

State-space modeling of multi-decadal mark-recapture data reveals low adult dispersal in a nursery-dependent fish metapopulation

Lecomte Jean-Baptiste ¹, Le Pape Olivier ^{2,*}, Baillif H el ene ², Nevoux Marie ³, Vermard Youen ^{4,5}, Savina-Rolland Marie ^{5,6}, Veron Matthieu ², Lehuta Sigrid ⁷, Hunter Ewan ⁸, Rivot Etienne ⁹

¹ AGROCAMPUS OUEST, 124109, Research Unit Ecology and Ecosystem Health, 65 rue de Saint Briec, CS 84215, Rennes, France

² AGROCAMPUS OUEST, 124109, Research Unit Ecology and Ecosystem Health, Rennes, France

³ INRA, UMR Ecologie et Sant e des Ecosyst emes, 65 rue de St Briec, Rennes, France

⁴ IFREMER, Unit e EMH, Nantes, France

⁵ IFREMER, Unit e d'Halieutique Manche Mer du Nord, F-62321, Boulogne, France

⁶ IFREMER, Laboratoire Ressources Halieutiques - Fisheries Resources Laboratory, Lorient, France

⁷ Ifremer, Ecologie et Mod eles pour l'Halieutique, Nantes, France

⁸ Centre for Environment Fisheries and Aquaculture Science, 41843, Lowestoft, Suffolk, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

⁹ Agrocampus Ouest, UMR 0985 INRA / Agrocampus Ouest ESE, Agrocampus, Ecologie Halieutique, 65, rue de St Briec, Rennes, France

* Corresponding author : Olivier Le Pape, email address : Olivier.le.pape@agrocampus-ouest.fr

Abstract :

Quantifying connectivity within fish metapopulations is an important component in understanding population dynamics and providing an evidence base for assessment and management. We investigate meta-population connectivity of the common sole (*Solea solea* L.) in the Eastern English Channel (EEC). The EEC common sole stock is currently assessed as a single and spatially homogeneous population but connectivity induced through adult movements within this stock and with nearby stocks remains unknown. To fill this knowledge gap, we developed a state-space mark-recovery model, designed to estimate adult connectivity, using mark-recapture data from multiple release experiments from 1970 to 2018 across the EEC and adjacent management areas. The model estimates seasonal fish movements between five pre-defined areas, Western English Channel, Eastern English Channel (split into three discrete sub-areas) and North Sea. Over 32000 fish were tagged, 4036 of which were recovered via fisheries. Our results suggest minimal large-scale adult movements between these areas: movements among spatial units within the EEC were very low with even lower levels of immigration from areas adjoining the EEC. Our results support the hypothesis of segregated populations within the EEC. The importance of accommodating population substructure in the fisheries management is considered.

Keywords : Population structure, capture-mark-recovery, adult connectivity, multi-event modeling, *Solea solea* L., Eastern English Channel

35 1 INTRODUCTION

36 Movements of individuals determine connectivity between habitats, control meta-
37 population dynamics (Hanski 1998; Benhamou 2014) and resilience of populations to
38 natural and anthropic stressors. Understanding the movement and dispersal patterns of
39 wild animals at every stage in their life cycle is therefore critical for a full understanding
40 of population dynamics and the subsequent provision of an evidence base for population
41 assessment and management.

42 In fisheries, an accurate definition of the spatial structure of fish populations is necessary
43 for fish stock assessment and for setting appropriate fisheries management strategies
44 (Kutkuhn 1981; Smith *et al.* 1990; Begg & Waldman 1999; Fogarty & Botsford 2007). A
45 misspecification of the spatial limits of a stock can lead to biased estimates of population
46 vital rates (Cadrin *et al.* 2014; Kerr *et al.* 2017). Dispersal process must be addressed at
47 all life-history stages to accurately assess the spatial and temporal delineation of
48 populations and to accurately specify spatial management measures that could
49 potentially target specific areas and life stages (e.g. protecting nursery areas and
50 spawning aggregations, Fogarty and Botsford 2007).

51 Recent studies have employed a wide variety of tools and methods to assess
52 connectivity within populations (Le Bris *et al.* 2017; Rogers *et al.* 2017; Moreira *et al.*
53 2018). Genetic studies using genetic markers such as microsatellites (Cuveliers *et al.*
54 2012; Jasonowicz *et al.* 2016; Martinez *et al.* 2017) or single nucleotide polymorphism
55 (Milano *et al.* 2014; Laconcha *et al.* 2015; Bekkevold *et al.* 2015) are often used to
56 assess the spatial structure of a population and reproductive isolation within populations

57 (Östman *et al.* 2017; Marandel *et al.* 2017). Otoliths are also extensively used in
58 connectivity studies, either through otolith morphology (Bacha *et al.* 2016; Hüseyin *et al.*
59 2016; Mahe *et al.* 2016) or otolith chemistry (Tanner *et al.* 2016; Callicó Fortunato *et al.*
60 2017; Régnier *et al.* 2017; Moreira *et al.* 2018). Morphometry and meristics (Allaya *et al.*
61 2016; Sley *et al.* 2016), parasites (Catalano *et al.* 2014; MacKenzie & Abaunza 2014)
62 and life history traits (Begg *et al.* 1999; Erlandsson *et al.* 2017; Du Pontavice *et al.* 2018;
63 Randon *et al.* 2018) have also been used to assess stock structure. In the past decade,
64 stock delineation studies have resulted in revised stock boundaries for numerous stocks
65 (e.g. blue whiting Mahe *et al.* 2007, Atlantic cod Zemeckis *et al.* 2014, and horse
66 mackerel Abaunza *et al.* 2008).

67 Although the information derived from mark-recapture experiments is limited (e.g. they
68 cannot be used to quantify gene flow, Cadrin *et al.* 2014), they have nevertheless
69 proven useful for the investigation of fish movements and the spatial structure of
70 populations (Howe & Coates 1975; Hilborn 1990; Gillanders *et al.* 2001; Patterson III *et*
71 *al.* 2001; McGarvey & Feenstra 2002; Adlerstein *et al.* 2008; Cadrin *et al.* 2014;
72 Hanselman *et al.* 2014; Le Bris *et al.* 2017; Liljestrand *et al.* 2019). When considering
73 commercial fish stocks, tagging data generally consist of mark-release experiments
74 conducted on scientific surveys, with tag-recovery facilitated via the fisheries, the latter
75 largely dependent on volunteer reporting by the harvesters. A weakness of such data is
76 that the detection probability is usually unknown, and non-reporting can be substantial
77 (Henny & Burnham 1976; Frusher *et al.* 2001; Pollock *et al.* 2002; Cadigan & Bratney
78 2003, 2006). However, ancillary information is often available (McGarvey & Feenstra
79 2002). Catch and fishing-effort data are collected for most exploited stocks. Classical
80 stock assessment models (e.g. Virtual Population Analysis or Statistical Catch-at-Age

81 Analysis) typically provide estimates of total and fishing mortality, and thereby total
82 abundance. Such information can be used as input in the analysis of tagging data of
83 harvested fish populations (McGarvey & Feenstra 2002).

84 The common sole (*Solea solea*, L.) is a flatfish substantively harvested in the Western
85 English Channel to the North Sea (ICES 2017). Today, stock assessment is conducted
86 separately for three ICES stock divisions (VIIe, VIId, IV; ICES 2017). The Eastern
87 English Channel (EEC, ICES division VIId) stock, managed as one homogeneous
88 population, has been overexploited over the last ten years (ICES 2017). Dispersal of the
89 subadult components has been described: the larvae drift passively over short distances
90 to local coastal nurseries (Rochette 2011), where the juveniles remain prior to migration
91 offshore at maturity (Riou *et al.* 2001), where the fish reproduce and enter the fishery.
92 Observed contrast in key life history traits (density-at-age and length-at-age data) have
93 suggested potential spatial structuring within the adult component of the EEC common
94 sole stock within three discrete spatial areas (Du Pontavice *et al.* 2018; Randon *et al.*
95 2018). However, the movements of adult sole between these areas remain largely
96 unknown. Here we have drawn on an extensive mark-recapture database collected over
97 49 years to analyze fish movements and assess connectivity of the adult common sole
98 population within the EEC and adjacent management areas. We tested the hypothesis
99 of metapopulation structure within the EEC and estimated the level of mixing between
100 sub-populations. For that purpose, we developed a capture-recapture model (Royle *et al.*
101 2013; McCrea & Morgan 2014) built in a state-space model framework (recently
102 reviewed in Aeberhard *et al.* 2018 in the context of fisheries) to estimate adult and
103 subadult movement probabilities. Finally, based on our observations, we consider the
104 implications for management of the common sole stock in the EEC (and more widely) of

105 acknowledging and incorporating population substructure in management and
106 assessment.

107 **2 MATERIALS AND METHODS**

108 **2.1 Spatial structure**

109 The spatial structure of the common sole population along the English Channel is
110 analyzed using five areas (Figure 1): the Western Channel (WC), the North Sea (NS)
111 and three areas for the EEC: English coast of the Eastern English Channel (UK),
112 Southern French coast (FrW) and Northern French coast of the Eastern English Channel
113 (FrE). The WC area is based on an existing spatial management unit (VIIe ICES 2017).
114 The spatial management unit IV currently used for stock assessment in the North Sea
115 (ICES 2017) is divided into three spatial subunits. Our study is restricted to the spatial
116 subunit IVc (ICES 2017) which contains the major part of the common sole commercial
117 catches in the North Sea. The division of the EEC into three areas (UK, FrW, FrE) is
118 based on the occurrence of natural barriers of habitat unsuitable for common sole
119 (Rochette *et al.* 2012). These natural barriers consist of deep gravel grounds, which
120 occur centrally in the EEC (separating UK from FrW & FrE), and wide rocky reefs from
121 the coasts out into deeper waters (separating FrW from FrE). These natural delineations
122 could potentially define the spatial structure of the common sole population within the
123 EEC and have recently been used to study its connectivity in the EEC (Du Pontavice *et*
124 *al.* 2018; Randon *et al.* 2018).

