Spatial distributions are determined by abiotic factors (Bonanno *et al.*, 2014; Zwolinski and Demer, 2014), but also by density dependence as demonstrated for small pelagic species (Petitgas *et al.*, 2014; Saraux *et al.*, 2014).

Integrated ecosystem assessments encompass non-fishery targeted species such as zooplankton and the potential for indirect effects of stock management via top-down control of predators on their prey. For example, Ressler *et al.* (2014) investigated whether there was evidence for a local top down effect of walleye pollock on euphausids, but did not find much evidence for such an effect. More studies of this type are needed to gain a wider understanding of potential indirect effects of fisheries exploitation.

Use of acoustic and other data collected by fishers during ordinary fishing operations for monitoring and assessment is increasingly being trialled (Joo *et al.*, 2014; Surette *et al.*, 2015). However, this can cause challenges for data quality (noise, echosounder calibration), analysis (non-random sampling, no identification hauls), and availability (storage, ownership). ICES led initiatives have provided protocols for acoustic data collection and analysis on fishing vessels (ICES, 2007) and meta-data formats (ICES, 2014), but more work is needed for standardising data collection and analysis methods.

Conclusion

The world of fisheries acoustics is expanding to meet the increasing needs for ecosystem studies and EBM. As demonstrated by the presentations and posters at the symposium, and reflected in the papers presented in this issue, the community has responded to this need by developing new technologies and methods, and by applying them to an increasing range of organisms and ecosystems. The synergy of these technological, scientific and management developments seem likely to fuel continued advancement in marine ecosystem acoustics far into the future.

Supplementary data

Supplementary material is available at the *ICESJMS* online version of the article.

Acknowledgements

The symposium was organized by Ifremer and supported by ICES, Ifremer, IRD, Nantes City Council, and the Region Pays de la Loire. We thank Marie-Pierre Etienne for help with the network analysis.

References

Benoit-Bird, K. J., and Lawson, G. L. 2016. Ecological insights from pelagic habitats acquired using active acoustic techniques. Annual Review of Marine Science, 8: 463–490.

Benoit-Bird, K. J., Würsig, B., and McFadden, C. J. 2004. Dusky dolphin (*Lagenorhynchus obscurus*) foraging in two different habitats: active acoustic detection of dolphins and their prey. Marine Mammal Science, 20: 215–231.

Bertrand, A., Grados, D., Colas, F., Bertrand, S., Capet, X., Chaigneau, A., Vargas, G., *et al.* 2014. Broad impacts of fine-scale dynamics on seascape structure from zooplankton to seabirds. Nature Communications, 5: 5239.

Bonanno, A., Giannoulaki, M., Barra, M., Basilone, G., Machias, A., Genovese, S., Goncharov, S., *et al.* 2014. Habitat selection response of small pelagic fish in different environments. Two examples from the oligotrophic Mediterranean Sea. PLoS One, 9: e1014498.

Brierley, A. S., Ward, P., Watkins, J. L., and Goss, C. 1998. Acoustic discrimination of Southern Ocean zooplankton. Deep Sea Research Part II: Topical Studies in Oceanography, 45: 1155–1173.

Chu, D., and Eastland, G. C. 2015. Calibration of a broadband acoustic transducer with a standard spherical target in the near field. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 137: 2148–2157.

Colbo, K., Ross, T., Brown, C., and Weber, T. 2014. A review of oceanographic applications of water column data from multibeam echosounders. Estuarine Coastal and Shelf Science, 145: 41–56.

Cutter, G. R., Stierhoff, K. L., and Demer, D. A. 2016. Remote sensing of habitat characteristics using echo metrics and image-based seabed classes. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 73: 1965–1974.

Davison, P. C., Koslow, J. A., and Kloser, R. J. 2015. Acoustic biomass estimation of mesopelagic fish: backscattering from individuals, populations, and communities. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 72: 1413–1424.

De Robertis, A., McKelvey, D. R., and Ressler, P. H. 2010. Development and application of an empirical multifrequency method for backscatter classification. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Science, 67: 1459–1474.

Demer, D. A., Zwolinski, J. P., Byers, K. A., Cutter, G. R., Renfree, J. S., Sessions, T. S., and Macewicz, B. J. 2012. Prediction and confirmation of seasonal migration of Pacific sardine (*Sardinops sagax*) in the California Current Ecosystem. Fishery Bulletin, 110: 52–70.