125 **2.2 Data Collection**

126 The dataset collates four mark-recapture experiments carried out by (i) the Center for
127 Environment Fisheries and Aquaculture Science (CEFAS, UK) from 1955 to 1985 and
128 2002 to 2007 (Burt & Millner 2008) and (ii) the French Research Institute for Exploitation

129 of the Sea (IFREMER, France) from 1976 to 1980 and 2016 to 2018 (Table 1, Figure 2).
130 For each release experiment, Petersen discs were used (Burt & Millner 2008). Discs are
131 uniquely numbered and are securely attached to the dorsal flank of the fish. Adults and
132 subadults were released close to the capture position as soon as was possible after
133 capture. Recaptured marked fish were recovered by fishermen, who provided dates and
134 spatial coordinates of the recaptures. To assess temporal variations in key model
135 parameters (see below), the entire dataset was divided into four release experiments
136 denoted (1) CEFAS₁₉₇₀ from 1970 to 1985, (2) CEFAS₂₀₀₂ from 2002 to 2007, (3)
137 IFREMER₁₉₇₆ from 1976 to 1980 and (4) IFREMER₂₀₁₆ from 2016 to 2018 (Tables 1 and
138 2). Data collected before 1970 were discarded, as information was not sufficient to
139 estimate fish movements from mark-recovery data (i.e. no reliable estimate of fishing
140 mortality, see section 2.4.2). Recaptured fish with no release or recovery position or date
141 of recovery data were discarded. The mark-recapture dataset consists of 32739
142 released and 7010 recovered fish with known dates and areas of release and recovery
143 respectively.

144 **2.3 Time at liberty and time step**

145 A discrete 4 months time step was used in our modeling approach, based on the life
146 cycle of the adult common sole (Rochette 2011): spawning (February to May), foraging
147 (June to September) and overwintering (October to January). For each individual, the
148 time at liberty (time elapsed between the date of release and the date of recapture) was
149 recorded. The time at liberty was computed in a number of time steps (Table 1 and
150 Figure 3). Individuals recovered within the time step of release were removed from the
151 analysis (2974 fish, 7% of released fish).

152 2.4 Modeling approach

153 2.4.1 Core modeling structure

154 The final dataset used in the modeling approach consists of 32739 released and 4036
 155 recovered fish with the following associated information (individual based): dates and
 156 areas of release and recovery and release experiment. The dataset was analyzed
 157 through a multi-event mark-recapture modeling approach (Pradel *et al.* 2005) built in a
 158 state-space modeling framework that accounts for both processes and observation
 159 errors. The process model tracks the history of each individual released fish on a
 160 'seasonal' (4-month discrete time step) basis. The trajectory of each individual starts
 161 with the release event, for which the date and areas are assumed to be recorded without
 162 errors. In our multi-event model, we consider 15 potential states for the true fate of
 163 individuals at each time step (Figure 4):

$$164 \quad \{A_{WC}, A_{UK}, A_{FrW}, A_{FrE}, A_{NS}, F_{WC}, F_{UK}, F_{FrW}, F_{FrE}, F_{NS}, M_{WC}, M_{UK}, M_{FrW}, M_{FrE}, M_{NS}\}$$

165 State A relates to live fish, state F relates to fish dying by fishing and state M relates to
 166 fish dying of natural causes, all located respectively in areas WC, UK, FrW, FrE, NS,
 167 Figure 1). At any time step t , a fish can be in one (and only one) of those 15 states. The
 168 transition between time step t and $t + 1$ consists of a three-step series of transitions
 169 representing ecological and observation processes (Figure 4):

- 170 1. Movement process. Any alive fish at time t can remain in its current area i ($i = 1, \dots, 5$)
 171) or move to another area j ($j = 1, \dots, 5$) between t and $t + 1$. The dispersion of all fish
 172 present in the area i at time t is modeled through a Multinomial distribution with
 173 movement probabilities $\phi_{(i,j)}$ and $\sum_{j=1}^5 \phi_{(i,j)} = 1$ (see details hereafter).
- 174 2. Survival. The model assumes that mortality occurs after movements. After
 175 movements, a fish can survive or die from either natural mortality or fishing mortality
 176 between t and $t + 1$. For each individual, this transition is modeled as a Multinomial
 177 distribution with survival rate, mortality rate by fishing or mortality rate by natural
 178 causes as parameters (denoted τ^s , τ^f and τ^m , respectively; see details hereafter).

179 3. Observation process. The observation process (that ultimately defines the
 180 likelihood) links observation to the true biological state of each individual at time t .
 181 Only fish caught by the fishery can potentially be observed. Alive fish or fish dead
 182 from natural causes are unobservable. Once a marked fish is caught by the fishery,
 183 it can eventually be declared. The declaration of a marked fish caught is modeled
 184 through a Bernoulli distribution with declaration rate Ψ (see details hereafter).

185 **2.4.2 Parameterization**

186 We tested several versions of the model accounting for different levels of spatial and
 187 temporal variations in the parameters. Below, we detail the parameterization used in the
 188 full model that accounts for seasonal movements, spatial heterogeneity and inter-annual
 189 variation of survival, and survey-specific declaration rate (model 1, Table 3). Other
 190 challenging models are detailed in section 2.4.3.

191 *Movement process*

192 Probabilities of movement $\phi_{(i,j,s)}$ are estimated separately for each pair of departure (
 193 $i = 1, \dots, 5$) and arrival areas ($j = 1, \dots, 5$) and for each season s ($s = 1, \dots, 4$). No variability
 194 between years is considered. Movement parameters from the WC to the NS, and from
 195 the NS to the WC are set to 0 and are not estimated (Figure 1). No fish were observed
 196 making these two migrations patterns in a single time step (i.e. 4 months). Therefore, it
 197 was assumed that the large distance separating the two areas does not allow for such
 198 movement in one time step.

199 *Survival process*

200 Survival probabilities for each time step are fixed and assumed known without errors,
 201 defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \tau^f &= \frac{f}{f+m}(1 - \exp(-(f+m))) \\
 \tau^m &= \frac{m}{f+m}(1 - \exp(-(f+m))) \\
 \tau^s &= 1 - (\tau^f + \tau^m)
 \end{aligned}$$

203 where τ^f is the probability of death by fishing, τ^m is the probability of natural fish death
204 and τ^s is the probability of survival. m and f respectively are natural and fishing mortality
205 (per time step of 4 months) as directly derived from published stock assessment
206 evaluations (ICES 2017). For the three ICES areas (IVc, VIId and VIle) the spatially and
207 temporally constant natural mortality was fixed to $m = 0.1 \times timestep^{-1}$ (ICES 2017).
208 Fishing mortality rate f was also considered known but with years and spatial variability.
209 Available information from stock assessment differ among areas (ICES 2017): estimates
210 of fishing mortality are available since 1955 for the NS area (ICES division IVc), from
211 1969 for the WC area (ICES division VIle) and from 1982 for the UK, FrW, FrE areas
212 jointly (ICES division VIId) (Figure 5). The data collected before 1970 were discarded
213 because no reliable estimate of f in the EEC could be found before 1970. In order to use
214 the longest time series of release data, we assumed that fishing mortality was equal in
215 areas VIle and VIId between 1970 to 1981. Temporal variations were smoothed to limit
216 the influence of uncertainty that surrounds short term (year-to-year) variations in
217 estimates of fishing mortality (Figure 5). Preliminary analysis demonstrated that
218 smoothed time series of f improve numerical stability of dispersal estimates. The
219 mortality rates were allocated to each time step within the same year by considering that
220 m and f were homogeneous among seasons within a year.

221 *Declaration*

222 The probabilities that marked fish caught by the fishery are declared (and then
223 observed) are estimated, and considered to be variable between release experiments
224 (but spatially homogeneous and constant among seasons).

225 **2.4.3 Hypotheses testing and sensitivity analysis**

226 The full model (model 1, Table 3) accounts for (i) a movement process with parameters
227 (estimated) that vary between seasons, (ii) yearly and spatially varying survival (fixed
228 parameters), and (iii) declaration rates (estimated parameters) considered to be variable
229 between release experiments. In all models, to avoid confusion between parameters and
230 ensure stable numerical results in the maximum likelihood procedure, estimated
231 parameters are the movement probabilities and the declaration rates, and all mortality
232 rates (fishing and natural) are considered known.

233 The existence of dispersal patterns that differ among seasons is tested by fitting models
234 with no variability of movement probabilities between seasons (models 2, 5 and 7, Table
235 3) and comparing the results obtained with the full model (model 1, Table 3). The
236 variation of the declaration rates between release experiments is tested by fitting a
237 model parameterized with a unique (but still estimated) declaration rate over the full time
238 series (model 3, Table 3). The existence of inter-annual differences in movements
239 during the time series is assessed by fitting separate models to the full time series of
240 data (1970-2018; model 1, Table 3) and to the most recent (2002-2018; model 8, Table
241 3) and historical time series only (1970-1998; model 9, Table 3). Hypotheses made on
242 the fishing mortality (considered known in our model) are critical. We therefore also
243 assessed the robustness of our results to the quantity of expertise on the spatio-
244 temporal variability of fishing mortality brought into the model. Models with less refined
245 hypotheses were fitted using: (i) fishing mortality constant over time but different
246 between areas, computed as the mean of fishing mortality over time series per area
247 (models 4 and 5, Table 3), and (ii) fishing mortality constant over time and

248 homogeneous in space, calculated as the mean over areas and times series (models 6
249 and 7, Table 3).

250 **2.4.4 Model fit and selection**

251 All models were built and fitted using the E-SURGE program (version 1.9.0, Choquet
252 and Nogue 2010). Details about the implementation of the model in E-SURGE are given
253 in Appendix A. Parameters (movement and declaration rates) were estimated in the
254 maximum likelihood framework (MLE). The data consist in the sequence of observation
255 events for all individuals, starting with i (the area of release, $i = 1, \dots, 5$) at the tagging
256 event, and ending with j (the area of recovery, $j = 1, \dots, 5$) when the fish is recaptured and
257 declared (with a series of 0 between the tagging and the recapture event as the fish can
258 only be recaptured once) or ending with a series of 0 for fish that are never recaptured.
259 The likelihood writes down as the product of Bernoulli distributions (declaration process)
260 over all time steps and all fish (considered independent), marginalized over the
261 probability distribution of all possible hidden states defined from the product of
262 Multinomial distributions for the movement and mortality processes. The maximum
263 likelihood is estimated using the Maximization-Expectation algorithm (Choquet and
264 Nogue 2010).