Doray, M., Berger, L., Coail, J. Y., Vacherot, J. P., and Petitgas, P. 2016. A method for controlled target strength measurements of pelagic fish, with application to European anchovy (*Engraulis encrasicolus*). ICES Journal of Marine Science, 73: 1987–1997.

Dragesund, O., and Olsen, S. 1965. On the possibility of estimating year-class strength by measuring echoabundance of 0-group fish. Fiskridirektoratets Skrifter Serie Havundersokelser, 13: 48–75.

Dray, S., Dufour, A. B., and Chessel, D. 2007. The ade4 package II: Two-table and K-table methods. R News, 7: 47–52.

Fallon, N. G., Fielding, S., and Fernandes, P. G. 2016. Classification of Southern Ocean krill and icefish echoes using random forests. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 73: 1998–2008.

Fernandes, P. G., Copland, P., Garcia, R., Nicosevici, T., and Scoulding, B. 2016. Additional evidence for fisheries acoustics: small cameras and angling gear provide tilt angle distributions and other relevant data for mackerel surveys. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 73: 2009–2019.

Foote, K. G. 1983. Linearity of fisheries acoustics, with addition theorems. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 73: 1932–1940.

Foote, K. G., Knudsen, H. P., Vestnes, G., MacLennan, D. N., and Simmonds, E. J. 1987. Calibration of Acoustic Instruments for Fish Density Estimation: A Practical Guide. ICES Cooperative Research Report No. 144. 563 pp.

Gerlotto, F., Castillo, J., Saavedra, A., Barbieri, M. A., Espejo, M., and Cotel, P. 2004. Three-dimensional structure and avoidance behaviour of anchovy and common sardine schools in central southern Chile. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 61: 1120–1126.

Gerlotto, F., Soria, M., and Fréon, P. 1999. From two dimensions to three: the use of multibeam sonar for a new approach in fisheries acoustics. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 56: 6–12.

Godø, O. R., Handegard, N. O., Browman, H. I., Macaulay, G. J., Kaartvedt, S., Giske, J., Ona, E., *et al.* 2014. Marine ecosystem acoustics (MEA): quantifying processes in the sea at the spatio-temporal scales on which they occur. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 71: 2357–2369.

Godø, O. R., Patel, R., and Pedersen, G. 2009. Diel migration and swimbladder resonance of small fish: some implications for analyses of multifrequency echo data. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 66: 1143–1148.

Handegard, N. O., Boswell, K. M., Ioannou, C. C., Leblanc, S. P., Tjostheim, D. B., and Couzin, I. D. 2012. The dynamics of coordinated group hunting and collective information transfer among schooling prey. Current Biology, 22: 1213–1217.

Holliday, D. V. 1972. Resonance structure in echoes from schooled pelagic fish. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 51: 1322–1332.

Holliday, D. V. 1977. Extracting bio-physical information from the acoustic signatures of marine organisms. *In* Oceanic Sound Scattering Prediction, pp. 619–624. Ed. by N. R. Zahurance, and B. J. Andersen. Plenum Press, New York.

ICES. 2007. Collection of Acoustic Data from Fishing Vessels. ICES Cooperative Research Report No. 287. 84 pp.

ICES. 2014. A metadata convention for processed acoustic data from active acoustic systems. SISP 4 TG-AcMeta. 44 pp.

Irigoien, X., Klevjer, T. A., Rostad, A., Martinez, U., Boyra, G., Acuna, J. L., Bode, A., *et al.* 2014. Large mesopelagic fishes biomass and trophic efficiency in the open ocean. Nature Communications, 5: 3271.

Ito, M., Matsuo, I., Imaizumi, T., Akamatsu, T., Wang, Y., and Nishimori, Y. 2015. Target strength spectra of tracked individual fish in schools. Fisheries Science, 81: 621–633.

Jech, J. M., Horne, J. K., Chu, D., Demer, D. A., Francis, D. T. I., Gorska, N., Jones, B., *et al.* 2015. Comparisons among ten models of acoustic backscattering used in aquatic ecosystem research. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 138: 3742–3764.

Joo, R., Bertrand, A., Bouchon, M., Chaigneau, A., Demarcq, H., Tam, J., Simier, M., *et al.* 2014. Ecosystem scenarios shape fishermen spatial behavior. The case of the Peruvian anchovy fishery in the Northern Humboldt Current System. Progress in Oceanography, 128: 60–73.