265 A goodness-of-fit (GOF) test was conducted prior to model selection to check if our
266 release and recapture data met the assumption of a general model (the Arnason-
267 Schwarz Model, Pradel *et al.* 2003). We performed a GOF test using the U-CARE
268 software (version 2.2, Choquet *et al.* 2009). GOF tests a 'trap-dependence' effect by
269 comparing future recapture histories between individuals released on the current
270 occasion versus individuals released on a previous occasion, for all individuals that are
271 seen again (for more details on GOF test, see Appendix A).

272 Model selection was used to assess which model formulation in Table 3 was the best
273 supported by the data. Model selection was based on the Akaike's information criterion
274 corrected for overdispersion (QAIC). The model with the lowest score of QAIC is
275 considered as the best model. Only models with the same dataset (same length of time
276 series of data) were compared together.

277 **2.4.5 Sensitivity to area boundaries**

278 A sensitivity analysis to the delineation of the areas was performed through a buffering
279 method consisting in removing fish released and recovered at or near a border. Such
280 individuals were potentially crossing the border using migration paths shorter than those
281 for centrally-based fish, creating a potential edge effect and introducing bias
282 (i.e. overestimation of movements among spatial areas) in estimates of movement
283 probabilities. We computed a 30 km buffer around each boundary to remove a
284 substantial amount (i.e. 10%) of released and recovered fish inside the buffer (3364 fish
285 were removed).

286 **3 RESULTS**

287 The GOF test performed on the full dataset (from 1970 to 2018) revealed a lack of fit (χ^2
288 = 57.476, $P = 0.000$ and $df = 24$) when over-dispersion is not accounted for. An
289 overdispersion coefficient (\hat{c}) of 2.39 was applied to all models to account for
290 overdispersion (\hat{c} superior to one, Burnham and Anderson 2003, Choquet *et al.* 2009).

291 Overall, the full model (model 1, Table 3) best explains the tagging-recovery data
292 including seasonal movements, specific declaration rate for each release experiment,
293 and fishing mortality varying across space and time.

294 The data also support the hypotheses of different detection rates per release
295 experiments (QAIC model 1 < QAIC model 3, Table 3) with the lowest declaration rates
296 estimated for the CEFAS₂₀₀₂, comparable detection rate between IFREMER₁₉₇₆ and
297 IFREMER₂₀₁₆ experiments and a relatively high detection rate for the CEFAS₁₉₇₀ release
298 experiment. Declaration rate estimates presented in Figure 6 for model 1 were similar
299 among models 1, 2 and 4-7 (Supplementary Files; Table S1).

300 Even if the estimated movement's probabilities between areas remain overall very low,
301 the results support the existence of seasonal movements (Figure 7 and Figure S2 in
302 Supplementary Files for a focus on movement between areas). Furthermore, the
303 conclusion that the data support the existence of seasonal movements patterns is robust
304 to changes in the time series of fishing mortality used as input to the model. Indeed,
305 models with seasonal movements in general presented better QAIC scores when
306 considering pairs of models with the same survival input (QAIC model 1 < QAIC model
307 2; QAIC model 4 < QAIC model 5; Table 3).

308 Overall, the results support the hypothesis of very low connectivity between the different
309 areas (model 1, Figure 7). For most areas and seasons, estimates of movement
310 probability are very low, if not null (i.e. probabilities of staying in the areas of origin are
311 close to one). Virtually no emigration is estimated from the NS and WC to the three
312 areas of the EEC. This result highlights the primarily residential nature of the adult
313 component of the common sole population, with only a very small proportion of adult fish
314 migrating among areas. Low probabilities of movement are estimated ($\Phi_{ij} < 0.25$) for
315 fish in the UK and FrE areas which move to WC and NS. Thus low to moderate exports
316 outside of the EEC occur between the overwintering and spawning season. Low
317 probabilities of emigration from the FrW to the WC is also estimated between spawning

318 and foraging seasons. Movement probabilities estimated with model 2 (no seasonal
319 variability of movements) also support the hypothesis of very low dispersion of common
320 sole between areas (Supplementary Files; Figure S2). Results are also robust to the
321 delineation of the five areas. The analysis performed on a dataset without fish released
322 and recovered near a border provided results (Supplementary Files; Figure S3)
323 comparable to those obtained with no buffering (Supplementary Files; Tables S2, S3
324 and S4).

325 Finally, the conclusion that very low connectivity exists between areas is robust to the
326 time series of data considered. No strong differences exist between movement
327 probability estimates obtained with the whole dataset (1970-2018), and with the shorter
328 time series 1970-1998, corresponding to historical release experiments (CEFAS₁₉₇₀ and
329 IFREMER₁₉₇₆; Tables S2, S3 and S4 in Supplementary Files). Movement probability
330 between the FrE and NS areas is an exception. Between these areas, higher
331 movements are estimated when considering historical release experiments only.
332 Between foraging and overwintering seasons, all fish from NS move to FrE (Table S3),
333 whereas from spawning to foraging and overwintering to spawning seasons all fish from
334 the FrE move to NS (Supplementary Files; Table S2). However, these estimated
335 probabilities of movements can be explained by the small amount of fish released and
336 recovered in the FrE area: 82 over the 1970-1998 period in comparison with the 1307
337 fish released and recovered in the NS in the most recent period. Movement probabilities
338 inferred from recent tagging data collected from 2002 to 2018 are similar to the ones
339 estimated with the entire dataset (Supplementary Files; Tables S2, S3 and S4), with only
340 small movements among areas. There are however small differences in estimates of
341 movement probabilities between the recent tagging data and the full-time series, which

342 mostly concern the three areas of the EEC. Between the foraging and overwintering
343 seasons, higher than average movement probability are estimated from the UK to the
344 FrE areas, as well as from the FrW to the FrE areas (Supplementary Files; Table S2).
345 Limited movements are also estimated from the FrE to the WC and FrW areas from
346 spawning to foraging seasons (Supplementary Files; Table S2). Confidence intervals are
347 greater for the more recent period than for 1970-2018 and 1970-1998 time series,
348 because of the smaller amount of fish released during CEFAS₂₀₀₂ and IFREMER₂₀₁₆ in
349 comparison with the CEFAS₁₉₇₀ and IFREMER₁₉₇₆ experiments (Table 3a).

350 **4 DISCUSSION**

351 In the present study, we have analyzed for the first time a substantive database of mark-
352 recapture data, with 32739 subadult and adult common sole being released over a
353 period of 49 years. Our results suggest minimal movements of sole among areas in the
354 EEC, and even lower immigration from adjacent areas, but low to moderate emigration
355 to the NS and to the WC, mainly between the overwinter and spawning seasons. Our
356 results provide evidence of low connectivity among common sole subpopulations within
357 the EEC, and no inputs from the adjacent spatial management areas. This evidence of
358 local segregation is consistent with recent studies using patterns in key life history traits
359 (Du Pontavice *et al.* 2018; Randon *et al.* 2018) for the common sole in the EEC.

360 *Reliability of the estimates of movement*

361 Commercially exploited fish populations are often widely monitored, which offers the
362 opportunity to use survey-generated estimates of population vital rates, expert
363 knowledge and/or stock assessment (McGarvey & Feenstra 2002). In our study, we
364 used estimates of fishing and natural mortality from published stock assessments (ICES

365 2017) as input fixed a priori in our state-space capture-mark-recapture modeling
366 approach. Models incorporating all data available on the survival process (e.g. yearly
367 and spatially varying fishing mortality) best explain the data.

368 Seasonal movement probabilities estimated in our study revealed low movements, with
369 small variations when considering different periods within the time series. However, the
370 historical release experiments (CEFAS₁₉₇₀ and IFREMER₁₉₇₆) were not designed
371 specifically to study movement patterns at the scale of the English Channel, and
372 relatively little tagging effort was expended in the two areas along the French coast (FrW
373 and FrE). This deficit of data in the oldest release experiments can explain the difference
374 in movement parameters estimated for the 1970 to 1998 time series with regards to the
375 full time series or to the recent release experiment. Only the recent release experiments
376 (CEFAS₂₀₀₂ and IFREMER₂₀₁₆) sampled all three EEC areas more evenly. Jointly
377 analyzing all four tagging experiments allowed for a more balanced dataset, and
378 reduced singularities and potential bias incorporated by the spatial locations of fish
379 releases between release experiments.

380 We recognize, however, some weaknesses in our approach, some of which open up
381 exciting opportunities for future research. Our model is structured on a seasonal time
382 step of 4-months that reflect biological seasons of the life cycle of the sole in the Eastern
383 Channel. Although this is justified from a biological point of view, this choice excludes
384 data from fish that were released and recovered within the same seasonal time step.
385 The percentage of fish removed because of the chosen time step remains low (7% of
386 released fish). For those removed fish, 94% were recovered in their zone of release, in
387 accordance with the results obtained on a 4-monthly basis. In all models, mortality rates
388 (fishing and natural) were considered known and estimated parameters are the

389 movement and declaration probabilities. Estimating movement, mortality and
390 detectability is possible in certain configuration of mark-recapture models (Royle *et al.*
391 2013) but separating temporal and spatial variations in those parameters is still difficult
392 overall. In our model, attempts to estimate both natural mortality and declaration rates
393 from our data have shown unstable numerical results and estimates that were non-
394 robust to small changes in hypotheses, revealing some statistical confusion between
395 mortality and declaration rates. In other terms, different combinations of mortality and
396 declaration rates provide the same likelihood for the data. Because the total mortality
397 estimated from statistical catch-at-age stock assessment models is robust (Quinn &
398 Deriso 1999; ICES 2017), and because no expertize exists on the declaration rate, our
399 choice here was to consider mortality as known, and to estimate declaration rates from
400 the data. Although stock assessment results provide some measure of uncertainty about
401 f (confidence intervals), only point estimates were considered in our approach. This
402 simplification answers practical considerations as no methods exist to account for
403 uncertainty in f using the E-SURGE software. However, we carefully assessed the
404 sensitivity of our results to the hypothesis made on the temporal and spatial variation of
405 the fishing mortality. Because temporal and spatial variation in f are much higher than
406 estimation uncertainty (ICES 2017), the robustness of our results to those changes in f
407 demonstrates the robustness of our inferences on movements to uncertainty about f .
408 However, estimates from stock assessment models (and especially fishing mortality) can
409 be sensitive to hypotheses made on the spatial structure of the population (see for
410 instance results by Archambault *et al.* 2016 on the same case study), and make
411 inferences on dispersion by using fixed f from previous assessments that do not
412 consider dispersion to be an issue. This paper is an important step toward the

413 construction of an integrated model to simultaneously estimate fishing mortality and
414 dispersion by integrating tagging data within the stock assessment model. Tagging data,
415 however, can have a complex structure, which when coupled with a poorly balanced
416 sampling design, can provide further challenge to obtaining robust statistical inferences
417 from tagging-integrated models (Maunder & Punt 2013). Consequently, we attempted
418 here to develop a first analysis of the tagging data before integrating them in a more
419 complex structure.

420 Our approach also considers natural mortality to be constant in space and in time. In
421 stock assessment evaluations, natural mortality is usually fixed and the fishing mortality
422 is estimated relative to the fixed value of natural mortality (ICES 2017). Preliminary
423 exploration of the data (not shown) suggested that consideration of a higher value of m
424 (but still considering m to be constant in time and space) has a simple and intuitive
425 impact on estimates of declaration rates. Considering a higher value of m leads to lower
426 estimates of declaration rates, as the same number of recorded marked fish must be
427 explained by a lower actual number of marked fish in the sea due to higher m . On the
428 opposite, considering a smaller value of m leads to higher estimates of declaration rates.
429 The effect of introducing spatial heterogeneity in m which is operationally challenging
430 was not tested here. However, there is no evidence of a spatially varying natural
431 mortality for the common sole in the English Channel. Consequently, our assumption of
432 constant natural mortality among areas was considered to be a realistic and
433 parsimonious modeling approach for the estimation of fish movement.

434 Although Du Pontavice et al. (2018) and Archambault et al. (2016) suggested
435 heterogeneity of fishing mortality within the EEC, with the fishing pressure in FrE being
436 higher than in the UK and FrW areas, no spatial variability of fishing mortality within the

437 three EEC areas was considered in our approach. However, because the EEC common
438 sole stock is considered homogeneous, no stock assessment results were available for
439 the individual 'sub-stock' areas (UK, FrW, FrE), and no spatialized catch data were
440 available in the time series. Furthermore, although the fishery is strongly seasonal
441 (Vermard and Savina, com. pers.), available times series of within-year fishing effort
442 distribution were too short to be considered in our analysis (2000-2016 for French and
443 2004-2016 for foreign fleets), precluding the application of varying fishing mortality
444 between the 4-month 'seasons'. However, given (i) the very low level of dispersal
445 estimated among the different areas in the EEC and (ii) the high robustness of these
446 results to hypotheses on spatial and temporal variations in the fishing mortality that were
447 tested, it is unlikely that using more refined data would have dramatically altered the
448 conclusions. Furthermore, recapture probability in our approach depends only on m and
449 f . However because the fleet and associated gear is not routinely recorded for mark
450 recovery, heterogeneity due to the use of different fishing gears, which could have
451 introduced further realism to our model, was unable to be considered. Finally, we found
452 strong statistical evidence in favor of different declaration rates between the tagging
453 periods. Unfortunately, we were not able to find definitive explanations for those
454 differences. One potential explanation might be haphazard levels of communication with
455 the fishermen to publicize the tagging programs and associated rewards at different
456 periods in time. We considered the declaration rate to be homogeneous in time and
457 space within a period, which might have been a source of bias, in that different fleets
458 operating in different zones may not have had equivalent information, interest or
459 motivation to participate in scientific tagging programs. As a result, our estimated
460 movement probabilities may have been biased by reducing the number of declarations

461 of marked fish caught in a particular area. We have assumed that the aggregation of
462 several tagging surveys from both UK and French research institutes in the present
463 modeling approach should limit the overall related biases.

464 *Combining different approaches to improve estimates of connectivity*

465 Several authors have recently highlighted the importance of combining multiple
466 approaches to study stock delineation (Pita *et al.* 2016). Indeed, individual methods
467 each have their own strengths and weaknesses, and combining results of different
468 methods generally improves the overall reliability of the results (Cadrin *et al.* 2014; Izzo
469 *et al.* 2017). For marine fish in particular, high mortality in early life stages (eggs, larvae
470 and juveniles, Le Pape and Bonhommeau 2015) and the lack of barriers in the ocean
471 often rend the genetic signal of segregation relatively weak (Selkoe *et al.* 2008). Only a
472 very small proportion of fish dispersing at each generation will erase genetics
473 differences between populations (Palmer *et al.* 2014), which can result in a mismatch
474 between ecological and genetic connectivity (Hawkins *et al.* 2016).

475 The common sole stocks in the English Channel and North Sea are recognized as
476 genetically distinct populations (Diopere *et al.* 2017) and have been managed separately
477 for decades. While common sole in the EEC has been managed as a single
478 homogeneous stock unit thus far, evidence from different approaches is now
479 accumulating in support of considering spatial structure at a finer scale. Here we
480 demonstrate very low exchanges between the three delineated EEC areas, and virtually
481 no immigration from adjacent stocks. This demographic isolation is consistent with the
482 marked discrepancies in growth between the areas (Du Pontavice *et al.* 2018; Randon
483 *et al.* 2018) and the lasting synchrony among density-at-age time series inside each
484 area (Randon *et al.* 2018).

485 *From low adult-mediated connectivity to segregation in EEC areas*

486 In the EEC, larval connectivity of the common sole is low, since spawning areas directly
487 feed adjacent coastal nursery grounds (Rochette *et al.* 2012). After metamorphosis,
488 juveniles grow on shallow nursery grounds (Riou *et al.* 2001; Rochette *et al.* 2010).
489 Limited movements of juvenile flatfish (Le Pape & Cognez 2016), and the dependence
490 of the juvenile common sole upon shallow nursery habitats (Riou *et al.* 2001) result in
491 low juvenile connectivity (Coggan & Dando 1988). After about two years on nursery
492 grounds, the common sole move to deeper offshore adult foraging grounds. In addition
493 to premature segregation, the lack of connectivity during the adult phase is a potentially
494 important driver of segregation (Frisk *et al.* 2014). However, estimated levels of
495 dispersal demonstrate that at subadult and adult stages, EEC export a low fraction of
496 individuals to the NS and a very low fraction to the WC. The EEC may act as a limited
497 source of fish for these adjacent stocks. These movements occur mainly during the
498 overwintering period of movements of subadults (Dorel *et al.* 1991) and adults (Horwood
499 1993; Burt & Millner 2008) when common sole move out towards deeper sea areas.

500 *Management implications*

501 Ignoring the spatial structure of exploited fish population dynamics may induce
502 mismatches between the stock units considered for stock assessment and management
503 and the biological population structure (Carson *et al.* 2011; Frisk *et al.* 2014; Kerr *et al.*
504 2017). A better consideration of the spatial structure of populations and of
505 metapopulation dynamics is critical for sound evidence-based decision-making (Heino *et*
506 *al.* 1997; Porch *et al.* 1998; Ulrich *et al.* 2017). Inconsistencies between the spatial
507 structure of populations and delineation of stock units could impede effectiveness and
508 appropriateness of management measures (Kerr *et al.* 2017), resulting in the

509 overexploitation of the less productive subunits (Cadrin & Secor 2009; Ying *et al.* 2011;
510 Goethel & Berger 2017). Adults' movements play a critical role in population connectivity
511 (Frisk *et al.* 2014), especially for species with a low level of connectivity at previous life
512 stages. Failure to appropriately consider the role of adults' movements (or local
513 segregation) can lead to bias in assessment of stock status and the proposal of
514 management non-adapted to the true dynamics and productivity of stocks (Punt &
515 Restrepo 1995; Porch *et al.* 1998).

516 Rochette *et al.* (2013) and Archambault *et al.* (2016) have developed an integrated life
517 cycle Bayesian model of the EEC common sole stock. The life cycle sequentially
518 considers the production of eggs by adults, larval survival and drift, survival and
519 settlements in coastal nurseries, habitat-dependent survival of juveniles on nurseries
520 and finally natural and fishing mortality of the adult population. Archambault *et al.* (2016)
521 consider two contrasted hypotheses: (i) one single homogeneous adult population
522 supplemented by all coastal nurseries; (ii) three isolated subpopulation supplemented by
523 separated pools of coastal nurseries. Results show that accounting for spatial
524 segregation markedly influences stock assessment results (Archambault *et al.* 2016).
525 Results, from both this and the previous study, show that estimates of fishing mortality
526 and management reference points such as MSY of the common sole in the EEC
527 strongly depend upon the underpinning hypothesis of adult connectivity. Further
528 extension of the integrated life cycle modeling framework of Archambault *et al.* (2016) to
529 integrate the analysis of tagging data within the integrated life cycle model would allow
530 the simultaneous estimation of fishing mortality in the different areas of the EEC and
531 connectivity between those areas. We suggest that such an exercise would contribute to

532 improving scientific advice for the spatial management of the fishery (Methot 2009;
533 Goethel *et al.* 2011; Griffiths *et al.* 2018).

534 **5 ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

535 We would like to thank Coline Lazard, Sophie Parrad, Nicolas Goascoz, Ronan Lebras,
536 David Osmond and Yves Verin for their extensive involvement in the tagging program.
537 We also thank Elodie Réveillac for fruitful discussions about ecological concepts and the
538 Associate Editor and two anonymous referees for their useful comments in the review
539 process.