Kaartvedt, S., Ugland, K. I., Klevjer, T. A., Rostad, A., Titelman, J., and Solberg, I. 2015. Social behaviour in mesopelagic jellyfish. Scientific Reports, 5: 11310.

Kloser, R. J., Ryan, T., Sakov, A., Williams, A., and Koslow, J. A. 2002. Species identification in deep water using multiple acoustic frequencies. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences, 59: 1065–1077.

Kloser, R. J., Ryan, T. E., Keith, G., and Gershwin, L. 2016. Deep-scattering layer, gas-bladder density, and size estimates using a two-frequency acoustic and optical probe. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 73: 2037–2048.

Korneliussen, R., and Ona, E. 2003. Synthetic echograms generated from relative frequency response. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 60: 636–640.

Lavery, A. C., Chu, D., and Moum, J. N. 2010. Measurements of acoustic scattering from zooplankton and oceanic microstructure using a broadband echosounder. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 67: 379–394.

Lawrence, J. M., Armstrong, E., Gordon, J., Lusseau, S., and Fernandes, P. G. 2016. Passive and active, predator and prey: using acoustics to study interactions between cetaceans and forage fish. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 73: 2075–2084.

Leger, J.-B. 2015. blockmodels: Latent and stochastic block model estimation by a V-EM algorithm. R package version 1.1.1.

MacLennan, D. 1990. Acoustical measurement of fish abundance. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 87: 1–15.

Melvin, G. 2016. Observations of *in situ* Atlantic bluefin tuna (Thunnus thynnus) with 500-kHz multibeam sonar. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 73: 1975–1986.

Moline, M. A., Benoit-Bird, K., O'Gorman, D., and Robbins, I. C. 2015. Integration of Scientific Echo Sounders with an Adaptable Autonomous Vehicle to Extend Our Understanding of Animals from the Surface to the Bathypelagic. Journal of Atmospheric and Oceanic Technology, 32: 2173–2186.

O'Driscoll, R. L., Hanchet, S. M., and Miller, B. S. 2012. Can acoustic methods be used to monitor grenadier (Macrouridae) abundance in the Ross Sea region? Journal of Ichthyology, 52: 700–708.

Parsons, M. J. G., Salgado-Kent, C. P., Marley, S. A., Gavrilov, A. N., and McCauley, R. D. 2016. Characterising diversity and variation in fish choruses in Darwin Harbour. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 73: 2058–2074.

Petitgas, P., Doray, M., Huret, M., Masse, J., and Woillez, M. 2014. Modelling the variability in fish spatial distributions over time with empirical orthogonal functions: anchovy in the Bay of Biscay. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 71: 2379–2389.

Renfree, J. S., and Demer, D. A. 2016. Optimising transmit interval and logging range while avoiding aliased seabed echoes. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 73: 1955–1964.

Ressler, P. H., Dalpadado, P., Macaulay, G. J., Handegard, N., and Skern-Mauritzen, M. 2015. Acoustic surveys of euphausiids and models of baleen whale distribution in the Barents Sea. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 527: 13–29.

Ressler, P. H., De Robertis, A., and Kotwicki, S. 2014. The spatial distribution of euphausiids and walleye pollock in the eastern Bering Sea does not imply top-down control by predation. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 503: 111–122.

Ressler, P. H., De Robertis, A., Warren, J. D., Smith, J. N., and Kotwicki, S. 2012. Developing an acoustic survey of euphausiids to understand trophic interactions in the Bering Sea ecosystem. Deep-Sea Research Part Ii-Topical Studies in Oceanography, 65-70: 184–195.

Ryan, T. E., and Kloser, R. J. 2016. Improved estimates of orange roughy biomass using an acoustic-optical system in commercial trawlnets. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 73: 2112–2124.

Saraux, C., Fromentin, J. M., Bigot, J. L., Bourdeix, J. H., Morfin, M., Roos, D., Van Beveren, E., *et al.* 2014. Spatial Structure and Distribution of Small Pelagic Fish in the Northwestern Mediterranean Sea. PLoS One, 9: e111211.

Sato, M., Horne, J. K., Parker-Stetter, S. L., and Keister, J. E. 2015. Acoustic classification of coexisting taxa in a coastal ecosystem. Fisheries Research, 172: 130–136.