540 **6 FUNDING**

541 This work is part of the SMAC (Sole de Manche Est Amélioration des Connaissances
542 pour une meilleure gestion du stock) research program. This work is supported by the
543 fisheries organization “France Filière Pêche” and the French Ministry in charge of
544 fisheries “Direction des Pêches Maritimes et de l’Aquaculture”.

545
546547 *Table 1: Number of marked and recovered fish, used in the analysis, per release*
548 *experiment and associated average time at liberty in number of 4-month periods and*
549 *recapture rates.*

Experiment	Marked	Recovered	Average time at liberty	Recapture rate
CEFAS ₁₉₇₀	3627	3627	6.26	1
IFREMER ₁₉₇₆	305	305	4.07	1
CEFAS ₂₀₀₂	29	29	5.59	1
IFREMER ₂₀₁₆	85	85	3.07	1
Total	4046	4046	6.02	1

550
 551 *Table 2: Number of fish released per area and time series and in parentheses the*
 552 *number of recovered fish per area and time series.*

	Areas	1970-1998	2002-2018	1970-2018
1	WC	5025 (949)	250 (10)	5275 (959)
2	UK	6897 (1298)	1861 (13)	8758 (1311)
3	FrW	1448 (90)	1048 (7)	2496 (97)
4	FrE	1143 (93)	2148 (55)	3291 (148)
5	NS	12509 (1505)	410 (16)	12919 (1521)
6	Total	27022 (3935)	5717 (101)	32739 (4036)


553

554

555 *Table 3: Model definition. Models 1 to model 7 are fitted to the full time series. Model 1 is*
 556 *the most complex model. Model selection is performed on the full dataset (1970 to 2018)*
 557 *from model 1 to less complex alternatives in the dispersal, fishing mortality inputs and*
 558 *detection rates. Δ QAIC represents the difference in QAIC in comparison to model 1.*
 559 *Models 8 and 9 have the same structure as model 1, but are fitted to truncated time*
 560 *series and hence are not considered in the model selection process.*


Model	Dispersal	Fishing mortality	Detection	Time Series	QAIC	Δ QAIC
1	Seasonal	Area x Years	Release experiments	1970-2018	144966	-
2	Constant	Area x Years	Release experiments	1970-2018	144976	10
3	Seasonal	Area x Years	Unique	1970-2018	145882	916
4	Seasonal	Area	Release experiments	1970-2018	145156	190
5	Constant	Area	Release experiments	1970-2018	145187	221
6	Seasonal	Homogeneous	Release experiments	1970-2018	145148	182
7	Constant	Homogeneous	Release experiments	1970-2018	145132	166
8	Seasonal	Area x Years	Release experiments	1970-1998	-	-
9	Seasonal	Area x Years	Release experiments	2002-2018	-	-

561



562

563 *Figure 1: Map of the model geographical definition with the five areas potentially*
 564 *structuring common sole stocks (ICES. 2017; IFREMER 2019): Western Channel (WC,*
 565 *ICES division VIIe), English coast of the Eastern English Channel (UK, ICES division*
 566 *VIIId), Southern French coast (FrW, ICES division VIIId), Northern French coast of the*
 567 *Eastern English Channel (FrE, ICES division VIIId) and the southern part of the North*
 568 *Sea (NS, ICES division IVc).*



569

570 *Figure 2: Release locations (in blue) and recapture locations (in red) of tagged common*
 571 *sole in the English Channel, east of the Western Channel and west of North Sea (Burt &*
 572 *Millner 2008; IFREMER 2019).*

Can. J. Fish. Aquat. Sci. Downloaded from www.nrcresearchpress.com by IPREMER BIBLIOTHEQUE LA PEROUSE on 09/24/19
For personal use only. This Just-IN manuscript is the accepted manuscript prior to copy editing and page composition. It may differ from the final official version of record.






Figure 3: Time at liberty in number of seasons (4-month periods) for the 4036 marked fish recovered between 1970 and 2018.

573
574
575
576
577
578
579



580
 581 *Figure 4: Diagram representing the model structure used in the analysis. Each step*
 582 *represents a different model parameter or transition probability. Only three (WC, UK,*
 583 *NS) of the five areas are represented for ease of reading. Live fish (A_{WC}, A_{UK}, A_{NS}) and*
 584 *fish dying due to natural causes (M_{WC}, M_{UK}, M_{NS}) cannot be seen and hence cannot be*
 585 *detected.*
 586
 587



588

589 *Figure 5: Annual fishing mortality rate estimated from stock assessments (ICES 2017).*590 *Dotted line represents f for area IV, triangle line represents f for area VIId, and cross-*591 *line is for area VIIe. Shaded triangle, dot and cross represent estimates from stock*592 *assessment without smoothing. Locally weighted least squares regression was used to*593 *perform smoothing with 30% of smoothing span.*

594





Figure 6: Detection rate (ψ) estimates and their 95% confidence intervals per release experiments from model 1 with the full time series (1970 to 2018).

595
596
597
598
599
600



601
 602 *Figure 7: Movement probability estimates and their 95% confidence intervals from model*
 603 *1. Rows represent areas of departure and columns areas of arrival. Triangles are MLE*
 604 *estimates of movement probabilities from spawning to foraging seasons. Circles from*
 605 *foraging to overwintering seasons. Squares from overwintering to spawning season.*

606
 607
 608
 609
 610
 611
 612
 613
 614
 615
 616
 617

618 **REFERENCES**

- 619 Abaunza, P., Murta, A.G., Campbell, N., Cimmaruta, R., Comesaña, A.S., Dahle, G.,
620 Santamaría, M.G., Gordo, L.S., Iversen, S.A. & MacKenzie, K. 2008. Stock identity of
621 horse mackerel (*Trachurus trachurus*) in the Northeast Atlantic and Mediterranean Sea:
622 Integrating the results from different stock identification approaches. *Fisheries Research*,
623 **89**, 196–209.
- 624 Adlerstein, S.A., Rutherford, E.S., Claramunt, R.M., Clapp, D.F. & Clevenger, J.A. 2008.
625 Seasonal movements of Chinook salmon in Lake Michigan based on tag recoveries from
626 recreational fisheries and catch rates in gill-net assessments. *Transactions of the*
627 *American Fisheries Society*, **137**, 736–750.
- 628 Aeberhard, W.H., Mills Flemming, J. & Nielsen, A. 2018. Review of State-Space Models
629 for Fisheries Science. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, **5**, 215–235.
- 630 Allaya, H., FALEH, A.B., Rebaya, M., Zrelli, S., Hajjej, G., Hattour, A., Quignard, J.-P. &
631 Trabelsi, M. 2016. Identification of Atlantic Chub Mackerel *Scomber Colias* Population
632 through the Analysis of Body Shape in Tunisian Waters. *Cah. Biol. Mar*, **57**, 195–207.
- 633 Archambault, B., Le Pape, O., Baulier, L., Vermard, Y., Véron, M. & Rivot, E. 2016.
634 Adult-mediated connectivity affects inferences on population dynamics and stock
635 assessment of nursery-dependent fish populations. *Fisheries research*, **181**, 198–213.
- 636 Bacha, M., Jeyid, A.M., Jaafour, S., Yahyaoui, A., Diop, M. & Amara, R. 2016. Insights
637 on stock structure of round sardinella *Sardinella aurita* off north-west Africa based on
638 otolith shape analysis. *Journal of fish biology*, **89**, 2153–2166.
- 639 Begg, G.A., Friedland, K.D. & Pearce, J.B. 1999. Stock identification and its role in stock
640 assessment and fisheries management: An overview. *Fisheries Research*, **43**, 1–8.
- 641 Begg, G.A. & Waldman, J.R. 1999. An holistic approach to fish stock identification.
642 *Fisheries Research*, **43**, 35–44.
- 643 Bekkevold, D., Helyar, S.J., Limborg, M.T., Nielsen, E.E., Hemmer-Hansen, J., Clausen,
644 L.A.W. & Carvalho, G.R. 2015. Gene-associated markers can assign origin in a weakly
645 structured fish, Atlantic herring. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, **72**, 1790–1801.
- 646 Benhamou, S. 2014. Of scales and stationarity in animal movements. *Ecology letters*,
647 **17**, 261–272.
- 648 Burnham, K.P. & Anderson, D.R. 2003. *Model selection and multimodel inference: A*
649 *practical information-theoretic approach*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- 650 Burt, G.J. & Millner, R.S. 2008. Movement of sole in the southern North Sea and eastern
651 English Channel from tagging studies 1955-2004. *Science Series Technical Report*, **44**,
652 1–44.
- 653 Cadigan, N.G. & Bratney, J. 2006. Reporting and shedding rate estimates from tag-
654 recovery experiments on Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) in coastal Newfoundland.
655 *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, **63**, 1944–1958.

- 656 Cadigan, N.G. & Brattey, J. 2003. Semiparametric estimation of tag loss and reporting
657 rates for tag-recovery experiments using exact time-at-liberty data. *Biometrics*, **59**, 869–
658 876.
- 659 Cadrin, S.X., Karr, L.A. & Mariani, S. 2014. Stock Identification Methods: An Overview.
660 *Stock Identification Methods (Second Edition)*, pp. 1–5. Elsevier.
- 661 Cadrin, S.X. & Secor, D.H. 2009. Accounting for spatial population structure in stock
662 assessment: Past, present, and future. *The future of fisheries science in North America*,
663 pp. 405–426. Springer.
- 664 Callicó Fortunato, R., Reguera Galán, A., García Alonso, I., Volpedo, A. & Benedito
665 Durà, V. 2017. Environmental migratory patterns and stock identification of Mugil
666 cephalus in the Spanish Mediterranean Sea, by means of otolith microchemistry.
667 *Estuarine, Coastal and Shelf Science*, **188**, 174–180.
- 668 Carson, H.S., Cook, G.S., López-Duarte, P.C. & Levin, L.A. 2011. Evaluating the
669 importance of demographic connectivity in a marine metapopulation. *Ecology*, **92**, 1972–
670 1984.
- 671 Catalano, S.R., Whittington, I.D., Donnellan, S.C. & Gillanders, B.M. 2014. Parasites as
672 Biological Tags to Assess Host Population Structure: Guidelines, Recent Genetic
673 Advances and Comments on a Holistic Approach. *International Journal for Parasitology:*
674 *Parasites and Wildlife*, **3**, 220–226.
- 675 Choquet, R., Lebreton, J.-D., Gimenez, O., Reboulet, A.-M. & Pradel, R. 2009. U-CARE:
676 Utilities for performing goodness of fit tests and manipulating CAPTURE data.
677 *Ecography*, **32**, 1071–1074.
- 678 Choquet, R. & Nogue, E. 2010. E-SURGE 1.7 user's manual. *CEFE, Montpellier*.
- 679 Coggan, R.A. & Dando, P.R. 1988. Movements of juvenile Dover sole, *Solea solea* (L.),
680 In the Tamar Estuary, South-western England. *Journal of Fish Biology*, **33**, 177–184.
- 681 Cuveliers, E.L., Larmuseau, M.H.D., Hellemans, B., Verherstraeten, S., Volckaert,
682 F.A.M. & Maes, G.E. 2012. Multi-Marker Estimate of Genetic Connectivity of Sole (*Solea*
683 *Solea*) in the North-East Atlantic Ocean. *Marine Biology*, **159**, 1239–1253.
- 684 Diopere, E., Vandamme, S.G., Hablützel, P.I., Cariani, A., Van Houdt, J., Rijnsdorp, A.,
685 Tinti, F., Consortium, F., Volckaert, F.A. & Maes, G.E. 2017. Seascape genetics of a
686 flatfish reveals local selection under high levels of gene flow. *ICES Journal of Marine*
687 *Science*, **75**, 675–689.
- 688 Dorel, D., Koutsikopoulos, C., Desaunay, Y. & Marchand, J. 1991. Seasonal distribution
689 of young sole (*Solea solea* (L.)) In the nursery ground of the Bay of Vilaine (Northern
690 Bay of Biscay). *Netherlands Journal of Sea Research*, **27**, 297–306.
- 691 Du Pontavice, H., Randon, M., Lehuta, S., Vermard, Y. & Savina-Rolland, M. 2018.
692 Investigating spatial heterogeneity of von Bertalanffy growth parameters to inform the
693 stock structuration of common sole, *Solea solea*, in the Eastern English Channel.
694 *Fisheries Research*, **207**, 28–36.

- 695 Duriez, O., Saether, S.A., Ens, B.J., Choquet, R., Pradel, R., Lambeck, R.H.D. &
 696 Klaassen, M. 2009. Estimating survival and movements using both live and dead
 697 recoveries: A case study of oystercatchers confronted with habitat change. *Journal of*
 698 *Applied Ecology*, **46**, 144–153.
- 699 Erlandsson, J., Östman, Ö., Florin, A.-B. & Pekcan-Hekim, Z. 2017. Spatial structure of
 700 body size of European flounder (*Platichthys flesus* L.) In the Baltic Sea. *Fisheries*
 701 *Research*, **189**, 1–9.
- 702 Fernández-Chacón, A., Moland, E., Espeland, S.H., Kleiven, A.R. & Olsen, E.M. 2016.
 703 Causes of mortality in depleted populations of Atlantic cod estimated from multi-event
 704 modelling of markRecapture and recovery data. *Canadian journal of fisheries and*
 705 *aquatic sciences*, **74**, 116–126.
- 706 Fogarty, M.J. & Botsford, L.W. 2007. Population connectivity and spatial management of
 707 marine fisheries. *Oceanography*, **20**, 112–123.
- 708 Frisk, M.G., Jordaan, A. & Miller, T.J. 2014. Moving beyond the current paradigm in
 709 marine population connectivity: Are adults the missing link? *Fish and Fisheries*, **15**, 242–
 710 254.
- 711 Frusher, S.D., Frusher, S.D., Hoenig, J.M. & Hoenig, J.M. 2001. Strategies for improving
 712 the precision of fishing and natural mortality estimates from multiyear tagging models: A
 713 case study. *Marine and Freshwater Research*, **52**, 1649–1655.
- 714 Gauthier, G. & Lebreton, J.-D. 2008. Analysis of band-recovery data in a multistate
 715 capture-recapture framework. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, **36**, 59–73.
- 716 Gillanders, B.M., Ferrell, D.J. & Andrew, N.L. 2001. Estimates of movement and life-
 717 history parameters of yellowtail kingfish (*Seriola lalandi*): How useful are data from a
 718 cooperative tagging programme? *Marine and Freshwater Research*, **52**, 179–192.
- 719 Goethel, D.R. & Berger, A.M. 2017. Accounting for Spatial Complexities in the
 720 Calculation of Biological Reference Points: Effects of Misdiagnosing Population
 721 Structure for Stock Status Indicators. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic*
 722 *Sciences*, **74**, 1878–1894.
- 723 Goethel, D.R., Quinn, T.J. & Cadrin, S.X. 2011. Incorporating Spatial Structure in Stock
 724 Assessment: Movement Modeling in Marine Fish Population Dynamics. *Reviews in*
 725 *Fisheries Science*, **19**, 119–136.
- 726 Griffiths, C.A., Patterson, T.A., Blanchard, J.L., Righton, D.A., Wright, S.R., Pitchford,
 727 J.W. & Blackwell, P.G. 2018. Scaling marine fish movement behavior from individuals to
 728 populations. *Ecology and evolution*, **8**, 7031–7043.
- 729 Hanselman, D.H., Heifetz, J., Echave, K.B. & Dressel, S.C. 2014. Move it or lose it:
 730 Movement and mortality of sablefish tagged in Alaska. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries*
 731 *and Aquatic Sciences*, **72**, 238–251.
- 732 Hanski, I. 1998. Metapopulation dynamics. *Nature*, **396**, 41.

- 733 Hawkins, S.J., Bohn, K., Sims, D.W., Ribeiro, P., Faria, J., Presa, P., Pita, A., Martins,
734 G.M., Neto, A.I., Burrows, M.T. & Genner, M.J. 2016. Fisheries stocks from an
735 ecological perspective: Disentangling ecological connectivity from genetic interchange.
736 *Fisheries Research*, **179**, 333–341.
- 737 Heino, M., Kaitala, V., Ranta, E. & Lindström, J. 1997. Synchronous dynamics and rates
738 of extinction in spatially structured populations. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of*
739 *London B: Biological Sciences*, **264**, 481–486.
- 740 Henny, C.J. & Burnham, K.P. 1976. A reward band study of mallards to estimate band
741 reporting rates. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 1–14.
- 742 Hilborn, R. 1990. Determination of fish movement patterns from tag recoveries using
743 maximum likelihood estimators. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*,
744 **47**, 635–643.
- 745 Horwood, J. 1993. The Bristol Channel sole (*Solea solea* (L.)): A fisheries case study.
746 *Advances in Marine Biology*, pp. 215–367. Elsevier.
- 747 Howe, A.B. & Coates, P.G. 1975. Winter flounder movements, growth, and mortality off
748 Massachusetts. *Transactions of the American Fisheries Society*, **104**, 13–29.
- 749 Hüseyin, K., Mosegaard, H., Albertsen, C.M., Nielsen, E.E., Hemmer-Hansen, J. & Eero,
750 M. 2016. Evaluation of Otolith Shape as a Tool for Stock Discrimination in Marine Fishes
751 Using Baltic Sea Cod as a Case Study. *Fisheries Research*, **174**, 210–218.
- 752 ICES. 2017. *Report of the Working Group on the Assessment of Demersal Stocks in the*
753 *North 685 Sea and Skagerrak*. ICES HQ. ICES CM.
- 754 IFREMER. 2019. *Sole de Manche Est : amélioration des connaissances pour une*
755 *meilleure gestion du stock*. Rapport d'avancement du projet SMAC - année 3 Sole de
756 Manche Est: amélioration des connaissances pour une meilleure gestion du stock.
- 757 Izzo, C., Ward, T.M., Ivey, A.R., Suthers, I.M., Stewart, J., Sexton, S.C. & Gillanders,
758 B.M. 2017. Integrated approach to determining stock structure: Implications for fisheries
759 management of sardine, *Sardinops sagax*, in Australian waters. *Reviews in Fish Biology*
760 *and Fisheries*, **27**, 267–284.
- 761 Jasonowicz, A.J., Goetz, F.W., Goetz, G.W. & Nichols, K.M. 2016. Love the One You're
762 with: Genomic Evidence of Panmixia in the Sablefish (*Anoplopoma Fimbria*). *Canadian*
763 *Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, **74**, 377–387.
- 764 Kerr, L.A., Hintzen, N.T., Cadrin, S.X., Clausen, L.W., Dickey-Collas, M., Goethel, D.R.,
765 Hatfield, E.M.C., Kritzer, J.P. & Nash, R.D.M. 2017. Lessons learned from practical
766 approaches to reconcile mismatches between biological population structure and stock
767 units of marine fish. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, **74**, 1708–1722.
- 768 Kutkuhn, J.H. 1981. Stock definition as a necessary basis for cooperative management
769 of Great Lakes fish resources. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, **38**,
770 1476–1478.