Scoulding, B., Chu, D., Ona, E., and Fernandes, P. G. 2015. Target strengths of two abundant mesopelagic fish species. Journal of the Acoustical Society of America, 137: 989–1000.

Simmonds, E. J., and MacLennan, D. N. 2005. Fisheries acoustics. Theory and Practice, Blackwell, Oxford. 437 pp.

Simonsen, K. A., Ressler, P. H., Rooper, C. N., and Zador, S. G. 2016. Spatio-temporal distribution of euphausiids: an important component to understanding ecosystem processes in the Gulf of Alaska and eastern Bering Sea. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 73: 2020–2036.

Soria, M., Fréon, P., and Gerlotto, F. 1996. Analysis of vessel influence on spatial behaviour of fish schools using a multi-beam sonar and consequences for biomass estimates by echo-sounder. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 53: 453–458.

Stanton, T. K., Chu, D., Jech, J. M., and Irish, J. D. 2010. New broadband methods for resonance classification and high-resolution imagery of fish with swimbladders using a modified commercial broadband echosounder. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 67: 365–378.

Stauffer, B. A., Miksis-Olds, J., and Goes, J. I. 2015. Cold regime interannual variability of primary and secondary producer community composition in the Southeastern Bering Sea. PLoS One, 10: e0131246.

Stenevik, E. K., Volstad, J. H., Hoines, A., Aanes, S., Oskarsson, G. J., Jacobsen, J. A., and Tangen, O. 2015. Precision in estimates of density and biomass of Norwegian spring-spawning herring based on acoustic surveys. Marine Biology Research, 11: 449–461.

Stockwell, J. D., Weber, T. C., Baukus, A. J., and Jech, J. M. 2013. On the use of omnidirectional sonars and downwards-looking echosounders to assess pelagic fish distributions during and after midwater trawling. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 70: 196–203.

Sullivan, P., and Rudstam, L. 2016. Quantifying acoustic survey uncertainty using Bayesian hierarchical modeling with an application to assessing *Mysis relicta* population densities in Lake Ontario. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 73: 2104–2111.

Sund, O. 1935. Echo sounding in fishery research. Nature, 135: 953.

Surette, T., LeBlanc, C. H., Claytor, R. R., and Loots, C. 2015. Using inshore fishery acoustic data on Atlantic herring (*Clupea* *harengus*) spawning aggregations to derive annual stock abundance indices. Fisheries Research, 164: 266–277.

Tomiyasu, M., Kao, W. Y., Abe, K., Minami, K., Hirose, T., Ogawa, M., and Miyashita, K. 2016. The relationship between body angle and target strength of ribbonfish (*Trichiurus japonicus*) displaying a vertical swimming motion. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 73: 2049–2057.

Trenkel, V. M., and Berger, L. 2013. An acoustic multi-frequency index to inform on large scale spatial patterns of pelagic ecosystems. Ecological Indicators, 30: 72–79.

Trenkel, V. M., Hintzen, N. T., Farnsworth, K. D., Olesen, C., Reid, D., Rindorf, A., Shephard, S., *et al*. 2015. Identifying marine pelagic ecosystem objectives and indicators for management. Marine Policy, 55: 23–32.

Trenkel, V. M., Mazauric, V., and Berger, L. 2008. The new multibeam fisheries echosounder ME70: description and expected contribution to fisheries research. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 65: 645–655.

Trenkel, V. M., Ressler, P. H., Jech, M., Giannoulaki, M., and Taylor, C. 2011. Underwater acoustics for ecosystem-based management: state of the science and proposals for ecosystem indicators. Marine Ecology Progress Series, 442: 285–301.

Tsujii, K., Otsuki, M., Akamatsu, T., Matsuo, I., Amakasu, K., Kitamura, M., Kikuchi, T., *et al*. 2016. The migration of fin whales into the southern Chukchi Sea as monitored with passive acoustics. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 73: 2085–2092.

Wall, C. C., Jech, J. M., and McLean, S. J. 2016. Increasing the accessibility of acoustic data through global access and imagery. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 73: 2093–2103.

Zwolinski, J. P., and Demer, D. A. 2014. Environmental and parental control of Pacific sardine (Sardinops sagax) recruitment. ICES Journal of Marine Science, 71: 2198–2207.