- 771 Laconcha, U., Iriondo, M., Arrizabalaga, H., Manzano, C., Markaide, P., Montes, I.,
 772 Zarraonaindia, I., Velado, I., Bilbao, E., Goñi, N., Santiago, J., Domingo, A., Karakulak,
 773 S., Oray, I. & Estonba, A. 2015. New Nuclear SNP Markers Unravel the Genetic
 774 Structure and Effective Population Size of Albacore Tuna (*Thunnus alalunga*). *PLOS*
 775 *ONE*, **10**, e0128247.
- 776 Lebreton, J.-D., Almeras, T. & Pradel, R. 1999. Competing events, mixtures of
 777 information and multistratum recapture models. *Bird Study*, **46**, S39–S46.
- 778 Le Bris, A., Fisher, J.A., Murphy, H.M., Galbraith, P.S., Castonguay, M., Loher, T.,
 779 Robert, D. & Grabowski, H.e.J. 2017. Migration Patterns and Putative Spawning
 780 Habitats of Atlantic Halibut (*Hippoglossus Hippoglossus*) in the Gulf of St. Lawrence
 781 Revealed by Geolocation of Pop-up Satellite Archival Tags. *ICES Journal of Marine*
 782 *Science*, **75**, 135–147.
- 783 Le Pape, O. & Bonhommeau, S. 2015. The food limitation hypothesis for juvenile marine
 784 fish. *Fish and Fisheries*, **16**, 373–398.
- 785 Le Pape, O. & Cognez, N. 2016. The range of juvenile movements of estuarine and
 786 coastal nursery dependent flatfishes: Estimation from a meta-analytical approach.
 787 *Journal of Sea Research*, **107**, 43–55.
- 788 Liljestrand, E.M., Wilberg, M.J. & Schueller, A.M. 2019. Multi-state dead recovery mark-
 789 recovery model performance for estimating movement and mortality rates. *Fisheries*
 790 *Research*, **210**, 214–223.
- 791 MacKenzie, K. & Abaunza, P. 2014. Parasites as Biological Tags. *Stock Identification*
 792 *Methods (Second Edition)*, pp. 185–203. Elsevier.
- 793 Mahe, K., Delpech, J.-P. & Carpentier, A. 2007. Synthèse bibliographique des
 794 principales espèces de Manche orientale et du golfe de Gascogne.
- 795 Mahe, K., Oudard, C., Mille, T., Keating, J., Gonçalves, P., Clausen, L.W., Petursdottir,
 796 G., Rasmussen, H., Meland, E. & Mullins, E. 2016. Identifying Blue Whiting
 797 (*Micromesistius Poutassou*) Stock Structure in the Northeast Atlantic by Otolith Shape
 798 Analysis. *Canadian journal of fisheries and aquatic sciences*, **73**, 1363–1371.
- 799 Marandel, F., Lorance, P., Andrello, M., Charrier, G., Le Cam, S., Lehuta, S. & Trenkel,
 800 V.M. 2017. Insights from genetic and demographic connectivity for the management of
 801 rays and skates. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences*, **75**, 1291–1302.
- 802 Martinez, E., Buonaccorsi, V., Hyde, J.R. & Aguilar, A. 2017. Population genomics
 803 reveals high gene flow in grass rockfish (*Sebastes rastrelliger*). *Marine Genomics*, **33**,
 804 57–63.
- 805 Maunder, M.N. & Punt, A.E. 2013. A review of integrated analysis in fisheries stock
 806 assessment. *Fisheries Research*, **142**, 61–74.
- 807 McCrea, R.S. & Morgan, B.J. 2014. *Analysis of capture-recapture data*. Chapman and
 808 Hall/CRC.

- 809 McGarvey, R. & Feenstra, J.E. 2002. Estimating rates of fish movement from tag
810 recoveries: Conditioning by recapture. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic*
811 *Sciences*, **59**, 1054–1064.
- 812 Methot, R.D. 2009. Stock synthesis (ver. 3.02 C). *NOAA Fish. Tool*.
- 813 Milano, I., Babbucci, M., Cariani, A., Atanassova, M., Bekkevold, D., Carvalho, G.R.,
814 Espiñeira, M., Fiorentino, F., Garofalo, G. & Geffen, A.J. 2014. Outlier SNP Markers
815 Reveal Fine-Scale Genetic Structuring across European Hake Populations (*Merluccius*
816 *merluccius*). *Molecular Ecology*, **23**, 118–135.
- 817 Moreira, C., Froufe, E., Sial, A.N., Caeiro, A., Vaz-Pires, P. & Correia, A.T. 2018.
818 Population Structure of the Blue Jack Mackerel (*Trachurus Picturatus*) in the NE Atlantic
819 Inferred from Otolith Microchemistry. *Fisheries Research*, **197**, 113–122.
- 820 Östman, Ö., Olsson, J., Dannewitz, J., Palm, S. & Florin, A.-B. 2017. Inferring spatial
821 structure from population genetics and spatial synchrony in demography of Baltic Sea
822 fishes: Implications for management. *Fish and Fisheries*, **18**, 324–339.
- 823 Palmer, S.C.F., Coulon, A. & Travis, J.M.J. 2014. Inter-individual variability in dispersal
824 behaviours impacts connectivity estimates. *Oikos*, **123**, 923–932.
- 825 Patterson III, W.F., Watterson, J.C., Shipp, R.L. & Cowan Jr, J.H. 2001. Movement of
826 tagged red snapper in the northern Gulf of Mexico. *Transactions of the American*
827 *Fisheries Society*, **130**, 533–545.
- 828 Pita, A., Casey, J., Hawkins, S.J., Villarreal, M.R., Gutiérrez, M.-J., Cabral, H., Carocci,
829 F., Abaunza, P., Pascual, S. & Presa, P. 2016. Conceptual and practical advances in
830 fish stock delineation. *Fisheries Research*, **173**, 185–193.
- 831 Pollock, K.H., Hearn, W.S. & Polacheck, T. 2002. A general model for tagging on
832 multiple component fisheries: An integration of age-dependent reporting rates and
833 mortality estimation. *Environmental and Ecological Statistics*, **9**, 57–69.
- 834 Porch, C., Kleiber, P., Turner, S., Sibert, J., Bailey, R. & Cort, J.L. 1998. The efficacy of
835 VPA models in the presence of complicated movement patterns. *COLLECTIVE*
836 *VOLUME OF SCIENTIFIC PAPERS-INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR THE*
837 *CONSERVATION OF ATLANTIC TUNAS*, **50**, 591–622.
- 838 Pradel, R., Gimenez, O. & Lebreton, D. 2005. Principles and interest of GOF tests for
839 multistate captureRecapture models. *Animal Biodiversity and Conservation*, 16.
- 840 Pradel, R., Wintrebert, C.M. & Gimenez, O. 2003. A proposal for a goodness-of-fit test to
841 the Arnason-Schwarz multisite capture-recapture model. *Biometrics*, **59**, 43–53.
- 842 Punt, A.E. & Restrepo, V.R. 1995. Some effects of ignoring mixing when managing fish
843 populations subject to limited mixing. *ICES Long-term Management Measures Working*
844 *Group WP1*.
- 845 Quinn, T.J. & Deriso, R.B. 1999. *Quantitative fish dynamics*. Oxford University Press.

- 846 Randon, M., Réveillac, E., Rivot, E., Pontavice, H.D. & Pape, O.L. 2018. Could we
847 consider a single stock when spatial sub-units present lasting patterns in growth and
848 asynchrony in cohort densities? A flatfish case study. *Journal of Sea Research*.
- 849 Régnier, T., Augley, J., Devalla, S., Robinson, C.D., Wright, P.J. & Neat, F.C. 2017.
850 Otolith chemistry reveals seamount fidelity in a deepwater fish. *Deep Sea Research Part*
851 *I: Oceanographic Research Papers*, **121**, 183–189.
- 852 Riou, P., Pape, O.L. & Rogers, S.I. 2001. Contribution respective de différentes
853 nourriceries cotières aux populations adultes de sole et de plie: Etude par couplage de
854 modèles linéaires généralisés avec un système d'information géographique. *Aquatic*
855 *Living Resources*, **2**, 125–135.
- 856 Rochette, S. 2011. *Effet des perturbations anthropiques sur la survie des juvéniles de*
857 *poissons marins dans les nourriceries et conséquences sur les renouvellement des*
858 *populations.: Application au stock de sole commune (Solea solea) en Manche Est.* PhD
859 Thesis thesis, Rennes, Agrocampus Ouest.
- 860 Rochette, S., Huret, M., Rivot, E. & Pape, O.L. 2012. Coupling hydrodynamic and
861 individual-based models to simulate long-term larval supply to coastal nursery areas.
862 *Fisheries Oceanography*, **21**, 229–242.
- 863 Rochette, S., Le Pape, O., Vigneau, J. & Rivot, E. 2013. A hierarchical Bayesian model
864 for embedding larval drift and habitat models in integrated life cycles for exploited fish.
865 *Ecological Applications*, **23**, 1659–1676.
- 866 Rochette, S., Rivot, E., Morin, J., Mackinson, S., Riou, P. & Le Pape, O. 2010. Effect of
867 nursery habitat degradation on flatfish population: Application to *Solea solea* in the
868 Eastern Channel (Western Europe). *Journal of sea Research*, **64**, 34–44.
- 869 Rogers, L.A., Storvik, G.O., Knutsen, H., Olsen, E.M. & Stenseth, N.C. 2017. Fine-Scale
870 Population Dynamics in a Marine Fish Species Inferred from Dynamic State-Space
871 Models. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **86**, 888–898.
- 872 Royle, J.A., Chandler, R.B., Sollmann, R. & Gardner, B. 2013. *Spatial capture-recapture*.
873 Academic Press.
- 874 Selkoe, K.A., Henzler, C.M. & Gaines, S.D. 2008. Seascape genetics and the spatial
875 ecology of marine populations. *Fish and fisheries*, **9**, 363–377.
- 876 Sley, A., Jawad, L.A., Hajjej, G., Jarboui, O. & Bouain, A. 2016. Morphometric and
877 Meristic Characters of Blue Runner *Caranx Crysos* and False Scad *Caranx Rhonchus*
878 (Pisces: Carangidae) from the Gulf of Gabes, Tunisia, Eastern Mediterranean. *Cah. Biol.*
879 *Mar*, **57**, 309–316.
- 880 Smith, P.J., Jamieson, A. & Birley, A.J. 1990. Electrophoretic studies and the stock
881 concept in marine teleosts. *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, **47**, 231–245.
- 882 Tanner, S.E., Reis-Santos, P. & Cabral, H.N. 2016. Otolith Chemistry in Stock
883 Delineation: A Brief Overview, Current Challenges and Future Prospects. *Fisheries*
884 *research*, **173**, 206–213.

- 885 Ulrich, C., Hemmer-Hansen, J., Boje, J., Christensen, A., Hüsey, K., Sun, H. & Clausen,
886 L.W. 2017. Variability and connectivity of plaice populations from the Eastern North Sea
887 to the Baltic Sea, part II. Biological evidence of population mixing. *Journal of sea*
888 *research*, **120**, 13–23.
- 889 Ying, Y., Chen, Y., Lin, L. & Gao, T. 2011. Risks of Ignoring Fish Population Spatial
890 Structure in Fisheries Management. *Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic*
891 *Sciences*, **68**, 2101–2120.
- 892 Zemeckis, D.R., Martins, D., Kerr, L.A. & Cadrin, S.X. 2014. Stock identification of
893 Atlantic cod (*Gadus morhua*) in US waters: An interdisciplinary approach. *ICES Journal*
894 *of Marine Science*, **71**, 1490–1506.

APPENDIX A

MODEL STRUCTURE AND E-SURGE SPECIFICATION

E-SURGE (Choquet & Nogue 2010) is used to implement multi-event models which are defined by steps representing biological and observation process. Each process is associated to a row-stochastic matrix for which each row corresponds to a multinomial distribution. All cells probability in the same row must sum to one and so one parameter is defined as the complement of the others (i.e. $1 - \sum \text{others}$) and is denoted by the symbol $*$ in the following matrices. Cells with probabilities fixed at 0 are denoted with a dash (-). Matrices rows correspond to the starting state and columns correspond to the arrival state. In our multi-event model, we consider 16 biological states to inform on the true fate of individuals at each occasion:

$$\{A_{WC}, A_{UK}, A_{FrW}, A_{FrE}, A_{NS}, F_{WC}, F_{UK}, F_{FrW}, F_{FrE}, F_{NS}, M_{WC}, M_{UK}, M_{FrW}, M_{FrE}, M_{NS}, \dagger\}$$

State A relates to live fish, state F relates to fish killed by fishing and state M relates to fish dying of natural causes, all located respectively in areas WC, UK, FrW, FrE, NS (Figure 1). An extra state \dagger is introduced to represent an unobservable dead state which discriminates between the “newly dead” fish from the unobservable “long-time-dead” fish (Lebreton *et al.* 1999; Fernández-Chacón *et al.* 2016). This state is required to estimate the detection rate of fish caught by the fisheries and to distinguish the different causes of mortality. In practice, a fish, that died from fishing or natural causes at time step t , is assigned to the state “long time dead” at the time step $t + 1$ and can not change of state afterwards.

Initialization

Table A1: Matrix I: initial state probabilities (π) are assigned to alive state only, because tagging is performed on alive fish only.

A_{WC}	A_{UK}	A_{FrW}	A_{FrE}	A_{NS}	F_{WC}	F_{UK}	F_{FrW}	F_{FrE}	F_{NS}	M_{WC}	M_{UK}	M_{FrW}	M_{FrE}	M_{NS}	†
*	π	π	π	π	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Dispersal

The first five rows of matrix D corresponds to fish that are alive at time t and move (or not) during the transition to time $t + 1$. For instance, $\phi_{WC,UK}$ is the probability for a fish in state A_{WC} at time t to move from the WC area to the UK area and be in state A_{UK} at time step $t + 1$. The last 10 rows correspond to fish that are dead and by definition cannot move to another area and hence cannot change state at time $t + 1$.

Table A2: Matrix D: migration probabilities ($\Phi_{i,j}$).

	A_{WC}	A_{UK}	A_{FrW}	A_{FrE}	A_{NS}	F_{WC}	F_{UK}	F_{FrW}	F_{FrE}	F_{NS}	M_{WC}	M_{UK}	M_{FrW}	M_{FrE}	M_{NS}	†
A_{WC}	*	$\phi_{WC,UK}$	$\phi_{WC,FrW}$	$\phi_{WC,FrE}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
A_{UK}	$\phi_{UK,WC}$	*	$\phi_{UK,FrW}$	$\phi_{UK,FrE}$	$\phi_{UK,NS}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
A_{FrW}	$\phi_{FrW,W}$	$\phi_{FrW,U}$	*	$\phi_{FrW,Fr}$	$\phi_{FrW,N}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
A_{FrE}	$\phi_{FrE,W}$	$\phi_{FrE,U}$	$\phi_{FrE,Fr}$	*	$\phi_{FrE,NS}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
A_{NS}	-	$\phi_{NS,UK}$	$\phi_{NS,FrW}$	$\phi_{NS,FrE}$	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
F_{WC}	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
F_{UK}	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
F_{FrW}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
F_{FrE}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
F_{NS}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
M_{WC}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
M_{UK}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
M_{FrW}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
M_{FrE}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
M_{NS}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
†	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1

Survival

After movement, fish survive (or not) following the survival transition matrix S . τ^f is the probability of dying from fishing and τ^m from natural causes. The first five rows of matrix S corresponds to fish that are alive at time t and can survive or not during the transition to time $t + 1$. The last 10 rows correspond to fish that are 'long-time-dead'. τ^f and τ^m are input from external knowledge (see section 2.4.2., ICES 2017) and are not estimated from the tagging data in E-SURGE.

Table A3: Matrix S : calculation of survival probabilities with fishing mortality probabilities (τ^f) and natural mortality probabilities (τ^m). Survival probabilities are fixed parameters from stock assessment evaluation (ICES 2017).

	A_{WC}	A_{UK}	A_{FrW}	A_{FrE}	A_{NS}	F_{WC}	F_{UK}	F_{FrW}	F_{FrE}	F_{NS}	M_{WC}	M_{UK}	M_{FrW}	M_{FrE}	M_{NS}	†
A_{WC}	*	-	-	-	-	τ^f	-	-	-	-	τ^m	-	-	-	-	-
A_{UK}	-	*	-	-	-	-	τ^f	-	-	-	-	τ^m	-	-	-	-
A_{FrW}	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	τ^f	-	-	-	-	τ^m	-	-	-
A_{FrE}	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	τ^f	-	-	-	-	τ^m	-	-
A_{NS}	-	-	-	-	*	-	-	-	-	τ^f	-	-	-	-	τ^m	-
F_{WC}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
F_{UK}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
F_{FrW}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
F_{FrE}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
F_{NS}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
M_{WC}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
M_{UK}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
M_{FrW}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
M_{FrE}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
M_{NS}	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
†	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1

First encounter event

This matrix is defined differently for the first encounter event (tag-release, $k = 1$) than for the second encounter event (tag-recovery $k = 2$).

Table A4: Matrix B: events and corresponding model states for the first encounter. Fish are captured in their respective area without errors.

	not seen	captured WC	in captured UK	in captured FrW	in captured FrE	in captured NS
A_{WC}	-	1	-	-	-	-
A_{UK}	-	-	1	-	-	-
A_{FrW}	-	-	-	1	-	-
A_{FrE}	-	-	-	-	1	-
A_{NS}	-	-	-	-	-	1
F_{WC}	1	-	-	-	-	-
F_{UK}	1	-	-	-	-	-
F_{FrW}	1	-	-	-	-	-
F_{FrE}	1	-	-	-	-	-
F_{NS}	1	-	-	-	-	-
M_{WC}	1	-	-	-	-	-
M_{UK}	1	-	-	-	-	-
M_{FrW}	1	-	-	-	-	-
M_{FrE}	1	-	-	-	-	-
M_{NS}	1	-	-	-	-	-
†	1	-	-	-	-	-

Second encounter event

The second elementary matrix presents the probability of each state given the observation for the second and solely encounter ($k = 2$). In the second encounter event, only fish caught by the fishery can be seen. The matrix contains the detection rates ψ :

Table A5: Matrix B: events and corresponding model states for the second and solely encounter. Only fish captured by the fisheries can be recaptured. Detection rate ψ is estimated from the data.

	not seen	captured WC	in captured UK	in captured FrW	in captured FrE	in captured NS
A_{WC}	1	-	-	-	-	-
A_{UK}	1	-	-	-	-	-
A_{FrW}	1	-	-	-	-	-
A_{FrE}	1	-	-	-	-	-
A_{NS}	1	-	-	-	-	-
F_{WC}	*	ψ	-	-	-	-
F_{UK}	*	-	ψ	-	-	-
F_{FrW}	*	-	-	ψ	-	-
F_{FrE}	*	-	-	-	ψ	-
F_{NS}	*	-	-	-	-	ψ
M_{WC}	1	-	-	-	-	-
M_{UK}	1	-	-	-	-	-
M_{FrW}	1	-	-	-	-	-
M_{FrE}	1	-	-	-	-	-
M_{NS}	1	-	-	-	-	-
†	1	-	-	-	-	-

GOODNESS-OF-FIT TEST

Goodness-of-fit (GOF) tests are an important component of capture-recapture modeling: they are used to assess the accuracy of a model in capturing the variance of the data (Pradel *et al.* 2005). The GOF test is divided into two components the 3G test, which compares the capture histories of newly-tagged and previously-tagged individuals released at the same time, and the M component testing a trap-dependence effect by comparing future capture histories between individuals released on the current occasion versus individuals released on a previous occasion, for all individuals that are seen again. In our case study, the 3G test does not exist, because our datasets only includes dead recoveries (Gauthier & Lebreton 2008). The GOF test then relies on the M component only.

GOF is performed on a reduced model that considers parameters to be state and time-dependent with only six states 'dead' or 'alive' in each area (Pradel *et al.* 2003; Duriez *et al.* 2009; Fernández-Chacón *et al.* 2016). GOF cannot handle multiple unobservable states and models with more than 10 different events. We then pooled together subareas of the EEC and summarized observations in seven types of events (not encountered = 0, encountered alive in WC = 1, recovered dead in WC = 4, encountered alive in EEC = 2, recovered dead in ECC = 5, encountered alive in NS = 3, recovered dead in NS = 6). The GOF test was conducted prior to model selection using the U-CARE software (version 2.2, Choquet *et al.* 2009). The GOF test performed on our data was significant revealing a lack-of-fit ($\chi^2 = 57.476$, $P = 0.000$ and $df = 24$) to the general Arnason-Schwarz model (Pradel *et al.* 2003). To address this χ^2 of the GOF test divided by the total number of degrees of freedom, to correct for potential lack of fit (Burnham & Anderson 2003; Choquet *et al.* 2009; Fernández-Chacón *et al.* 2016).